OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

SECOND SESSION—EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

60-61 VICTORIA, 1897

VOL. XLIV.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTY-FIFTH DAY OF MARCH TO THE NINETEENTH DAY OF MAY INCLUSIVE

OTTAWA
PRINTED BY S. E. DAWSON, PRINTER TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1897

MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

OF THE

HONOURABLE WILFRID LAURIER

AT THE OPENING OF THE

SECOND SESSION OF THE EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

1897

(CABINET FORMED 13TH JULY, 1896)

President of the Privy Council (Premier)	Hon. WILFRID LAURIER.
Minister of Trade and Commerce	Hon. Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT, K.C.M.G.
Secretary of State	Hon. R. W. SCOTT.
Minister of Justice	Hon. Sir OLIVER MOWAT, K.C.M.G.
Minister of Marine and Fisheries	Hon. L. H. DAVIES.
Minister of Militia and Defence	Hon. F. W. BORDEN.
Postmaster General	Hon. W. MULOCK.
Minister of Agriculture	Hon. S. A. FISHER.
Minister of Public Works	Hon. J. I. TARTE.
Without Portfolio	Hon. R. R. DOBELL.
Minister of Finance	Hon. W. S. FIELDING.
Minister of Railways and Canals	Hon. A. G. BLAIR.
Without Portfolio	Hon. C. A. GEOFFRION.
Minister of the Interior	Hon. CLIFFORD SIFTON.

[*Not in the Cabinet.*]

Solicitor General	Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK.
Controller of Customs	Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON.
Controller of Inland Revenue	Hon. Sir H. G. JOLY DE LOTBINIÈRE, K.C.M.G.

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

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS:

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

OFFICIAL REPORTERS:

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

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

CONSTITUENCIES AND MEMBERS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SECOND SESSION OF THE EIGHTH PARLIAMENT OF THE DOMINION OF CANADA

1897.

ADDINGTON—John W. Bell.
ALBERT—William J. Lewis.
ALBERTA—Frank Oliver.
ALGOMA—Albert Edward Dyment.
ANNAPOLIS—John B. Mills.
ANTIGONISH—Colin F. McIsaac.
ARGENTEUIL—Thomas Christie.
ASSINIBOIA, East—James Moffat Douglas.
ASSINIBOIA, West—Nicholas Flood Davin.

BAGOT—Flavien Dupont.
BEAUCE—Joseph Godbout.
BEAUHARNOIS—Joseph Gédéon Horace Bergeron.
BELLECHASSE—Onésiphore Ernest Talbot.
BERTHIER—Cléophas Beausoleil.
BONAVENTURE—Jean François Guité.
BOTHWELL—James Clancy.
BRANDON—Hon. Clifford Sifton.
BRANT, S. Riding—Charles Bernhard Heyd.
BROCKVILLE—Hon. John Fisher Wood.
BROME—Hon. Sidney Arthur Fisher.
BRUCE, E. Riding—Henry Cargill.
BRUCE, N. Riding—Alexander McNeill.
BRUCE, W. Riding—John Tolmie.
BURRARD—George Ritchie Maxwell.

CAPE BRETON—{Hector F. McDougall. / Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, Bart.
CARDWELL—William Stubbs.
CARLETON (N.B.)—Frederic Harding Hale.
CARLETON (O.)—William T. Hodgins.
CHAMBLY AND VERCHÈRES—Hon. C. A. Geoffrion.
CHAMPLAIN—François Arthur Marcotte.
CHARLEVOIX—Louis Charles A. Angers.
CHARLOTTE—Gilbert W. Ganong.
CHATEAUGUAY—James Pollock Brown.
CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY—Paul V. Savard.
COLCHESTER—Firman McClure.
COMPTON—Rufus Henry Pope.
CORNWALL AND STORMONT—John Goodall Snetsinger.
CUMBERLAND—Hance J. Logan.

DIGBY—Albert J. S. Copp.
DORCHESTER—Jean Baptiste Morin.
DRUMMOND AND ARTHABASKA—Joseph Lavergne.
DUNDAS—Andrew Broder.
DURHAM, E. Riding—Thomas Dixon Craig.
DURHAM, W. Riding—Robert Beith.

ELGIN, E. Riding—Andrew B. Ingram.
ELGIN, W. Riding—George Elliott Casey.
ESSEX, N. Riding—William McGregor.
ESSEX, S. Riding—Mahlon K. Cowan.

FRONTENAC—David Dickson Rogers.

GASPÉ—Rodolphe Lemieux.
GLENGARRY—Roderick R. McLennan.
GLOUCESTER—Théotime Blanchard.
GRENVILLE, S. Riding—John Dowsley Reid.
GREY, E. Riding—Thomas S. Sproule.
GREY, N. Riding—Hon. Wm. Paterson.
GREY, S. Riding—George Landerkin.
GUYSBOROUGH—Duncan C. Fraser.

HALDIMAND AND MONCK—Hon. Walter H. Montague
HALIFAX—{Robert L. Borden. / Benjamin Russell.
HALTON—David Henderson.
HAMILTON—{Thomas Henry MacPherson. / Andrew Trew Wood.
HANTS—Allen Haley.
HASTINGS, E. Riding—Jeremiah M. Hurley.
HASTINGS, N. Riding—Alexander W. Carscallen.
HASTINGS, W. Riding—Henry Corby.
HOCHELAGA—J. Alexander Camille Madore.
HUNTINGDON—Julius Scriver.
HURON, E. Riding—Peter Macdonald.
HURON, S. Riding—John McMillan.
HURON, W. Riding—Malcolm Colin Cameron.

INVERNESS—Angus McLennan.

JACQUES CARTIER—Frederick D. Monk.

JOLIETTE—Charles Bazinet.

KAMOURASKA—Henry George Carroll.
KENT (N.B.)—George V. McInerney.
KENT (O.)—Archibald Campbell.
KING'S (N.B.)—James Domville.
KING'S (N.S.)—Hon. Frederick W. Borden.
KING'S (P.E.I.)—Augustine Colin Macdonald.
KINGSTON—Byron Moffat Britton.

LABELLE—J. Henri N. Bourassa.
LAMBTON, E. Riding—John Fraser.
LAMBTON, W. Riding—James Frederick Lister.
LANARK, N. Riding—Bennett Rosamond.
LANARK, S. Riding—Hon. John Graham Haggart.
LAPRAIRIE AND NAPIERVILLE—Dominique Monet.
L'ASSOMPTION—Joseph Gauthier.
LAVAL—Thomas Fortin.
LEEDS AND GRENVILLE, N. Riding—Francis Theodore Frost.
LEEDS, S. Riding—George Taylor.
LENNOX—Uriah Wilson.
LÉVIS—Pierre Malcolm Guay.
LINCOLN AND NIAGARA—William Gibson.
LISGAR—Robert Lorne Richardson.
L'ISLET—Arthur Miville Dechêne.
LONDON—Thomas Beattie.
LOTBINIÈRE—Côme Isaïe Rinfret.
LUNENBURG—Charles Edwin Kaulbach.

MACDONALD—Mr. Rutherford.
MAISONNEUVE—Raymond Préfontaine.
MARQUETTE—William James Roche.
MASKINONGÉ—Joseph Hormisdas Legris.
MÉGANTIC—George Turcot.
MIDDLESEX, E. Riding—James Gilmour.
MIDDLESEX, N. Riding—Valentine Ratz.
MIDDLESEX, S. Riding—Malcolm McGugan.
MIDDLESEX, W. Riding—William Samuel Calvert.
MISSISQUOI—Daniel Bishop Meigs.
MONTCALM—Louis E. Dugas.
MONTMAGNY—Philippe A. Choquette.
MONTMORENCY—Thomas Chase Casgrain.
MONTREAL, St. Anne—Michael Joseph Francis Quinn.
MONTREAL, St. Antoine—Thomas G. Roddick.
MONTREAL, St. James—Odilon Desmarais.
MONTREAL, St. Lawrence—Edward Goff Penny.
MONTREAL, St. Mary—Hercule Dupré.
MUSKOKA—George McCormick.

NEW WESTMINSTER—Aulay Morrison.
NICOLET—Fabien Boisvert.
NIPISSING—James B. Klock.
NORFOLK, N. Riding—John Charlton.
NORFOLK, S. Riding—Hon. David Tisdale.
NORTHUMBERLAND (N.B.)—James Robinson.
NORTHUMBERLAND (O.) E. R.—Edward Cochrane.
NORTHUMBERLAND (O.) W. R.—George Guillet.

ONTARIO, N. Riding—Duncan Graham.
ONTARIO, S. Riding—Leonard Burnett.
ONTARIO, W. Riding—Hon. James David Edgar.
OTTAWA (City)—Napoléon A. Belcourt. / William Hutchison.
OXFORD, N. Riding—James Sutherland.
OXFORD, S. Riding—Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright, K.C.M.G.

PEEL—John Featherston.
PERTH, N. Riding—Alexander Ferguson MacLaren.
PERTH, S. Riding—Dilman Kinsey Erb.
PETERBOROUGH, E. Riding—John Lang.
PETERBOROUGH, W. Riding—James Kendry,
PICTOU—Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, K.C.M.G. / Adam Carr Bell.
PONTIAC—William Joseph Poupore.
PORTNEUF—Hon. Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière, K.C.M.G.
PRESCOTT—Isidore Proulx.
PRINCE, East (P.E.I.)—John Yeo.
PRINCE, West (P.E.I.)—Stanislaus F. Perry.
PRINCE EDWARD—William Varney Pettet.
PROVENCHER—Alphonse A. C. LaRivière.

QUEBEC, Centre—François Langelier.
QUEBEC, East—Hon. Wilfrid Laurier.
QUEBEC, West—Hon. Richard Reid Dobell.
QUEBEC (County)—Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick.
QUEEN'S, East (P.E.I.)—Alexander Martin.
QUEEN'S, West (P.E.I.)—Hon. Louis Henry Davies.

RENFREW, N. Riding—Thomas Mackie.
RENFREW, S. Riding—John Ferguson.
RESTIGOUCHE—John McAlister.
RICHELIEU—Arthur Aimé Bruneau.
RICHMOND (N.S.)—Joseph A. Gillies.
RICHMOND AND WOLFE (Q.)—Michael Thomas Stenson.
RIMOUSKI—J. B. Romuald Fiset.
ROUVILLE—Louis Philippe Brodeur.
RUSSELL—William Cameron Edwards.

ST. HYACINTHE—Michel E. Bernier.
ST. JOHN (N.B.) City—John Valentine Ellis.
ST. JOHN (N.B.) City and Co.—Joseph John Tucker.
ST. JOHN AND IBERVILLE—Hon. Joseph Israel Tarte.
SASKATCHEWAN—Thomas Osborne Davis.
SELKIRK—John Alexander Macdonell.
SHEFFORD—Charles Henry Parmalee.
SHELBURNE AND QUEEN'S—Hon. William Stevens Fielding.
SHERBROOKE—Hon. Wm. Bullock Ives.
SIMCOE, E. Riding—William H. Bennett.
SIMCOE, N. Riding—Dalton McCarthy.
SIMCOE, S. Riding—Richard Tyrwhitt.
SOULANGES—Augustin Bourbonnais.
STANSTEAD—Alvin Head Moore.
SUNBURY AND QUEEN'S (N.B.)—Hon. A. G. Blair.

TÉMISCOUATA—Charles Eugène Pouliot.
TERREBONNE—Léon Adolphe Chauvin.
THREE RIVERS AND ST. MAURICE—Hon. Sir Adolphe Caron, K.C.M.G.

TORONTO, Centre—William Lount.
TORONTO, East—John Ross Robertson.
TORONTO, West—{Edward Frederick Clarke. / Edmund Boyd Osler.
TWO MOUNTAINS—Joseph Arthur C. Ethier.

VANCOUVER—William Wallace Burns McInnes.
VAUDREUIL—Henry Stanislaus Harwood.
VICTORIA (B.C.)—{Thomas Earle. / Hon. Edward Gawler Prior.
VICTORIA (N.B.)—Hon. John Costigan.
VICTORIA (N.S.)—John L. Bethune.
VICTORIA (O.) N. Riding—Samuel Hughes.
VICTORIA (O.) S. Riding—George McHugh.

WATERLOO, N. Riding—Joseph E. Seagram.
WATERLOO, S. Riding—James Livingston.
WELLAND—William McCleary.
WELLINGTON, C. Riding—Andrew Semple.
WELLINGTON, N. Riding—James McMullen.
WELLINGTON, S. Riding—Christian Kloepfer.
WENTWORTH AND BRANT, N. Riding—James Somerville.
WENTWORTH, S. Riding—Thomas Bain.
WESTMORELAND—Henry A. Powell.
WINNIPEG—Richard Willis Jameson.
WRIGHT—Louis N. Champagne.

YALE AND CARIBOO—Hewitt Bostock.
YAMASKA—Roch Moïse Samuel Mignault.
YARMOUTH—Thomas Barnard Flint.
YORK (N.B.)—Hon. George Eulas Foster.
YORK (O.) E. Riding—William Findlay Maclean.
YORK (O.) N. Riding—Hon. William Mulock.
YORK (O.) W. Riding—N. Clarke Wallace.

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

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

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

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION—EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 25th March, 1897.

The Parliament which had been prorogued from time to time, was now commanded to assemble on the 25th day of March, 1897, for the despatch of business.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

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

MR. SPEAKER,—

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

Accordingly, the House went up to the Senate Chamber.

And the House being returned,

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

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

For the Electoral District of the South Riding of the County of Brant;

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

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

For the Electoral District of Champlain ; and

For the Electoral District of Colchester.

In all of which electoral districts the elections were declared void.

Mr. SPEAKER also informed the House that in conformity with chapter 9, section 46 of the Revised Statutes he had issued his several warrants to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out new writs of election for the said electoral districts respectively.

Mr. SPEAKER also informed the House that he had received from the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada a certified copy of the judgment of the said court in the Election Appeal for the Electoral District of Prince (West) P.E.I., confirming the report of the trial judges in the court below, declaring the election void.

Mr. SPEAKER also informed the House that in conformity with chapter 9, section 46 of the Revised Statutes, he had issued his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

ELECTION PETITIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER further informed the House that he had received from the Judges selected for the trial of Election Petitions, pursuant to "The Dominion Controverted Elections Act," certificates and reports relating to the elections :

For the Electoral District of Terrebonne ;

For the Electoral District of Two Mountains ;

For the Electoral District of Nicolet ;

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

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

For the Electoral District of the East Riding of the County of Northumberland, O. ;

For the Electoral District of Maskinongé ;

For the Electoral District of Three Rivers and St. Maurice ;

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

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

For the Electoral District of West Toronto ;

For the Electoral District of the East Riding of the County of York, O. ;

For the Electoral District of Pontiac ;

For the Electoral District of St. Antoine, Montreal ;

For the Electoral District of St. Lawrence, Montreal ; and

For the Electoral District of West Toronto.

By which the said election petitions were severally dismissed, and the sitting members declared duly elected.

REVISED EDITION.

VACANCIES.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House, that during the recess, he received communications from several members notifying him that the following vacancies had occurred in the representation, viz. :—

Of Darby Bergin, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Cornwall and Stormont, by decease ;

Of William LeBouthillier Fauvel, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Bonaventure, by decease ; and

Of Charles Ramsay Devlin, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Wright, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER further informed the House, that during the recess, the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, certificates of the elections and return of the following members, viz. :—

Of Thomas Osborne Davis, Esq., for the Electoral District of Saskatchewan ;

Of the Hon. Clifford Sifton, for the Electoral District of Brandon ;

Of John Goodall Snetsinger, Esq., for the Electoral District of Cornwall and Stormont ;

Of Charles Bernhard Heyd, Esq., for the Electoral District of the South Riding of the County of Brant ;

Of Duncan Graham, Esq., for the Electoral District of the North Riding of the County of Ontario ; and

Of William H. Bennett, Esq., for the Electoral District of the East Riding of the County of Simcoe.

MEMBERS INTRODUCED.

Hon. Clifford Sifton, Member for the Electoral District of Brandon, introduced by the Prime Minister (Mr. Laurier) and Mr. Sutherland.

William H. Bennett, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of the East Riding of the County of Simcoe, introduced by Sir Charles Tupper and Mr. Haggart.

John Goodall Snetsinger, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Cornwall and Stormont, introduced by the Prime Minister (Mr. Laurier) and Mr. Sutherland.

Duncan Graham, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of the North Riding of the County of Ontario, introduced by the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) and Mr. Douglas.

Charles Bernhard Heyd, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of the South Riding of the County of Brant, introduced by the Prime Minister (Mr. Laurier) and the Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson).

Thomas Osborne Davis, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Saskatchewan, introduced by the Prime Minister (Mr. Laurier) and Mr. Sutherland.

Mr. SPEAKER.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 1) respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(The Prime Minister, Mr. Laurier.)

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

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

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons.

In welcoming you on your attendance at the Second session of the present Parliament, I desire to express the gratification I feel at the evidences which prevail throughout the Dominion, of the loyalty and affection entertained by the Canadian people for Her Majesty the Queen and of the desire to join with their fellow-subjects in all parts of the Empire in celebrating the Diamond Jubilee in a manner worthy the joyous event. And I am pleased to be able also to announce that in accordance with an invitation from the Imperial Government, arrangements are being made for an effective representation of the Dominion in connection with the commemoration of this historic occasion at the Capital of the Empire.

Immediately after the last session, the Government of Manitoba was invited to hold a Conference with my Ministers on the subject of the grievances arising out of the Act of that Province relating to Education passed in the year 1890. In response to that invitation, three members of the Manitoba Government came to Ottawa, and after many and protracted discussions, a settlement was reached between the two Governments, which was the best arrangement obtainable under the existing conditions of this disturbing question. I confidently hope that this settlement will put an end to the agitation which has marred the harmony and impeded the development of our country, and will prove the beginning of a new era to be characterized by generous treatment of one another, mutual concessions and reciprocal good-will.

A measure will be submitted to you for the revision of the tariff, which it is believed will provide the necessary revenue, and, while having due regard to industrial interests, will make our fiscal system more satisfactory to the masses of the people.

You will be asked to give your support to a Bill abolishing the present expensive and unsatisfactory Franchise Act and adopting, for the

election of Members of the House of Commons, the Franchises of the several Provinces.

My Government has determined that the advantages to accrue, both to our Western producers and the business interests of the whole Dominion from the completion of the works for the enlargement of the St. Lawrence Canals, should no longer be deferred, and has, subject to the approval of Parliament, taken the initial steps for a vigorous prosecution of those works and for the perfecting of the Canal system by the close of the year 1898.

I have much satisfaction in informing you that arrangements have been concluded which, if you approve, will enable the Intercolonial Railway system to reach Montreal, and thus share in the large traffic centering in that city. The many advantages which will flow from this extension of that railway are apparent, and I have no doubt you will gladly approve of the proposal.

Appreciating the difficulties encountered by our farmers in placing their perishable food products on the English markets in good condition, my Government has arranged a complete system of cold storage accommodation at creameries, on railways, at ports and on steamers, by which these products can be preserved at the desired temperature during the whole journey from the point of production to Great Britain. The contracts made for this purpose will be laid before you.

It is desirable that the mind of the people of Canada should be clearly ascertained on the subject of prohibition, and a measure enabling the electors to vote upon the question will be submitted for your approval.

The Behring Sea Claims Convention constituted during the past year to adjust the damages payable to the owners of the British Sealing vessels, seized by the cruisers of the United States on the high seas, has completed taking the evidence submitted to it by the respective Governments of Her Majesty and the United States, and has adjourned for a time to hear the arguments thereon on behalf of both Governments. I indulge the hope that a final and satisfactory adjudication of those long delayed claims will now speedily be reached.

The calamity which has befallen our fellow-subjects in India has evoked a widespread sympathy in this country. The generous manner in which the appeal for practical tokens of this feeling has been responded to, has elicited warm assurances of grateful acknowledgment from the Government of India which have also been specially and heartily endorsed by the Imperial authorities.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

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

The Estimates for the coming year will be presented at an early day. They have been framed with every regard for economy consistent with the efficiency of the public service. I regret that the receipts from ordinary sources continue to be inadequate to meet the charges against the Consolidated Revenue. The proposed revision of the Tariff and the application of strict economy in the administration of the Government will, I trust, restore the equilibrium between income and expenditure.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

Among the Bills which have been prepared and will be submitted for your approval, are Bills amending the Superannuation Act and the Civil Service Act.

These and other measures, I commend to your earnest consideration and express the hope that your deliberations under the Divine guidance will tend to increase the happiness and prosperity of every class in the Dominion.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved:

That the Address with which His Excellency has been pleased to open the session be taken into consideration to-morrow.

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved:

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

Motion agreed to.

REPORTS.

Report of the Joint Librarians of Parliament for 1897.—(Mr. Speaker.)

Report of the Department of Trade and Commerce for 1896.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 26th March, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, if any difficulty presents itself in attempting to move a reply to the Address with which His Excellency the Governor General has been pleased to open the present session, it certainly does not arise from any want of material to form the basis of discussion. Perhaps I might be allowed at the very outset, to dispel any fear which any hon. gentleman may entertain of a too long discussion on my own part, by assuring the House in advance that I shall not feel obliged to deal with more than one in three of the numerous subjects which are treated in the Speech from the Throne. Those subjects are so numerous, Mr. Speaker, and so diverse, that we might very well be alarmed by the fear of a long and protracted session, if it were not for the fact that as to most of the questions at issue, I think I may fairly anticipate that there will not be any very serious differences of opinion between the two sides of this House. I may perhaps be a little sanguine, but I do think that it is quite possible that on most of the subjects which are presented for our consideration in this Speech, we shall be troubled with very little discussion of debatable principles, and that our attention will for the most part be confined to matters of detail. Whatever little opportunity I have had of observing the trend of public feeling in this country, whatever little skill I may have in discerning the spirit of the people throughout this Dominion, or rather in gathering the impressions of those who are wiser and have more experience than I have myself, has convinced me that the people of Canada are tired for the moment of political agitation, that the very violence and acrimony of the discussions in which we have been engaged during the immediately past few years have produced a feeling, perhaps not exactly of exhaustion, but at all events a disposition which longs for calmness and repose. Speaking for the great mass of the people of Canada in general—leaving out the extremists of whatever kind or description they may be—I think, Sir, that there is no one desire that is more widely entertained by our people, no one aspiration that is more fervently breathed by the people of this country, no one prayer that meets with a more profound response in the breasts of the people of this country, than that we may be allowed a short breathing space during which to forget the angry and bitter controversies in which we have been engaged, and which during the last few years have made so great and so inordinate a draught upon the public energy of this country.

I forbear to dwell upon those unhappy differences. The remembrance of them is grievous. It was a great comfort to me to know that even in the estimation of the distinguished and hon. gentleman who holds a position in this House, perhaps second only in importance, and hardly second in dignity to that of the leader of the House, the time had come when these angry controversies might be allowed to cease. It was, Sir, a great comfort to gentlemen on both sides of the House; it must have been peculiarly gratifying to hon. gentlemen on his own side, to hear his frank and unequivocal declaration, as I understood it, that he proposed for the future to confine himself to those subjects that come legitimately within the sphere of the political activity of Parliament, and to abandon the agitation of those exciting questions, which cannot be flung down, and which never yet have been flung down into the political arena without exciting the wildest and fiercest passions of which our human nature is susceptible. And, Sir, I think it would not at all be improper, for me to say further, that I have observed an interesting change in the hon. gentleman's manner in this House since those exciting controversies have been abandoned. I believe I have observed in the hon. gentleman, a spirit of mildness and sweet reasonableness, which well befits the unique position which he holds in this House; a spirit of fairness and equity which he has brought to the discussion of most of the questions, with which he has been called to deal, a spirit, I say, which is very engaging to many of us, especially the younger members of this House, who, while we cannot agree with that hon. gentleman, and while we cannot approve or endorse all that hon. gentleman has said and done throughout a very long and very distinguished public career, nevertheless entertain a high admiration for the Titanic force which has characterized his public life, an admiration which has led us to entertain with virtual and probably with absolute unanimity the desire that he may be spared for many long years and for many Parliaments if that were possible, to adorn the distinguished and honourable position which he now holds as leader of the Opposition.

I have said, Sir, that the public mind in respect to that exciting and once disturbing question is at rest. Thanks to the admirable spirit in which the question has been approached by the distinguished leader of this

House, to the remarkable calmness and evenness of temper which has been proof against every temptation to return blow for blow, to the Christian character which has enabled him to bear with equanimity, attacks which a smaller and meaner spirit would have angrily and bitterly resented; thanks to the wisdom that has inspired the soft answer that turneth away wrath, to the charity which has not been easily provoked, which beareth all things, hopeth all things, believeth all things, endureth all things; to that calm and restful and inexhaustible patience, which we have very high authority for saying is of the essence of genius, and which in every grave crisis of national affairs is the indispensable condition, if it is not the very basis of the highest statesmanship, we have been borne in safety through a crisis which was of a serious and alarming character; I will not say a crisis which threatened the national life of this country, because I think that none but pessimists and alarmists would concede so much to their fears as that, but a crisis which threatened to bring about in this country a condition of things similar to that of the United States in "the times that tried men's souls" before the federal constitution was adopted; a state of things presenting the kind of obstacles to stable and successful constitutional government which were encountered in the old province of Canada during the few years that preceded the union of the provinces. Local agitations there will be, of course, a recrudescence here and there of the furious spirit which was imported into our discussions and controversies of a twelve month ago, eddying circles of sectarian bitterness and rancour, but only such as to direct attention more conspicuously to the central current of peace and harmony that flows through this land for its enrichment in every branch of our national life. But in spite of these local and temporary agitations, I believe, that for the great mass of the people of Canada, the halcyon days have come. An epoch has been brought in not unworthy to be celebrated in the organ tones of Milton:

> The ocean now hath quite forgot to rave,
> While birds of calm sit brooding on the charmed wave.

There is one subject, Mr. Speaker, and one subject only, which I think will occasion any sharp divergencies of opinion in this House; and even as to that subject, I think our differences will be in the main of a theoretical rather than of a practical character. So far as our differences may be of a practical character, I believe they will largely concern mere matters of detail. Of course, there are differences of principle among the members of this House with respect to the kind of tariff that should be imposed upon the people of this country—differences of principle which might occupy volumes, which have occupied volumes in their discussion. It was not always so, Mr. Speaker. Twenty or twenty-five years ago the people of this country were all of one mind on this subject. There was then a universal and unquestioned concurrence among public men of all shades of politics throughout this country in the principle that a tariff was a tax—that it was at the very best a necessary evil, something to be endured only so long as it had to be endured, and to be got rid of if by any possible means it could be,—in the meantime, to be endured with what measure of patience we could command, to be kept within the narrowest possible limits, to be curtailed and hemmed in at every point and to be made to press as lightly as possible upon the incomes and resources of the people of this country. There is even a tradition floating in the minds of many people—I thought at one time that it was a historical fact, though I have heard its historical accuracy questioned—that when the mild and reasonable proposition was made in this House to advance our tariff from 15 to 17½ per cent, it was assailed here as the thin edge of the protectionist wedge. From that point to the present how great the distance that has been traversed. Now, I believe it is the received doctrine of Conservative orthodoxy that a tariff tax is not a necessary evil at all, but a thing intrinsically and essentially good.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Hear, hear.

Mr. RUSSELL. But from the beginning it was not so, as the hon. gentleman who says "hear, hear," will remember, that when we took our leap in the dark in 1878, the leader of the Conservative party in this country did not defend his position upon economic so much as on strategic grounds. We were to have trade restriction, not because it was a thing intrinsically good and excellent, but because it was to lead to the opening up of a still larger field of commercial freedom. It was the commercial freedom that was the good and excellent thing in itself, and we were to have only a temporary restriction of our commercial freedom as a means to an end, that end being the untrammelled freedom of our commerce which it is now the quintessence of Conservative protectionist orthodoxy, the "articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiæ" of the Conservative faith to consider one of the greatest evils with which any country can be afflicted. According to the present lights of Conservative orthodoxy in this House, a tariff tax is not a necessary evil, only to be endured for as short a time as possible, but a thing intrinsically good and excellent, —so good and excellent that even if it were not required for the purposes for which all tariffs are primarily devised it would nevertheless be desirable to have it for the sake of the collateral benefits it can be made to confer. It is a necessary and logical deduction from that proposition that even if by some

interposition of Providence, by some miracle of modern science, we were able to dispense with every dollar of taxation altogether, if we were able to provide for all the want and public services of the country—our railroads and waterways, our lighthouses, our fisheries protection, and all the thousand and one demands that wear upon the patience and good nature of the Minister of Finance, and of every Minister of Finance, it would nevertheless be necessary to levy an import tax for the purpose of preventing our domestic industries from going to destruction.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. RUSSELL. That irresistible logical deduction which seems to commend itself to the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite, appears on the contrary to us on this side of the House, and I would have said, but for the appearances to the contrary on the other side of the House—to the mind of every intelligent man in this country, to be the "reductio ad absurdum" of the principle that underlies the policy of protection. I, for one, believe that if it were possible for us to strike down all restrictions, to abolish all custom-houses, and to leave all men as free and untrammelled in the matter of buying where they choose and selling where they can get a market, as we leave them in regard to their conduct in every other respect, the fruits of freedom in this field would be just as beneficent as in every other field in which the bounds of human freedom have been enlarged.

We go still further, Mr. Speaker. We think there are evils attending the protective system in this country to-day which could not have been foreseen, or which, at all events as a matter of fact, were not foreseen eighteen years ago when that policy was first introduced. The odious system of trusts and combines which, I am frank enough to say, are in some cases more offensive to the feelings and sentiments of our people than they are actually injurious to their material interests, was not anticipated eighteen years ago. Hon. members of this House, one hon. gentleman in particular whom I have in mind, when they were ransacking the tombs and dissecting rooms to find the materials for the monstrous creation of 1878, never dreamed of the kind of merciless Frankenstein that they were bringing into life. Why, before ever I had any dream of entering this House I read with tears in my eyes almost——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. RUSSELL. I only said "almost." I read, at all events, with very deep emotion, I am bound to say, the very pathetic appeal that was made to this Parliament for the release of the North-west from the grinding monopoly caused by the operation of the tariff on agricultural machinery. That pathetic appeal might be paralleled by references to one item after another in the tariff which was imposed on this country in 1878.

We believe, further, that experience has proved that we were right in respect of most of the contentions that were made when that system was set up; but I do not intend to enter into the discussion of that experience or to discuss at great length those differences of principle that exist between this and the other side of the House with reference to this question. Those differences are vital, they are immense, they would take volumes to discuss; and if we did not think we could employ our time to better advantage, we might take up what remains of this winter and the bulk of the coming summer in discussing them. But the discussion would be largely of an academic nature. In the pregnant words of Mr. Cleveland, we are not dealing with a theory, we are facing a condition. The condition which Mr. Cleveland had to face was the condition of an overflowing treasury. The condition we have to face is the fact that, in spite of all the heavy imposts that have been placed upon our people, under the policy of the late Government, we have, nevertheless, a deficit to face, left to us as a legacy by the Government which has just gone out. We have public obligations to fulfil, we have our public credit to maintain, and public works to provide for, and there is no conceivable way that I know of in which a revenue can be raised in this country, short of direct taxation, which will not incidentally afford all the protection that any honest industry has a right to claim, even supposing we were to concede the validity of the protectionist idea, a doctrine which I, for one, do not for a single moment propose to concede. Speaking for myself, if this matter were "res integra," if we could cultivate our national inheritance as if we were cultivating on virgin soil, if there were no vested interests which have been created—most of them artificially created under that policy, and which have a right to claim that they ought not to be ruthlessly struck down, if there were no delicate fabric of national, corporate and individual finance, which may very fairly claim that it ought not to be too rudely shaken, then I believe the proper tariff for this, as for any, country should be that no articles whatever should be taxed, except such as we were bound to import, so that we could have, in its integrity, the good sound English principle that not a dollar should be taken out of the pockets of the people, under the operation of the tariff, which did not go directly into the treasury of the country. But no country can ignore its past history, and we cannot ignore our past history. We have been for eighteen years upon the wrong track. For eighteen years we have been pursuing the wrong policy, and we must get back to the right

policy by gradual and not by revolutionary processes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. RUSSELL. Did I not say, at the outset, that I thought we would not be very much divided in opinion? I trust, however, that in the tariff which is to be introduced by the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), he will be able to do what his predecessors in office attempted and endeavoured to do, but were never able to accomplish. I hope he will in reality be able to lop off the mouldering branches, to simplify, in many respects, the methods by which taxes are to be collected. I hope he will be able to eliminate the features of that tariff which make for monopoly, and to render its pressure upon the great and staple industries of the people, upon the farming, the mining and the fishing population of the Dominion—less oppressive than it is at present. If he can succeed in accomplishing this, he will fulfil all that can reasonably be expected of him; if he does less, it will be a disappointment to many of us; but, if he should attempt to do more, I am afraid that, in the effort to pursue a thing which is intrinsically good and worthy, by too hasty methods, he will injuriously affect the financial and industrial system of the country. I feel assured that he will do nothin which will injuriously affect the one or the other.

There is one aspect of the question I have not dwelt upon, but which I do not wish to pass over without some observations. We have had suggestions given to us in the pres that our conduct in respect of this matte is, to some extent, to be guided by the con duct of our neighbours to the south. Now, have no reason to suppose, and I think that nobody has any reason to suppose, that the United States Congress, in passing its legislation on the subject of its own tariff, has had any regard to any other than the interests of its own people, as it conceived them. I do not think it would be manly in us to whine over the matter or sensible in us to go into hysterics in applying the remedy by our own legislation. As they have legislated to suit themselves, so we propose to legislate here for the Dominion of Canada. We should not, in my judgment, act in a spirit of jingoism, or with a view to retaliation; but the Government that will in this crisis command the confidence of the people of this country must go forward with its legislation in a manly and self-reliant spirit, with an eye solely to the advancement of the interests of Canada and to its relations as a member of the great British Empire, of which we form a part.

There is one paragraph in the Speech from the Throne which has a peculiar interest for the people of the maritime provinces. It is of peculiar interest and importance to the people of those two sister cities, St. John and Halifax, which are competing in friendly rivalry for the trade of this great Dominion. I refer to the paragraph which promises us the extension of the Intercolonial into the city of Montreal. I believe it is the unanimous opinion, or the almost unanimous opinion of the merchants of Halifax, that in that extension of the Intercolonial into the city of Montreal lies their best hope of securing any fair share of the trade of this great country. With the Intercolonial commencing at Halifax and ending at Point Lévis, I think it is impossible for the people of Halifax, and not very easily possible for the people of St. John, to have any very considerable share of the trade of this country. The people of Halifax, I believe, are keenly interested in this matter, and will watch with very great interest the progress of the measure in this House.

The situation of Halifax in some respects is very difficult in regard to this matter of securing trade. The hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition knows very well that much of the trade which Halifax enjoyed in former years, has been parcelled out among the thriving towns throughout the province that have in late years been doing their business for themselves. It was promised to us many years ago that, in lieu of the trade that we were losing and had lost, we were to become the great winter port of the Dominion, the wharf of British America, and secure a continental trade to restore to us the commercial prestige that we formerly enjoyed.

We have watched, with great interest, with great anxiety, and some measure of despondency, the various expedients that have been resorted to to bring back to the port of Halifax the trade of which it has been deprived. The late Government I suppose endeavoured in good faith, but they endeavoured in vain, to do anything substantial in this direction, but though nothing of a substantial character has been accomplished, I do not despair that something substantial yet will be accomplished. I believe, however, that as a condition precedent to the bringing about of the state of affairs that we desire, we must have the extension of the Intercolonial into the city of Montreal, so that we may ignore, as much as possible, differences of distance and disadvantages of position as compared with Portland and Boston, and secure for the city of Halifax its fair and reasonable share of the trade of this country. We in the maritime provinces have borne great burdens for the development of the interior of the Dominion. We do not urge our sacrifices in any sectional spirit, we do not claim to have done anything exceptional in making such sacrifices as were necessary to develop the country, but we do entertain the hope that our friends in the west will remember these sacrifices, and that when the proper time comes they will insist upon our only real national highway being given such con-

nections and administered in such a spirit as will result in bringing to us more than the mere semblance of a traffic, the reality of which goes now and has gone for years and years, under the fostering care of a so-called national policy, to the enrichment of a foreign country.

There is one paragraph in the Speech which I approach, as I have no doubt some hon. gentlemen opposite will approach it, with some degree of trepidation. I refer to the passage which relates to the proposal to test the opinion of the country on the subject of a prohibitory liquor law. The question of a prohibitory law is not a party question in this country; it runs its line of cleavage through both political parties. and I fancy it will have very little respect to either party. It is not bound to have much respect to the lines of political parties as they are drawn in this country. Like an hon. friend whom I see on the other side of the House, I myself, possibly "in a moment of weakness," espoused the cause of prohibition. I found so many good and excellent people going in that direction that it seemed but natural for me to wish to bear them company. I have not yet seen reason to recant, but I cannot honestly say that I am as dead sure about the matter as I would like to be. My sympathies are, as those of all lovers of their country must be, entirely with the objects which these excellent people have in view. I entirely sympathise with them in their desire to do everything possible to mitigate and to remove, if possible, the evils that have been brought upon this country by intemperance, but I am not absolutely convinced that a prohibitory law is the best possible way. My faith has been somewhat shaken by a very important series of investigations that have recently been made, investigations conducted in the most scientific manner, and in the most unbiassed, impartial and altruistic spirit. There is clearer light upon this subject now than there was a few years ago. I do not allude to the labours of the Royal Commission which roamed over the country at very great expense and collected a vast mass not so much of evidence as of miscellaneous opinions bearing upon the liquor traffic. I allude rather to the voluntary commission of gentlemen in the United States of whose investigations a most interesting and instructive account has been published in the "Atlantic Monthly" of February last, under the hand of President Eliot, of Harvard University. I could wish that the results arrived at by that commission were more conclusive and more helpful than they are. So far as they go, I am sorry to say that these investigations do not establish that a prohibitory liquor law has been universally successful in the states in which it has been adopted or that it would, if adopted in this country, be the most effective means of curtailing—I suppose we cannot hope to abolish—the evils of the liquor traffic. I hope that those who are engaged in the agitation will give careful study to the results of that investigation. I believe that anybody who will deliberately close his eyes to the results of that investigation, will show that on this subject he prefers darkness to light. When the matter has been carefully considered by the people of this country, as I believe it will be carefully, soberly and impartially considered, if it should turn out that there is a pronounced majority in favour, a majority so pronounced as to afford reasonable ground for hoping that such an enactment can be enforced in this country, I believe it will be the duty of the Government to introduce such a measure and place it on the statute-book, and from that duty, I believe, the Government will not shrink.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have hardly kept faith with the House, for I said when I began to discuss the Speech that I would deal with only one in three of the subjects of which it treats. I find that I have reserved to the last that which constitutes the first paragraph of the Speech from the Throne, the paragraph in which His Excellency says:

> I desire to express the gratification I feel at the evidences which prevail throughout the Dominion, of the loyalty and affection entertained by the Canadian people for Her Majesty the Queen and of the desire to join with their fellow-subjects in all parts of the Empire in celebrating the Diamond Jubilee in a manner worthy of the joyous event.

I believe there is no part of the Empire in which that glorious occasion will be more cordially celebrated than in the Dominion of Canada, and no people by whom it will be more joyfully welcomed than by ours. Ten years ago, on the occasion of the jubilee of Her Majesty's accession, volume after volume was written to show the wonderful expansion and development of the British Empire during the Victorian era. I would not attempt to pass even in the briefest retrospect, the history of the Empire in the last sixty years. I prefer to confine myself to our own quarter of the world. We have in our own country abundant reasons for thankfulness and congratulation when we review the history of the Victorian age. Sixty years is not a very long period in the history of a great commonwealth, but it requires an effort of the imagination to recall the condition of things that existed in this country sixty years ago, and to contrast it with that which we see about us to-day. At the accession of our gracious Queen, these various colonies in British North America were travelling each in its own individual orbit; they were sundered by dissension of race and creed; some were even in open rebellion against the British sovereign; all of them were poor and sparsely settled, and none of them had even the semblance of parliamentary government.

To enumerate the various steps by which that condition of things has been changed, by which internal improvements have been secured and external commerce has expanded, by which the continent has been spanned with railways, and the oceans bridged with lines of palatial steamers, by which agricultural, fishing, mining and manufacturing industries have been expanded and developed, to show the steps by which our noble educational institutions have been established and endowed, and those still more noble and princely charities have been instituted, which bear witness to what is highest and best in our national life, would be to write the history of the Dominion for the last sixty years.

Time would fail me for even the faintest strokes that would go to compose a picture such as that. But there is one subject to which I will not refrain from referring. It has been said by one of the old New England governors, that the Almighty had sifted a whole nation that he might send choice grain into New England. We have been more highly blessed in this country, because in addition to the three strong races which form the basis of New England society, we have a fourth in this country; we have added the lightness, and brightness, the grace and genius of the French race. Time was in this country when English-speaking and the French-speaking people of Canada looked upon each other with jealousy and distrust, when our people of French descent cultivated deliberately a spirit of isolation from their English-speaking fellow-subjects; and when people of English race and English blood looked upon their French fellow-subjects and fellow-citizens with suspicion, if not hostility. Now such a state of things could not continue if this country was to become one great and united commonwealth. Nothing could be more fatal to the unification of this people of Canada than the continuance of such a spirit, and every true patriot in this country looked forward to the time when these antagonisms should pass away. But they looked in vain for many a long and weary year. It was a toilsome and painful ascent from those conditions to the conditions in which we find ourselves to-day. Within the past year or two, even within the past few months, we have witnessed in this country one of the most striking, one of the most interesting things that ever occurred in the history of any country; because the very question, the very agitation of all others which threatened to intensify and perpetuate those differences of race and creed, has been overruled, in the good providence of God, to weld into a permanent and indissoluble unity of esteem and affection those two races whose mutual antagonism in the estimation of many persons threatened the very foundations of the state. I have been recently reading a poem of Mrs. Browning's which is not perhaps as much read to-day as twenty years ago, in which she says in her own striking manner, "the English have a scornful, insular way of calling the French light." Sir, if that great and good woman could have lived to this day to witness the constancy and devotion of this people to a true ideal, and a trusted leader, she might well have compared their lightness to that of the bullet:

That dashes from the gun mouth while the eye
Winks and the heart beats one * *
* * Even so direct,
So sternly undivertible of aim
Is this French people.
"Set your orators
To blow upon them with loud windy mouths."

Array in order the strongest and the most persuasive influences that could be brought to bear to make them swerve from what they believe to be in the best interests of their race and faith—

This light French people will not thus be driven,
They turn indeed but then they turn upon
Some central pivot of their thought and choice,
And veer out by the force of holding fast.

And so, Sir, it has come about that by their constancy, and courage, by their devotion to what they knew to be right and fair and just, they have drawn to them every sound and honest English heart in this country; they have conquered the last fortress of prejudice among the English-speaking people of the Dominion. They have shown to us that this "scornful, insular English way" is in fact, what Hamerton in his essays years ago proved it to be, simply a species of narrow philistinism, and they have brought about an epoch which is eloquently described in the Speech from the Throne as "the beginning of a new era to be characterized by generous treatment of one another, and by mutual concessions and reciprocal good-will." We are about to hear from one of those hon. gentlemen to-day, who, I believe, is to address us in his own charming tongue, which it is one of my great regrets that I am able to follow so imperfectly. I do not feel justified in detaining the House for a single moment longer from the treat which is in store for those of us who are able to partake of it. Thanking you, Mr. Speaker, and thanking the House for the kind indulgence which has been shown me, I will conclude by moving that an humble Address be presented to His Excellency in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, it is not without a feeling of fear and of hesitation that I rise to second the motion of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell), that an humble address be presented to His Excellency in reply to the Speech from the Throne, and I must, at the outset, crave the indulgence of this House in behalf of one of its junior members.

Mr. Speaker, although I fully realize the difficulty of the task I have assumed in

rising to address the House under so solemn a circumstance, still I may say that I experience a particular pleasure in discharging this duty, on account of the honour which reflects on the constituency which I represent in this House, and because also of the opportunity it affords me of voicing the feelings of confidence placed by a large majority of the people of this country in the hon. gentlemen whom they have put at the head of affairs, on the 23rd June last, and in the wise and patriotic policy which they have pursued, since their accession to power. Mr. Speaker, after listening to the eloquent words fallen from the hon. member for Halifax, I feel that I could safely content myself with cheering the generous and patriotic words fallen from the hon. member who has so eloquently spoken of and so firmly adhered to the policy enunciated in the Speech from the Throne, and the legitimate hopes which it has evoked in our breasts for the future of our country. That policy, an outline of which we have just heard, shall be defined during the present session; meanwhile, let us, for a moment, divest ourselves of unfair prejudice begotten by party spirit, and examine, from a national standpoint, the official statements embodied in the Speech from the Throne. The Speech from the Throne mentions a fact unparalleled either in the records of the House of Commons of Canada, or in the annals of the legislative bodies of any other country. I mean the sixtieth anniversary of the reign of our august Sovereign, Queen Victoria. I think I am but voicing the feelings of the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House as well as those sitting opposite, when I say that, as loyal subjects of Her Majesty, we are proud of our Sovereign; that we all pray to Heaven that long may she continue to occupy the Throne of Great Britain, the noble woman who is the adornment of the nineteenth century and who, for the last sixty years has worn and still wears with such lustre the British Crown, of which Canada is, unquestionably, the brightest jewel. Complying with the invitation extended to him by the home government, the distinguished leader of this House will, no doubt, cross the Atlantic and go and testify to the devotion of the Canadian people, to their Queen and to their motherland. He will bear witness to the fact that on the banks of the St. Lawrence is found a young nation in which are blended British energy and the chivalrous spirit of France, Irish impetuosity and Scottish tenacity; a nation which, through the union of the English rose, the French fleur-de-lis, the Irish shamrock and the Scotch thistle, has grown and reached manhood, while loving and revering Victoria, Queen of the United Kingdom of England and Ireland.

Allow me now, Mr. Speaker, to say a few words concerning that burning and vexed Manitoba school question, which has been set at rest since last session. As a French-Canadian, and as one of the representatives of the province of Quebec, I deem it my duty to offer a few words on the matter. If I am asked on what ground I shall place myself to deal with this question, I may say, without any hesitation, that I will deal with it from a national standpoint, from the standpoint of a Canadian and of a member of Parliament who has given his oath to follow only the dictates of his own conscience, free alike from fear, violence or undue influence from whatsoever quarter or authority it may come. Political capital has been made out of this unhappy Manitoba school question. And what was the outcome of that agitation? For over six years the country has been disturbed by racial and creed wrangles, and by dissensions which have troubled the harmony which ought to prevail among the various elements of our population. For six years the public affairs have been paralyzed and the regular development of the country brought to a standstill. Now, through the settlement effected by the present Government and by the Manitoba government upon the basis of conciliation, peace and harmony have been restored within six months; a result which could not be attained by six long years of procrastination, provocation, nay more, of broken promises. And thus, to use the very words of the Speech from the Throne, begins a new era. Yes, let us hope that this is the beginning of a new era; let us hope that moderate men, irrespective of party ties, will join hands to promote harmony, peace and good-will among the several races and elements of our population. Ideas of conciliation shall prevail, I doubt not, and from the cliffs of Gaspé to the shores of the Pacific, there will no longer be found any Englishmen, Irishmen, Frenchmen and Scotchmen at war against each other, but only Canadians walking hand in hand, turning to the future with the brightest hope of grandeur and prosperity. It is high time that the country should be placed above political parties; let us render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's and to Canada what is her due. At all events, the result of the by-elections in Cornwall and Stormont, in Bonaventure and Wright——

Mr. LaRIVIERE. (Translation.) The hon. member should not forget the result in St. Boniface.

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) Those elections bear witness that the policy of conciliation pursued by the present Government is emphatically approved of and endorsed by the voters of the province of Quebec, and Champlain, I venture to say, will likewise express its approbation of the policy enunciated in the Speech from the Throne. Before dismissing this subject, let the hon. Prime Minister allow me to congratulate him on the part he has played in that policy of conciliation which, as I said, will usher

in a new era in the history of this country. The third paragraph of the Speech from the Throne is of the highest interest to the people of the Dominion. The reform of the tariff will be the object of a strong, systematical and judicious legislation, likely to prove satisfactory to the country, insomuch as it will show preferential treatment of the agricultural and working classes, in opposition to monopolies, while fostering our national industries and manufactures. The country is now going through one of those financial crises out of which parties unfortunately try to make political capital, but the hon. gentlemen opposite know very well in what sad condition the country was in when the Government of the day came into power; they are fully aware of the legacy they have bequeathed the Ministry, of the obligations imposed upon them and the grave issues which have to be solved. Immediate steps will, undoubtedly, be taken by the present Government, so as to restore the equilibrium in our budget, bring back prosperity to the country, produce a fiscal system which will prove satisfactory to the masses, and fulfil the legitimate demands of the farming and industrial community. Continuing its policy of economy and retrenchment, the Government announces the abolition of the Franchise Act. While effecting, by that policy, a saving of $250,000 for the revision of the lists, the Government secures to the several provinces of the confederation the respect of their autonomy, by adopting the franchises of the various provinces, for the election of members to the Federal Parliament The country and this House, irrespective of parties, will, I doubt not, hail with delight this wise and economical measure, so long expected and asked for. It can hardly be expected of me, Sir, that I should enter into the details of all the different measures mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. I may, however, point out here the importance for this country of the policy of deepening the St. Lawrence Canals, of extending the Intercolonial from Lévis to Montreal, and of establishing cold storage facilities on railways and on steamers, for the shipment of our farmers' products. The prosperity and progress of a country, says a writer, do not depend only on the wisdom of its statesmen, on the number of its institutions, on its higher education, but also on the facilities of communication whereby its inhabitants are enabled to exchange their products, their commodities and even to exchange their views and their thoughts. Such is the reason why the present Government express in the Speech from the Throne their intention of completing those important public works. Let us rise to the importance of the occasion and show ourselves worthy of a country so full of resources and promises. A great responsibility weighs upon our shoulders, as representatives of the people, entrusted by the country with the duty of watching over its development and prosperity, and, I venture to say, this responsibility assumes, under the circumstances, an exceptional importance, but I have no doubt that with the help of the enlightened and wise advisers of His Excellency and with the equally wise, patriotic and enlightened co-operation of this honourable House, the measures foreshadowed in the Speech from the Throne will be successfully carried out, causing trade, industry and agriculture to spring into new life and vigour. Allow me, Sir, to tender you my heartfelt thanks, as also to the hon. gentlemen in this House for the indulgent hearing you have granted me. My remarks have been prompted by the sole love of our common country, of this Canada of ours which, I doubt not, will play a distinguished and honourable part in the jubilee celebration to be held in London in June next. Let me before resuming my seat, repeat with the poet:

Canada Excelsior! Brille au premier rang!
Un peuple altier prend son essor chez toi, libre et franc,
Il sait, pour ta défense, signaler sa vaillance,
Vive Régina! Vive Victoria!

I second with pleasure the motion of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell).

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to me to have the opportunity of expressing the satisfaction with which I have listened to the able and eloquent speech delivered by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) in moving the Address, and the interesting speech, which I regret I was not as well able to follow, of the hon. member for Two Mountains (Mr. Ethier), who has just taken his seat. I need not say, Sir, that the hon. mover of the Address had a somewhat difficult task to discharge. An ideal free trader, as I believe that hon. gentleman has always professed himself to be, had to discharge the somewhat difficult task of preparing the House for a protectionist tariff. I do not regret that fact, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that I shall be only too happy to join him heartily in carrying out the policy which he has indicated as the one that the best interests of this country demand at the hands of the Government and of this House. It is a still more agreeable duty on my part to tender to the leader of the House, the First Minister, my most hearty congratulations upon the distinction which has been conferred upon Canada, as well as himself, by the invitation of the Imperial Government to take part in the celebration of the Diamond Jubilee. I need not say, Sir, that there is no person within the wide domain of Canada who will, in my view, not feel it fortunate for Canada that on such an occasion, when so great a compliment has been paid to this country, an hon. gentleman occupies the position of First Minister who is so well able to discharge the duties incident to that

hon. gentleman's position on so important and so august an occasion. I read with some astonishment a telegram from London, published a few days ago in the press here, referring to the fact that Canada was being penalized by having only one representative on this great and important occasion, while Australasia will be represented by no less than five Premiers, and the correspondent felt it was necessary that some suggestion should be offered to Her Majesty's Government in order to overcome that great disparity. I can only say that the person who committed himself to such an opinion knows very little of the position that Canada occupies in the estimation of the Empire. Sir, when Canada became a confederation, a great Dominion, she spoke with authority. She was represented at the heart of the Empire, before the Imperial Government, by a High Commissioner, who was charged with the duty of representing not a province, but the whole of this great Confederation, and I am happy to be able to testify that not only in regard to my predecessor but in regard to the gentleman who has succeeded me in that high office, the High Commissioner has on every occasion obtained the hearty support and co-operation of every one of the representatives in London of the autonomous colonies, which embrace all the colonies of Australasia and South Africa, and that all those representatives fully recognize that the Dominion of Canada is entitled to that precedence which gives its representative the position of leader of the colonial representatives in London. So on this occasion, Sir, although there might be, and I should have been very glad if there could be a representative from every one of the Australian and South African Colonies, the hon. First Minister would find that he would be associated with a body of gentlemen one and all of whom would recognize the precedence that Canada occupies in consequence of her advanced position as a Dominion. There is no ground for apprehension on the part of any person, that we will not be well, worthily and efficiently represented on that great occasion. This Diamond Jubilee is unique in itself. There has been no occasion in the world's history perhaps on which such a celebration has taken place at all corresponding in magnitude to this. It has been the good fortune of this great Empire that Her Majesty the Queen has throughout a longer period than any other ruler in the history of any other country filled the high position of Sovereign of the British Empire. Not only is that the case, but Her Majesty has the satisfaction of having witnessed during that long period a development in Great Britain itself and throughout the Empire that is unparalleled in the history of the world. Great and striking have been the advances made within the United Kingdom itself since Her Majesty ascended the Throne. When I remind hon. gentlemen opposite that 56 years ago, when I had the pleasure of visiting Great Britain for the first time, there was only a horse railway six miles in length in Scotland and a railway running from Liverpool to Manchester in England, and ask them to contrast that situation as regards railway operations with the present position in that country, they will grasp in a moment the tremendous and gigantic advances made in different directions relating to the progress, prosperity and grandeur of the United Kingdom. But great as has been the progress of the United Kingdom, the progress of the colonies has been still greater. Sixty years ago, at the time Her Majesty ascended the Throne, Australia was a terra incognita, a small portion of it only was practically known, and it was a penal settlement, and the site of the great city of Melbourne was occupied at that period by camps of aborigines, and in fact the creation of Australia and New Zealand as great colonies has taken place since Her Majesty ascended the Throne. This has been a revelation to the world. The same remark will apply to South Africa. I need not refer to the satisfactory progress made by the Dominion of Canada, or do more than mention the progress made by India and the extension of that vast Empire, but I desired briefly to call attention to the enormous progress made throughout the Empire during the benign reign of Her Majesty. It has not only been the good fortune of Her Majesty the Queen to witness this enormous development of the Empire under her sway, but it has been the greater good fortune of the people dwelling in every portion of this great Empire to recognize in Her Majesty a Sovereign of whom everyone is justly proud. It has been the good fortune of every subject of Her Majesty even in the most remote portions of the Empire to recognize that the Queen, whether as a woman, wife or sovereign, in fact in every relation of life, possessed all those great charms which endear her to the hearts of every one of her subjects. Sir, I am glad to know that Canada is not only to be represented by the Prime Minister at the Diamond Jubilee, but I also deem it to be a most happy suggestion on the part of the Imperial Government to signalize this great and important event by bringing together from the remote portions of the Empire the Premiers of the great autonomous colonies, and at the same time secure a suitable representation of the militia and military forces of Canada and the other colonies. I believe, Sir, that these matters may by some be regarded from an economical point of view as perhaps attended with some little expenditure and outlay; but I am in a position to say from knowledge gained by many years, residence in England that any expenditure connected with a display of that kind is utterly insignificant compared with the

enormous benefits it will confer on Canada by presenting before, not only the people of the United Kingdom, but people from the Continent of Europe and other countries that will be assembled in England on that occasion, an exhibition that is calculated to make a lasting impression on their minds as to the advance Canada has made in that as well as in other respects. I am quite sure that every hon. member will be only too happy to join in giving the Government the most hearty and cordial support in any measure proposed in connection with this great event calculated to give it that due importance to which it is in my judgment entitled.

Sir, I am obliged to pass rapidly to a less agreeable portion of my duty on the present occasion, and that is to offer some slight criticism in respect to what remains in this Address.

There is much of it to which I am not disposed to take any exception whatever, but I draw the attention of the hon. the First Minister to what I think trenches very nearly upon an unconstitutional attitude on the part of the Government of Canada in relation to the school question. I find it stated in the Address that:

> A settlement was reached between the two governments which was the best arrangement possible under the existing conditions.

Now, Sir, who authorized, where is the authority for a settlement being effected by this Government? Within the four corners of the constitution of this country I do not think you will find any authority for the action which the Government here declares it has taken. The Manitoba Act lays down, and the Act of Confederation defines what the position of the Parliament of Canada is, and what the position of the Government of Canada is in relation to the question of education. The constitution of our country declares that this Government has nothing whatever to do with the question of education except under particular circumstances. It provides that when any local legislature withdraws from the minority the rights which are guaranteed by the constitution and by the laws of the country, then, and not till then is this Government clothed with power to interfere in the slightest degree. Why, Sir, when the time came that the highest tribunal in the Empire declared that this condition of things existed, when the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council gave their judgment that the rights and privileges enjoyed under the law and the constitution of the country by the minority in Manitoba had been invaded, and that a grievance existed, and that the time had come when the appeal justly lay to the Government of Canada to redress that wrong; then, acting under that authority the Government of my predecessor, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, addresesd a Remedial Order which was strictly in conformity with the constitution of the country, calling upon the Government of Manitoba to provide by legislation for the restoration of these privileges which they had taken away from the Roman Catholic minority of Manitoba by the Act of 1890. And, Sir, when the Government of Manitoba refused to comply with that Remedial Order, then, and not till then, did the case arrive at such a position as that this Parliament was not only justified, but was called upon in the discharge of its duty to pass a Bill for the restoration of the privileges of which the Roman Catholic minority had been deprived. There is nothing else provided for in the constitution. It was the most natural thing that the Government of Canada should adopt and exhaust, (as its predecessors had done), every means in its power for the purpose of obtaining a satisfactory solution of this question; but in my judgment, there is nothing in the law nor in the constitution—on the contrary, I believe it to be an invasion of the principle laid down in the constitution for this Government to assume that it is in a position to make a settlement with anybody. I draw the attention of the hon. the First Minister to that, because although it may be considered a hypercriticism, I believe that a close examination will prove my suggestion to be well founded, and that there is no warrant in the constitution of our country for the course which the Government declares it has taken with regard to this question.

I have another objection to make to a statement in the Address, and I am bold enough to challenge the accuracy of that statement. The hope is expressed that:

> It will prove to be the beginning of a new era to be characterized by generous treatment of one another.

Sir, upon what grounds are these words put into the mouth of His Excellency the Governor General? Where is the authority for declaring that the conditions existing in this country were such, that there was room for hope for a new era of peace and happiness between the two great nationalities of this Dominion? I say, Sir, there is not a country on the face of the globe in which the peoples of two great nationalities living side by side, have lived in greater mutual respect and enjoyment of each other's society than has existed between the English and French people of Canada down to the present hour. Whatever question may have arisen to produce a certain amount of feeling, it is nevertheless a fact known and recognized, and it is a fact greatly to the honour and credit of both our French and English people, that cordial and genuine good feeling and friendly intercourse has never been disturbed for a single moment.

I shall now take the opportunity of drawing the attention of the House briefly to the position which in my judgment this ques-

tion occupies, and I am compelled to do that because the position of myself and my friends, the position of the great party to which I have the honour to belong, has been greatly misrepresented in reference to this matter. I find, in a speech delivered by the hon. the First Minister in the county of Wright a few days ago, the following statement :—

He denied that under the Remedial Bill the minority would have secured their rights, and challenged any Conservative to prove that they would have got as much as under the present settlement.

I will ask the House to pardon me while I draw its attention to what I regard as the historical position of this question so far as regards the efforts made by the late Government and by the present Government. I shall first draw attention to what the Remedial Bill provided as submitted to the House by myself as a member of the Government of Sir Mackenzie Bowell :

The Remedial Bill proposed to constitute a separate school board of education for the province, to be composed of a number of persons, not exceeding nine, all Roman Catholics. This board was to have control of the separate schools, and among other things, to select the books, maps and globes, to appoint a Roman Catholic speaking both French and English as superintendent of separate schools.

My hon. friend will admit that no such provisions are to be found in the measure to which he has referred as giving more than the Remedial Bill gave. Section 4, subsection C, after amendment in committee reads as follows :—

To select all the books, maps and globes to be used in the schools under its control ; provided, however, that no book, map or globe other than books in history, morals or religion, shall be selected unless such books, map or globe has been authorized for use either in high or public schools of the province of Manitoba, or is now or hereafter shall be in use in any of the public or separate schools of any province of the Dominion, or books published in any country.

I ask my hon. friend if he can find in the measure to which he has referred any provision giving that security to the religious convictions of the minority in Manitoba. The history of this clause is as follows, so far as it provides for bi-lingual teaching. Mr. McCarthy proposed the following amendment :—

That in districts where any large number of the pupils attending separate schools do not understand English, but speak French, or a foreign tongue, the books and maps shall, as far as practicable, be bi-lingual in the English or French or foreign language spoken by the pupils, with the object of teaching the English language in the most effective way.

The clause carried as above was deemed to embrace the scope of Mr. McCarthy's amendment, and when read Mr. Choquette said : "I think that is fair." Clause 4, subsection C, was Mr. Powell's amendment up to the last six words. Mr. Langelier proposed these words : "Or books published in any country." "The object of this I may say," he added, "is to give full power to the board to select any books they think proper." This proposal was accepted. Provision was made by this Bill so that on a petition of at least five heads of families in municipalities representing at least ten Roman Catholic children of school age, a school district could be established. Provision was made also for the establishment of school districts in cities and towns or where there was no municipal organization. The Remedial Bill made further provision for the assessment of Roman Catholic ratepayers and their property who did not prefer the provincial system and exempted the persons and property from taxation for provincial schools of those who contributed to the support of separate schools. The hon. Premier, concerning this measure, said before the last general elections :

God help my poor fellow-countrymen and co-religionists of Manitoba, if all the help they are going to have is what the hon. gentleman and his followers are prepared to give them. I pity my poor fellow-countrymen of Manitoba or anywhere else, if they expect any justice from the hon. gentleman.

And again :

What is before the House? A half-hearted and faint measure.
A measure of compromise, and nothing else.

During the consideration of this measure by the House of Commons, the commissioners appointed by the Dominion Government conferred with the Government of Manitoba. Speaking at the Club National Banquet at the Windsor Hotel, Montreal, in December, 1896, the hon. Premier pretended to state the position of the settlement by way of comparison. Referring to the proposal of Sir Mackenzie Bowell's Government, he said :

Here is the proposition made by the commissioners of the Dominion Government :. "In towns and villages where there are 25 Catholic children in a school, and in cities where there are 50, the school commissioners will be obliged to furnish a separate school or a separate apartment and a Catholic teacher."

The actual terms of the commissioners were very different. They suggested that the Manitoba legislature should provide in towns and villages where there were resident twenty-five Roman Catholic children of school age and in cities where there were fifty of such children for the establishment of a school house or school room where they should be taught by a Roman Catholic teacher. Where the majority of the school children were Catholics the requirements for religious exercises should not operate. That the text-books in Catholic schools should not offend the religious views of the Catholics. That Catholics should have representation on the Advisory Board of the

province as well as on the Board of Examiners for the examination of teachers. That Catholics should have assistance in the maintenance of a Normal School. That the existing system of permitting a non-qualified teacher in the Catholic schools should be continued for two years so as to enable them to qualify. The Minute of the Privy Council, 27th March, 1896, which empowered the commissioners, provided that the settlement should be: "On such terms as shall be satisfactory to the said minority." What did Mr. Sifton consider this proposal involved? The reply of the Manitoba Government, signed by him, will tell us. Among their grounds for refusal it was said that the proposal "Would establish a system of state-supported separate schools for the Roman Catholic people, and would compel their support by the school taxes and legislative grants." Not only so, but the whole school organization—text-book regulations, constitution of Advisory Board, Board of Examiners and Normal School—would be modified to bring it in accord with the separation principle. The organization of the separate school would be compulsory. The plan "Would impair the efficiency of the public schools." It was also argued that the legislature would be divested of the control of the schools so far as religious exercises and teaching were concerned. The proposal to assist a separate Normal School, "Would be absolutely unjustifiable." In the future discussion of the answer of the Manitoba Government, the Government of that province claimed that the proposition of the Dominion Commissioners "Aimed at the legal recognition by the legislature of Manitoba of the right of the Roman Catholic people to separate for school purposes." "We regard ourselves as precluded by our declaration of policy preceding our last election from assenting to such statutory recognition." It appears also that any settlement between the Government of the Dominion and that of Manitoba must, by the very terms of your instructions, be subject to the sanction of a third party. "In a word, we are absolutely debarred from conceding a system of Roman Catholic and state-aided separate schools while the representatives of the minority, and, as a consequence, the Federal Government will accept nothing else." The memorandum containing this statement was signed by Clifford Sifton and J. D. Cameron. The hon. Premier continued:

> Yet, after we have accepted from the provincial government of Manitoba much more than the commissioners of the late Government asked last spring, we are none the less denouced, in the name of religion, as traitors to our race and creed.

Will the hon. Minister of the Interior agree to that statement? Will he say that the hon. Premier has obtained more than was proposed by the commissioners sent by the late Government? For the purpose of disposing of that point, I may just draw attention of Mr. Sifton's address as it appears in the "Gazette" of December 3. Mr. Sifton said:

> The long-pending dispute between the federal and the provincial authorities over what is popularly known as the school question, has now been happily terminated by a final settlement.

That is not what I understand a number of the friends of the hon. Premier and of his supporters who sit behind him think on that question. I observe that reference has been made by the hon. seconder of this Address to the statement that Bonaventure had given its decision in favour of this settlement, but I think it will be found that the hon. member who has been returned from Bonaventure has stated in the most emphatic terms that he did not regard this question as finally settled but would endeavour to get more justice for his fellow-countrymen.

In the address of Mr. Sifton to his electors of Brandon, which therefore is authentic, he said:

> The terms of the settlement will, upon examination, be found to be in strict accord with the principle of national schools. The oft-repeated demand for separate schools has finally been rejected. The conduct, management, regulation and control of the public school system remain substantially unaltered. The settlement amounts simply to a provision for more efficient religious instruction upon the lines of the present proposition formerly made by the government of the province to the federal commissioners at the conference held in the city of Winnipeg early in the present year. In the plan adopted for imparting such instruction, all denominations are placed upon an equal footing.

That is the view which Mr. Sifton held on this matter. I may say that, in introducing this Bill in the Manitoba legislature, Mr. Cameron, the Attorney General, seemed to differ in a very striking manner from the views announced by the hon. First Minister, on various occasions, as to what this settlement had accomplished. Mr. Cameron said:

> He wished to deal with a particular charge. It was stated that the government had dealt perfidiously, as the settlement was substantially the same as the offer of the Dominion commissioners a year before. If such were really the case, the provincial government would have been guilty and susceptible of condemnation. But such was not the case. He referred to the offer of the Dominion commissioners to prove this. The first clause of that offer was compulsory: that, without consulting the wishes of anyone, as soon as there were sufficient Roman Catholic children, there must be a separate school which should be taught by a Roman Catholic teacher. The Dominion commissioners further asked for separate text-books, statutory representation on the advisory board and a separate normal school, none of which things were to be found in the settlement. Thus there was no resemblance between the offer of the Dominion Commissioners and the Bill before the House to-day.

I draw the hon. First Minister's attention to the fact that he claims to have done a great deal more than was proposed either by the Remedial Bill or the commissioners who were sent by the Government of Sir Mackenzie Bowell to Winnipeg, and that he is in direct antagonism with the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), who controverts this view in the strongest posible manner, and also with the Attorney General of Manitoba (Mr. Cameron) who introduced the Bill in the Manitoba legislature.

I pass on as rapidly as I can and am only taking the time I consider absolutely necessary. As this is perhaps the only opportunity that may be presented for discussing the question, I feel it due to its importance and the share which the late Government, of which I was the head, had in it, to put the facts, as I think, more correctly upon record than they would stand if the statement of the hon. First Minister were allowed to go unchallenged.

Comparing the hon. Premier's statement at Montreal with the Bill recently introduced by the Manitoba Government in pursuance of the settlement, I find very striking contradictions. The hon. gentleman said :

> Wherever there are ten Catholic children, it will be permitted to priests to enter the school at half-past three o'clock in the afternoon and give religious teaching.
>
> In every municipality where there are 25 children belonging to the Catholic Church, and in every town and municipality where there are 50 children belonging to that church, the commissioners will be obliged, on the petition of the parents, to provide a Catholic teacher, not only to teach religion, but secular matters, such as arithmetic and grammar, as well.

Contrast the Bill itself with the description which the hon. First Minister has given of it, and which I am afraid he must have given after a very careless perusal of that measure. The Bill itself says :

> Religious teaching in public schools is to take place between 3.30 and 4 o'clock in the afternoon, and is to be conducted " by any Christian clergyman whose charge includes any portion of the school district, or by any person duly authorized by such clergyman, or by a teacher, when so authorized," but this religious teaching may take place only
>
> (a) When authorized by school trustees, or
>
> (b) When the parents of at least ten children attending the school in the case of a rural district, or by parents of at least 25 children attending the school in the case of a city, town or village.
>
> One duly-certificated Roman Catholic teacher is to be employed in any village or rural district where the average attendance in any school of Roman Catholic children is 25, and one duly-certificated Roman Catholic teacher in towns and cities where the average attendance is 40.

The hon. Premier took care not to mention other provisions of the settlement which practically compel the children to study text-books, history, &c., which are objectionable to Roman Catholics, for it is to be enacted that " No separation shall take place during secular work," and no provision is made for meeting the conscientious scruples of Roman Catholics in any other matter than purely religious teaching.

The settlement contained in the Manitoba Bill of 1897, involves therefore the following :—

Roman Catholics to obtain advantage of the right to have either religious exercises or religious teaching must attend the schools as conducted under existing laws obnoxious to their consciences and in derogation of their rights. But when, and only when, an average attendance at a particular school in town or country reaches a certain figure, they may have a Roman Catholic teacher and a Roman Catholic priest to give religious exercises.

The teacher must be fully qualified under the general law, and must teach from the very text-books to which earnest conscientious objections are made by Roman Catholics.

Outside of Winnipeg and large towns, therefore, the " average attendance " renders the Bill practically inoperative. For the children must gather from far and wide and make a record of attendance at the same school, under the existing system before their parents or guardians can obtain for them the right to have the religious teaching between 3.30 and 4 o'clock each day or to have a Roman Catholic teacher teach from Protestant school-books.

Nevertheless the hon. Premier, speaking in Hull on March 16th, said :

> Taking up the Remedial Bill, he denied that under it the minority would have secured their rights, and challenged any Conservative to prove that they would have got as much as under the present settlement. In order to have separate schools, three things were necessary : distinct organization, legislative grants and exemption from taxation. The Remedial Bill only gave the first ; the present settlement gave all three.

The Remedial Bill secured separate schools and provided for the creation of a Roman Catholic board of control and the teaching of their own language and their own selection of text-books, &c.

Five Roman Catholic heads of families could have a school district established or allowed so long as there were ten Roman Catholic children of school age living within the district or proposed district not over three miles from the proposed school site.

Yet the hon. Premier says the Remedial Bill gave no organization. Section 28, subsection 2, of the Remedial Bill, provided as follows :—

> No Roman Catholic who is assessed for the support of a separate school shall be liable to be assessed, taxed or required in any way to contribute for the erection, maintenance or support of any other school, whether by provincial law or otherwise ; nor shall any of his property in respect of which he shall have been so assessed, be so liable.

Yet the hon. First Minister says the Bill gave no exemption from taxation. The present settlement gave, he says, organization, legislative grants, and exemption from taxation, and, therefore, separate schools. This is a burlesque, I humbly submit, on the Bill of the Manitoba Government. The hon. Premier said in Hull on March 16th :

When he entered office, he entered into negotiations with the Government of Manitoba and obtained from them concessions which gave the French Catholics of Manitoba religious teaching in their schools and the protection of their language. As a result, the French language will now be taught in the schools of Manitoba. Are you satisfied ? (Cries of "Yes, yes.") He appealed to the good sense of all reasonable men, if this was not a satisfactory settlement. I want the two languages taught in all the schools. I speak French because it is the language of my mother, of the historic nation from which I have sprung, but I also speak English because it is the language of business. This double teaching will enable the children of Manitoba to earn their living as they could not otherwise do.

It was a misstatement, the hon. gentleman will permit me to say, to say that the French language "will now be taught in all the schools," as intended in the above, when all that the Bill provides, is that when there are ten pupils whose mother tongue is French the bi-lingual system of teaching shall prevail. But, this aside, the pretense that this is a concession obtained by the hon. Premier, is, in my opinion, absurd. It is a proposal of Mr. McCarthy, as a matter of fact, and was accepted by the late Government and made a part of the Remedial Bill. It is in the interests of Protestants as well as of Catholics, and this principle generally obtains the world over to-day. And yet the hon. gentleman, at Hull, took credit for having himself been the author and orginator of the idea, and excited a good deal of enthusiasm, and I have no doubt obtained a large amount of support from this very delusive statement. The hon. Premier in addressing the House in August, 1896, said :

I have every reason to hope, every reason to believe, that, when again this Parliament assembles, this question will have been settled satisfactorily to all parties concerned.

And at Quebec in October, 1896, the hon. gentleman said :

I have only one word to say. During the fight I have often declared that, with the aid of Sir Oliver Mowat, I would settle that question in six months. I am not in a position to-night to discuss our recent arrangement. But I am happy to say that now, before six months, it will be settled by giving to the Catholics rights of conscience, and those who believe in religion in schools, will be satisfied. We obtained from the delegates of Manitoba all the concessions which men in honour could make.

I draw the attention of the hon. Minister to this statement that he had obtained all the concessions that men in honour could make. And yet when face to face with the electors of Wright in Hull, the hon. gentleman made the following confession :—

I know I have not got as much as I wanted, but I have got as much as I could.

Does he mean to say that he wanted more than men in honour could give ? He would hardly like to take that position, and yet that is the conclusion at which one must inevitably arrive if he takes the hon. gentleman's statements as made. The "Star" continues, in reporting the hon. Premier at Hull :

Amidst loud applause, Mr. Laurier quoted Hon. Edward Blake's opinion that the settlement was far more advantageous to the minority than any Remedial Bill that Parliament could pass.

The whole force of this is in the suggestion that this was the opinion of the counsel for the minority. But Mr. Blake's fee was long since earned, and he is in a position to give either legal or political opinions now irrespective of his old clients. If his opinion is examined, it will be found that Mr. Blake writes as a lawyer on a question not now in dispute, respecting the legal effect of the decision of the Privy Council and the powers of the Governor in Council. He traces the history of this dispute till it becomes (after judgment, Order in Council and Remedial Bill), a political question. The passage relied on from Mr. Blake's opinion is in no sense stronger than language used by other leaders of the Liberal party, nor are they in any sense supported by the Catholic minority of Manitoba, certainly not those congregated in the district of St. Boniface. But it is important to observe that this opinion relates to the political phase of the question. I draw the attention of the First Minister to the fact that the act of the Manitoba legislature does not restore any of the privileges that were taken away. This question arose from the decision of the Privy Council that the rights of the minority in Manitoba had been taken away, and that the duty of restoring them devolved upon the Government of Canada. The hon. the Premier boasts of the settlement he has effected, but I ask him to read the judgment of the Judicial Committee, and, for the purpose of refreshing his memmory, I will quote a single clause of it which deals with the subject :

Contrast the position of the Roman Catholics prior and subsequent to the Acts from which they appeal. Before these passed into law there existed denominational schools, of which the control and management were in the hands of Roman Catholics, who could select the books to be used and determine the character of the religious teaching. These schools received their proportionate share of the money contributed for school purposes out of the general taxation of the province, and the money raised for these purposes by a local assessment was, so far as it fell upon Catholics, applied only towards the support of Catholic schools. What is the position of the Roman Catholic minority under the

Acts of 1890? Schools of their own denomination, conducted according to their views, will reeeive no aid from the state. They must depend entirely for their support upon the contribution of the Roman Catholic community, while the taxes out of which state aid is granted to the schools provided for by the Statutes, fall alike on Catholics and Protestants. Moreover, while the Catholic inhabitants remain liable to local assessments for school purposes, the proceeds of that assessment are no longer destined to any extent for the support of Catholic schools, but afford the means of maintaining schools which they regard as no more suitable for the education of Catholic children than if they were distinctively Protestant in their character.

The hon. gentleman boasts of the settlement he has effected, and of the Bill which has been passed. Yet I ask him to state one single privilege, one single right, taken away from the Roman Catholics of Manitoba by the Bill of 1890 which they will enjoy under this Bill. I know of none. I have read the Bill carefully and I have been unable to find one single privilege that was taken away from them that has been restored by the Bill of which the hon. gentleman seems so proud, and which it seems almost a breach of the constitution to mention in the Speech from the Throne as a settlement. The minority did not ask for what is conceded, and declares that it will not accept it. There has been no petition sent in, no application made by the minority or by anybody representing them, even down to this very hour, that asks for one single thing that has been given by the Remedial Bill, as it is called, of Manitoba. Yet the hon. gentleman boasts of it as a very great achievement. I remember the hon. member for St. John and Iberville (Mr. Tarte), when he returned from Manitoba, where, I believe, he had a very conspicuous part in effecting this arrangement, boasted that even under the very shadow of the Palace at St. Boniface, this arrangement, which had been made by his Government would be ratified by the people. He did did not expect that the Archbishop would concur, but he said that the French people whose interests were at stake, would be found to concur in it. Well, Sir, there has been an opportunity to test the correctness of that prophecy, and it certainly has not stood the test. You have the unanimous declaration of the electorate of St. Boniface in opposition to this measure. I give you my grounds for that statement. A gentleman was brought forward who stood on the platform of opposition for the legislature of Manitoba, and he was opposed by Mr. Bertrand, a gentleman brought forward by the Government of Manitoba, and supported with all the influence that Government could give him, in opposition to the gentleman so nominated. And, Sir, what happened? Why, not only was the person opposed to the Manitoba Government elected by a large majority, but, during the contest their own candidate came out and placarded the district with declarations that he had never been in favour of this settlement. I have only to add that not only was the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Tarte) a little mistaken in assuming that it was going to be ratified by the people who were interested, but I have given the unanimous declaration that this settlement is entirely opposed to their wishes and feelings. But I wish to draw the attention of the First Minister, and of other hon. gentlemen in this House who have never sympathized with the claim of the Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba, to a very important feature of this measure. While this Bill gives nothing that the Roman Catholic minority were deprived of, while this Bill gives nothing that was asked for by them, it does give them a number of things that were not asked for, and that are outside of anything that the Roman Catholics enjoyed in the province of Manitoba up to the time of the passage of the Act of 1890. I draw the attention of the House to the fact that just as the minority were able to go to the highest tribunal in the Empire and get the legislation of 1890 condemned, and obtain the declaration that it had taken away rights which belonged to the minority, so now the moment this Bill becomes law you are going to have a number of new and additional claims that were not enjoyed by the Roman Catholics previous to 1890; you are going to have those put upon the Statute-book of Manitoba; and as soon as that Bill becomes law the minority can go to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council and claim that their rights have been extended to the extent, whatever it may be, of any privileges that may be conceded. The hon. gentleman smiles, because he thinks that one part of my argument somewhat antagonizes the other; but that is taking too superficial a view of the question. What the Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba claimed was, that the rights they enjoyed under the law of 1890 were not restored to them, you have not given them anything that they claimed, you have not restored to them a single right that was taken away from them, according to the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. But you have created new and additional rights outside of those, so that they are in a position not only to reject any settlement, not only to fall back upon the claim given them under that judgment of the Privy Council as their right, but they are in a position to add to that these new things you have put on the Statute-book, under the Manitoba Act which says that any concession made by the local legislature to a minority can never be withdrawn. They are in a position to press for these in addition to all there was before.

Now, Sir, I have very little more to add upon this question. No person would rejoice more sincerely than myself if this question were settled once and for ever. No

person would be more delighted than myself if the First Minister had been able to effect a settlement of this question that would be regarded as a just, fair and honourable settlement of the claim that, under the law and constitution of the country, as declared by the highest tribunal in the Empire, these people were entitled to. But, Sir, that is not the case, as I have shown. A settlement that does not give substantial justice, that does not meet the case, in my judgment ought not to be dignified by the name of a settlement. It may be forced upon the minority, they may be weak, they may be unable to resist, and a variety of causes may be brought into operation that will prevent them from obtaining their rights. But I am now speaking upon the position of the question in the abstract. My predecessor, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, when this judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was given, felt bound to bring forward a measure that was, in his judgment, calculated to carry out what the law and constitution of the country demanded, as declared by the highest tribunal in the Empire. I need not remind the House that, as representing the Government in this branch of the legislature, I submitted a Bill for that purpose. I need not remind the House that there was no effort I could make that was not made, that I put forth the most strenuous efforts possible, not only on the floor of this House, but with members of the party, individually as well as collectively, for the purpose of carrying that measure to a successful conclusion. The First Minister knows that the measure was not defeated for the want of a majority in this House, for we had an overwhelming majority ready to carry it. The hon. gentleman knows that the great body of his supporters left him on that occasion, and again and again their names are found on the Journals in opposition to the hon. gentleman, and are recorded as opposed to the obstruction by which that Bill was prevented from becoming law. As I say, when I was called upon to form an Administration, believing as I did, whether rightly or wrongly, according to the best light and information I possessed, that a wrong had been done to the minority of Manitoba, and that the Government of the country were bound to right that wrong in accordance with the provisions of the constitution, I went boldly to the country and, notwithstanding the great cleavage, that great division, in the party with which I had the honour to be connected, notwithstanding all the clamour, and agitation, and prejudice that were incited throughout the country on this question, in the faithful discharge of what I conceived to be my duty, I went forward and staked the existence of my Government upon that measure. Well, Sir, as the hon. gentleman knows, I failed, and the hon. gentleman knows how I failed. He knows that the language which he held, standing on this side of the House as leader of the Opposition, directed to the Protestant portion of the community of this country, was entirely at variance with the language which he held when he came face to face with his own constituents in St. Rochs at Quebec; and the hon. gentleman knows that he there committed himself to the unqualified declaration that if he obtained power he would go further than I had gone. The hon. gentleman knows that he declared that if he failed in obtaining by conciliation the passage of a measure by the Manitoba legislature that would do full justice to his fellow-countrymen, he would fall back upon the law and the constitution, and give them their rights in their entirety. The language is fresh in the hon. gentleman's mind, as well as in my own, but lest he might think that I am giving, perhaps, a strong colouring to the attitude he assumed on that question, I will give him the opinion and declaration publicly made during the campaign, at a meeting at Brockville, by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). Speaking of the then leader of the Opposition (Mr. Laurier), he said:

> He, too, is a coercionist in the last resort. He has said that the touch should be gentle but the hand firm. He has said, in effect, that if separate schools are not restored by provincial action, they must be re-established by federal coercion. And I am more alarmed for Mr. Laurier's position because of the Mowat alliance. That alliance, the speech of Mr. Ross at Orangeville, the speeches of Mr. Laurier himself, all point in one direction—if the Liberals come into power an attempt is to be made to conciliate Manitoba in the first instance, and if that effort fails, as fail it must, then the firm hand of coercion is to be applied.

That is the declaration of one of the hon. gentleman's allies, one of his supporters, a gentleman who has contributed very largely to bringing him into power, and I therefore take it that his opinion will not be questioned. But whatever means were taken, the hon. gentleman knows that the support for which I had a right to look, both from a public standpoint and upon the question of principle, from the province of Quebec, I did not receive. The hon. gentleman is perfectly well aware that the question of race, if nothing else, proved stronger than the question of religion. But whatever the cause may be, the fact remains, that the efforts made by the Government of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, and the efforts made by myself, and by those of the Liberal-Conservative party who sustained me on that occasion, to restore the rights which had been taken away from the Roman Catholic minority of Manitoba, were defeated by the votes of the French Roman Catholics in the province of Quebec.

I do not want to raise any unpleasant controversy on this matter, but, without going into particulars, I draw attention to the fact that a large number of the hon. gentleman's supporters made distinct pled-

ges in order to place themselves in a position to bring the hon. gentleman into power. I ask the hon. gentleman if those pledges have been redeemed. Has the pledge made by the hon. Solicitor General, made in the most solemn manner that a man could make a pledge and on a most solemn and important question, been redeemed by this settlement, which the hon. gentleman boasts through the Speech from the Throne has been made on this question? The hon. gentleman will not say that the pledge given by the hon. member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion), or by other hon. gentlemen to whom it is not necessary more particularly to refer, made to the people of Quebec, in the most clear, strong and unqualified manner, that if the hon. gentleman was brought into power, they would withdraw their support from him if he did not carry out faithfully the pledge which the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) declared the hon. gentleman had made in order to obtain the support of the province of Quebec has been fulfilled. I am not now concerned as to how that support was obtained, but only as to the result of that action. The position now is this. In the discharge of what I felt to be a solemn duty that I owed to my country, in the discharge of what I believed to be a duty I owed to maintain the constitution of the country so far as I was able, I, in the most open manner, notwithstanding the antagonism of a large number of my hon. friends, for whose views I entertained the greatest regard, and whose opposition I knew was as conscientious as was my view in maintaining the opinions I did—I at very great risk as a public man, went forward to vindicate what I believed to be demanded in common justice by the minority under the constitution, and I was defeated, and defeated by the votes of the Roman Catholic electors of the province of Quebec. Under these circumstances I do not for a single moment hesitate to say that while my views remain unchanged, the responsibility which rested on the shoulders of Sir Macknzie Bowell as leader of the Government, and which subsequently rested on my shoulders of dealing with this question as properly became the Government of Canada, now I am happy to say rests on the shoulders of the hon. gentleman opposite. I say more, if the hon. gentleman and his friends can reconcile those most interested in this question to their position and secure their consent to the manner in which they have disposed of the question, then I have not a word to say. No person will be more delighted to find it removed from Parliament once and for ever. I am glad that the responsibility no longer rests on my shoulders, and freed from the responsibility of Government, while my views remain unchanged and my personal opinions will be always maintained, I shall not feel it in the future as in the past incumbent on me to make those exertions that I did make in defending rights, the protection of which under the constitution now rests upon the shoulders of the hon. gentleman who sits opposite. I regret, Mr. Speaker, having been obliged to occupy so much of the time of the House in dealing with a question with which hon. gentlemen are so familiar, but I felt it incumbent upon me to do so, under the circumstances, and as this perhaps might be the only opportunity that might offer of correcting some misapprehensions under which hon. gentlemen opposite seem to labour as to what is the real position of this question.

Sir, I have now great pleasure in passing on to the question of the tariff, which is one of very great interest to the people of Canada, and about which expectation is rife at the present moment. I was a little surprised to find the statement made in the Speech that:

> A measure will be submitted to you for the revision of the tariff, which is believed will provide the necessary revenue, and, while having due regard to industrial interests, will make our fiscal system more satisfactory to the masses of the people.

Sir, I feel as one of those who took an active part in the promulgation of the National Policy, as one who has been a firm supporter of it from that time until now, that it never occupied a prouder or more triumphant position than it occupies to-day. The hon. gentleman who moved the Address (Mr. Russell) referred to the deficit of $300,000 on 1st July, 1896. But I call the attention of the House to the fact that the general election was quite sufficient to account for that deficiency, that the very uncertainty created in the minds of the commercial men of the country as to what might be the result of the election was sufficient to account for the deficit. Every person knows that the bare possibility of a party coming into power which was pledged in the most solemn manner to uproot every vestige of protection and adopt a policy of free trade in this country, was enough to create sufficient commercial disturbance to account for that deficit. But I have no hesitation in saying that the year 1896, when the National Policy had been eighteen years in existence, was the most successful year that Canada has experienced, the fact that the exports, that valuable indication as to what this country is able to export, reached a figure never previously attained was in itself sufficient tribute as to what the National Policy had done for this country and what has been achieved under it. Not only so, but the volume of trade increased in that year by no less than $15,000,000. So if there was ever a time when a satisfactory financial and commercial condition of the country was shown, it was during that year, as established by statistics in relation to the operation of the tariff and the fiscal policy of Canada.

But, from that time, it will be seen that a very unfortunate change has been taking place. Everything has been in favour of the progress of the country, and everything has been in favour of the Government so far as it represents the country. We know that owing to an unhappy visitation of Providence in India, the price of wheat has greatly increased and the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west have been placed in a position of prosperity that they have not enjoyed for many years. Every person knows that the European lumber trade has not been for many years in such a prosperous condition as during the past season. I need not tell what the mineral development of Canada has accomplished. I dare say some of you remember that when on the floor of this House, I was advocating the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, I ventured to predict that the advent of that road in piercing the Rocky Mountains and giving our Pacific province communication with the rest of Canada, would develop a mineral wealth which in a few years would render comparatively insignificant any expenditure that the Government undertook in constructing that road. That development has perhaps come more slowly than many of us hoped, but it has come at last, and now we find the mineral resources of British Columbia attracting the attention of the civilized world. Every country on the globe is now directing its attention, with the keenest interest, to the development of the boundless mineral resources of British Columbia. We know that from the Yukon country come marvellous stories of the discovery of gold, and all through that province; in Alberni, through the Kootenay, the Slocan and the Rossland and Rainy River districts, vast deposits of rich mineral-bearing ore are being developed. Under these circumstances, I have no hesitation in saying that the commercial condition of Canada to-day should be the most prosperous in the history of our country. But what has prevented us reaping the benefit of all those great advantages which I have enumerated? What has deprived us of the advantages of these great sources of wealth and of the circulation of the money thus brought into this country? Why, Sir, if the First Minister will turn to the columns of the "Globe" he will find there a doleful communication from its Montreal correspondent saying that 400 men are turned out of employment because the rolling mills have been shut down until they know what the tariff it to be. This is only a single instance of what is taking place throughout Canada, and of what has produced a commercial and financial paralysis that has more than discounted all these marvellous advantages which the country has enjoyed in connection with those other resources to which I have referred.

I do not wish to occupy the time of the House at great length, but I must refer briefly to the proposal with reference to the franchise. I need not say how deeply I regret to learn that the Government of this country promises to pass a law which will place the Parliament of Canada in the most humiliating position that any parliament of a civilized country was ever placed in. Sir, that indefeasible right that the members of a great legislature like that of the Dominion of Canada have, the right to provide an electoral Act which will return to this House men on a uniform franchise; that right is to be swept away, and we are to have it placed in the power of half a dozen local legislatures to tamper with the franchise of the Dominion. Is the word "tampered" too strong? Why, Sir, I have in my mind's eye a fact that is known to the Minister of Finance (Mr Fielding), with reference to the manner in which the Nova Scotia legislature acted in connection with the franchise. Why, Sir, before we had a Dominion Franchise avowedly and ostensibly a change was made in the local franchise so as to affect the representation of this Dominion Parliament, and the law embodying that change was repealed before the local elections came on. You propose to adopt the franchises of the various provinces, and under such a system what may occur? Suppose that this Parliament is nearing the end of its term and elections are about to take place, you put it in the power of the provincial legislatures throughout this country to sit down and manufacture a law that will be in the interest of the party to which they belong, and without having any guarantee that that franchise will be one that they will use for elections to their own House. It is possible that such a thing may occur as did occur in the province of Nova Scotia, when they passed an Act for the Dominion elections, and when the Dominion elections were over, they repealed that franchise Act and let the franchise remain as it was previously. I need not waste the time of hon. gentleman in showing that a measure of that kind must, in the nature of things, lower the dignity of this Parliament. Instead of each member of this House feeling as he now feels, that he sits here under the same rights as his brother member, one representative of the people will take a seat in this Parliament under one franchise, and another member of this House will sit under a franchise entirely different. While I would be glad to see some means provided to avoid the large expense that is necessarily attendant upon the Franchise Act as it exists, I feel that it is a very retrograde position for this Parliament to abandon the control of its own franchise, and delegate it to people who may be sitting thousands of miles away, the power to control the franchise under which members to this Parliament should be elected.

Now, Sir, it gives me immense satisfac-

tion to have an opportunity of approving of any proposal of my hon. friend. I express the pleasure with which I find that the present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) has, I have no hesitation in saying, devoted a great deal of time and a great deal of ability, and a great deal of energy, in the most effective manner to carry out one of the greatest industries that this country possesses. I feel, Sir, that I am only doing justice to that hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) in saying that in doing this he has simply been closely following the course pursued by his predecessors in office, of the late Government. I am quite certain that the Minister of Agriculture will admit on the floor of this House that he finds in Mr. Robertson, a gentleman who was appointed under the late Government, a zealous and efficient officer, who is devoting his great abilities in the most unwearied manner to developing our agricultural industries.

I am delighted to find that the hon. gentleman has grappled with this question of cold storage and other matters connected with his department, with such vigour, and that the Government are making such successful efforts to carry forward the policy of their predecessors. The hon. mover of the Address complained that Halifax had not been made a winter port for ocean steamers. If the hon. gentleman will read the few remarks I addressed to the House last session on the subject of the Fast Atlantic Service, he will find that nothing was left undone which the late Government could do to accomplish that object; and when we went out of office, we had already agreed upon a contract with the Messrs. Allan under which the ships would have been so constructed as to provide ample cold storage, so that the perishable products of this country might be carried to the markets of England in the best possible condition, as well as in the shortest possible time.

There is another point to which I wish to make a single reference—a subject which is a source of just pride and satisfaction to every Canadian; that is, the contribution that Canada has made to the Indian Famine Fund. In this connection, I think the thanks of this House and the thanks of every person in this country are due to the "Star" newspaper, of Montreal, for the enthusiastic manner in which it took that matter up and pressed it from day to day, until to-day it is able to announce that the "Star" fund alone has totalled no less than $50,000. I say that the proprietor of any newspaper who will devote his ability and resources in the manner in which the proprietor of the "Star" has done, in pushing this important work forward, is deserving of, as he will receive, the thanks of this House and the thanks of every patriotic person in Canada.

Now, Sir, reference is made here to the Superannuation Act, and the Civil Service Act, and I think it is quite time that we had a reference made to those Acts. I have no hesitation in saying, as I have said on former occasions, that Canada has just reason to be proud of her civil service. I do not believe there is any other country just in the position of Canada—we cannot of course compare our position with that of England—I do not believe there is any other country with a civil service composed of gentlemen of greater ability, industry or devotion to their duties. There may possibly be exceptions here and there; but, as a whole, my experience of the civil service of Canada—and it has been considerable, because I have held office in a good many of the departments here—has increased my respect for its ability, industry and high integrity; and that service has received at the hands of the present Government a most serious, discouraging and damaging blow. If anything could be done to lower the tone of the civil service of this country and to discourage the persons who are discharging the important duties of the service from devoting their best energy and ability to those duties, it is the course which has been pursued by this Government. Why, Sir, talk of superannuation. While superannuation has been attacked and reviled by hon. gentlemen opposite—and I do not mean to say that it has not had its weak points—what do we see? We see what has never been seen in this country before—men in the prime of life, of high character and of first-class ability, who occupy the very highest positions in the civil service of the country, obliged to choose between dismissal and being degraded to subordinate positions. Nothing that this Government could do has been left undone to lower the tone of the civil service of Canada. You have had wholesale dismissals without rhyme or reason, from the humblest artisan to persons occupying the highest offices. You have had the nauseating spectacle of the Government of Canada sending out emissaries to search and endeavour to find cause of complaint against civil servants all over this country—in fact, degrading every civil servant, whether he was maintained in his office or dismissed—degrading him in the estimation of the people where he was situated, by the very fact that a man of no position and no authority, neither a Minister nor the representative of a Minister, was sent there as a political spy, to find, if possible, cause for his dismissal. That, in my judgment, is no way to raise the tone of the civil service of Canada or to deal with the important question of superannuation, and I am sure the House will give very careful attention to these questions when they come before us.

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

After Recess.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope not to be obliged to trouble the House much longer, but I thought I should be consulting the convenience of the House and expediting public business by making a few references to matters that seemed to require a certain amount of notice in the debate on the Address, in order that they might be disposed of. I am sorry not to see the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) in his place as I wanted to call the attention of that hon. gentleman to a statement which he made in a meeting a few evenings ago at Aylmer, in the county of Wright. The hon. gentleman said there that one of the greatest surprises which Sir Charles Tupper and his lieutenant, Mr. Foster, would meet with would be the sight of a band of politicians loyally carrying out their promises. I perfectly agree with the hon. gentleman, for there is nothing that would give me such a tremendous surprise as to see hon. gentlemen opposite carrying out their promises. Adding to the hon. gentleman's statement what no doubt he intended, the word "Liberal," I must say that it is one which I thoroughly endorse. I go further, and I say that the record of the Liberal party in this country is one of violated promises. I have a tolerably good memory, and I am not at this moment able to recollect one single instance in which they have carried out their promises.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The hon. gentleman has a lively imagination.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, that is where I fail. The hon. gentleman entirely surpasses me in that respect. He has a brilliant imagination while I am obliged to keep down to the dry level of matter of fact. As reported in the "Citizen," the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries said that the charge was made that the Liberals had no policy and no intentions. That statement I also endorse. I plead guilty to having made that charge myself, and I now repeat that, so far as my experience goes, the Liberal party have no policy and have no intentions except to keep themselves in office by changing their policy as often as is necessary for that purpose. The hon. gentleman said:

> I can tell you that within a week of the opening of Parliament we shall produce our Budget and our tariff, and we shall give Sir Charles Tupper one of the surprises of his life.

As I have just said, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing that could give me a more complete surprise than anything in the shape of an accord between Liberal principles, Liberal professions and Liberal practices. I now draw the attention of the House to a very important matter, concerning which the Liberal party put themselves on record in the Journals of this House, and that is a specific denunciation by them of Governor General's warrants. They tabled a resolution and recorded their names in support of the declaration that one of the most unjustifiable things that any Government could be guilty of was to use the warrant of the Governor General for any purpose except to meet unforeseen and unprovided expenditures. Yet these gentlemen were not warm in their seats—I do not know that they had even entered this House—when they asked the Governor General to sign his name to an authority to draw between one million and two million dollars out of the public revenue for services which His Excellency himself had declared, over his own signature, were perfectly foreseen. If that is carrying out in practice the principles they professed in Opposition, I am at a loss to see it.

I shall not further detain the House on that point, but shall take up the question of economy. For eighteen long years the Liberal party had denounced the Liberal-Conservative Government and party for wild extravagance, and declared to the people that in order to have an economical administration of affairs in Canada the people should clothe them with authority to deal with the public business of the country. Well, the country at last took them at their word. With what result? Why, before last session rose the House was startled by finding that this economical Administration, this party which had come into office pledged to the most rigid economy, actually demanded and obtained from their confiding supporters a vote of nearly three million dollars more than had ever been asked for by any Government in this country. What more? Why, they have been in power eight months, and the House will be startled, if hon. members have not already seen it, to learn what the condition of public affairs is already, so far as economy is concerned. I have already said that the small deficit at the close of last year, was due to the paralysis of business caused by the uncertainty attending a general election, when it was possible that the Liberal party, would come into power and sweep away the fiscal policy of the country. But that small deficit was about offset by the increase in the revenue from the 1st of July, 1896, to the 30th September, 1896. The revenue of the previous year amounted to $8,610,564, and from the 1st of July, 1896, to the 1st of September, 1896, it was $8,846,208, showing an increase of $235,644, or nearly sufficient to offset deficit at the end of the year. Hon. gentlemen opposite may say: Yes, but we were in power. So they were, but the effect of their being in power had not yet come into operation, because the revenue is derived from the customs tariff, and the purchases of goods had been previously made, so that this increase of revenue was due to the business transacted

before these hon. gentlemen came into power. Let me now take the commencement of the period from which their advent to office would operate on the revenue of the country, and what do I find? In the five months from October, 1895, to the 28th of February, 1896, the revenue was $15,260,598. The revenue for the same period, after they came into power, fell to $14,225,340, or a decrease of $1,035,258, a marked and striking decline down to the latest period for which we have the calculations of revenue. Well, Mr. Speaker, what about the expenditure? What did this economical Government do with regard to the expenditure for the corresponding period, during which the decrease in revenue was assuming rather alarming proportions? The expenditure from the 1st of July, 1895, to the 1st of September, 1895, was $5,537,627. The expenditure for the same period in 1896 was $4,662,321, or a decrease of expenditure in 1896, during that period, as compared with 1895, of $875,276. Then the expenditure from October, 1895, to the 20th of February, 1896, was $15,840,246. The expenditure for the same period from October, 1896, to February, 1897, the five months from which the present Government are directly responsible, was $17,600,495, or an increase of $1,760,249. In other words, during the first three months of the fiscal year the revenue increased $235,644, and the expenditure decreased $875,276, while for the last five months of the fiscal year the revenue decreased $1,035,258, and the expenditure increased $1,760,249. So that, making a moderate calculation, this House is face to face with a deficit, in the first years of the administration of this Government, of not less than something like three million dollars. That is the evidence which these hon. gentlemen have given of their readiness to carry out in office the pledges they made to the country when in Opposition. I could not give a more striking evidence of the contrast between Liberal professions and Liberal practice than the manner in which the moment they have obtained power, they have thrown to the winds everything like pledges of economy and adopted a course completely at variance with those pledges. Then, I would like to ask the House whether they do not remember that for a long series of years the late Government were charged with doing public works by private tender. I would ask you if there is any subject in which the members of the Liberal party have been more often or more plainly put on record than with reference to this. You will search in vain the records of past Liberal-Conservative Administrations in this country for anything like the violation of the principle of public tender that has marked the administration of the present Government, and when the papers are laid upon the Table I think that that will be abundantly shown.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Again, this country has rung with their denunciations of dismissals from office. The journals of the House show that the hon. Prime Minister, when sitting on this side, asked his followers to support him in denouncing the dismissal from office of an officer of this House who had grossly and on a public platform insulted a member of the Administration, the present Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec (Sir Adolphe Chapleau). But to-day dismissals from office are so numerous that the country rings with the clamour arising from them. Officers are dismissed, whether high or low, and whatever their past service may have been. All that is necessary is the clamorous demand of a hungry office-seeker to induce the Government to drive out the best, the most devoted, the most intelligent, and most respectable men in the civil service of the country. The Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) just before the House rose last session and when my mouth was closed upon the subject, read a letter behind which the Government proposed to shield themselves. He had found, during the long period of eighteen years, a single instance in which I had dismissed an officer on the Intercolonial Railway, and this treasure which he had exhumed he brought forward and held up for the admiration of his followers. At last here is a case in which the Minister of Railways (Sir Charles Tupper) had actually dismissed a railway official for taking too strong and conspicuous part in an election. I have had an opportunity of investigating that matter, and I am prepared to prove to the House that the person who was dismissed on that occasion was dismissed in consequence of having actually resorted to physical force at a public meeting in support of his political views, and that, I think, will be regarded as about as strong an evidence of what you call "offensive partisanship" as it is possible to find. So I make the hon. gentleman a present of that case; and I wish he was able to say that he had refrained from the dismissal of public officers to the same extent as I did when I held the office that he now holds. But I was referring to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) for he is a very bold man. I say it to his credit. He is always ready to stand up and defend his views in a very forcible and energetic manner. But among all the brave and bold things that the hon. gentleman has ever done during his public career, I think that the throwing down of the challenge contained in that portion of his Aylmer speech which I have just read, is the boldest. I think we might shorten the debate upon the contrast between the promises and practices of the Liberal party if the hon. gentleman would rise and state one case in which the Liberal party has carried out in power the principles they professed while in Opposition. I have sought far and wide, I have examined most diligently into their

records, and I am unable to find one single instance in the whole of their career in which their practice has not been in diametrical opposition to their promises. I have instanced the case of dismissals from office. The House will appreciate that when I give an instance in which, according to my judgment, the Government have been guilty of one of the deepest wrongs to Canada. Mr. Speaker, you can imagine my astonishment, when, in London, I took up the morning papers and found the announcement that the gentlemen who had served Canada faithfully for forty years—served both Liberal and Conservative Governments—to the great advantage of the people, had been dismissed from the office of solicitors to the Government, and a young man, comparatively unknown, appointed in their place. I say that this exhibits an utter recklessness of everything that is due to the people of Canada and to the character of its Government, such as I could not have believed possible for them to do, had I not seen it with my own eyes. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) knows these gentlemen well, he has had their services again and again, and I need not say to him that no solicitors are to be found in the great city of London of higher standing, of greater integrity, or more able efficiently to serve the interest of Canada than Messrs. Bompas, Bischoff & Co. Yet when I found it announced broadcast—and a very unprofessional thing, I am told, it is to do—in the morning journals of London that these eminent solicitors, who for forty years had served all the Governments of Canada ably and well, had served Mr. Mackenzie's Government with the same fidelity that they did all the others, as the Minister of Trade and Commerce well knows, when I found this ancient and honourable firm ruthlessly swept aside and a young man, Mr. Russell, put in their place, I was greatly astonished. Whatever Mr. Russell's abilities may be, he can have no standing, no position, from his years, as these gentlemen have; still I have no doubt that for the purpose for which he was appointed to the office, he may be infinitely better calculated to serve this Government than the eminent firm whose services have been dispensed with. No doubt, Sir, that as an emissary to Rome, or as representative of the Government of Canada at the Vatican, Mr. Russell will suit their purposes infinitely better than the well-known firm of Bompas, Bischoff & Co.; and that, Sir, is the only justification that can be given for the wrong done, not to these gentlemen—that is a matter of utter insignificance to them—but the wrong done to Canada, and to the reputation of the Canadian Government everywhere.

Now, Sir, these hon. gentlemen opposite have found great fault with the Superannuation Act, and I see an hon. gentleman before me, one of the most important of whose duties it was to attack the Government in their dealing with this subject, and no doubt occasionally with some good ground, for straining the purpose of the Superannuation Act. But I ask that hon. gentleman, I ask every hon. gentleman in this House, whether it was ever in his power to bring forward instances of young, able and efficient men, men brought into the public service for their high attainments and ability to serve the public, being dismissed from office under a pretense of superannuation, and charging them upon the public revenues of the country. I give that to my hon. friend, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) as another instance in which an utter disregard of principle has been exhibited, and in which promise and performance have been signally different.

There is another very important subject to which I will refer. Hon. gentlemen opposite who have been long in this House, know that the late Government were again and again attacked—and it is possible there may have been occasionally some foundation for it—for violating the cardinal principle embodied in the Statute-book in regard to holding simultaneous elections. The whole object of simultaneous polling in the elections is to prevent an unfair advantage being taken by either party; the object of simultaneous polling is to prevent the Government in power being able to select constituencies in which to run certain elections with the view of influencing them by the result of public sentiment in other constituencies. That principle was swept away, and the principle of simultaneous polling was adopted, that is, having every election in Canada held on the same day so far as possible. That is one of the dearest and most important rights of the people. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman who seconded the Address here to-day, although I regret to say I could not follow him as closely as I could have wished, made a great boast as to the manner in which the policy of the Prime Minister had been sustained in the province of Quebec. Well, I am prepared to challenge that hon. gentleman and his Government with having been afraid to appeal to a fair and honest expression of sentiment in the province of Quebec.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, hon. gentlemen may laugh, but they cannot alter the records. I ask them why was Champlain vacant for months, and yet elections were sprung in Bonaventure before the late member was scarcely cold in his grave? I ask, why was an election sprung in the widely extended county of Wright when large bodies of the electors were not at home, and others could not be reached in the brief time that was at their disposal, when the Government had had all the opportunity of carefully preparing their in-

trenchments and getting everything ready for battle? I want to know why Champlain was left open. Why was Colchester, in Nova Scotia, left open? The county of Colchester is entitled to have its representative on the floor of this House to-day. The seat had been vacant for months, and yet the writ was only issued a few days ago. Why was Champlain and Colchester left vacant for months, when elections were suddenly sprung in Bonaventure and Wright? Sir, I will tell you why. It was because the hon. leader of the Government wished to take an unfair advantage of the public sentiment of the country, because he was afraid to act with even-handed justice between the two parties in this country. That was the reason, and there can be no other. The hon. member boasts of what he has achieved in the county of Bonaventure. Sir, when that matter is investigated, as investigated it will be, no doubt, it will be found that the result is no triumph for the Government, but the very reverse. In the county of Bonaventure the Baie des Chaleurs Railway had been opened. I was applied to to open the Baie des Chaleurs Railway before the elections; I submitted the question to the Minister of Justice as to whether this Government had power to make any arrangements for opening the Baie des Chaleurs Railway. I may say that the application came to me from the First Minister of Quebec, who wanted that railway put into operation; and the Minister of Justice stated that without the authority of Parliament it would be illegal for the Intercolonial to operate the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, and consequently we had to forego any advantage that could be gained by giving the people of that section of the country those railway facilities. Well, these gentlemen in office have no such trouble, the law is a matter of secondary consideration to them, and they opened the Baie des Chaleurs Railway. But what more? Why, Sir, the moment that vacancy occurred by the death of our late lamented friend, Mr. Fauvel, the election is sprung upon the county, an extensive county, the inhabitants of which are spread over a great extent of country, and the Government were in a position to say: See what we have done for you, we have opened the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, if you will elect our man we will extend this railway down through your county. But worse than that, the Government, having power to control the fishery licenses there, gave out that the men who opposed this Government should be deprived of their fishery licenses. Then what did you get? I am astonished that the hon. seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address should have ventured to mention in this House the subject of the Bonaventure election. Talk about a Janus-face or double-face policy! The most scandalous double-faced policy was adopted by the hon. gentleman who carried the county of Bonaventure. What did he do? He issued two addresses. The time was short. There is a large Protestant vote, amounting to something like 1,000, and there is a still large Roman Catholic vote. The hon. gentleman issued an address to the Protestant electors, saying: I call upon you Protestants to stand by me—I am not giving the words, but the substance—because I am flouting the bishops and the priests to their faces; I have refused to take anything but an independent position. I have refused the advice of the bishops as to giving a pledge in regard to the school question, and I am entitled to your support for the manly and independent course I am pursuing. While the hon. gentleman took that position as regards the English voters, this Janus-faced politician turned around to the French electors and issued an address to them, in which he pointed out that he was opposed to the Conservative party because they had not accepted, but had treated with contumely, the advice of the revered episcopacy of Quebec. If hon. gentlemen opposite think they can obtain credit for getting public sentiment behind them by acting in this fashion, I do not agree with them. The intelligent people of this country will feel that, so far as the Bonaventure election is concerned, hon. gentlemen opposite have no reason to plume themselves upon the result.

A word now with regard to the Wright election. What do you find? Mr. Devlin, who, on the floor of this House, delivered one of the most able and eloquent philippics in opposition to the course adopted by the present Prime Minister to which he ever listened, joined issue with the hon. gentleman on the question of the Manitoba schools. Mr. Devlin was able to secure his election because he was able to show the Catholic electors of Wright that his leader had pledged himself in the most solemn manner that, if he could not obtain full rights and justice for the minority in Manitoba by persuasive methods, he would fall back on the law and the constitution to give them their rights in their entirety. But as Mr. Devlin felt himself unable to support his leader on the floor of this House, and as he shrank, as a man would naturally shrink, from meeting Parliament again and going back on the pledge given to his electors to stand fast to his trust, if they would re-elect him—finding he was in a position in which he could not come here to defend his course and support his leader, he placed his resignation in his hands—for a consideration. I wonder whether the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) is within the sound of my voice. I am sorry to disturb his slumbers, but I must recall to that hon. gentleman that I believe he introduced a Bill in this House to make it a penal offence for a member of Parliament to accept an office

from the Government which he was supporting; and I call his attention to the fact that, in vulgar parlance, his supporter and friend, Mr. Devlin, sold out, rather than come here and stand in the presence of Parliament, where he had proved himself to be one of the most able defenders of the minority of Manitoba, and support the present leader of the House. What was done then? It appears that the Government had ample knowledge of all these facts. They, however, kept the secret, and suddenly in that constituency, extending over hundreds of miles and embracing points which it is almost impossible to reach, they rushed an election in the very shortest time possible. But that is not the worst feature. In the history of Canada hon. members cannot point to such a scandal as marked the conduct of that election. What was it? The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) let a contract privately for putting a covering upon the Western Block, and, having let this contract to Mr. Bourque, that contractor had electors of Hull brought over here by the hundred and paid out of the public treasury of Canada—because their work has to be paid for by the Government—voters, I say, were brought over here by hundreds—350 in all, I am told—when an Ottawa man could not get a day's work, and they were found smoking and sunning themselves in groups of fifties. If there was work for them to do, why were they dismissed by the hundred the day after the Wright election? That was one of the most daring, one of the most flagrant violations of election law ever witnessed, and one of the most flagrant that, I trust, ever will be witnessed in Canada.

I will not go into the particulars respecting the election in the county of Brant, although the statement made by the late representative are enough to make one's hair stand on end. The statements that are put before me by the late member go to prove this, and I am certain that hon. gentlemen who had the opportunity of meeting the late representative, Mr. Henry, will admit that the House lost in him one of its most able and valuable members. That gentleman reports the means resorted to in order to carry Brant, where the majority had been given at the general election against one of the most able and respected members of this House, the present Controller of Customs, and hon. members know that if there is one man calculated to poll the last vote that could be honestly polled in that constituency, it is the present Controller; and when we find that such devices could be used by the Government to enable them to poll a heavy vote the other way a few months afterwards, the inference is obvious. But it is not on inference I go. Mr. Henry will be able to show, and will show, that no voters of the Liberal party in that constituency had died for many years past who were not polled on that day, that the personation of voters was resorted to to an extent that I would be ashamed almost to mention on the floor of this House, in view of the disrepute into which it would tend to bring Parliament. I am quite certain that public opinion manufactured in that fashion will not be very valuable to hon. gentlemen or to any person who has to resort to such measures.

Sir, there is another subject that hon. gentlemen opposite have been very long and loud in denouncing, that is, the National Policy and retaliation. Where is the question of the National Policy and retaliation now? Why, Sir, I need not tell the House that one of the standing charges of hon. gentlemen opposite was as to the impropriety of and absolute folly of any suggestion of retaliation on our great neighbours to the south. Take up the press of the Liberal party now; take up the interviews of the Ministers now; and what do you find? You find that retaliation is the trump card they are playing. They have stolen our clothes and they are masquerading about in them without a blush upon their faces. I cite that to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) as another instance in which the professions and practices of the Liberal party are entirely at variance. During the last session of Parliament it was my painful duty to offer some strictures upon the action of the First Minister in regard to his interview with the reporter of the Chicago "Record." The hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) will remember that I ventured to insinuate that for him to unbosom his mind to a Chicago reporter was not the best mode of diplomacy, and was calculated to lead to the impression that Canada was in a very bad state. What has that action of the Prime Minister been followed up by? It has been followed by a mission to Washington of hon. members of this Government at a time when there was no United States Government for them to meet; and what was the result? Why, before the gentlemen had returned they received their answer. They have got the Dingley Bill, they have got the Alien Bill, and they have got the Republican Club of New York publishing all the arguments used by hon. gentlemen opposite themselves when they were denouncing us; in order to show to the people of the United States that Canada is now in the most deplorable financial position and that all that is necessary is for the United States to jump on us while we are in that prostrate condition, to compel us to bow to their own terms. There is another instance of the profession and practice of the Liberal party being at variance. These gentlemen opposite have told the people of this country that all that was necessary to obtain favourable and friendly relations with the United States was to put the Liberal party in power. There never was any-

thing more unfounded than the insinuation that the Liberal Conservative party were not always disposed to treat the American nation and the American Government with the utmost consideration. The people of Canada have been told time and time again by hon. gentlemen opposite, that if they wanted friendly relations with the United States, and if they wanted a reciprocity treaty, the only way to obtain it was to put the Liberals in power. Well, they are in power now, and they have gone to the Chicago reporter with the interview, and they have gone down to Washington to interview public men, and they have come back, and the evidence is to the fore that instead of friendly relations with the United States we have never had graver cause to complain of our most vital interests being attacked, and formidably attacked, than we have at the present time by reason of the course pursued by the United States.

I would like my hon. friend the Minister of Marine (Mr. Davies) to tell me how it would be possible to carry out the promises of the Liberal party. He tells me that it is going to be one of the surprises of my life to find the Liberal party, within a week, bring down their budget and their tariff, and exhibiting to the world the magnificent spectacle of a body of Liberal politicians carrying out their promises. Well, Sir, if they do carry out their promises, I can assure the hon. Minister that it will astonish me tremendously and be one of the surprises of my life. If they want to give us one of the greatest possible surprises, they will astound us in the last degree by carrying out their promises. Let me call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to what he said in 1893. These were his remarks then :

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

Sir, was the last contest between free trade and protection ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, it was not, and the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows it, and he knows too that the promise he made was falsified by his party. He declared that the battle was to be between free trade and protection, but free trade was thrown overboard and the effort was made, and successfully made, to climb on to the protectionist platform. The hon. gentleman spoke on the 4th January, 1896, and the words are hardly cold yet, because all the words come so burning from the lips of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies), that they preserve their warmth for a length of time. He then said :

> A seventeen and a-half or twenty per cent tariff was high enough to give protection to the manufacturer. If it were not the manufacturer should go down.

Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) tell me that he is going to say that next week when the budget comes down. Is he going to say to the manufacturers of this country that they must take a 17½ per cent or a 20 per cent tariff, or go down. The hon. gentleman knows he will not say it, and he knows that it was an idle boast of the most glaring kind to tell the people of Aylmer that such a sight was to be expected on the floor of this House as a body of Liberal politicians carrying out their promises. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) added to the last declaration of his, which I have quoted :

> The policy of the Liberal party on the contrary is a reform of the tariff by the elimination from it of every vestige of protection.

Is that to be their policy ? Will this tariff which they will bring down do that ? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) need not be so reticent now, because his hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) from whom a few months ago wild horses would not draw a word in reference to the tariff, has unbosomed himself to some gentlemen connected with the coal industry in the city of Montreal, and he has announced what the policy of his Government is going to be. I do not quite understand the mode in which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) reached his conclusion, but I would like to know which promise is to be carried out ; whether it is the promise of the Minister of Finance that coal shall be protected or the promise of the First Minister, made and reiterated to the electors of Montreal, that coal should be made free. You cannot carry them both out. The hon. gentleman will find that no legerdemain will reconcile both of these policies. My own belief is that the policy of the First Minister will be carried out. I believe that coal will be made free, and I believe it because the hon. gentleman pointed out, in an elaborate argument to the people of Montreal, that great manufacturing centre, that his object was not to injure the manufacturers, and that whatever he was obliged to reduce, of the protection which the manufacturers had, would be more than made up to them by the free coal and the free iron he would give to them. Therefore, I take it that the only means by which the hon. gentleman can carry out his pledges to the electorate of Canada—pledges given before he obtained his present position—and his assurances to the manufacturers and the great railway interests of this country, that coal would be made free, is by falsifying the declarations made by the Minister of Finance the other day at Montreal, in somewhat equivocal terms, that, while they were very desirous of going in the direction

of reducing the tariff on coal, if the United States increased their duty, they would be obliged, not only to maintain the duty on bituminous coal, but to tax anthracite coal as well. Here is the declaration made by the Finance Minister. I will read his words:

> If, however, your view is correct, and it turns out that the United States duty is raised to a high figure, then we shall claim and exercise the right to revise our views respecting this Canadian duty, and we shall feel bound to impose a duty not only on bituminous coal but also on anthracite coal, which at present comes into our markets from the States free of duty. We should much prefer, however, to move in the other direction, and we shall still hope that nothing may occur at Washington to prevent us carrying out our desire.

Now, Sir, I want to know if the hon. Finance Minister had the authority of the hon. First Minister to make that declaration. I have a right to know that, when we have public declarations of policy absolutely and completely contradictory from the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance. "Under which king, Bezonian? Speak or die." I want to know what is to be the fact. My own impression is that this interview in Montreal was manufactured for the Nova Scotia market. The hon. First Minister laughs; but he will, perhaps, permit me to give him my reason for that opinion. The Nova Scotia legislature does not expire by efflux of time until the spring of 1898. It has been dissolved, however, at the most inclement season of the year in the maritime provinces.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no period of the year in which communication throughout the country is so difficult as it is in the present month; and I want to know why the Nova Scotia legislature has been dissolved just on the eve of this new tariff being brought down, if it is not for the purpose of snatching a verdict from the electors while they are blindfolded, and before they know that their interests are to be sacrificed. The hon. Minister of Finance knows well that the party with which he was connected, of which the Hon. Mr. Murray is now the leader, would not have the ghost of a chance to carry the elections in Nova Scotia, if this Government were to repeal the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party of protecting the great coal interests of that province, and he adopts the course of bringing the elections on a year before the end of the term. Did he want to create triennial parliaments? What do you suppose the hon. gentleman's friends down there did? When they were told that their heads were to be cut off ahead of time, they revolted, and a Bill was brought in making the term of the legislature five years instead of four years. That is the way in which matters are carried on by the hon. gentleman's friends in Nova Scotia. Now, I will read the cause assigned for the dissolution of the legislature at that most inopportune time, and this is the most farcical part of the whole proceeding. Here is the manifesto of the leader of the Government of Nova Scotia, putting the whole issue on a Dominion question:

> For this reason (and in view of the proposed action of the present United States Congress) the Provincial Government has already distinctly assumed the position that no action ought to be taken by the Federal Government which would in any way imperil this important industry, and I deem it fitting and proper, before any action is taken in regard to fiscal legislation affecting coal, that the voice of the people of Nova Scotia should be heard upon this issue. This is one of the reasons which influenced the electorate at this early period.

What has the hon. gentleman got to say to that? Instead of requiring an opinion of the people, he knows that the people of Nova Scotia are a unit on this question. He knows that there is at the present moment in the province of Nova Scotia no man who is not prepared to stand up and defend the protection of the great coal industry of Nova Scotia; and he knows, too, that if this Government wanted to strengthen the hands of their party in the local elections of Nova Scotia, there is no means by which they could do it so completely as by protecting that industry. Were it intended to carry out the suggestions which the Minister of Finance has thrown out here, I say there would have been no election in Nova Scotia at present. Instead of closing up the House in a great hurry and dissolving it, if they had wanted to give advice to the Parliament of Canada, they would have had a unanimous vote of the legislature; for there has never been in that House, as the hon. gentleman knows, any one who has not been in favour of the protection of coal except his own party. But they have been converted; and I ought to be a very proud man, and the great party to which I belong ought to be very proud, to find this great rush of converts to our arms on the national policy. Why, the hon. gentleman himself was, a short time ago, for free coal. He was an out and out free trader. But he is, I am happy to say, gradually improving, and I fully expect to have the pleasure of giving a hearty enthusiastic support to a tariff to protect Canadian industries, which we may look for at his hands at a very early day. But so far as the coal industry of Nova Scotia is concerned, I believe that the hon. Finance Minister will prevail, and that the coal interests of Nova Scotia will be sacrificed. The hon. gentleman hopes, however, that before his policy is announced, the elections, which have been so rapidly rushed to a conclusion, will be over, and that the Government will have snatched a verdict from the people of Nova Scotia while these people are blindfolded.

The House will be glad to know that I do not intend to detain them any further. I must apologize for having taken up so much time, but I must say this, and it is the only other remark I shall make before sitting down. Hon. gentlemen opposite will find no obstruction or vexatious opposition on any question from this side of the House. They may rely, with the utmost confidence, on the support of every hon. gentleman on this side in every measure calculated to foster and promote the great industries of this country or the prosperity of Canada.

The PRIME MINSTER (Mr. Laurier). It is to me more than an ordinary pleasure to add my own to the congratulations which my hon. friend has most generously and most fairly and deservedly bestowed upon my hon. friends who moved and seconded the Address. My hon. friend who moved the Address (Mr. Russell) comes from a province which has long been acknowledged as the classic ground of oratory in British North America. He showed us last session, and has shown us again to-day, that the soil of Nova Scotia is as classic as it ever was. He has shown us that the fame which that province has acquired it still retains, and that, in this as in other respects, it shows no signs of degeneration. With regard to my hon. friend from Two Mountains (Mr. Ethier), those of us who had the privilege of following his remarks can testify to the fact that he acquitted himself in a manner most creditable to himself and most creditable to his electors.

Now, with regard to the speech which has just been delivered by my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper), the least I can say of it is that it certainly showed that my hon. friend is not in a very happy frame of mind. There were certain portions of it which, I must say, and I say it with very great pleasure, indeed, were certainly commendable. What he said with reference to the fact that the position which I now occupy may compel me to go to the other side of the water in order to take part in the celebration of the Queen's Jubilee this year, was not only courteous but very generous indeed, and I am happy to tender the hon. gentleman this expression of my sincere gratitude.

But there were other parts of the hon. gentleman's speech which were not at all couched in the same style. There were other parts which showed that the hon. gentleman had severely cudgeled his brains in order to find some ground of attack against the present Administration, and the method which he followed is not altogether peculiar to the hon. gentleman. When arguments were deficient, he supplied their place with copious doses of vituperation. When, for instance, he spoke of inquiries into charges against officers of the civil service, he made use of the terms emissaries and spies, and later on, if I remember rightly, spoke of ballot stuffing, or if not exactly of ballot stuffing, of election frauds of some kind or another. And as he spoke in this strain, I was reminded of the language applied by one of the recent American poets to a vituperative orator who was stumping Morgan county:

He held the banner upwards from trailing in the dust,
He cut loose from monopolies, and cussed and cussed and cussed.

My hon. friend devoted a good part of the speech, I am afraid, to cussing and cussing and cussing. When he spoke of superannuations and of the civil service, I listened to him, I must say, with some interest, for he dared to utter the words emissaries and spies. This is, I am afraid, the only reward we may expect at the hands of the Opposition for having been generous in our treatment. We announced on the floor of Parliament last session that no member of the civil service, whether of the inside or outside service, would be dismissed, except for cause. We declared that every man against whom a charge was brought would have an opportunity of defending himself before a court of inquiry. We appointed commissioners, to investigate charges against members of the civil service, and all the reward we have at this moment is that honourable men, discharging their duty faithfully, are called by my hon. friend emissaries and spies. Sir, the temptation might be great not to be generous. The temptation might be great to recall those spies and emissaries, as the hon. gentleman describes those men who are dealing justly and honourably with the members of the civil service, on the charges brought. But we shall not do that. We shall be generous as well as just and fair. What we have done and are doing, we shall continue to do. We shall dismiss no man except for cause. Every charge shall be investigated and justice be done, but no mercy shall be shown to a delinquent officer.

The hon. gentleman, proceeding with his remarks, said that he would be very much astounded indeed if he saw a Liberal Administration carrying their principles into practice. Why, Sir, he has had that spectacle already. At this very moment he has the spectacle of the Liberal party carrying into practice the principles it professed in opposition. In opposition we pledged ourselves to appeal the infamous Franchise Act, and that is the very first thing we are doing. I am very sorry this reform does not commend itself to the judgment of my hon. friend. The hon. gentleman used, in reference to this matter, some very strong language. I do not care to discuss it at this moment, because not later than next Monday the Bill will be introduced, and we shall have it up for its second reading at an early date. But if the Franchise Act

is the palladium of our liberties, which the hon. gentleman says it is, if without it the federal system cannot be worked, how is it that hon. gentlemen opposite did not dare to apply that Act as often as it should have been applied? How is it they were ashamed and afraid to apply it? It has been in force during ten long years, and under it there should have been a revision of the lists every year. Nevertheless we had but four revisions, and in this House during the last Parliament, when the then Minister of Justice announced that there would be no revision of the lists, he was greeted with cheers, not only from this side but from his own followers. Well, we are going to revert to the system which was in force during the first twenty years of confederation, a system which worked most admirably, and against which there never was a murmur. We are going to revert to that system, and abolish the one which was never accepted with any sense of security even by those who supported it. From that point my hon. friend passed to the reform of the tariff. Well, I shall follow the example of my hon. friend in this matter by not saying much about it. To that extent I shall follow him. But I shall endeavour to say the little that I have to say in fewer words than my hon. friend employed. My hon. friend is in doubt as to what will be the character of the reform of the tariff, and he says that the country also is in doubt. I take issue with him; the country is not in doubt as to the nature of the reform of the tariff which we are to bring in. True, there are a few doubting Thomases on the other side of the House, and the hon. gentleman himself is the chiefest sinner of all. But he cherishes his doubts; he rolls them as sweet morsels under his tongue. As to the character of the reform of the tariff, there is no business man, there is no consumer or producer who is in doubt as to what it will be. It is well known that we will endeavour to alleviate the burdens which now press upon the people, without, at the same time impairing any of the interests which now exist. As to gratifying my hon. friends curiosity, the hon. gentleman will not be surprised if I tell him, that this is not the moment for such a course. Everything will come in its time, and when my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) introduces his measures the hon. leader of the Opposition will find it exactly on the lines I have stated. From this point my hon. friend launched into a comparison of expenditure. Upon that point I shall not say much, as it is sufficient for me to recall just one expression to show to the House very forcibly how little there is to answer in what he has said upon that point. He stated in so many words that we had asked for estimates last session which were $3,000,000 more than had ever been asked by any previous Parliament. This statement he made deliberately. As a matter of fact, we took the estimates of the hon. gentleman himself and for the very same amount. We did not ask $3,000,000 more than had been asked by any Government before when we took the very same estimates that he had asked for himself. Does not the hon. gentleman see how little of force and weight are to be attached to such statements as this? They carry their own refutation. We were told that we should be judged by the expenditure of the money that we were asking Parliament to vote. That is all there is to be said upon that point.

Another statement made by the hon. gentleman I was agreeably surprised to hear him make. That statement was to the effect that simultaneous polling is the privilege and the right of the people. Sir, I welcome that; it is a triumph for the Liberal party to hear such a statement from the hon. gentleman. How many years of agitation and strife did it cost the Liberal party to gain from the Conservative party that simultaneous polling which he says is the right of the people? I want to ask the hon. gentleman whether, when he was sitting on this side, he ever put in practice that principle of simultaneous polling which he now says is necessary in order to maintain the people's liberties. Is it not a fact that when there were by-elections to be held, they were held one after the other, so that the same band of wire-pulling could go from one constituency to another. We believe, as the hon. gentleman professes to believe, in the principle of simultaneous polling, and we have fought for that principle for many years. We believe, that where it is practicable, simultaneous polling is the right of the people, and not only do we believe that, but let me tell the hon. gentleman in answer to what he said a moment ago, that in this as in every other respect we put our principles in practice. Several by-elections were to be held some time ago and we had simultaneous polling, in South Brant, North Ontario, and East Simcoe. My hon. friend asked why we did not have an election in Champlain as well as in Bonaventure. I will give him the facts at once. Bonaventure is populated largely by fishermen, and all the electors there are at home and the election was held at the best time for them. But Champlain is largely a county of lumbermen, and at least one quarter of the electors are in the woods. But we have issued the writs at a time when, the operating season being over, the electors will be back home to vote. I do not know what the result will be, I make no boast. But I have reason to believe that the temper of the people in Champlain is the same as it has been shown to be in Bonaventure, in Wright, and everywhere else throughout the length and breadth of the province of Quebec.

In connection with this, the hon. gentleman ventured to make remarks, which, bold

as he is—for I pay him the compliment readily, he is a bold man—I did not expect from him on this occasion. He attempted to speak of frauds in these recent elections. He gave us only words without any proof whatever. But why does he not speak of what took place in Manitoba? We know that the majorities gained by his party in Manitoba were obtained by ballot-stuffing, ballot-scratching, ballot-tampering, such as never was known in any country, not even in New York, in the worst days of Boss Tweed and Tammany Hall. Why, Sir, it is a well known fact that the officers in that election, the men who were to take the votes of the people, were, some of them, jail-birds, convicts escaped from penitentiary, men who should have been in jail instead of recording the votes of a free people. It is a well known fact that there are men actually in jail to-day having been put there because the truth, or rather a part of the truth came to light.

But the hon. gentleman devoted by far the greater part of his speech to the Manitoba school question, and it was indeed a characteristic speech. From the first word to the last it exhibited the policy of the hon. gentleman and those who still adhere to him. The hon. gentleman commenced by stating that the settlement that we had made with the Manitoba Government was not constitutional. He said that it was hardly constitutional for us to say in the Speech from the Throne that a settlement had been arrived at between the two governments. I do not know exactly what the hon. gentleman means by that, especially in view of the history of the case. But the hon. gentleman has occupied so many positions on this question that, perhaps, I should not be surprised at that which he takes to-day. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman says that it is not constitutional for the Federal Government and the provincial government of Manitoba to come to a settlement upon that question. Well, if it be not constitutional, I want to know why did the hon. gentleman send commissioners to Winnipeg to negotiate a settlement.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. I did not say that it was not within the right and the power of the Federal Government to negotiate with the government of Manitoba; but the point I raised, as a constitutional point, was that the Government of this Dominion have no authority, outside the constitution of the country, to warrant them in making a settlement. They can frame a settlement, and they could announce that they had used their good offices, and that a settlement had been effected with the government of Manitoba; but, in my judgment, there is no warrant for placing themselves in the position of claiming that they had made the settlement.

The PRIME MINISTER. I rather thank the hon. gentleman for the explanation that he has given. I always thought that those negotiations were a sham. In the very words of the hon. gentleman, commissioners were sent by the late Government to Manitoba. If they were not sent to effect a settlement, why were they sent at all? Sir, if the conduct of the hon. gentleman, last winter, when he sent commissioners to Manitoba, was not a sham, his present language is nothing else than a sham. This is the condition in which we find ourselves. The verdict of the people upon this question, taken on the 23rd of June, has put a new face upon it. When we came into power, we approached that question in the only way in which it should have been approached, and if it had been approached in that way first, his country would have been spared the years of agitation which have brought it almost to the verge of civil war. We went to the government of Manitoba and said to them: The legislation of 1890 has inflicted a grievance upon the minority of Manitoba. You have the authority of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council that such is the case. Repair the grievance yourselves. Sir, they undertook themselves to repair that grievance. We thought, and still think, and upon that issue I am ready at any time to take the verdict of the country—that the smallest measure of conciliation was far preferable to any measure of coercion. The hon. gentleman says that we obtained no concessions for the minority; he argued no less than forty minutes to prove that we obtained no restoration to the minority of the rights which they had enjoyed before. I care not what he says about that, in view of what he said immediately afterwards. He insisted that we had obtained no restoration of any rights which had been enjoyed by the minority, but in the next breath he says that we have obtained new rights for the minority. I care not whether we obtained a restoration of old rights or a concession of new rights; the only thing I care for is that, whereas, under the Act of 1890, they had not the privilege of teaching their own religion in the schools, by the concessions which have been made, whether they are concessions of new rights or a restoration of old rights, they will have the right hereafter of teaching their own religion in the province of Manitoba. Sir, the hon. gentleman said that the population of the province of Quebec were not satisfied with the settlement. First of all, the hon. gentleman attempted to show that my friends and myself were in contradiction with ourselves, when he stated that here, on the floor of Parliament, I had addressed myself to the Protestants, and going afterwards to the province of Quebec, had addressed myself to the Catholics. I repudiate both assertions. Whether on the floor of Parliament or in the province of Quebec, I addressed myself neither to Protestants nor to Catholics, but I addressed myself to

Canadians. The position I took upon this question, I took on the floor of this Parliament, I took it in the province of Ontario, I took it in the province of Quebec, I maintained it everywhere, and it was this: That though the constitution of this country gave to this Parliament and to this Government the right and power of interference with the school legislation of Manitoba, it was an extreme right, a reserved power, to be exercised only when all other means had been exhausted. Well, the moment I found that the people of Manitoba were ready to make concessions which practically restored to the Catholics the right of teaching the French language and of teaching their own religion in the schools, I submitted to my fellow-countrymen in the province of Quebec that it was far better to obtain those concessions by negotiation than to endeavour to obtain them by means of coercion. Sir, that question has been submitted to the electors more than once. It was submitted in Wright, and you have the result by an increased majority. It was submitted in Bonaventure, and you have the result by an increased majority. It was submitted in Cornwall and Stormont, and you have the result there also by an increased majority. Sir, that question will be submitted to the people in other constituencies; and I venture at this moment to say that there is not a man in the province of Quebec, there is not a man in this country, who, looking at the settlement, unbiassed and unprejudiced, will not come to the conclusion that it was a happy solution of a very difficult situation indeed. I am perfectly aware—why should I disguise to myself a thing which stares us in the face?—I know very well that the settlement we have effected is not acceptable to certain high dignitaries in the church to which I belong. But I have every reason to believe, nay, as day after day passes, it becomes more evident, that as the facts are better understood, the conviction will take possession of every breast in this country that, if we are ever to make a nation of Canada, if we are ever to solve successfully any of these difficulties that may arise, we can only solve them in the way expressed in the Speech from the Throne, by mutual concession and reciprocal good will. I might say more, I am quite free to say more. I may say that this settlement is not as advantageous as I desired myself; but I have no hesitation in saying, that though it is not as advantageous as I would have desired myself, still, after six long years of agitation, when the passions of men had been aroused to the highest pitch, it was not possible to obtain more, nor for the government of Manitoba to concede more, under present circumstances.

My hon. friend has the audacity—yes, I will use that word—to mention the name of the new member for Bonaventure, Mr. Guité, with some opprobrium. Why, Sir, if there is a man to-day who, in my estimation, occupies a proud position in this country, it is the new member for Bonaventure, a man who maintains his civil rights against great odds, a man who, while maintaining his civil rights against great odds, did not hesitate to say: I am a Catholic, and I shall spare no effort to secure for my fellow-countrymen in Manitoba more rights than they now possess. And who can blame the hon. member for so doing? It is open to every man in the province of Manitoba to seek for an amendment to the law. Now, the only thing upon which I take issue with my hon. friend opposite is that, while it is open to my friend, Mr. Guité, to persuade the people of Manitoba, it is not open to the hon. gentleman to coerce that same people. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman, after having made that speech, concluded—no, I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, he did not conclude at all—he spoke for an hour, and after having spoken for an hour, did not dare to enunciate a policy. Why, Sir, on the contrary, he told the House, so far as his language would go, that he washed his hands of the whole matter, that he had no more to do with it. Last session he was ready to die, to shed his blood, for he expected there would be votes for him in the province of Quebec. But like many another hero, when there is nothing more to be gained by heroism there is no more heroism whatever. But the hon. gentleman uttered a word a moment ago which he does not suppose I will allow to pass by without having something to say in regard to it. The hon. gentleman, speaking of Mr. Russell, referred to him as the emissary of the Canadian Government to the Court of Rome. I do not understand what the hon. gentleman means. If he will make a charge plain and substantial, that we can understand, I will meet him, but I will have no cowardly insinuations in regard to that matter.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say to the hon. gentleman that I based my statement that he was an emissary of the Government to Rome on the telegram that was published in the hon. gentleman's own papers, I think, in which it was stated that he had officially communicated to the Government the result of his mission.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman wants to give circulation to a newspaper report. I am surprised that an hon. gentleman of his years, of his reputation and experience on the floor of Parliament, in discussing great questions, as he has been discussing them, should make charges on mere newspaper rumours. Again, I repeat, if the hon. gentleman will make a charge, I will not say make a charge, but put a question even, I will be prepared to give him an answer; but I do not want, and I protest against any such

innuendoes being thrown into this discussion.

The hon. gentleman stated before six o'clock, that there was peace and amity among the different races and creeds of this country. Thank God, there is. But if it is so, there is too much reason to fear that if such statements as the hon. gentleman has made, if the policy of the school of the hon. gentleman were to prevail, we would not have peace and harmony, but civil war amongst us. The hon. gentleman spoke this afternoon feelingly, eloquently and well in regard to the jubilee of Her Majesty the Queen. I could not add a word to what he said at that time, except this, that there is not perhaps in the broad dominions of Her Majesty any portion of the Empire where so much can be achieved out of the jubilee year. This is the jubilee year; this is the sixtieth anniversary of Her Majesty the Queen. Throughout the broad Empire all the tribes, all the races and all the nations which acknowledge her supreme authority, will vie with each other to do her honour; all the tribes, all the races, all the nations, divided though they may be in colour, in religion, in education, in blood, still will be unanimous in their endeavours, in their efforts, in emulation among themselves to testify to their devotion to her person. Monuments will be erected in commemoration of the event. The arts will be called on to give expression in marble and in bronze to the loyal devotion of so many millions to one who is so wise and whose reign has been so beneficent. But there are monuments which speak more eloquently, more loudly and more eloquently than even those of sculptured bronze or carved marble. There are monuments which will be more fitting for this occasion than sculptured bronze and carved marble. Let this be a jubilee year, indeed. Let this year be as of old, a year of remission. Let the past be forgotten, let old scores be put into oblivion, let strife and contention be for ever buried, and instead let trust, confidence and good-will spring forth from the ground and rise towards heaven. This is the noblest monument, in my estimation, which the Canadian people could offer as their contribution to the glory of the jubilee year.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, there is one fact which is quite patent to hon. members on both sides of the House, and after to-morrow it will be quite patent to the country at large, and that fact is this, that the nine months of ministerial responsibility which have weighed, we will say, upon the shoulders of my hon. friend who has just taken his seat have not had the effect either of diminishing his verbiage or of adding to the weight or to the logic of his remarks. I may be permitted to remind my hon. friend and the hon. gentlemen who sit behind him that that same light, indefinite and airy method which might well become a gentleman who led the skirmishes of his army on the side of the Opposition, is not quite what we might expect from a gentleman who is now leader of Her Majesty's Government in the Dominion of Canada and who is expected in a grave, reasonable and dignified manner to answer the objections that are brought against his Government and his party. I leave it to the hon. gentlemen on either side of the House to say if the hon. leader in the course of his fifteen or twenty minutes address even attempted to answer the strong points made by my hon. friend against his Government and party. The hon. gentleman has given us an example to-night of the skirmishing order of debating school reply. He has given an answer which when it comes to be placed side by side with the indictment of his Government and party made here to-night, will not read to his advantage, and will not accrue to the advantage of his party. If he can be serious for a moment, let me call the hon. gentleman's attention to some things that he found it convenient to forget. To take the first point, my hon. friend pointed out a distinct disagreement which prevailed between the hon. gentleman and his Finance Minister with respect to certain matters in regard to the tariff. Is the tariff an unimportant matter to hon. gentlemen opposite? If the hon. leader of the House thinks it an unimportant matter, the commercial interests have not thought it an unimportant matter during the last nine months, and to-morrow, when the business men read the light and flippant answer the hon. gentleman made to the remarks of my hon. friend, they will be no more satisfied and no more set at rest and at peace with respect to the way in which the hon. gentleman treats matters of this kind, which is one that would not be expected from him as leader of his party on this, the gravest question which to-day is before this Parliament for consideration. I ask the leader of the Government: Is it true or not, that his Finance Minister went down to Montreal the other day and took it upon himself to make an announcement with reference to the duty on coal, evidently with the consent of the Government—unless the Prime Minister allows the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to do what the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) declared before he went into the Ministry he would do, namely, do just as he pleased and have a free hand in everything. But, Sir, if there is to be any solidarity in government, and if the strong grasp in the gloved hand is to typify my hon. friend as the leader of the Government, let me ask him: if it was under his advisement that his Minister of Finance went down to Montreal a little while before the tariff was to be brought down, and made a public announcement with reference to one industry, while he has for nine months sealed his lips with reference to every other industry in this country. Does my hon.

friend (Mr. Laurier) think that is a practice which is honest or decent? The pork packers of this country, taken in connection with the agricultural interests, are as important an industrial body as any in Canada. They were in the direst quandary of any set of producers in this country, and the farmers were linked with them in that quandary. The pork packer buys in the autumn of the year and does the packing and curing of what he purchases in order to sell in the market ten or twelve months thereafter. Like highwaymen, who when they had not the tools of war in their hands threatened and boasted of what they would do when they got the implements of warfare, the party led by my hon. friend bullied the business interests of this country, and boasted that when they got into power and got the sword, they would cut off the head of protection and trample upon its body. When the sword of power was put into their hands they uplifted it upon the basis of their preceding pledges; the solemn promises of the 1893 convention which was their bible, and their compendium of solemn pledges which they gave to this country for the last eighteen years—a country that they said was being bled white, a fair country that they told us lay helpless and powerless under the shackles of protection. The sword of power was put in their hands, and the pork packers of Canada came before these would be executioners, these professed executioners. The pork packers laid their dire straits before them, and they asked that commission to be kind enough to give them some hint as to their policy, for the sake of the farmers from whom they bought, and to whom they must pay on the basis of what might be the worst possible position they would be put into nine months hence. If to-day they had a protection of 2 or 3 cents per pound and could be sure that that protection would hold in this country when they came to sell their purchases of the nine months previous, they would pay on that basis; but if they thought that the duty was to be taken off, and that when they came to sell they would have to face a competition which would take so much from their price, they must pay the farmer the lessened price for his pork. The pork packers of Canada appeared humbly before this great commission with the uplifted sword in their hands, and laid these facts before them, and prayed them for the sake of the farmers and in their own interets to give them some indication of what they would do so far as the principle of revision was concerned, or at least that their Royal Highnesses would say they would not put into effect any reduction of the tariff which would injure them in the sale of the purchases they had made under differing conditions; but the Finance Minister buttoned up his lips, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce looked wise and said nothing. You could not draw from any of them a hint as to that industry. They were right in that, because, though they might indicate the principle on which they proposed to proceed, they are bound by the law and practice not to announce the details on any given article. Sir, they had no right to give out a detail of one single item of their tariff, until they published all the details. What right has the Minister of Finance, because a certain industry may be a pet of his own, or because he may be "rigging" a political market; what right has he to announce in advance a single item of his tariff rates. If he refused to every other industry in the country an indication of what the Government would do, what right has he, for a political purpose and on the eve of a political election, to state what he is going to do with reference to one singe industry? And, Sir, relying upon the Minister of Finance who did that indecent thing, politically speaking, there is to-day a provincial election in the province of Nova Scotia, which is not a contest on provincial policy. The programme of Mr. Murray was read and it is based on a Dominion issue; it is constructed on the promise of the Finance Minister. I arraign the Government of which my hon. friend is the Prime Minister, for no man who is Finance Minister under him would dare to make a statement like that, if this Government is a constitutional government, without having first consulted his colleagues. Did the Prime Minister authorize the Finance Minister to single out one industry and in that indecent fashion make the will of the Government known to that industry, whilst every other industry languished in doubt. Did he or did he not? No answer. If the Finance Minister was authorized to state that, what is the position of the Prime Minister, as his words stand before him to-day and gaze at his face from every paper which published them. Does he remember that he stood before the business men of Montreal—that is before the business men of Canada—and declared, that the policy of his Government would be to make cheap coal and cheap iron, to take off the duty on coal and iron. And, Sir, when the inconsistency of these statements is pointed out, and the Prime Minister is asked to reconcile them, he makes some flippant argument such as a school boy would use in a debating society. He has no dignified, no governmental answer to give such as this House and this country demand. Now, Sir, I put this question strongly, and not one whit more strongly than it deserves: what right has my hon. friend to single out one industry and set that at rest, while every other industry is kept hanging in doubt and uncertainty. I want to ask the Prime Minister one more question. He has come before us with one single unbroken promise. Out of the five hundred promises he has made, when they are flung in his face broken into flinders, he takes up one and he says: Oh, the hon. gen-

tleman says that we did not keep our promises but I will prove that he is not right for here is a promise that we kept, we are going to introduce a Bill to repeal the Franchise Act. Here is one insignificant promise fulfilled amongst the hundreds that have been broken and the scattered fragments of which lie all around my hon. friend. He is going to bring down a Franchise Bill now. After nine months of the flaming sword over the business heads of the country, after the preceding year of threats when they had not the sword; by what right do they meet Parliament to-day and refuse to bring down their Tariff Bill until the election in Nova Scotia is over. In the face of the statement of Mr. Murray—I challenge the Finance Minister to deny it—let me ask: is he going to put that tariff before the House before Mr. Murray's election is over? Mr. Murray knows. Mr. Murray is running his election on that promise and on that rig. Mr. Murray declares to the people of Nova Scotia: you are called upon to vote because through you, this general election in Nova Scotia is to tell the people at Ottawa what you want, before their tariff is brought down, and before their tariff is carried through. Hon. gentlemen may think that I speak warmly. I do. I speak what I feel, and I speak what every honest Liberal will feel, at such a gross manipulation of secrets that should lie locked up in the Finance Minister's breast, until he is prepared to lay them all before Parliament, and at the unblushing and pronounced abuse of his position which he thus prostitutes for the purposes of party politics.

Now, Sir, I am not going to debate the tariff question at this time. I will debate it later when the tariff comes down; but I point out to this House and the country that my hon. friend the Prime Minister has not taken a dignified position here to-night, and I charge him and his Ministry with doing what was never before done in the Dominion of Canada by a Finance Minister on the eve of bringing down a tariff, and I ask again for a justification of this course. Honour and purity in elections sit very nicely on the lips of my hon. friend; but there is not a scheme nor a wrinkle known to the latest resources of political warfare that my hon. friend and his followers are not capable of putting into operation; and this one is the worst and the most indecent one that has taken place in the history of parliamentary government in this country.

There is one other point that I wish to speak of on this same tariff business. In his airy, delightfully airy, nothing but airy way, my hon. friend the leader of the Government says there is not a man nor woman in this country who does not know to-day what the Government is going to do with the tariff. You heard him say that, Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen on both sides heard him say that; and then to show how undesirable it was that every man in the Dominion of Canada knew just what they are going to do, he defined, in just so many English words, what their tariff is to be. Here it is:

> To alleviate the burdens of the people, and impair no present business interests.

Delightfully definite. The president of the Board of Trade in Toronto knows now exactly what this tariff is to be: the new president of the Board of Trade in Montreal knows now exactly what the tariff is to be; the rolling mill men can now light their furnaces and start their fires, and roll along merrily, for they know exactly what the tariff is to be. The great man has spoken; the wonderful definer of things to be defined has made his definition, and it is definite. Do you want to know what the tariff is to do in all its principles and details? It is "to alleviate the burdens of the people and to impair no present business interests." Delightful! No longer will the commercial papers say that the business of the country is retarded, is languishing and is becoming demoralized on account of prevailing doubt and uncertainty. Dun, Wiman & Co., and Bradstreets will now be delightfully explicit, and will say: "All doubt is removed, and the clink and whirr of the wheels of business goes on right merrily since the 27th day of March, 1897, when the Premier of the Dominion gave this lucid explanation of just what the principle and the details of the tariff are to be." And the bankers, one of whom, by the way, writing to me the other day, said to me at the end of the letter: "Help them to get through the tariff as quickly as possible, for everything is hung up on uncertainty." I am going to send him in the morning the very words of this definition, and ask him if everything cannot now be taken off the pin and allowed to roll along.

As to simultaneous polling, it was a delightful and logical and straightforward answer which the Prime Minister made on that question. Here you have, Mr. Speaker, for eighteen years a virtuous party, a party of purity, a party of principle, thundering at the wrong method and bad practice of a Government at any time holding the by-elections one after another, and arranging them to suit themselves. It is brought to the leader's mind that in four or five cases, after he has got the rule and power, instead of carrying out the principle which he has been advocating for all these years, he has violated his own principle. His answer is ready, and it is just as weighty as it is ready: "What have you to say about it? See how you used to do it." That is a complete absolution for present disregard of principle which he was so strongly in favour of, and which he made a cardinal principle of the Liberal party when in opposition, and even then he said too much, or he did not say enough. The

hon. gentleman has a wide knowledge of the county of Bonaventure. He knows exactly where the people were and what they were doing. Why was the election brought on so soon in Bonaventure ? Because he says the people there are fishermen, and might go away fishing. Why was it not brought on so soon in Champlain ? Because he says the people there are lumbermen and are away lumbering. Does the hon. gentleman not know that Bonaventure is a very large lumbering as well as fishing county ? Does he not know that the fishermen do not go out to their fishing for a month yet ? Was it so pressing, therefore, that he did not allow the days of honest grace to his opponents to canvass the county and make preparations for the election ? What has he to say about the county of Colchester, one of the best counties in the province of Nova Scotia, which for three months and more has been without a representative, and which to-day has no voice in this Parliament ? He was asked the reason of that by the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills), and he dodged the question, as he dodges every question which he finds it a little difficult to answer, and forgot to tell us what the reason was. Will he tell us now the reason why the election in Colchester was not brought on ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The answer was made to the questions of the hon. leader of the Opposition, who was speaking of the effect of the school question in Quebec. My attention had not been called to Colchester.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has not answered my question. I asked him if he would give the answer now why he had not brought on the election in Colchester. He has dodged the question again. If my hon. friend goes on in this way as Prime Minister, he will soon be called the artful dodger. I will tell my hon. friend what I think is the reason why he has not brought on the election in Colchester. I think the motive which induced his Finance Minister to make a wrongful declaration with reference to the coal industry before the time, so as to influence the elections in Nova Scotia was about on an even keel with my hon. friend's intention of keeping back the election in Colchester so as to bring it on on the very same day as the provincial elections. For what purpose ? For the purpose of overwhelming the Liberal-Conservative candidate in the county of Colchester under what they hoped would be a very great rush, a very great majority in the provincial elections which are now being carried on. My hon. friend forgot the county of Wright. If Champlain could not be called on because lumbermen lived in Champlain, and were absent, is not Wright a lumbering county, and a very large lumbering county ? My hon. friend forgot to square all these points, when he thought of that ready, light answer to his opponent. He brought on Bonaventure because he thought he had a catch on the Conservatives, and he did not bring on Champlain because he did not want that election brought on before all the others were decided. He brought on Wright, but in doing so he violated a Liberal principle again. What has been his contention, as Liberal leader ? It has always been that, when a county wished to elect a representative, it should not be left to the bosses and leaders to dictate to the county what representative it should choose, but the independent men of the party should be called together and nominate the candidate they desired. In this case that principle was not carried out, but my hon. friend himself was the nominator for the party. It was he who choose the nominee for the party. So anxious was he to smother the real voice of that large electorate, that his writs were issued so late that I doubt very much if the notices could have been posted up within the legal delay of eight days before the day of the election. I believe that, unless they were posted up on Sunday, the required legal notice could not have been given. So determined was he that the county of Wright should not have any time to discuss the question thrust on the electorate all at once, that he rushed this election on within a working period of less than ten days.

There was a charge made against my hon. friend to-night which he cannot let go and maintain his position in this House as a Prime Minister and a public man anxious that his word, when given, should be looked upon as seriously given. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) analysed what the hon. gentleman said in the town of Hull regarding the number of school children required by the Manitoba Bill to compel the carrying out of certain things which were agreed to in the school settlement, and my hon. friend pointed out that there was a very great difference between children of school age in average attendance and the number of children living in the parish or district. My hon. friend the Prime Minister took the latter as the basis of his statement, if he is correctly reported—and he has not denied the report—which is, therefore as incorrect as it could well be. The inaccuracy has been pointed out to him, and he has not noticed it. If it were an inaccuracy, made simply through carelessness or inappreciative reading, it is bad, but if it were intended to deceive the electorate, all the worse for my hon. friend. But I call the attention of the House to the fact that he has not thought it worth while to notice this grave charge made against his veracity.

My hon. friend made another statement. He said that the statement made by the leader of the Opposition that the Estimates brought down last year by the Government were some three million dollars greater than the largest estimate brought down by the Liberal-Conservatives, had no founda-

tion in fact. Well, I have the figures before me, and they bear out the statement of the hon. leader of the Opposition. And, if the First Minister did not know that he was wrong, his hon. colleague the Finance Minister might very easily have set him right. Here are the figures. The Estimates brought down by the late Government were $37,800,000, and the amount which was passed through by hon. gentlemen opposite, as their Estimates, including what should have been passed for expenses of this session but was left over as Supplementaries, was a little over $40,000,000.

But my hon. friend tried to turn the point of the attack by introducing new matter, and he referred to the alleged illegal practices in the province of Manitoba during the elections. It would have been as well for my hon. friend if he had not done this. My hon. friend has followed the example set by the Liberal papers, and some of the Liberal speakers, of taking every charge made as proved, but he has not got their excuse of doing this before the charges were gone into. From one end of this country, to the other, and throughout England as well, the charges were circulated of misdoings by the returning officers and Conservative candidates in the province of Manitoba, and every charge made was heralded as if fully proved. Well, the trials were rushed on by the Liberal government of Manitoba, and constant changes of court were obtained, in order to secure convictions, if possible; but, after the cases had gone through the courts, what was the net result? Out of the whole twenty-seven or more against whom charges were made, but one conviction was obtained. Every other man accused was cleared for want of proof, and the attorneys of the Liberal party, conducting the case against Mr. Hugh John Macdonald, whom we miss here to-night, said in open court that there was not a shadow of proof for the statement made charging him with personal corruption. Although he had been charged with being a personator and a ballot-stuffer and with having been guilty of illegal practices, the attorneys for the party admitted that for these charges there was not a tittle of foundation.

Then, with reference to the civil service, my hon. friend deftly turned the argument against the hon. leader of the Opposition by charging my hon. friend with having called the commissioners spies on the civil service. I listened to my hon. friend and did not take that meaning from what he said. I understood him to say that the civil service, from the top to the bottom, was permeated by spies and emissaries, and that statement is as true as the Gospel. Going into the Department of the Interior to-day or any time since the late election, one could see that the statements made by my hon. friend is true, and that the department had been the haunt of spies and emissaries. Every man who felt that he belonged to the dominant party and wanted promotion to the place of another, was at work trying, if possible, to trump up some charge against a superior officer in order to secure that officer's place for himself. I say that from one end of this country to the other the civil servants of a political faith different from that of the party in power do not feel themselves secure in their position. No man knows but that a chance word that he drops to an acquaintance may be reported to his injury. There is fear and trembling and demoralization and confusion among the civil service such as will always be manifested when the dominant party, not being strong enough to ward off the assaults of its greedy supporters, listens to their demands, and, while giving fair words to the public such as my hon. friend gave here to-night that no man would be dismissed without a charge and an investigation, acts upon a different principle. Did not my hon. friend state to-night that no man would be dismissed without a charge and an investigation? He did. But the time will come when, in this House, I will give him dozens of examples of men who have served their country faithfully for ten, twelve, or perhaps twenty years, without charges against them, were dismissed, the first intimation being a notice from headquarters that their services were not required after a certain time. Take the case of a man appointed under the Liberal-Conservative Administration, who has done his work faithfully and served the Government well for years without a blot upon his record, and has paid into the superannuation fund for the benefit of his wife and family if he should be disabled. The other party comes into power, and this man, merely because he is a Conservative, is dismissed, and the Government retains the money that he paid in. I would ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier), who has just left the House, if he thinks that is an honest and fair thing to do? That has been done, and before the session is many weeks older we shall have the cases before the House. And yet the hon. gentleman has the effrontery, the audacity, to use a word which he used with reference to my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper), to stand up and, in the face of the country, which has examples of this thing from one end of it to the other, declare upon his word of honour, that no man has been or will be dismissed unless there is a charge and an investigation. And yet behind him sits the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), who, in this House, made public declaration of the policy he would follow—that he might possibly give a chance for a man to repel a charge if he was a high class official and got a good salary, but in the case of a poor labouring man, there were so many of them, that he could not take them into consideration. And do you know what else demoralizes the civil

service? If you are doing your work well in a public capacity, you have your own dignity and self-respect, and does it help that to have a political heeler whom you know to be not your equal made a high commissioner to come and scent around your official district, and hale you before him to answer charges against you. As a man of self-respect and good standing you are apt to say: I would rather go out of the service than submit to such an indignity. In New Brunswick, in Manitoba, in other parts of the country, that kind of commissioner is travelling the country to-day. I can give the case of an honest old man who for the last fifteen years has done his duty as caretaker in a public building—inoffensive as ever a man was, respected by the people of both sides of politics, and who, simply because he voted for the Liberal-Conservative candidate, was turned adrift, and his family is without this means of livelihood to-day. Is that honest? Is that a thing for a great party of talents, and brains, and business capacity, to be engaged in? Why is their tariff not ready, why is not some policy upon the fast line matured, why is the Crow's Nest Railway matter not decided? Simply because the great heads have been so busy cutting of the small heads that they have had no time to devote to matters of policy. And we may look for worse because they have capitulated to their followers.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend knows it, he knows that they have capitulated to their followers, and that the dismissals that have been made are not a circumstance to the dismissals that will be made. And dismissals, superannuations, appointments—everything goes through with the greatest of facility. Things are not as they used to be.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. From my hon. friend's standpoint he would think that that was hard. But we do not think it so. But I know the gentlemen opposite would find it still worse if they had to go out of office. I wish to call the attention of the House to a matter which has already been before it—the reputed action of the Government with reference to the Baie des Chaleurs Railway. I thought it was a tenet of the Liberal party, I thought it was a feature of sound constitutional government in British countries, that Government could not enter into contracts and spend money for purposes for which no appropriation has been made by Parliament. We own the Intercolonial Railway, and we appropriate money for the purpose of carrying on that railway. But have we appropriated any money which would justify the Government in taking twenty or thirty or ninety miles of railway and operating it? They could make an agreement to operate it, to be afterwards presented to the House and the expenses provided for. If they have been operating the Baie des Chaleurs Railway they must certainly have been operating it at an expense to the country; and, if so, what becomes of the principle that the Government is simply the servant of Parliament to expend the moneys appropriated by Parliament. Has my hon. friend, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who got up last year and, in a fit of penitence, declared he had done it, he knew, but would not do it again, has he been at it again? Has my hon. friend been getting a Governor General's warrant to operate the Baie des Chaleurs Railway for political or other purposes? We will have the answer by and by. I draw the attention of the House and of the country to this: It has been stated that this matter has been carried on for some months. If it has, under what warrant, and by what right?

Now, Sir, I come to another question, and that is the Manitoba School Act. I have a few words to say with reference to the Manitoba School Act simply and solely because the question is now a question of record between the two parties; and I do not think that we on this side can sit still and have the record of the Liberal-Conservative party put in a different position from that which it should occupy. There are just some thoughts which come to my mind. In the first place, my hon. friend the leader of the Government, praises Mr. Guité, concerning whom he tries to tell the House that my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, had made insinuations. The leader of the Opposition made no insinuations against Mr. Guité. He did say that there had been a double-headed circular sent out to the electors of Mr. Guité's county, and that these two had been directed to people of two different beliefs. That did not constitute an insinuation against Mr. Guité. But I wish to draw the attention of the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) to the high encomiums that my hon. friend the leader of the Government, and his leader and colleague in the Government, paid to Mr. Guité—for what? Because Mr. Guité had been brave enough and strong enough to say to the bishop: No, I cannot sign what you want me to sign, I must stand for civil liberty. Was the Solicitor General in his place at that particular time? Did it grate harshly upon his ears? No, I am afraid that even my hon. friend has not that within his bosom which sometimes makes cowards of men. What was the point of the encomium upon Mr. Guité? That he did not bow to the bishop, that when the bishop wanted him to sign a letter, he would not sign it. There was your hero, there was your brave man. And, par conséquence, is my hon. friend the Solicitor General a hero or a brave man? For he bent the knee and he took the pen, and he straightway made his solemn pledge of faith and honour, that he would—stand

for civil liberty? No, but do just exactly what the bishops' mandement bade him do. Now, if Mr. Guité was a hero in the estimation of my hon. friend for the reason given, what must be the rather equivocal position of my friend the Solicitor General? My hon. friend the Solicitor General is in a peculiar position. But I will make it a little clearer. We missed to-day the ruddy countenance of the former member for Wright. I was told in the county of Wright when I was conducting a canvass there as best I could against the myrmidons of the Government——

Mr. DOMVILLE. You have not much intelligence.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, there is my hon. friend again. I did not know but that business out in the North-west had rather relieved us of him. Now I was going on to say that I was told in the county of Wright the reason why the former member was not here. Is the Minister of the Interior around? He does not seem to be in his place. But the reason that was given to me in the county of Wright why Mr. Devlin resigned, was that his health was so poor that it would not allow him to do his duties to his constituents, the electors of Wright. Now, I understood my hon. friend last year to declare that the Government was going to launch out into a vigorous immigration policy. They have launched out, and they have commenced by making a sort of national sanitarium for sick politicians on the other side of the water. Well, Mr. Devlin's health was so delicate, so report says, that he cannot stand three months of the year here, and the other eight or nine months in the balmy breezes of Aylmer and the county contiguous; but he is vigorous and strong enough to go to an exigent and large field of labour, and to put in operation that vigorous immigration policy! I think that was not the real reason. Now, I make another illustration for my hon. friend the Solicitor General. Why did Mr. Devlin not face the House? Mr. Devlin, I think, gave the reason why when, last year, he stood in his place in the House and launched that speech of his in favour of the Manitoba minority, the oppressed minority, the humiliated minority, the minority robbed of rights by superior and arrogant power, as he phrased it. On that occasion he uttered this language:

> I vote for the principle of this Bill because it declares the right of the minority to separate schools, and God forbid that the day should ever come when, in this House or out of it, holding the belief which I do, I should refuse to vote in favour of the principle of restoring to the Catholic minority its separate schools.

That was Mr. Devlin's principle, that was his stand. Having stated that in this House Mr. Devlin felt that he could not, in consistency with his manhood, come into this House again and vote for my hon. friend opposite. But my hon. friend the Solicitor General is made of different metal. When the bishop asked him to sign the pledge he gets down and signs it—because he wants to be elected. He declares to his bishop that he submits to the bishops' will and mandement, that he is in favour of remedial legislation, that if, at the next session of this House, remedial legislation is not introduced and carried through by his leader, he will resign. He has not resigned. There is the Solicitor General, the representative of justice in the cabinet of the country, making a solemn pledge, which is stronger than an oath to any honest man, violating his pledge; in the first place making a pledge to get into the House, in the second place, violating the pledge to keep in the House, and to keep his position. The former member for Wright would not face a contingency of that kind, and he handed in his resignation—for a consideration. The hon. gentleman opposite, in a piece of casuistry which is anything but commendable in the representative of justice in the cabinet of this country, tries to justify himself, and he justifies himself by saying that after all he did not know that it would do any good if he did keep his word, and that therefore he might just as well break it. But his colleague, the Hon. Mr. Geoffrion—he will pardon me for mentioning him by name—took occasion to read his friend and other such friends as he, a lecture the other night at a club meeting in Montreal. Mr. Geoffrion proceeded to give his definition of a Liberal. "He was a man who had the courage of his convictions, and one who defended the cause he had at heart with firmness." Now, I want to ask the leader of the Government this: Is it true, as he is reported in the papers, after his declaration, and the declaration of Mr. Greenway and his Government, that the settlement given was final and nothing more would be given, that my hon. friend, speaking in Montreal, described this as but the first instalment of the justice that was to be done to the Manitoba minority? If that is true, how comes it that my hon. friend now, in the Speech from the Throne, deliberately declares that this is the best and only arrangement that can be got? How is it that Mr. Greenway, the Premier of Manitoba, when the rumour went up to Winnipeg that he was going to give more concessions to the Catholic minority, came out and said: That is not true, this is the ultimate and all that we will do as a Government. But the hon. the Solicitor General is a member of the hon. gentleman's Government, he is one of his colleagues, he is responsible for the speech that was put in the mouth of the Governor General as well as is my hon. friend; and yet the Solicitor General in explaining that he has not kept his solemn word, makes two important statements. He said that "either Sir Charles Tupper or Mr. Laurier will be returned, the

latter of whom promised conciliation first and coercion only in the event of the appeal to obtain a peaceful settlement failing." That disposes pretty effectively, so far as the testimony of the law officer of the Crown goes, of the contention that the leader did hold out to the province of Quebec, that he would secure justice to the minority of Manitoba, that if he could not get it by conciliation he would do it by using the constitutional power. But the Solicitor-General goes further. He says: the settlement might be modified and made more satisfactory. He did not accept the settlement as final—the law officer of the Crown does not accept it as final—nor did Mr. Laurier accept it as final; the Solicitor General speaks for his Prime Minister, and thereby backs up the assertion of the hon. gentleman that this is only "a first instalment." The duplicity is not yet ended. Commencing six long years back in the party to which the hon. gentleman belongs, and continuing through their own partisans, and none of them stronger and wilder than the present Minister of Public Works on that question in those past days, making one statement in one place and another statement in another after the Governor General's mouth had uttered the words that this is the final settlement, the Solicitor General and the Premier both saying: I am not satisfied with it, and Mr. Guité saying to the bishops: it is not all I want and I will do my best when I get into Parliament to have full justice done. Now, with respect to the Manitoba schools let me add something further. I am open to the judgment of the country if it is not true that the whole course of the leader of the Government when in Opposition was directed to impress on the minds of all Catholics in this country that he wanted Manitoba separate schools restored. Was the Manitoba minority anywhere simply asking for the privileges of getting a half hour after school was out in which to teach religion? That was not what the minority were after. The discussion did not rage about a proposition of that kind at all; it raged over the proposition raised by the Minister of Public Works—and I have his words under my hands—where he declared that the minority of Manitoba had been deprived of their rights and had been sufficiently humiliated, that they had made concessions when the upper chamber of Manitoba was allowed to go under a promise that their rights would never be taken from them. The hon. gentleman stated at that time that the Catholic minority in Manitoba will make no more concessions, that they will stand on their rights, and turning to the then Government he demanded that justice be done to that minority and that their separate schools be restored. And all the way up they have impressed that lesson on the public mind until it sank deep into the heart of Catholicism from one end of the country to the other. Am I right in that statement or not?

Mr. DOMVILLE. No.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a very high authority, I must, however, appeal from this luminary to Cæsar.

Mr. DOMVILLE. From King's County.

Mr. FOSTER. I will appeal to Cæsar. That was, however, the course pursued throughout; that was the line of argument used. I want to call the hon. gentleman's attention to one point, which he as a responsible Minister cannot afford to treat in silence. He repels the insinuation that he broke faith, that he broke any pledge. He has utterly broken and ignored a pledge he made from his seat on this side of the House to Parliament and to the country. When he moved the six months' hoist to the Remedial Bill, what was the hon. gentleman's position? I will not read the whole of his argument, but I will give the gist of it, and it was this: That this is more than a matter of law, it is a matter of prejudice, a matter of opinion, a matter of feeling; that you cannot drive people by force, but that you can get things by showing the people that they are reasonable. He asserted that the people did not understand this question; he urged that an inquiry be made into the facts, saying that the people did not know the facts. He demanded on the floor of this House that before anything was done a commission should issue and the whole facts of the case should be inquired into. What for? For his information, for my information? No; for the information of the people of this country, for the information of the Protestant people especially, for, said he, I have more influence with the Protestants of Ontario than has the present Government; there is my old friend Sir Oliver Mowat, who is the champion of separate schools in Ontario, I will go to him, and when all the facts are brought out we will place them before the people and show them how reasonable is our proposition that separate schools should be restored. And the hon. gentleman pledged his faith as a man and as a leader of the party that the first thing done should be the appointment of a commission with Sir Oliver Mowat at its head to investigate and obtain full information on the subject and spread it before the people. Did the hon. leader of the Government do so? His solemn pledge was treated as the idle wind. Once the election was over and his pledge had served its purpose, he did not think that the best settlement for this country would be secured by having the whole facts inquired into, that Sir Oliver Mowat should be placed at the head of a commission of inquiry, that when the whole facts were brought out they would produce such an impression on the minds of Protestants they would see the justice

of restoring the right of having separate schools for the minority of Manitoba. Not a step was taken in that direction. The hon. gentleman and the Manitoba Government sat down together and settled the question. Settled what question? Settled the question of party advantage between himself and the Greenway government. That is what he settled.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Very successfully anyway.

Mr. FOSTER. Very successfully; the Minister of the Interior is there, and my hon. friend is there.

Mr. FRASER. And you are there.

Mr. FOSTER. And I am happy to say that I am here, and hon. gentlemen opposite will know that I am here.

Mr. DOMVILLE. And you will stay there.

Mr. FOSTER. And perhaps the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville), if he will just curb the exuberance of his spirits, may know also that I am here. I was going on to say that what this hon. gentleman promised to the country was that he would get the full information and spread it before the people, so as to mould the Protestant mind into an acceptance of separate schools being restored to the Manitoba minority. But the hon. gentleman sat down with the party of one side and without consultation with the party on the other side. A, B and C are three persons. A comes to B and says: There is a contract of twenty years' standing existing between us, under which I have had certain rights and privileges; to-day you have annulled that contract. B says: No, I deny that there is any contract. A says: There was, but if you deny it, I will take it to the courts. They take it to the courts, and the decision comes, and then A goes to B and says: The courts declare that you had an absolute right to cancel the contract, but they declare, as well, that I had certain privileges for twenty years, and which I believed, and which it was believed, were guaranteed to me by the constitution of the contract, under which I made the contract, and that, therefore, I have the right of redress by appeal to a higher power. A comes with his appeal to C. C tells the person who is aggrieved to stand out of the way whilst he and B get together and make a little settlement to suit themselves, ignoring the party which has the primary grievance and which got a verdict in his favour. And my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) calls that a settlement.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. A is at (C) sea now.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, A is at (C) sea.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. You are all at sea.

Mr. FOSTER. That reminds me that the Liberal party is becoming demoralized all round. They leave off one species of bad work and go to another. For instance, in the county of Wright, the Liberal party left off Devlin and then took strongly to Champagne. But that is an unpardonable pun, Mr. Speaker, and I will never make such a one again.

My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) calls that a final settlement, and yet he says it is only an instalment, and the Solicitor General says that both he and the Premier consider the question is not settled, but that it is open yet. Using the word which the Prime Minister (Mr. Laurier) applied to my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper), he has the audacity to accuse the Liberal-Conservative party of destroying the peace and good-will and harmony of this country during these last five or six years. In the light of records and history, the proposition is too absurd to demand a single minute's refutation. The plain statement of fact that I have made simply shows that the Liberal party commenced it, the Liberal party kept it up, the men who are now prating so strongly for peace and amity, were the men who were strongest in their expressions, two, and three, and four, and five years ago. For every sake, let us have all the amity we can have in this country, but I enter my protest, because we are Frenchmen, and Englishmen, and Scotchmen, and Irishmen, that every time we seem to have a little disagreement on a principle or detail of a question, alarmists shall say that the whole of this Dominion is being set aflame. There is nothing of the kind. Catholics, Irishmen or Frenchmen, are men just the same as Englishmen. They know quite well that there are differences of opinion, and if a Frenchman and an Englishman do not see eye-to-eye upon a question, either public or private, who is to say that they are going to tear at each other's throats because they are discussing a principle or a detail of practice. The history of the last five years is the strongest possible argument that the French and the English are coalescing in this country, that they are uniting together to form one people, not a people which shall have every diversity combed down so that there shall be no points of difference between them, but a people who are stronger and better united because they do differ on some things and because they are strong enough and manly enough to differ, and yet not set the heather afire on account of such differences. Sir, I reiterate the sentiment so well expressed by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, and so elaborately expressed by my hon. friend the leader of the Government with regard to the auspicious year through which we are passing now; the sixtieth year of Her Majesty's reign. Signalized as that sixtieth year is by all the evidences of pro-

gress and advancement in the physical sciences, in the mental sciences, in religion and morals, I hope that we shall go out of that sixtieth year of Her Majesty's reign strong in our admiration of the history of that great country which for a thousand years has been the synonym for civil and religious liberty, and for progress and advancement; and stronger still in our hope, relying upon that past record of unexampled greatness and progress; stronger I say in the hope, that the future holds no peril in the distant horizon threatening disaster to the Empire, which having progressed through a thousand years in the van of liberty may, united in all its parts, progress in the same van of liberty and enlightment for a thousand years to come.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr Speaker, I am not going to inflict myself at this hour, upon the indulgence of the House, but before I move the adjournment of the debate, I might take occasion to make a remark or two. I am inclined to think, and I believe the majority of the House will agree with me, that taking into account the well-known feelings of a large proportion of his own followers, all things considered, I am not going out of the record in saying, that the speech of the hon. leader of the Opposition in respect to the Manitoba school question was about as injudicious as could well have been delivered under any circumstances. At least that was my opinion until I heard the remarks of the ex-Finance Minister on the same subject.

Mr. FOSTER. And then you changed ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And then I am obliged to say, I modified my conviction.

Mr. FOSTER. I am glad I modified you.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, there are no depths so profound that there are not a deeper still, and I think my hon. friend the ex-Finance Minister has probably attained to the lowest. I would like to put two questions to these hon. gentlemen opposite. They have occupied between them, pretty nearly three hours of actual count by the clock, in discussing the Manitoba settlement; I would like to know whether either or both of these hon. gentlemen are prepared to move a vote of censure upon the settlement as arranged. I should like to know if they have the smallest intention of doing it, and I would like to know how many of their followers would dare to support them in it. I would like to put a second question: If any of their followers move a vote of censure, will either, or both of them, venture to vote for it? As that is a conundrum equal to either of those which the hon. gentleman has proposed, I will give him till Monday to think it over; and, in order that he may have ample time, I propose now to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery the certificate of the election and return of Louis Napoleon Champagne, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Wright.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Louis Napoleon Champagne, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Wright, introduced by the Prime Minister (Mr. Laurier) and Mr. Sutherland.

REPORTS.

Report, Returns and Statistics of the Inland Revenues of the Dominion of Canada, for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1896: Part I. Excise, &c.—(Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière.)

Part II. Inspection of Weights and Measures and Gas, for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1896.

Part III. Adulteration of Food, for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1896.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 29th March, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, a certificate of the election and return of Jean François Guité, Esq., for the electoral district of Bonaventure.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved:

That notices of motion be deferred until after the consideration of His Excellency's Speech at the opening of the session.

Motion agreed to.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Jean François Guité, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Bonaventure, introduced by the Prime Minister (Mr. Laurier) and Mr. Talbot.

SAFETY ON RAILWAYS.

Mr. CASEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 2) further to secure the safety of railway employees and passengers. He said: This is substantially the Bill which I have already introduced twice. It went to its second reading in the last session of the late Parliament, but was done away with by the Railway Committee. On the present occasion I hope for a better fate for the Bill. I have urged before, and I intend to urge again, that a Bill of this nature, being a public Bill, should not be sent to a private bills committee, where there is no opportunity for a careful discussion of its provisions such as there would be in a committee composed of persons knowing something about the particular subject, and interested therein. At the proper stage, therefore, after the second reading of the Bill, I shall try to have it considered by a committee composed of persons favourable to the principle of the Bill and interested in its success. I shall not enter fully into its provisions now, but will merely mention one or two of them, as there are a number of hon. gentlemen present who have never heard of this Bill before. It provides for certain attachments to box cars and to air-brakes on such cars as are fitted therewith, calculated to increase the safety of railway employees and travellers. Accidents frequently occur from the air-brakes failing to work, and this Bill provides that the engineer shall have means of knowing at any time whether the air-brakes are in working order or not. Conveniences are also to be provided for railway men getting on and off cars. Perhaps the most important part of the Bill, however, is a proviso for a minimum compulsory compensation for all employees on railways who may be injured by accidents not caused by their own negligence. The Bill contains rather elaborate provisions for this purpose, which I will further explain on the second reading. I have not included in this Bill all the provisions which I would wish to have in one Bill, for the reason that the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) has made himself master of one branch of the subject, and has given notice of his intention to introduce a Bill to deal with it. Therefore, I have not included in my Bill anything covered by the Bill introduced by him on a previous occasion.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. MACLEAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 3) to promote the safety of railway employees. He said: Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer one or two words of explanation. This is the same Bill that was introduced last session, and it seeks to compel railway companies to adopt the automatic coupler and air-brake, and it also contains one or two other provisions on a similar line. The Bill is supported by the entire railway organizations of this country; the trainmen and the engineers, and not only is it in their interest, but it is in the interest of the public as well. I also desire to intimate to the Government that I would prefer that this Bill should be considered by a special committee, much on the same lines as outlined by my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Casey). We did not make much headway with the Bill a year or two ago, but I propose to push it this session and to ask for a special committee, and also to ask the support of the Government. I believe the First Minister and some of his colleagues have already intimated to the railway men of Canada that they are disposed to be very favourably inclined towards the objects of the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY AMENDMENT ACT.

Mr. MACLEAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 4) to amend the Railway Act.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Explain.

Mr. MACLEAN. The object of this Bill is to provide, in the first place, that all railroad companies which run sleeping cars on their trains shall keep the upper berth closed whenever a passenger in the lower berth requires it, and when the upper berth is not occupied. This is at present the law in a great many States of the Union, and I think we ought to have a similar law here. The second clause of the Bill is to compel railway companies to make a return to Parliament, under the oath of their chief administrative officer, of the number of passes of all kinds they issue and of all the special rates for passenger travel that they give in the course of the year. I believe we can only reach the solution of the transportation problem by knowing the number of persons that travel free each year and by knowing the number of persons who get what is called preferred rates in regard to passenger travel.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

EMPLOYMENT OF ALIENS IN CANADA.

Mr. COWAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 5) respecting the employment of aliens in the Dominion of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. COWAN. This is a Bill for the prohibition of the employment of labour con-

tracted outside of Canada, and also for the purpose of prohibiting the employment in the Dominion of Canada of persons who reside outside of Canada and earn their living in Canada.

Mr. MACLEAN. I would like to ask the hon. member (Mr. Cowan) if there is any provision in his Bill for preventing the Government from giving contracts to contractors who are not subjects of Her Majesty ?

Mr. COWAN. No. There is, however, a provision in the Bill forbidding the employment of alien labour on any public works in Canada.

Mr. MACLEAN. That does not cover contractors. You will have to widen it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

IMPORTATION AND IMMIGRATION OF FOREIGNERS.

Mr. MILLS (for Mr. Taylor) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 6) to prohibit the importation and immigration of foreigners and aliens under contract or agreement to perform labour in Canada.

An hon. MEMBER. I do not think it needs any explanation. It has been before the House a good many times.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is the same thing.

Mr. MILLS. Yes.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FRANCHISE ACT.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 7) to repeal the Franchise Act and to make provision in lieu thereof. He said : The heading explains fairly accurately, I may say very accurately, the character and scope of this Bill, and also the changes which, if passed, it will make in the present system. The heading to which I refer to reads : A consolidation of the present law respecting Dominion elections, with some amendments, and with the addition of provisions substituting provincial laws as to franchises, voters' lists, and polling divisions for the present Dominion Franchise Act.

So that the chief object of this Bill is to substitute the provincial lists for those now in use under the Franchise Act. I need not go into details in discussing the Bill at the present time, because I apprehend it will be more convenient to the members on both sides of the House if we take the matter up after the Bill has been distributed and an opportunity has been afforded for considering its provisions. On the second reading there will be opportunity for the regular debate. I understand that this has been the proceeding hitherto in matters of this sort. I may say that the Bill has been very largely drawn upon the lines of the Bill introduced by Sir John Thompson as Premier and Minister of Justice in 1894, when he also undertook to substitute the electoral lists of the provinces for those existing under the Franchise Act. Perhaps it would be proper, at the same time, to draw the attention of the House to the fact that, up to the present time since the electoral Franchise Act has been in force, there has been an expenditure of $1,141.000 under it. And I may say that the chief object that the Government has in view in introducing this legislation is to avoid similar expenditure in the future. I would like to draw the attention of hon. members to the fact that there is an error in schedule 3 of this Bill. The second paragraph would purport to convey the idea that the whole of chapter 7 of the Revised Statutes of Canada is repealed. This is a printer's error. Chapter 7 is all repealed except sections 2 and 3.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I need not inform the House, after the remarks I made upon this subject Friday, that this is a question upon which the Opposition in this House feels very strongly. I need not recall to the attention of the House a number of the objections that I feel could be pressed against such a measure as is indicated in the Speech from the Throne. I am quite certain that hon. gentlemen opposite cannot expect such a measure as this to pass this House without very full and very elaborate discussion. I do not for a single moment mean to say that it might not be possible to improve the present Franchise Act. I am quite certain that attention could be given to that subject which would result in one of the principal objections to the existing Act, to which the hon. Solicitor General has referred, that of expense, being largely mitigated. But I wish to put the question very seriously to the consideration of the hon. leader of the House as to the propriety of pressing this measure upon this legislature at the present moment. The hon. gentleman knows that in England it is usual, after passing an Act which largely changes the franchise of the country, to appeal to the electors. When such changes are made Parliament no longer represents the electorate as it exists under the law, and, therefore, an opportunity is given to the new electorate to choose their representatives. I believe the hon. gentleman will probably be able to quote a precedent, perhaps in this House, that will bear against that view of the case. I do not wish to refine upon that point, but simply to call attention to the British practice and to say that unless there is an intention—and I do not gather from the hon. gentleman that he has such an intention—of appealing to the country, such a measure should not be passed. I should be very much surprised

if the hon. gentleman, situated as he is, should adopt the course of appealing to the country. But, that being the case, I want to put to my hon. friend whether it is well in this, practically the first session of a new Parliament, at any rate in the first year, without any immediate or early prospect of a dissolution of the House, there is any necessity whatever for pressing this measure at the present time. The hon. gentleman will have accomplished largely the object that he has in view, I believe, that of vindicating the position he has taken before the country of his intention to adopt such legislation as this, by bringing down the Bill, having it printed and distributed for the information of the country. I would ask him, whether it is well to take up a measure that, in the very nature of things, as the hon. gentleman knows, must be a very contentious Bill, and must occupy a great deal of time and attention. I need not remind the hon. gentleman of the anxiety I have expressed, a most sincere anxiety, that there should be no failure on the part of the Prime Minister of this country to take part in the great Diamond Jubilee to take place in June which is not very far away. In expressing that view, I think I am expressing the feelings, not only of the members on both sides of this House, but of the people of this country, and I give that as an additional reason to my hon. friend why such a contentious measure as this, with no expectation of its being required at an early date, should not be pressed upon the attention of the House at this session. The hon. gentleman knows that at this moment the country is suffering, most keenly suffering, and has long suffered, from uncertainty in reference to the tariff. I am quite certain there is not a member on either side of the House that will for a moment question that statement. We may differ as to the necessity that has existed of that condition of things, but no person will question the accuracy of the statement I make that at this moment the great commercial classes of this country, the best interest of this country, are deeply interested in a prompt declaration on the part of the Government of their tariff policy. I am inclined to believe, I do not hesitate to say, I am inclined to hope, that the measure will be one that will not necessarily involve a very long and laborious consideration; but at the same time no material alteration, no substantial alteration, of the tariff can be made without a considerable portion of time being devoted to it. I think under these circumstances I am justified in making an appeal to my hon. friend to adopt the course I have suggested, of having this measure introduced and published for the information of the country, and allowed to remain over until a future session, when there will be an opportunity of giving it the fullest possible consideration. Before I sit down I may say that from the little consideration I have been able to give to this question of the franchise, looking at the character of the franchise in the various provinces, it appears to me it is quite possible that, after careful consideration, we might arrive at the conclusion that there is a better and a more effective way of dealing with the franchise of the electors of Canada. I believe that if you look at the franchise as it exists to-day in the various provinces, if it is to be accepted as a model, and if you look at the tendency in all the provinces to extend the franchise, I am inclined to think that we have approached to-day so near, in many of the provinces, if not all of them, to the confines of manhood suffrage, as to render the question worthy of the careful consideration of this House as to whether we might not adopt a franchise that would be unattended with any considerable amount of expense, one that would not materially broaden it, certainly not in many of the provinces, beyond what it is at this moment; and thus come to a general agreement and a final accord upon a franchise that would be found beneficial and acceptable to the whole country. I am speaking now rather of the views I personally entertain than otherwise, as I have not had an opportunity of conferring upon this subject with the gentlemen on this side of the House, so I merely throw that out. I may also add that in my view the adoption of manhood suffrage in Canada to-day would not give to Canada anything like as low a franchise as exists in England. When I say that I am quite aware that manhood suffrage does not exist there; but every person who knows anything of the character of the large body of the electorate in England knows that tens of thousands of those who now enjoy the franchise in England know nothing whatever of the political questions that are agitating the country, and take comparatively no interest in those questions; therefore, so far as an intelligent discharge of the duties of the electors are concerned, manhood suffrage would, in my judgment, be a higher franchise than that which exists in England to-day. I do not intend, after what has fallen from the hon. Solicitor General, to go into this debate at any length; but I rise simply for the purpose of asking my hon. friend opposite if, under all the circumstances, he does not think that it would be a wise and convenient course, looking at the condition of public affairs, to allow this measure to stand over for a time, when we will be able to give it that full and deliberate consideration which, if pressed in its present form, it is absolutely essential should take place before any such measure should be adopted.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I do not approach a consideration of this matter in the same way as does my hon. friend opposite. The Government are convinced

that they can do nothing which will be hailed with greater satisfaction by public opinion at large than to introduce at once and prosecute to a proper solution, a measure for the repeal of the Franchise Act. The hon. gentleman says this is a subject upon which he and his friends feel strongly. I can assure him that he does not feel, that he cannot feel, half as strongly as we feel, and have felt for the last ten years that this Act has been in operation. The hon. gentleman says that he feels strongly upon this question, but when the hon. gentleman and his friends were in power they honoured the law more in the breach than in the observance. They never observed the law. They always proclaimed its want of utility, they proclaimed its deficiency. We are pledged to the country to repeal that Act, and we intend to carry out that pledge. The hon. gentleman said a few days ago that we never fulfilled our pledges. Sir, we are pledged to repeal this Act, and we shall do it, and in that I hope we shall have the assistance of the hon. gentleman, as I think we shall have, judging by the half-hearted manner in which they approved of the Act when they were in office. It is true, we are not likely to have a general election very soon, at least, such is not the intention of the Government, and the Government sees no signs in public opinion which require a general election at present. But, Sir, I wish to give every opportunity to my hon. friend to fulfil his own pledges. If I remember aright, it is not six months ago, it is not four months ago, when he stated that there would be another general election before six months were over. I am glad to see that my hon. friend has changed his views upon that subject. We shall have a new franchise, but there will be no necessity of going to the country upon that question, because the people have already passed upon that question, as well as upon many others, on the 23rd of June last.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to add a word upon a point upon which I do not think my hon. friend who has just taken his seat, has dwelt long enough—probably because he did not altogether take it in—in his desire to make a point against my hon. friend with reference to an election in six months. My hon. friend, in the few remarks he addressed to the House, has stated the best of all reasons why there is no pressing necessity of bringing this Franchise Bill on at the first of the session, and in front of what I think the whole country will acknowledge is the piece of legislation that is looked for and longed for by the business interests of the country. The hon. gentleman has stated that there is not any present necessity for such a Bill on the ground that there is soon to be an appeal to the electorate. Then if there is not soon to be an appeal to the electorate, however strongly this Bill may appeal in principle to the hon. gentleman, there is nothing practically gained by its passage two months, hence, rather than six or more months after. They have made a pledge, my hon. friend says, that they will do so and so. They have made more than one pledge, Mr. Speaker. They have declared that they would reform the tariff the moment they got into power. They have been in power for nine months. They could not reform the tariff at the last session because, they said, it was too early to have the details ready. Now, I want to impress upon my hon. friend that whatever he may think of the views of the country at large with reference to the present necessity of a repeal of the present franchise, that subject is not in it in the public mind with the requisition from the press, from the hon. gentleman's own press, from the boards of trade, from the chambers of commerce, and from the business men and the business interests of this country, from one end of it to the other. The cry is: Let us know what you are going to do with our business.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Oh dear, now.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend does not want to hear that. I am afraid my hon. friend will have to listen to a good many things that he does not like to hear; and I am afraid he will have to hear a great many things that he is not fitted to understand; but he must not rate the intelligence of other hon. gentlemen who sit beside him, so low as his own in supposing that they do not want to hear this question debated, and are not able to understand it. But I was proceeding to say, when interrupted, that there is a cry from the business interests of the country to have the tariff policy of the Government brought down and announced. I think I am right in that, and I think the men who sit on both sides of this House know that. Where, then, is the sense, or rhyme, or reason, in interposing between that demand of the business interests of the country and its answer, a Bill which may be good in itself, according to the views of hon. gentlemen opposite, but which cannot be of any service for months, for years, and for which the country is not crying out? Why interpose this Bill before the demands of the business interests in respect to a reform of the tariff in accordance with the will of the Government? I do not think there can be any ground for this proceeding. What we expected from the Government was that they would bring down their tariff measure. Why is it that the tariff measure is not brought down? Is it on the ground that this Bill supervenes as a matter of greater necessity, and that it must be put through first; or is there some other reason, and is this Bill thrown in in order to fill up a gap between the present time and some future time when it will be more desirable for political reasons to bring down

the tariff ? The country will ask that question and will await the answer to it. I can tell hon. gentlemen that the Opposition seated on this side of the House has a duty to perform in this matter, and the plain duty from the Opposition at the present time to perform is this, to say to the Government, that we with the country want your tariff measure ; bring it down ; we will help you to put it through just as fast as it can be put through with any reasonable discussion on its merits. But we would not be performing our duty if we allowed a useless Bill, such as this is, to intervene and take a month of discussion before the tariff measure is brought down. That is the only point I wish to put before the House, and I desire to put it strongly. What we want to do is to assist the Government to get the tariff measure into the House and through the House, not to keep it back a month in order to waste our time in passing a Bill that will not be wanted in this country for years and years, for probably four or five years.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. GIBSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 8) in further amendment of the Railway Act.

Mr. BERGERON. Explain.

Mr. GIBSON. This is practically the same Bill that I introduced into the House last session. The object of the Bill is to prevent sub-contractors and others doing work on our railways from being defrauded by means of contracts given out by construction companies. So it is, in a word, to cover all wages due and payment for work done and material supplied in the construction of a railway, and to make these charges a first lien on the road. In the west we have had considerable experience regarding this matter. In the construction of a certain railway, which was before the House some time ago, the late Government intervened and caused the railway company to provide no less a sum than $100,000 to pay the wages then due and materials supplied for the construction and operation of that line, on the condition that it should be extended from Hamilton to Welland ; and we find the same conditions obtain to-day, namely, that a large sum of money, if not exceeding $100,000, at all events very nearly that sum, is due by the same railway company under a similar mode of operation, that is to say, that the railway company gave the contract to a construction company. The construction company, formed of a number of gentlemen coming from the United States, gave out the work to sub-contractors, and the result has been that the sub-contractors have not been paid and the conditions of the contract fulfilled, for under a provision in the contract to the effect that the construction company should not receive a final certificate until such time as the chief engineer of the company would grant the same, that certificate has not been forthcoming for at least twelve or fifteen months. The result has been that a large number of Canadian contractors are out of pocket in sums varying from $2,000 to $10,000 ; in other words, the sub-contractors have built this railway with their own money, and now the construction company leave the country and at the same time receive the benefit of the work done at the expense of our own people. This, briefly, is the object of the Bill, and I think no railway company of standing will object to its provisions. I am quite satisfied from discussing the matter with leading railway companies in the Dominion, they are not afraid to pay their honest debt when due, nor to pay for materials supplied for the construction of their railways.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. MACLEAN asked :

Whether it is the intention of the Government to enter into negotiations with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the abrogation or modification of the following article in the contract and agreement made between Her Majesty and Mr. George Stephen and others, as set out in chapter 1, 44 Victoria :—

"14. The company shall have the right from time to time to lay out, construct, equip, maintain and work branch lines of railway from any point or points along their main line of railway to any points within the territory of the Dominion : Provided always that before commencing any branch they shall first deposit a map and plan of such branch in the Department of Railways, and the Government shall grant to the company the lands required for the road-bed of such branches, and for the stations, station grounds, buildings, workshops, yards and other appurtenances requisite for the efficient construction and working of such branches, in so far as such lands are vested in the Government."

2. Whether it is the intention of the Government to enter into negotiations with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the modification or abrogation of the following clause of chapter 1, 44 Victoria :—

"20. The limit to the reduction of tolls by the Parliament of Canada, provided for by the 11th subsection of the 17th section of the Consolidated Railway Act of 1879 respecting tolls is hereby extended so that such reduction may be to such an extent that such tolls when reduced shall not produce less than ten per cent per annum profit on the capital actually expended in the construction of the railway, instead of not less than fifteen per cent per annum profit as provided by said section, and so also that such reduction shall not be made unless the net income of the company ascertained as described in such subsection shall have exceeded ten per cent per annum as provided by the said subsection ; and the exercise by the Governor in Council of the power of re-

ducing the tolls of the company, as provided by the 10th subsection of said section 17, is hereby limited to the same extent with relation to the profit of the company, and to its net revenue, as that to which the power of Parliament to reduce tolls is limited by said subsection 11 as hereby amended."

3. What steps, if any, have been taken by the Government to ascertain the capital actually expended in the construction of the said Canadian Pacific Railway as referred to in the above quoted clause ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I may say for the information of the hon. gentleman, that the subject is under consideration, but no conclusion has yet been arrived at ; I refer to the two first questions. As to the third question, we have no intention at present of making the inquiry to which the hon. gentleman refers.

THE DIAMOND JUBILEE.

Mr. DAVIN asked :

Is it the intention of the Government that the North-west Mounted Police shall be represented at the Queen's Jubilee ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). This question is now engaging the attention of the Militia Department.

CANADIAN MANUFACTURE OF PIG IRON.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron) asked :

1. How many tons (2,000 lbs.) of pig iron were manufactured in Canada during the years beginning 1st July, 1873, and ending 30th June, 1878 ?

2. What was the amount and rate of duty paid on pig iron during those years and the rate and amount of bounty paid (if any) during this period ?

3. How many tons (2,000 lbs.) of pig iron were manufactured in Canada during the years beginning 1st July, 1891, and ending 30th June, 1896 ?

4. What was the amount and rate of duty paid on pig iron during those years and the rate and amount of bounty paid ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). In answer to the first question, I have to say that the figures cannot be given, as prior to the time when a bounty on the manufacture of iron was authorized, no returns of quantity were required from our manufacturers, and there are no statistics other than mere estimates available, and those only for a portion of the time. In answer to the second question : There was no duty paid upon pig iron during the years in question, neither was there any bounty paid during the same period. In answer to the third question, the manufacture of pig iron in Canada during the years beginning 1st July, 1891, and ending 30th June, 1896, was as follows :—

	Tons.
1891-92	30,294
1892-93	46,948
1893-94	62,522
1894-95	31,692
1895-96	52,871

The rate of duty paid during the years in question was $4 per ton for the year 1891-92. Pig iron was classified with iron kentledge and cast scrap iron ; the amount collected on pig iron cannot be given. For the year

1892-93	the amount was	.....	$226,816 15
1893-94	do	do	167,207 01
1894-95	do	do	125,397 40
1895-96	do	do	144,040 49

The rate of bounty payable was for the year 1891-92, $1 per ton. Subsequent to 1892-93, $2 per ton. The amount of duty paid during the year

1891-92	was	$ 30,294 37
1892-93	.....	93,896 48
1893-94	.....	125,044 49
1894-95	.....	63,383 95
1895-96	.....	105,741 24

THE KINGSTON COTTON MILLS—DUTY ON COTTON.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Finance Minister a question, and as a basis for the question I shall read a very short extract from one of the newspapers of Saturday last. The correspondent of the daily "Mail and Empire," writing from Kingston, says :

To-day the welcome announcement was made that the Kingston Cotton Mill, beginning on Monday next, would be run on full time. When the manager of the mill was seen this forenoon, he said he could not account for the present order any more than they could for the one for half-time a few weeks ago. He was asked whether it was possible that an intimation had been received from Ottawa that the cotton industry would not be seriously interfered with by the coming tariff. He said he could not say anything about that, but would not be surprised if it were true.

I hope my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) will be able to assure the House that nothing so unconstitutional as an intimation with reference, either to the principle or details of the tariff, has been made known to the cotton manufacturers.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) said he was about to put a question. I shall be pleased if he will put that question distinctly, because I must confess I did not hear any question at the conclusion of his remarks. What exactly was the question ?

An hon. MEMBER. Let him give notice.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not want any notice. If the hon. gentleman states what the question is, I shall answer it.

Mr. FOSTER. The question is simply this, and I supposed it was made quite definite in my concluding sentence, when I hoped that my friend the Finance Minister would be able to assure the House that nothing so unconstitutional had been done by the Government as to give an intimation to the cotton manufacturers with reference either to the principle or details of the tariff, before bringing the tariff down.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hopes of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) are exceedingly interesting, but I do not think they amount to a question. If so, I shall have to give my hon. friend the assurance that he can always comfort himself with the belief that the present Government will do nothing that is unconstitutional.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend is not satisfied——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. I am perfectly in order. The Finance Minister has asked me to put the question, as he cannot see that a question has yet been put. The question is: Is it true, as intimated in the paragraph I have read, that an intimation has been made by the Finance Minister, or by any member of the Government, with reference to either the principle or details of the cotton schedule which will be framed in the coming tariff?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the first place, in the paragraph as read by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), I have failed to hear any statement that the Finance Minister gave any intimation on the subject at all; and in the second place, as he has quoted from the Toronto "Mail and Empire," I beg to say that with every respect to that journal I have no desire to be held responsible for its telegrams.

Mr. FOSTER. I commend the hon. gentleman's answer.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Mr. Speaker, possibly my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) will be able now to answer the question of which I gave notice a couple of days ago.

Mr. FOSTER. You are too inquisitive.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Let us have reciprocity in questions now.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I asked my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) whether his opinions as to the settlement which was arrived at in the matter of the Manitoba school question are such as to induce him to move or to support a motion of censure on that settlement. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) does not appear to be in any great hurry to reply to that question. I would like to know, because I will take the liberty of saying to him and to his friend beside him (Sir Charles Tupper), that if these gentlemen do not feel themselves called upon to move a censure upon the settlement which was arrived at, and to which they devoted so large a portion of their speeches, all I can say is—and I think not a few of their own supporters will be disposed to agree with me—that they show very small discretion indeed in dwelling on a subject which must recall painfully to the minds of these hon. gentlemen themselves, and also to the minds of a good many of their supporters, how terribly that question was mishandled by them during the preceding year or two. Sir, I have to say to these gentlemen who criticise so severely the action of the Prime Minister; I have to say to them, that I believe it is a pretty general opinion entertained by both sides of the House that whatever their motives may have been, their action was such as greatly to imperil the peace of Canada, and that it resulted to no small extent, and deservedly resulted, in their own political destruction.

Now, Sir, this question was one of those few questions which arise from time to time and which may, I think, be considered as a real test of the capacity of the men who had to deal with it. The Manitoba question was one which required for its settlement no small amount of courage and no small amount of statesmanship. It was not one of that class of questions which could be settled by a faculty for glib phrase-making: higher qualities a good deal were required for it. How did these hon. gentlemen opposite deal with that question? They had had ample time; heaven knows they had ample time to consider their course. It was not sprung upon them hastily. Four or five years at least had elapsed since that matter became a prominent question in Canada and before these hon. gentlemen were called upon to deal with it, and I will venture to say, looking at the matter impartially, that I do not think it would have been possible for any set of men to have committed a greater number of tactical and strategical blunders in a shorter space of time than they did in their dealings with that question. Why, if there ever was a case in which the Federal Government of Canada were called upon to deal both cautiously and courteously with a provincial government with whom they were brought in contact. I say if there ever was a question on which the Federal Government were

called upon to deal cautiously and courteously wtih a provincial government, it was in reference to that same Manitoba school question.

And yet, Sir, the Manitoba Government, whom it was important for them to have conciliated, with whom it was important to have full negotiation, were treated by them, on the occasion of their issuing what was known as the remedial order, in a fashion in which a common county court debtor would not have been treated in the ordinary courts of this country. That, Sir, was their initial blunder; and, Sir, in a tactical point of view, it was followed by another and, perhaps, greater blunder. The only excuse, from a party point of view, for passing that remedial order was that had they followed it up by a dissolution, they might possibly have had a chance of snatching a verdict; they might have confused the public mind on the question; and they might have posed as constitutional martyrs (which I understand is the role of the hon. leader of the Opposition. They might have passed in the province of Ontario as the mere vehicle for conveying Her Majesty's commands to the electors, and in another section they might have come forward as the chosen champions of the church. What they did practically was to conspire against each other. I do not think this House will readily forget the spectacle—a spectacle never, I trust, to be repeated in our annals—when seven Ministers of the Crown, in the interval between bringing down the Address and its consideration by Parliament, came forward on the floor of this House to denounce their late chief as a traitor or an imbecile. Nor do I think we are likely again to see a repetition of the scene of men, after having, in such fashion, calumniated their chief, choosing to slink back into his Cabinet; and I may add that it was a mistake, which the most ordinary tyro in politics would have avoided committing, under these circumstances, to have staked the whole fortunes of their Government on the desperate chance of passing an Act of the complicated character of the Manitoba School Settlement Act, in the sixth session of moribund Parliament.

The hon. gentleman was pleased to allude rather disrespectfully, I thought, to the conduct of my hon. friend on that occasion. What was the hon. gentleman's conduct, I should like to know? What was his policy, what was his recipe for settling that question? Why, Sir, he knows, and we all know, because he has virtually admitted it, that he was simply making a desperate bid for a certain vote, which he failed to get; and I do not wonder that his disappointment was proportionately considerable. Like Lord Salisbury, on a recent occasion, the hon. gentleman has bet on the wrong horse; but, unlike Lord Salisbury, he had not the frankness to admit that he had made a mistake and was very sorry for it. It is true, he told us he was going to wash his hands of the question from this time forth; and if he had consulted some of his friends, I think he would have added that for the future he intended to hold his tongue about it. But I do not want to be unreasonable, and perhaps neither they nor I should ask for impossibilities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that comparisons are odious, and they are likely to be particularly odious to my hon. friend. But I desire to ask in all fairness what this present Government have accomplished in and by the settlement they have effected of the Manitoba school question. Sir, the present Government have grappled with that question as they promised to do, and have grappled with it successfully. The present Government, within six weeks after the last session of Parliament had risen, had accomplished what hon. gentlemen opposite in six years had failed to do, except, indeed, to make confusion worse confounded. Sir, it was a difficult, a delicate and a dangerous problem; and I will venture to say that of all impartial and sensible men throughout this country, ninety-nine out of one hundred, whatever their political creed may be, approve on the whole of that settlement, and are very glad it was effected. I believe, Sir, that when the news spread over our various provinces that that settlement had been successfully accomplished, there was a great and general feeling of relief on the part of men of all classes and creeds and ranks. Sir, what Mr. Laurier promised, Mr. Laurier has done. From the first to the last—and hon. gentlemen know it well, and never was it more plainly and distinctly declared than in the course of the speeches made by my hon. friend last session—from the first to the last during the last half dozen years the whole course of my hon. friend was to advise conciliation. Did he not recognize from the beginning that this was not a matter that could be settled according to strict legal conditions and limitations, but that the feelings, and, if you will, the prejudices, of all classes of the community had to be taken into account, if you were to make a stable and lasting settlement? And if that settlement has been effected, it is due in great measure to the courage and the wisdom of my hon. friend, and also to the loyalty and good sense of his supporters from the province of Quebec. I hold and will maintain that the present Administration has rendered a great service to the people of Canada at large by its settlement of that question; and if hon. gentlemen are not able to recognize it, if they do not choose to applaud it, the least they can do is to be silent respecting it. But, Sir, if hon. gentlemen opposite do not recognize it, I think I may say with truth that the country at large has recognized it fully. Since the terms of the Manitoba school settlement were made public, we have had, in various parts of this country, no less than eight

by-elections—one in Manitoba, one in the North-west Territories, four in Ontario, and two in Quebec. If I remember rightly, the seats for which those elections were held were evenly divided, four having been held formerly by our supporters, and four by supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite; and, unless my memory fails me, the net results have been: seven to us and one to them—a proportion which I do not object to, because I should be sorry to see the Opposition unduly diminished in this House. Now, Sir, I humbly submit to those hon. gentlemen that if they pay no attention to our representations, at least they might profit by the lesson taught them by the electors of Saskatchewan, by the lesson taught them by the electors of Cornwall—as to which I think my hon. friend the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) indulged in some prophecies which did not come off; by the lesson taught them by the electors of North Ontario, by the lesson taught them by the electors of Brant, which produced an unpleasant effect, I am told, on my hon. friend's mind; and last, though not least, by the lesson taught them by the electors of Wright and Bonaventure.

An hon. MEMBER. There were more prophecies then.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Well, I was not so well acquainted with these. Possibly, the hon. gentleman will offer the explanation which has been advanced by some of his press, that, after all is said and done, this is not to be wondered at, because by-elections do usually go in favour of the Government of the day. Well, if that be the case, all I can say is that it is a doctrine these hon. gentlemen were diligently preaching to their supporters for eighteen years, and as they have sowed so let them reap. Now, what remains for the country? What remains for the House? I say that, in this matter, this remains. I think that parties on both sides of this House will do well to recognize the utter and superlative folly of stirring this question up any more. So far as federal interference goes, it appears to me that no sensible man can dispute that the page is closed, that we must look, if there be need for further improvement and amendment, to such amendments being made by the Government of Manitoba; and if it will relieve the minds of hon. gentlemen, I can tell them that we have had every assurance that men could have from the Government of Manitoba that this Act of settlement will be administered in a generous and liberal spirit, that my hon. friend (Mr. Greenway) will redeem to the full, in the spirit as well as the letter, the pledge which he made on a certain memorable occasion in Montreal, fresh in the memory, I dare say, of many of my hon. friends. Under these circumstances, he is no friend of his country who will stir this question up again, and if any man so does, let him be buried eight hundred fathoms deep, as in Wright and Bonaventure.

Mr. FOSTER. And have a glorious resurrection.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Of the Manitoba question? I hope my hon. friend will be the party to bring it up. Now, as regards the rest of the attacks from the hon. gentleman, they will be dealt with, I can assure him, in the proper time. These hon. gentlemen complain of dismissals. Well, if dismissals have been improperly made, we are here to justify them and explain the causes, and we are not going to shirk our duty. If they want to discuss the tariff, they need not do it on vague rumours of newspapers, because they will have the opportunity very shortly when the tariff is produced, and they will be heartily welcome to do it.

Mr. FOSTER. When?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No one knows better than my hon. friend that I would be grossly violating my official duty if I were to tell him when. As for those iniquities which have occurred at recent elections, and which were of such a character that they have made the very hair on the head of the hon. leader of the Opposition stand on end, I confess that my imagination fails to realize what they can be. I had thought that, if there was a man who, from his age and experience, was likely to know pretty much everything that could be known in the way of corrupt practices in elections, it was that hon. gentleman. Why, it is my private impression that, so far as hon. gentlemen on this side are concerned, in the matter of corrupt practices at elections, the hon. gentleman has forgotten more than we ever knew. All I can suppose, is that his memory has played him false, and that peradventure, some indiscreet persons at Brant may have resorted to certain old tricks which long ago he may have abandoned in favour of more perfect methods.

There was one point, however, which was made by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, and to a certain extent endorsed by his hon. friend beside him (Mr. Foster), which needs a little attention. As the House knows, I have been ordinarily adverse to engaging in any financial debate on the Address. Usually speaking, it seemed to me that the proper time to indulge in that was on the occasion of the introduction of the Budget. But I intend to depart a little from my practice on this occasion, and for two good reasons. First of all, that the Opposition have challenged it, and in the next place, because I am perfectly well aware, as is everybody here, that when the Budget comes to be brought

down, the attention of this House and the country will be wholly concentrated on the changes proposed to be made in the tariff, and that the mere financial side of the question cannot possibly hope to receive any particular attention. Therefore, it is that being a matter of very considerable moment, I desire to spend a short time in calling the attention of the House to the financial position and the unfairness of the criticisms which were levelled at my hon. friend beside me. Sir, an old trick is being repeated, but it is none the less dangerous on that account. To the older members of this House I may venture to recall the circumstances which attended the fall of the Conservative Government from power in 1873. I very well recollect how, within a very few days after I became Finance Minister, my attention was called to the fact that the Government which we succeeded had gone out of power, having added over four millions of dollars a year to the annual expenditure of Canada, for which it had made no provision, that it had likewise entered into engagements, set forth in the speech of Sir Leonard Tilley, which would require a further addition, for interest alone, according to his estimate, of $3,360,000 a year, for which no provision had been made, making in all a total addition to our annual charges, when these engagements would be fulfilled, of something like seven and a half million dollars in round numbers; and I very well recollect at that time how exceedingly difficult it was to explain to the hon. leader of the Opposition how he and his friends, who had incurred these liabilities, who had made provision for the huge increase of debt and interest, were in any wise responsible for their own acts. They repudiated them like men, and in the elections which succeeded, we found it exceedingly difficult to explain to the public the extent to which those gentlemen had tied our hands, and the extent of the burdens they had inflicted on Canada. Something of the same kind is being attempted now. These gentlemen have raised, whatever they may be pleased to say to the contrary, our annual expenditure largely. They have left behind them various large and formidable liabilities, for which they had made no provision. But there is this difference between them and their predecessors. Sir Leonard Tilley, whatever else may be said about him, certainly stated plainly and definitely what he had done. Sir Leonard Tilley's successor on the Conservative side has not been equally candid. I am afraid that he has kept his cards up his sleeve, and I propose to explain to the House the reasons why I entirely dissent from the position assumed by him and his friends beside him. Now, I do not want to repeat to the hon. gentleman the language which he thought fit to use to my hon. friend beside me. I shall not, therefore, say that his conduct was indecent in the highest degree—I think that was the phrase he used—and utterly unbecoming a Finance Minister; but I would ask him in what words I can describe his conduct, that will be pleasing to him. I say that the hon. gentleman's conduct on the occasion of the delivery of the last Budget, and his conduct since, has been doubly misleading. In the first place, he concealed facts which it was his bounden duty to have stated to the House and the country, and, in the second place, he is now claiming credit for a reduction for which he has no right to claim credit. I propose to call the attention of the House to the facts, so far as we have ascertained them.

The hon. gentleman cannot possibly deny, because it is a matter of public notoriety, that on the occasion of his last Budget speech he brought down estimates amounting to $38,308,548. Estimates for this sum were commended to our attention in a message from His Excellency himself. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman knew, and everybody who knows anything about our finances knew perfectly well, that these main estimates by no manner of means contained all the sums that he was likely to ask Parliament for. It was perfectly notorious that in addition to them he would be obliged to bring down large supplemental estimates. Over and over again, not one, but twenty times, knowing that, I in my place in Parliament demanded of him that he would state to us what these supplemental estimates were, in order that we might know, in order that the country might know, the true amount of money which was required for the services of 1896-97. Not one single particle of information could we extract from the hon. gentleman. But, Sir, after the hon. gentleman went out of office I was able to obtain a copy of the estimates which had been submitted for the consideration of Council, which I now hold in my hand, and I beg to call the attention of the House to the fact that, over and above the $38,308,000 in his main estimates the hon. gentleman had under consideration the trifling sum of $3,180,000, to be added to the consolidated fund expenditure. I say nothing of capital charges, nor would this include all the estimates he would probably have had to produce. So that, if the hon. gentleman were to be judged, as he ought to be judged, by the addition together of his supplemental estimates and his main estimates, the sum that he was expecting to demand for the charges of the year was $41,488,578. I say nothing of the large statutory provisions, I say nothing of the large loan engagements, I say nothing of the proposals he made to us for the construction of railroads in Prince Edward Island and elsewhere, I just give the general results and they are these—that the hon. gentleman, had the opportunity presented itself to him, was, apparently, will-

ing to have raised our expenditure to forty-one and a half millions per annum, with a million and a half or two millions to follow if his engagements were fulfilled and the provisions of statutes involving heavy charges were carried out. Now, the hon. gentlemen come to us and say that they are responsible only for the expenditure of 1895-96 amounting to thirty-seven millions. On that, I will have a word to say hereafter. But at present I desire to say;—and this is a point on which, I have not the slightest doubt, I shall not gain the hon. gentleman's concurrence, but I appeal to the judgment of the country and the House;—that the attempt to disown the responsibility for these supplemental estimates, under the circumstances, is disingenuous and unfair. I will not permit, I trust my hon. friends will not permit, I trust our press will not permit, the hon. gentleman to repudiate his own supplemental estimates. It is a well known principle of law, I believe—my legal friends can correct me if I am wrong—that no man should be allowed to profit by his own wrong doing. I hold that hon. gentleman doubly responsible. First of all I say, and everybody, I think, who considers the constitutional rule, will see the force of my contention, that it was his bounden duty, having brought down his main estimates, to lay his supplemental estimates on the Table. That was his duty to the House, it was doubly and trebly his duty to the country. He and his friends were about to appeal to the country to judge between them and us, and it was very important, in the public interest, that the people should be fully advised of the sum total which these gentlemen required for the services of the coming year. Now, I lay it down as a sound constitutional principle, that honour, justice, and good faith required that the hon. gentleman should take the House and the country into his confidence as to the extent of his supplemental estimates. Heaven knows he had time enough to do it. In the last six or seven weeks of the session what had he to do? He was keeping us here morning, noon, and night, or his leader was, and he himself had nothing to do but to polish and finish and bring down his supplemental estimates, which he should have done. Another thing will commend itself to the House and it is this. All through the last elections, more particularly in the Maritime provinces, we found that these gentlemen were using statements from these very supplemental estimates in various counties for the purpose of promoting the election of their friends. My Nova Scotia friends know how they were met in various counties with the statement that were it not for the Opposition, such and such and such and such items for the benefit of Nova Scotia would have been passed in the supplemental estimates. And, certainly, the former First Minister is not liable to the charge of having forgotten his own, for I see in the supplemental estimates that he proposed to give 106 separate votes in Nova Scotia. So I say the hon. gentleman has no right to repudiate his supplemental estimates now. Mind, I do not pretend to say that he might not possibly have pared them down, but, under the circumstances, and knowing the conditions under which these gentlemen were struggling for existence, knowing the difficulty they had to keep their men in their own ranks, I can tell you, Sir, my private impression is, that very few of these supplemental estimates would have been withdrawn before——

Mr. FOSTER. Private impressions do not count.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We will not call it that. I say that is the inference I draw and that the previous conduct of these hon. gentlemen and the surrounding circumstances warrant that way of putting it.

Now I come to another side of the case. The hon. gentleman places himself on his expenditure for 1896. He declares, and declares with truth, that this showed a very considerable reduction from the expenditure of 1895. In 1895 our charges against consolidated revenue amounted to $38,132,000, and in 1896, they had fallen to $36,949,142. That would have been an important reduction on one condition—that it was an honest and a fair reduction and was likely to be permanent. But how was that reduction produced? I will give the House a sample or two. Take, first, the case of militia. In 1895 these gentlemen expended $1,574,000 on militia, while in 1896 they expended $1,136,000. Now, was that a bona fide saving? Not a bit of it; it was effected simply by declining to drill the militia, simply, I may say, by wasting two-thirds of the vote; because, without the annual drill—as my hon. friend the Minister of Militia pointed out to the House—the great bulk of the expenditure, not all, but a very large portion of the expenditure incurred, was absolutely useless. To claim this $300,000 or $400,000 as a genuine saving is to trifle with the House and the country. We will take another case—the post office. I am aware that my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) has had a special audit made of the transactions in his department, and I am informed that he has discovered that some $500,000 or $600,000 of accounts which ought to have been charged to and paid in 1896 have been thrown over to 1897. Sir, under these circumstances, I am not altogether surprised that the hon. gentleman was able to make a reduction of a million or more; and it is easy to force a balance on those terms.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend vouch for the accuracy of that statement he makes?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I cannot vouch from my personal knowledge of the matter; I can vouch for my hon. friend having made an audit, and I am advised that is the result. No doubt the hon. gentleman will have the most ample opportunity of discussing that matter in detail. Mind you, Sir, these are only selections; because I have strong reason for believing that a closely similar scheme, or practice, was carried out in respect of the public works of this country, and that numerous sums which ought to have been charged to 1896 were thrown improperly into 1897; and I am bound to say that the last three or four years go to show tolerably clearly that this practice existed. In 1896 our public works cost us $1,927,000; in 1894 they cost us $2,033,000; in 1895 they cost us $1,742,000; in 1896 they fell to $1,299,000. Now, that may have been genuine economy, but I am afraid that when my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works comes to explain the details of his department, he will be obliged to point out to the House that the way in which this was effected was by endangering many important public works, by neglecting work that ought to have been done, and, as I said, by deliberately casting forward on 1897, for very obvious reasons, charges and expenditures that ought to have been properly placed to the credit of 1895-96.

Mr. FOSTER. Which cannot be done.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Oh, my hon. friend underrates his own ingenuity.

Mr. FOSTER. I beg my hon. friend's pardon. I said that it cannot be done; I meant that it could not be done while I was Finance Minister, and while we had the public works under our management.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Perhaps it was done during the six days you were out.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say it could not be done under the present regime.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. My hon. friend, on consideration, admits the possibility. I do not know whether he accepts my hon. friend's suggestion that a great deal of mischief was done in the interregnum. However, I think my hon. friend beside me will be able to make it very plain and clear to the House that for the sake of producing an apparent saving in 1896, many important public works which ought to have been attended to, were neglected. There is not the slightest doubt that that can be done. There is not the slightest doubt, either, that by neglecting at the proper time legitimate expenditure on important public works which were in danger of being destroyed, for the sake of effecting an apparent and temporary saving of a few thousand dollars, a loss of many hundreds of thousands of dollars may easily be inflicted upon the public. I repeat, it is exceedingly easy to force a balance on those terms; and it is for these reasons that I wholly and utterly repudiate, for myself and for my friends here, any idea of admitting that the actual statement of 1896 can be taken at all as a fair average, or as fairly representing the true actual expenditure of the people of Canada for that period. Now, Sir, let us briefly sum up the situation as we find it. We find here, as I have said, a false and fictitious economy practised in 1896, by which an apparent saving of a million over the preceding year of 1895 was effected at the expense of great loss to the service, and by throwing over on the succeeding year large sums of money which ought to have been properly charged to 1896. We find, also, that the actual engagements for 1897, and the liabilities that they had incurred for various works, some of which were proper enough, such as canals, and for various other works as to which I have my doubts, such as their projected scheme of railways in Prince Edward Island, and certain other works of a similar order—all this would have entailed future liabilities of one million and a half a year. So that we had practically, although not nominally, a real charge against the public revenue under the hon. gentleman, if he had had the candour to bring down the supplementary estimates, if he had had the candour to allow the House to know the position in which we really were—an actual charge of about $41,500,000, supplemented by other charges of the same character, which would have amounted to a million and a half more at least, if not two million. Now, the hon. gentleman is aware that forty-one million and a half, and one million and a half, equal forty-three millions, and that would be a very much more accurate statement of the case than the assumption that all he is entitled to be charged with is the thirty-seven millions which were actually expended in 1896. Now, Sir, it is only common justice to the Government, it is only common justice to my hon. friend, that these facts should be stated and publicly brought forward. I can tell my hon. friends here present that they may rely upon it that this assertion which I have just exposed, will be brought against them on every occasion that they will have to meet the electors, after the actual facts of the case have been forgotten; and I urge upon them to take the earliest opportunity, collectively and individually, of impressing upon the people, so far as in them lies, the real and actual state of the case. It is not correct, it is not true, to say that these hon. gentlemen went out of office with an expenditure of thirty-seven millions; it is correct to say that their main and supplementary estimates together amounted to forty-one millions and a half; and if they object to being charged with the whole of their supplementary estimates, on their own

heads be it, because, in defiance of constitutional practice and their clear duty to the country, they concealed the facts from the electors, as they concealed the facts from the House in the session of 1895-96. Now, Sir, for the rest I have simply to say this to the hon. gentlemen: We are perfectly well aware, on this side of the House, that we have got a delicate and very important task to discharge. I am not going into a discussion of the tariff, or any of its conditions, but I will say to the hon. gentlemen, that it is the earnest desire, and will be the endeavour of the Government, so far as in them lies, to do justice to all classes in this community, to do justice to the consumer, to the producer, and to the manufacturer alike, and they hope to be able to produce a tariff at an early date which will show that the Government of Canada have, to say the least of it, made an honest attempt to do their duty by the people who have entrusted them with the responsibility of office.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not rise to take up the time of the House at any length upon the Address. But I think it would be improper that I should allow the debate on the Address to go by without expressing my own opinion, and also the opinions of those whom I represent, on some of the subjects of that Address. But, Sir, before I deal with anything in the Address, I want to deal with what it is not in the Speech. When I heard it read, I was amazed, because when the hon. Prime Minister and several of his colleagues were up west, when they were in Manitoba, when they were in the Territories, and in British Columbia, they held out before the people of the west that certain things were dear to their legislative hearts, and that the moment they got an opportunity they would put them into practice. The Minister of the Interior, whom I do not see in his place just now, spoke at Moosomin. After he had been made Minister of the Interior he spoke at Brandon, full of his blushing honours; he spoke at Winnipeg where he received a banquet, and he there held out before the people of the west that we should have a Land Bill, that we should have a measure enlarging the powers of the Executive of the North-west Territories. But, Sir, I look in vain in this Address for anything whatever for the North-west Territories. But a more important man than the Minister of the Interior dealt with this matter. The Prime Minister himself, when he was up west, promised to do away with tariff monopoly, with land monopoly; and what was of great importance, and what he dwelt on in many places, he would do away with the oppressive freight rates on the railways. Last year, and last session when I put a question on the Paper to the Prime Minister and asked him how he was going to implement the promise that he made at Moose Jaw to do away with the oppressive freight rates, his answer to me was that that promise must have been made in connection with the tariff, and that the tariff was to be so regulated that the result would be that freight rates would be greatly modified, and their oppressive incidence upon the travelling public, removed. That was not explained. Nor it seems shall we have relief. I come to that conclusion from the tenor of this speech, and also by what we hear, for instance from the leading organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, that leading organ which for seventeen years expressed the varying opinions of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat and of his colleagues, which for seventeen years was consistent only in opposition to the National Policy. I find that organ in 1882 stated that the moment the Liberal party got into power they would sweep away every vestige of protection. I read to-day a speech delivered by the hon gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) not made so long ago as 1882, not made longer ago than three years, in which he described the manufacturers of this country as legalized robbers, and yet to-day he concluded his speech by asserting that when the tariff was brought down it would be found that all interests, including the interests of manufacturers, would be protected. Sir, I greatly admire the mildness, the contentedness of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). Why, Sir, I not only admire him, but I admire the cloak—I do not want to use that term harshly—the smiling mask he puts on, in view of the feelings that must rankle in his breast when he looks back to his seventeen years of denunciation of the National Policy, when he recalls the fact that the Liberal party has come into power not by means of free trade, although he often declared that free trade as it is in England was inscribed on their banner, and when he looks back over those seventeen years and finds that now that the party has reached power he is not only degraded from the position of Finance Minister to which he properly looked forward, but is like the captives of old, dragged at the tail of the triumphal chariot of a policy which he utterly abhors. The hon. gentleman has ventured to say something about keeping faith, about carrying out the policy of which the party with which he acts has held out before the public. I cannot speak leniently of the position of hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to their promises on the tariff, or in respect to their promises upon any subject whatever. The leader of the Opposition when speaking the other night excited a good deal of laughter by quoting what the Minister of Fisheries said in Wright County, that he would be very much surprised to see the Liberal Government keep its promises. Coleridge used to say that he did

not believe in ghosts, as he had seen too many. On the same principle, I do not believe in Liberal promises, and I never had such doubt in Liberal promises as I have at the present moment. In fact, much as I admire the Prime Minister, and I do sincerely admire him, and I am glad we have such a man to go and represent us at the Queen's jubilee, for we shall be well represented and nobody can say that he will be a man who will require any allowances to be made for him—when I look at the history of the last few years, at the statements made in regard to the tariff especially and made through out the length and breadth of the country, and compare the position taken then with the position taken by the hon. gentleman now and the position for which we have been prepared by the turning around and swivelling on the part of the "Globe," for which there is no parallel whatever, I must admit that it is very hard indeed to be asked to trust almost any promise made by hon. gentlemen opposite, because it is perfectly clear that even they laugh heartily at the position in which they find themselves. They have sold the people, they have sold to some extent the Conservative party, they have sold the great Liberal party throughout the country. It is true that members on the back benches will cheer them, and that when the House divides those members will stand behind their leaders, and they will have a majority in the House. But what is a political party? It is a body of men in a country who believe in certain principles and aim to carry out these principles. And was there ever a set of politicians who to the same extent as the leaders of the Liberal party abandoned every principle inscribed on its banner in the past, especially every principle of free trade? As to promises: the other day I saw in the "Globe" a cartoon, which was a companion cartoon to one to which I called the attention of the House last session. The cartoon to which I then called attention represented the Prime Minister as bending over a North-west farmer and administering to him the wine of consolation and pouring the oil of comfort into his wounds. The other day we had what was almost a replica of that. It must be admitted that Mr. Bengough, who at one time was thought to be and I suppose is still considered to be a man of genius, has been struck with atrophy. Since he sold his genius for hire and became a mere instrument to represent partisan views, no longer do we find in those cartoons the humour that once characterized them.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Not for you.

Mr. DAVIN. My perception is not so keen as that of the hon. gentleman; I do not see humour in them. We had a replica, and what was it? We had a picture of the Premier leaning over a North-west farmer, who was very much oppressed, and the Prime Minister was giving him, among other things, "freedom from land monopoly," "freedom from tariff monopoly," "freedom from railway monopoly." Where are all those remedial measures set forth in the Speech from the Throne? There is no such remedy mentioned. The only thing the Prime Minister has done for the North-west is this: He has stood sponsor for a bell which is to be sent to Wolseley. I was glad to notice this fact, because I suppose we in the North-west must be thankful for small mercies. We have at the hands of the Premier the blessing of a bell to be sent up to Wolseley, and when the bell is rung and its tones vibrate it will tend to dissipate evil spirits. Not only so, but we are told it will dissipate bad weather; and so I suppose when a blizzard is coming over the North-west the bell will bid us not to grieve because we did not get freedom from railway monopoly from its sponsors; but the magic and brazen tongue will send forth its vibrations over the North-west Territories, and no doubt the result will be that the ticket sellers at the railway stations will charge less, and if there is a blizzard brewing, why it won't dare to make its appearance. So, Sir, we must be thankful that we have got from the sponsor of the bell this brazen present in order to dispel any gloom and make up any difficulties that may attach to us up there.

Now, seriously speaking in regard to this tariff, hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches are in a position that cannot be justified on any moral ground. They have come into power promising to carry out a certain policy, and it is now perfectly clear they are not going to carry out that policy. What is their position? My hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) has used very strong language about the Estimates that he alleges were not brought down by the ex-Finance Minister. He has suggested fraudulent action, deceptive action, in not bringing alleged Supplementary Estimates down. But what is the position of his own Government? Are they standing in the same shoes that they stood in up to the date on which the election was won? Are they going to implement one of their promises? Is there a single promise of theirs in regard to the tariff which they are going to carry out? If we are to believe the "Globe," if we are to believe the guarded statement of the hon. gentleman who moved the Address (Mr. Russell), what are we to assume is their position? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Russell) is as eloquent as he is learned, but I believe he is a strong free trader, and although there was the same felicity of language as he used last session, and although there was the same grace of utterance, he was very like (and I do not say it in any uncomplimentary mood), he was like an unwilling school boy brought up by the ear to say an unwelcome

lesson. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Russell) did not like the task that had been set him. He had to prepare this House and to prepare the country for one of the most flagrant slops-over that has ever occurred in the history of any political party. Remember, Mr. Speaker, that there is no parallel for the position that the Liberal leaders are in to-day. There is no parallel in the case of Sir Robert Peel. Peel, four years before he took action on the corn laws, had proclaimed a principle that carried within it the kernel of the action that he afterwards took on that question. He had proclaimed himself a free trader, and he said there were two planks on which he would not carry out his free trade views, and he mentioned the corn and sugar laws. Peel was some four years in office and meanwhile important events had taken place. He was not hot from an election where he had professed principles wholly different from those he was about to carry out in practice. There is no parallel for gentlemen coming back fresh from the constituents with a mandate to carry out free trade as they have it in England, a mandate not to leave a vestige of protection in the tariff, a mandate not to leave a single grain of the virus of protection in our fiscal policy; there is no parallel, I say, for a party in the position of the Liberal party of Canada acting as they now propose to do. This was the mandate that they had from the electorate to which they made these professions, and they come here, and they are not warm in their seats when they refuse to carry out these promises. The "Star" newspaper, on July 2nd, commenced an article by saying: Now that it is clear Mr. Laurier is not going in for a revenue tariff, then such and such things have to be considered. They propose to carry out their policy on the lines of protection, although the people were told by the Prime Minister himself, and by others of his supporters, that not an atom of protection was to be allowed to remain in the tariff. The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright)—who should have been Minister of Finance—denounced all the manufacturers as robbers.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Are you not pleased that he has changed his mind?

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Wood) will excuse me if I say that I am not discussing now whether I am pleased with the change of mind or not. I may be pleased that gentlemen have adopted views that I have held, but I am not pleased to have men occupying the high position of members of the Government of Canada laughing cynically in the face of the electors they have deceived. I am not pleased with that, and I am not pleased to see a whole lot of gentlemen that have been howling all over the country for seventeen years in favour of a revenue tariff and against protection, and who in this House I have heard for ten years cheering and cheering the sentiments of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright); I am not pleased to see them, now that they are wallowing in power, laughing at their own shame. There is no man in Canada who has finer qualities or no man who could occupy the position of Prime Minister in a more distinguished manner than the present Premier of this Dominion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes; but there is no man who has occupied that position, or could ever occupy it, that, in my opinion, has struck or could strike a more deadly blow at public morals. I say that already a deadly blow has been struck at public morals. When I come to deal with the school question, although I probably shall have to say some things that will surprise some of my friends, I will show where I think the Prime Minister was wrong there. I will not discuss the financial question raised by the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright), but as it is now palpable that the Government of Canada is going to turn around to its followers and say to them: We want you to be converted in squadrons and baptized into our new doctrine in platoons; I must say that the spectacle presented to this young country and to the world at large is an immoral spectacle.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Oh.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, I say it is, and I say that it must be attended with a serious Nemesis for the country, and that if the people of this country are what I believe them to be; if the Liberal party of Canada is, as I believe it to be, composed of honest men who hold honestly by their opinions; then, Sir, the first real opportunity that is given them they will undoubtedly avenge their bertayal. Not merely has the Liberal party been, as it were, sold, but look at the position of the Patrons. In the "Sun" of 1894—

Mr. CAMPBELL. Tell us about your majority.

Mr. DAVIN. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that any one will suppose I am making an idle boast when I say that I can deal with that gentleman or with the whole crowd. You know, Mr. Speaker, that he has no right to make that kind of interruption. It is the first time I ever appealed to the Chair, but I must mention that last year similar interruptions took place, and I had to turn around and deal with these gentlemen, and when it was found that I was squeezing them pretty tightly, then the Chair came to their rescue, although I was the person over whom your ægis should have been thrown. Sir, I call on you to defend me, although I must

say that I do not need your defence, for I can take care of the whole crowd of them any time I like.

There is another body in this country that has reason to complain. I refer to the Patrons. I see a distinguished Patron opposite me, a colleague of mine from the North-west Territories.

Mr. BENNETT. He has his trunk, too.

Mr. DAVIN. Has he his trunk ?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. DAVIN. Oh, impossible. However, don't you interrupt me either. I was reading a few days ago a letter addressed to the Patrons by the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in which that gentleman tells them : " My dear friends, why should you think that you and the Liberal party are opposed to each other. I have read the Patron platform, and these are exactly the principles for which the Liberal party has been contending for years." He goes over these principles in the most loving manner, and, in his elephantine way, of course metaphorically, he hugs to his bosom, the Patron correspondent, as a friend and a brother and says: " These are my principles." The principle most dear to the Patron heart is a tariff for revenue, and the hon. member declares it to be a principle most dear to his heart. Where are the Patrons today ? Nothing contributed much more to the success of the Liberal party in the late contest than the support they got, sometimes insidious, sometimes genuine, from the Patron body. The great majority are noble specimens of our yeomanry, thoroughly honest men. Where are the Patrons today ? Where will they be when they find that the party to which they gave their support and in which they trusted has sold them also ?

One subject in which we are much interested in the North-west is the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, and I see nothing about that subject here. It is important, as everybody who knows anything about the mining conditions of Rossland and Slocan knows, that we should have a railway there as soon as possible. What we are doing at the present moment is building up a great American city, when we might be building up a great Canadian city, because we have not the transportation facilities. Why have we not ? Was there or was there not a bargain made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to build that railway ? If there was a bargain made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to build it, and proper conditions were imposed, as I gathered from the " Globe " newspaper, which I read very religiously, we should know it. The Government would have had my support if they had chosen to build the railway either in that way or to build it themselves. In fact, I am inclined to think—and we may as well face the question—that in the not distant future we shall have to have Government railways, if we want to retain our freedom in this country. Whether that railway is built by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or by another company, or by the Government directly, built it should be. Why have we no mention here of that railway ? Because, Sir, the practice which characterizes hon. gentlemen on other matters is going to characterize them on this, and they are going to put off to a safe or tactical moment the taking of a definite course.

There is another subject which is dear to the North-west, of which we have no mention here, that is, the Hudson's Bay Railway. The people of the North-west are anxious to have the Hudson's Bay Railway built ; why is it we have no mention of it here ? The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has sent a little twopenny-halfpenny boat up to the Hudson's Bay to see whether it is navigable for four or five months in the year. We did not need to have that fact established, for it is already established. Why did he not accept the offer of an English firm to send out boats of a proper size, and maintain the navigation if he would build the road ? Thus going farther than merely testing the question, instead of sending up a little boat which will be crushed between the icebergs ? The Winnipeg " Free Press," which cannot be said to be other than friendly to the present Government, discussing this question, pointed out that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had never uttered one word on the subject that was not hostile to the Hudson's Bay Railway. It expressed regret that so important a matter was in the charge of that hon. gentleman, and even hinted that he had sent such a boat to the Hudson's Bay to test its navigability, as would force the person commanding it to come back and report that the Bay was not navigable, and that the project should be given up. No government can have the confidence of the North-west, as I know it, which is not ready to build the Hudson's Bay Railway. There is no question so near to the hearts of the people of the Territories, and I am therefore surprised to see no mention of it in this Speech.

There are other things which I miss. We were promised by the hon. Minister of the Interior, in those post-prandial speeches which he made, a Land Bill. One of the hon. members of this House has brought forward certain views in regard to our land laws, both in and out of this House. Some ten years ago the " Call " of Winnipeg was converted to those views, but even before that time, even as far back as 1885, a person in the North-west advocated that the Government should acquire the odd sections. Almost the very words of that person were quoted by the Minister of the Interior on the occasion to which I have

referred. He pointed to the great loneliness of the settlers, and other difficulties under the present system; and I am very glad, although it is late in the day, that the same views have commended themselves to another member of the House coming from the North-west Territories. But how is it that we have no mention of that question in this Speech, after the Minister of the Interior announced at those banquets that he intended to deal with the question? How is it, I repeat, that we have no mention here of any amendment to the North-west Territories Act, which also we were promised? In his speech at Moosomin, the Minister of the Interior said that now that he had become Minister of the Interior, the swaddling days of the North-west Territories were over. He said he was surprised at the moderation of the demands of the North-west Executive. I think he had had an interview, a couple of days before that banquet, with my hon. friend Mr. Haultain, the head of the Executive, and Mr. James H. Ross, a colleague of his. He had an interview with those gentlemen, and he said, fresh from that interview, that he was surprised at the moderation of their demands. Those demands were for enlarged powers. They were demands which were made of the late Government when we spoke on this question, and which prominent men in the then Opposition, notably Mr. Mills, who is no longer here, I regret to say, rose up to state should be granted because the Territories were ripe for responsible government. We have not a hint now of anything at all being done in the way of conceding those demands. In fact, if a little bird has told me rightly, it would seem that the Government has sat upon the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton). The Minister of the Interior, I have no doubt, made his proposals, but the Government sat on them.

Mr. FOSTER. He was going to sit on them.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, in one of his speeches he said he was bound to have a free hand. He intended that things should be changed. He even pointed out that all the blame was not to be attached to Mr. Daly, that if Mr. Daly failed it was not all his fault, that it was the fault of the other members of the Conservative Government, who had sat on Mr. Daly, but that he was not going to be sat upon. He would let the Government understand that he was going to have a free hand. He—an independent man—would not have accepted the position at all unless he were going to have a free hand. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am told that the way he has had a free hand is that he left the Council two or three times in dudgeon, threatening, I suppose, to resign, but the following morning found him in his place again. That is the independent man who was going to do so much for the Territories.

An hon. MEMBER. They are not a happy family.

Mr. DAVIN. I know that. But that is one of the reasons why I admire the First Minister so much. I may tell him that, against the opinion of some of his own friends as well as mine, I have never wavered in my estimate of him. I have always maintained that he was not merely a cultivated and refined man, but a strong man as well, and I have been confirmed in that opinion by the way in which he has managed his team. Why, there is the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) who has been a kind of Czar in his section; there is the hon. member for—

Mr. BENNETT. North Lincoln (Mr. Gibson).

Mr. DAVIN. No. I am going higher than that, there is the hon. member for Sunbury and Queen's (Mr. Blair) who has also been in his province, a kind of Czar; then take the hon. member who has lately taken his seat—think of the ponderous eloquence of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), when, from that seat where the hon. leader of the Opposition now sits, he used to rise and thunder and swell and fume and roar, and now we find he can do nothing more than smile blandly at his own disruption. Why, Mr. Speaker, it is a wonderful thing. I having been reading some of the speeches of the Finance Minister, and find that he is a great free trader, that he perfectly abhors every vestige of protection just as much as ever my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) did, and yet he, too, eats the leek with just as good grace as the hon. member for South Oxford. I have a speech of the member for Sunbury and Queen's (Mr. Blair) to which I wish to call the attention of the House, and I am sorry he is not in his place.

An hon. MEMBER. Wait until after dinner.

Mr. DAVIN. Is it possible that this is getting unpleasant for hon. gentlemen? I grant you it is unpleasant for people to be confronted with the ghosts of their own misdeeds. You all remember that scene in Macbeth, which is one of the most striking in the whole range of dramatic literature. When Macbeth, after having committed a crime, is confronted with the ghost of the murdered Banquo, he exclaims: "Take any shape but that." And I have not the slightest doubt that for hon. gentlemen opposite, who still have some sense of shame left in them, it is cruel to have conjured up before them the ghosts of these broken promises and these dead reputations, because the reputations of some of these gentlemen are pretty well interred now. We had a visit from the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) at Regina, and there he made a speech, and an able speech, as no

doubt he could not fail to do. I had not the honour of hearing him, because his speech was addressed only to a select number of the Liberal party in the Liberal room, or I would certainly have been present. The hon. gentleman said :

The Liberal party had strenuously upheld great principles during a very long period in opposition, and it was now their duty to apply these principles.

How are they going to apply them ? I suppose the hon. gentleman will change his tune when he comes to address you in this House. Oh, he will say, the Liberal party had strenuously upheld great principles during a very long period in opposition, and it is now our duty to eat them all.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Are you speaking of your majority of one ?

Mr. DAVIN. That joke, if joke it be, has done its work. There was never anything gaulois about it, and it comes with very bad grace from the representative of a witty race. He makes but a sorry exhibition when he has always to hark back to a poor little joke ; it shows a barrenness of intellect on the part of my hon. friend which one would hardly have expected. But I know that he is suffering, too, and has to be content with very little.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I had a bigger majority than that.

Mr. DAVIN. I know that very well, but I see the pallor that never fails to come on the face of a man that is dying of balked and baffiled ambition. These little petulant outbreakes on the part of my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) argue a want of respect for his great leader. Does he not see that I am building a pyramid on which to place his leader ? I want to show how high I place his leader, because I am building a pyramid for him upon the bones of these distributed and degraded statesmen. Let me refer to a statement made by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) to which some importance appears to have been attached because the Minister of Railways repeated it at Regina. He says : Every man in the Government had achieved signal success in his own business. If that is intended to have any influence on the electors, I would point out that it is not true. Every member of the Government has not achieved success in his own business. But if the statement is meant to carry weight with the electors, I wish, I repeat to point out that it is untrue. What is the major premise behind it ? It is that the man who achieves success in his private business is likely to prove a good statesman. I say that the converse of this is true. I say that a man capable of taking an interest in public matters has a great weight to carry the moment he attempts to succeed in his own private affairs, and this has been the history of every great statesman, be it in Greece, or Rome, or England, or Canada. What has been the fate of most of the Prime Ministers of Canada ? My late illustrious friend, Sir John Macdonald, told me once that most of the Prime Ministers of Canada had died paupers. Why ? Because a man cannot devote the whole force of his intellect to the affairs of other people and attend to his own. What enables a man to succeed in business ? Narrow concentration upon his own concerns. Take the greatest statesman England ever produced, who, I think, undoubtedly, was the younger Pitt. He could not take care of his own affairs, but left those affairs in a state of the greatest possible confusion. I could give a dozen of such instances and, on the other hand, I could give you the names of men who have risen to the places of statesmen and have been able to take care of their own private affairs, and have bungled the public business, as was done by a celebrated Athenian statesman. I do not wish to elaborate this point, but I may say that the position I take is shown in the very Government we have to-day, because the men in that Government who have the best claims to be considered statesmen are not the men who have paid most attention to their own private affairs. He goes on then to speak about railways :

He believed it was more important to know the people's wishes than to know the wishes of the men who have charters and have already a large railway system.

He is taking a dig here at the Canadian Pacific Railway, though at that very time it is believed an arrangement had been come to by other members of the Government with that railway.

I feel that the time has come for a new departure in the principle of railway building in Canada—or the adoption of a principle founded on the real interests of the people who have to pay for the building. In any case, their interest alone is to be considered in plan and methods of railway construction. He would cast no reflection upon any existing corporation.

You see he is doing what the Prime Minister objected to—he is striking by innuendo at the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Men are alike. They do not do business for their health.

And so on. Then he closes in this way :

He promised that he would propound in Council the railway policy he had outlined, and make secure the approval of his colleagues. He believed that it would be like bread cast upon the waters—the return would surely come with manifold advantage.

And he says earlier that it is sometimes to the advantage of the country to work a Government railway at a loss rather than to give the building to a corporation. Why then is it that we have nothing for the

Crow's Nest Pass? It is absolutely needed at the present time, and it should be built, if necessary, as a Government work. My hon. friend who has just sat down spoke about incompetence. In regard, anyway, to the part of the country I am interested in, the grossest incompetence is shown in relation to this important work, and in having no announcement regarding the Hudson's Bay Railway, and in having nothing concerning legislation to amend the monopoly freight rates. Not one single suggestion have we that we are to be relieved from the freight rates that weighed so heavily upon the souls of hon. gentlemen. I think that we in the North-west Territories have some right to complain of that. Then, Sir, we hear something of another proposed measure. I do not propose to dwell upon this as it is none of my funeral. I refer to a bill of pains and penalties against the bishops in Quebec. If bishops, or priests, or ministers, clergymen of any church, go out of their way to interfere improperly in elections, any man or any government that take steps to prevent such conduct shall have my sympathy and support. But, Sir, the "Mail" smelt a rat months ago in regard to these ecclesiastical philippics in Quebec. The fact is that in the history of politics or in the history of art, there never has been such a sublime comedy, such a sublime piece of melodrama played as that played by the Liberal leaders in regard to this school question. We should have a trilogy. I would fain take as my subject "Not for Joe, or the engineer hoist with his own petard." First, we had Joe Martin, whom I regret not to see in this House. He passed the Manitoba legislation of 1890, and, at the same time, he declared himself to be the greatest enemy in Canada of the freight rates of the Canadian Pacific Railway. He declared himself, in season and out of season, the enemy of the Canadian Pacific Railway. He does all he can to get his party into power. His party gets into power and where is he? The engineer is hoist with his own petard. He passes the School Bill of Manitoba, but he himself reaps nothing of the success of his policy. He denounces the freight rates of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but we find him pocketing $12,000 a year to further the Canadian Pacific Railway, and doing everything he can for them. That is a good sample of Liberal existency, but he, of course, is only a minor actor. The great actor in this melodrama is the Prime Minister himself. He poses well. He behaved with great skill in regard to the school question. Of course he was in danger with a certain portion of the people in the west especially—there are such things as prejudices in the world—but what is done? A certain number of his clerical friends in Quebec make a feint of fighting him. They issue thunders of a certain sort against him, but when you examine them, they are as harmless as the powder crackers that the boys let off in the streets on a certain day in November. No better course could be taken for the hon. gentleman than that. It enables his supporters in the west to figure him as riding the Protestant horse and as the champion of Protestantism against ecclesiastical and hierarchical tyranny. It is really amusing. But I think he should have put an embargo on that reporter, that enthusiastic reporter, who has now revealed him to us in his true light, because no man who was not heart and soul with the Ultramontane party in Quebec would be able seriously to go through the solemn ceremony of standing sponsor to the blessing of the bell. That, I am told, is a cardinal test of a man's devotion to the extreme tenets of the church to which he belongs; and therefore all this supposed fighting with ecclesiastics on the part of my hon. friend, is but a masked fight. The truth is that it is a fine piece of melodrama which enables the hon. gentleman to carry out the Government policy in Quebec as a devoted son of the church, while he rides the Protestant horse out west, wearing the appropriate danger scarf while fighting the ecclesiastics. It is a case of riding two horses. In circuses I have seen these clever acrobats riding two horses when there was not more than a foot or so between the horses, and thought it marvellous enough, but to ride two horses with fifteen hundred miles between them displays an agility on the part of my hon. friend the Prime Minister that even I was unable to give him credit for, until I had witnessed it. Now, having remarked upon the melodramatic character that applies to a good deal of the discussion connected with the school question, let me say what I think of the action of the Manitoba Government in regard to that. Now, Sir, in regard to this settlement I think I speak not only for myself but for a good many others, when I say that the legislation of Mr. Greenway is, to my mind, a final act. I consider that that legislation is very like what I suggested in 1895 should be done. The only government that I held should deal with it, the only power that could deal with it successfully, in my opinion, has dealt with it—the Government of Manitoba and the legislature of Manitoba. I consider that as between those who held that this Parliament could deal fruitfully with the question, and myself, there was always a great gulf. I never could think that any other power could settle that question except the Government and legislature of Manitoba. I may say also that whatever they have done was very like what has been done in the North-west Territories, and I accept that, and have no adverse criticism to make on it. Now, there is a point connected with that which I wish to mention. The Prime Minister, in his speech on that

question, very properly, and very honestly, took the responsibility for that settlement as being the outcome of an agreement made between the Government of Canada and the Government of Manitoba. I have no controversy with the settlement, I personally am satisfied with that settlement; but if I had a controversy with it, I would have to point this out, that it is not, of course, a settlement in this sense, that when two parties have a controversy, and an arbitrator comes to settle the matter between them and you bring both of them together, and the two agree, you have a settlement. Here you have the controversy dealt with in a different way and it is not a settlement in that sense. An arrange ment has been made between the two governments, and so far as the Government consulted with others, they probably were acting unconstitutionally, although I would not attack them for consulting with others than the Government of Manitoba. But, Sir, what the Prime Minister has done is to take full responsibility for that settlement, and before the country to-day he is as responsible for that settlement, as Mr. Greenway is responsible before the people of Manitoba. In his own language, what has taken place? I have thus far spoken for myself, but now speaking for others, I must say there are a large number, not merely in my own constituency, but in the North-west Territories, who feel that Mr. Greenway has gone too far. They feel that the principle of separate schools has been adopted by Mr. Greenway, and they resent that. On the other hand, there are also in the North-west Territories those who feel that enough has not been done, that a great deal more should have been done. However, I have expressed what my own view is. Now I have also expressed my views on that question on previous occasions. In 1895, from the seat where the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) usually sits, and when the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) was in the gallery, I stated my views on this question. Also in the course of the debate in the session of 1896, when we were in committee, I rose and declared what my view was, and my speech on that occasion was sent up to the North-west Territories to a paper in which it should have been forthwith published. That speech never appeared till a long time afterwards, and the consequence was that a false view of my position on that question was diffused, until I went up and saw my constituents; but unfortunately I had not an opportunity to see as many of them as I desired in order to do away with the machinations that had been used to misrepresent me upon that question. I see in his place a gentleman who was absent when I was speaking a few minutes ago, the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson). I was greatly edified by an article that appeared in my hon. friend's paper when the commission went up west. I am harking back for a moment, as I did not wish to refer to him when he was not in his place. But when the commission was up west my hon. friend smelt a rat, he thought the commission was about to abandon its allegiance to the Liberal doctrines that the Government were about to abandon their allegiance to tariff reform, to a revenue tariff. Subsequently his fear became still greater when they went down to Montreal and the leading business men of Montreal, the leading business men of this country who hold the business of the country in their hands, came before them and lectured them as if they were children, when they lectured the Finance Minister and lectured the Minister of Trade and Commerce as if they were children, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce hung his head and the Finance Minister was mute. Then, Sir, what happened? Again, I admire the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister sends a couple of them down to Washington. Now, what happened was this: They came to him and they said: We must bring in a revenue tariff, we must move for free trade as they have it in England, we must carry out our promises. The hon. gentleman smiled on them with that smile which charms gods and men, and said: You are very simple. The best thing you can do is to go down to Washington. But before this, in order to help them, he sent to Washington a turtle dove with an olive branch in his mouth, in the shape of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). The result was that those gentlemen came back from Washington, having achieved nothing and the Prime Minister told them: We are not going to have any revenue tariff, we are not going to have free trade as it is in England. Then the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) got sciatica and rheumatism—political rheumatism and revenue-tariff sciatica—and off he went. He came back after some weeks, and he had been here only a couple of days, when we were told the tariff was ready. What it means is this, that the hon. member for South Oxford was scandalously used, and the Finance Minister had to sacrifice his principles; and now I want to know whether the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) will be called upon to sacrifice his principles. He came out strongly—I think he thought he might have an election, but it was put off like my own for three or four months—and in his paper, and he denounced the members of the Government for not standing to their guns in regard to a revenue tariff and in regard to reforming the franchise and taking off duties. I look forward with eagerness to ascertain what he will do when he finds such a tariff submitted as is indicated by the speeches delivered here and by the leading organ in Toronto.

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

After Recess.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, there is another question to which I desire to refer before I resume my seat, and that is the Manitoba school question. There is a sense in which the arrangement arrived at is not a settlement. In fact it would seem that the Government do not regard it as a final settlement, because a number of them, including the member for Chambly and Verchères, and I believe the Prime Minister himself, sent for the ablegate, and the ablegate, it seems from a telegram published in the "Star" of March 27th, is endowed with extraordinary and plenary powers. We are told that a powerful London churchman said:

I cannot see how the passage of the Act of the Manitoba legislature settles the case. Certainly, Mr. Laurier's future, together with that of his party, depends practically upon Monseigneur Del Val's decision. All the Liberal members from Quebec, except three (of whom Mr. Laurier is one), signed the pledge to settle the Manitoba school question in favour of the rights of the minority.

Of course that is what some of my constituents would say to me: "It is all very fine for you, Mr. Davin, (it is only just to them to say that) to say that you are satisfied with what Mr. Greenway has done, but it does not satisfy us; you cannot properly call it a settlement unless the minority consents to it." The telegram goes on to say:

These men cannot act otherwise, or they must resign or be defeated at the polls next time. Then, the 45 Catholic members of the Senate and Commons, including Mr. Laurier and all the Catholic members of his Government, of whom there are about 30 in the Commons, just Mr. Laurier's majority, signed a petition to the Pope, asking him that a delegate be sent to settle the question.

We have the statement made to a reporter by the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion) to the effect that he signed this document. The telegram continues:

These men, in signing such a petition, practically bound themselves to accept their own arbitrator's decision. Should they refuse, they must, from the church's standpoint, be held to have violated their word to the Pope.

I see the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Tarte) laughs at that. But, Sir, it is only three years ago since the hon. member, who then sat behind me, rose, and in language vehement and excited called attention to the wrongs that had been done to the minority, and so long as he could make it a card to fight with he used it; but the moment he got into power and found it inconvenient to carry out his pledges and former principles, he turned around—I do not say it offensively—and with shameless effrontery he laughed at his former self and jeered at his inverted consistency. I saw a most respectable picture of the hon. member for Iberville published in the "Globe." I do not know what beneficent act Mr. Bengough attributed to him; but having before me the record of the hon. member for Iberville, I will say that Mr. Bengough may draw him and paint him; he may paint him in bright or dark colours, but there is one thing neither he nor any other artist can do, and that is whitewash him. The telegram continues:

It was on this petition, brought by Mr. Charles Fitzpatrick, the Solicitor General of Canada, to Rome, and only on assurances that they meant to abide by the delegate's decision, that the Pope consented to intervene.

Why, of course, it could be only on such a condition as that stated that an ablegate would be sent.

Monseigneur Del Val is given plenary powers to settle the controversy, discipline the recalcitrant bishops, and place Mr. Laurier and his followers, in case of their refusal to abide by his decision, in such a plight as to practically ruin their political prospects or force them to turn renegade to their obligations to His Holiness. As a matter of fact, Monseigneur Del Val is going to see Mr. Greenway at the earliest possible moment and ascertain exactly how much concessions to the Catholics Mr. Greenway is willing to make, while, on his side, Monseigneur Del Val will state to Mr. Greenway the exact irreducible minimum of the church's demands.

This falls in with two things: the opinion expressed to the reporter in London by Monseigneur Merry del Val as to what he thought of the proposals of Mr. Greenway, and the opinion expressed in the west respecting the dilatoriness of Mr. Greenway. We could not help wondering why Mr. Greenway delayed the introduction of his Bill, but we now know he did so because he was waiting the arrival of the ablegate from the Pope in order to consult with him as to what concession would be acceptable at the Vatican. The telegram proceeds:

Monseigneur Del Val hopes the views will be nearly alike, so as to enable prompt settlement. Should this be so, Monseigneur Del Val will not hesitate to beat down all opposition of the bishops' party in Quebec with measures as severe as necessary. He does not intend to combat the bishops; but he will not permit their opposition to extend beyond the irreducible minimum which the Pope has fixed.

This telegram, and the conduct of the Prime Minister and his colleagues in sending for an ablegate, entirely destroys the character that certain persons in the west have been trying to fasten on the Premier, and that is, the character of a protagonist of Protestants. The position of riding the Protestant horse and fighting the Quebec bishops can no longer be given to the Premier, because there is no difference, except in degree, between submitting to his immediate ecclesiastical superiors and his more remote ecclesiastical superiors. Speaking as a member of this House, and as a citizen of Canada, I

say it is an unconstitutional thing to have done. I say, that if the Prime Minister has any controversy with the bishops of Quebec in regard to their civil action, what he should have done was to have used the constitutional powers at his disposal, and not send for an ablegate to Rome, signing a round robin—the member for Chambly and Vercheres (Mr. Geoffrion) told us some time ago he did it—signing a round robin to bring an ablegate from Rome to decide a question that was a purely civil question which should have been decided in accordance with our constitution.

Sir, in regard to the paragraph from the Queen's Speech respecting creameries, I wish to echo the praise that has already been given to the Minister of Agriculture for his energy in this matter. I wish also to point out, however, that when he entered the Department of Agriculture he found the whole machinery in order in regard to creameries, and in regard to cold storage. Some two years and a half ago, my friend the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) assured me he was going to put $20,000 into the Estimates, and both Professor Robertson and myself were perfectly certain that that would be done, and in consequence I telegraphed that we should have thirty creameries established in the North-west Territories, mentioning some of the places where they would be established. Professor Robertson then told me that about that number would be required, and I find that the present Minister is erecting these creameries in some of the places I then indicated. If we take the interpretation of the prophecies given us by the Apostles and make a comparison of their fulfilment, we shall find that my prophecy as to the carrying out of these creameries has been verified earlier even than those divine prophecies to which I have dared to refer.

There is one subject in the Queen's Speech which I cannot pass without referring to, and that is the Superannuation Bill. I do not know what the Superannuation Bill is like, but I know that already the Government has introduced a most demoralizing element, socially and politically, into this community. From Halifax to Vancouver we have hanging committees in every little centre, and I have been told that a western member has written to one of his constituencies a letter somewhat like this: "I cannot find out causes for the dismissal of people, but I rely on you to supply me with these." Hon. gentlemen opposite have introduced the spoils system into Canada. In defiance of British tradition, in defiance of the constitution of Canada, in defiance of the example of our neighbours below the line who are trying to escape from that vicious system, they have introduced the spoils system. What is that system but paying for support in the vilest of all ways? Talk of bribing a man with money for his vote, talk of offering him an office that is vacant, for his vote; why, Sir, that is a venial thing compared with saying to a man: Find me a reason against this or that man and I will drag him from his position and give it to you. It has introduced espionage; it has introduced false accusers; it has introduced a malignly degrading element into our political and social life, and what is the consequence? In communities out west, and I have no doubt it is the same all over Canada, where there was peace and harmony, where there was confidence between man and man before, now there is suspicion in the atmosphere, every man is afraid of his fellow, and there is espionage and false accusation, and subornation of testimony, and every vice that can possibly be generated by that degrading and sinister system. By and by, when we come to deal with that I shall show that they have gone so low as to drive even poor widows from petty positions in order that some clamorous vulpine supporters should get these positions.

Now, Sir, I shall not be tempted to the immodesty of daring to emulate the example of those who have, with so much grace, risen to the suggestion of that paragraph in the Speech from the Throne in which Her Majesty is in a special manner referred to in language so appropriate and just. Sixty years of unequalled rule over an unparalleled empire. There have been long reigns—but none like this—in which around a domestic hearth, sweet and simple, revolving lustres have crowded victories in every field of science and every walk of art—triumphs of freedom and benevolence—world-wide imperial expansion—renowns outdazzling each other. I can recall no reign, short or long, over which some permanent cloud has not rested—in which there has not been the insistence and the assertion of some defacement. The wedding bells of the parents of men now growing old had not rung when she began to reign; the requiem of many of the men then unborn who have won great honours and illustrated her era, has ceased to echo. Empires have risen and disappeared, while her own Colonial Empire has grown beyond the fondest dreams of the greatest among her earliest advisers. The conditions of life, socially and commercially, have been revolutionized. The map of Europe—of the world—has been transformed, and yet she sits, untouched, a desired and beloved sovereign on a throne as unshaken as it is august. Sixty years since a girl, she rose in virgin innocence to that giddy pinnacle, into that rare and difficult atmosphere, and to-day her Imperial front lifts itself high above all mighty surrounding eminences, but not so high as her character above all past and present regal fames. Sixty years—two generations of men—going on to three-quarters of a century—the sixteenth of a millenium, in the fierce light that beats upon a throne—and there is not a shadow on the woman—not a fleck on the diadem of the Queen. Nor is it hazardous

to say that the future, like the past, will fail to present to the world such a combination of exalted grandeur and unsullied purity.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Speaker, before this Address is put to the vote, I feel it is my duty, as one of the few representatives of the province of Quebec who sit on this side of the House, one of the very few who represent electoral divisions in which there is a large French Canadian vote, to express my opinion, which I think is in a large measure the opinion of my constituents, on the subject-matter of the Address.

There are in this Address some paragraphs from which it is impossible to dissent. That part of the Address which refers to the jubilee year of Her Majesty, and the common concert of praise and joy participated in by all her subjects throughout the immense, the unprecedented Empire over which she rules, is something upon which, as has already been indicated by the hon. leader of the Opposition and by others, there cannot be a dissenting voice. Indeed, I deem it to be our duty to add what we can to the concert of praise and jubilation which should mark this remarkable epoch, so eloquently and so properly described by the speaker who has just preceded me.

We can all agree, also, in that paragraph which refers to the calamity which has overtaken our fellow-subjects in India. But, Sir, even in this connection I feel bound to call the attention of the hon. leader of this House, as to whose sincerity I do not entertain the slightest doubt, to the position in which we stand. It has been the custom in the province of Quebec, on more than one occasion, among a limited class I am bound to say, to qualify the representatives of that province sitting on this side of the House as supporters and promoters of a theory in favour of more closely binding together the dependencies of the British Empire. In this respect, we have more than once, I think unjustly, been held up to the odium of our fellow-citizens. We have been held up as the supporters of the Bleu-Orange party. Well, Sir, gentlemen who come from my native province know what weight that qualification may possibly have among our electors. But certain it is that on more than one occasion, for having professed, or for having been supposed to profess sentiments which I find contained in this first paragraph of the Address, we have been taken to task, and marked as a set of men who were in favour of binding together the different portions of the Empire. I think it is time that a stop should be put to that and that the sentiments which are expressed in this paragraph should be made known as the sentiments of the whole population of this country. What do I find in a leading French Liberal paper which I received to-day? Precisely the expression of the same animadversion against those who are asked by hon. gentlemen opposite to vote in favour of this paragraph. I find in "Le Signal," a leading Liberal paper published in the city of Montreal, that "a breeze of Imperialism is blowing over this country"—precisely that breeze which I find manifested in this opening paragraph of the Address. It says this:

> At the present moment a strong breeze of Imperialism is blowing over this country. Those who have at heart the French cause cannot remain indifferent in the face of what is taking place. Public men of the province of Quebec, Liberal, as well as Conservative, have not for several years taken the slightest trouble to stimulate French sentiment among our population or to rekindle among our compatriots national aspiration.

Then follows a strong attack upon sentiments which are precisely those contained in this opening paragraph of the Address. Further on we find these words:

> Let us be Canadians—very well; but let us not be English. Our interests are by no means common with those that are defended and guarded in Downing Street. Moreover, they are absolutely foreign to those which England may have in India, in Egypt, in the Transvaal, in the Mediterranean, in Venezuela, and in other places; and it would be an anti-patriotic move on our part to espouse her quarrels, her difficulties, or even her adventures. We have something else to do.

Further on, in reference to that paragraph which states that we have behaved properly in taking into consideration the suffering of our fellow-subjects in India, this newspaper says:

> If the English of Canada subscribe $100,000 to come to the assistance of the famished Hindoos, robbed and ruined by England, that is their business, and it is their way of advertising their devotion to the British Empire. Let the English in Canada sing "God Save the Queen," after having drunk a cup of tea, or having played a lacrosse match, or even before a passing regiment. That is with the object of galvanizing their loyalty, that is to whip up their English blood and cause vibration throughout their English fibre, and stimulate their fanaticism. Do you think that our jingoes of Montreal or Toronto would have given a hundred cents, if the bubonic plague were raging in Indo-China or Algeria, instead of in India?

I will not take up any further the time of this House in quoting from this newspaper. The object I have in view is to point out to the hon. leader of this House that if this paragraph of the address thoroughly represents the sentiments of his party, he should use the powerful influence which he undoubtedly possesses to make those sentiments unanimous among all those who support him. I do not believe, Sir, that this is the only paper in which you will find expressed sentiments of that kind. We have another one in Montreal, which fortunately, I believe, has lately become the property of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), from which fact I gather great hopes for its future loyalty; and in that paper, on more than one occasion, we have had the expression of senti-

ments exactly similar to these. Why, during the last electoral contest, what was the story which that daily newspaper circulated ad nauseam throughout my county? It was that the hon. leader on this side (Sir Charles Tupper) had entered into a combination with Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, and had purchased three million dollars worth of rifles, and brought them out here with the object of arming the young men of the province of Quebec and sending them to Venezuela to fight the battles of England. I have never been able to find out what has become of those rifles, but I think it is fair for me to ask the gentlemen on the Treasury benches if they now intend to arm with them the young men of the province of Quebec to go and fight the battles of Venezuela against England. I believe that the time has come, if the sentiments contained in that paragraph of the Address really represent the sentiments of hon. gentlemen opposite, when there should be unanimity among them, and we should hear no more protestations of this kind from the province of Quebec and no more such insinuations passed against hon. gentlemen on this side, because if what is described in this Address as Imperialism is correct, then I have no hesitation in saying that I am an Imperialist. If by Imperialism you mean a system of gross servility to the British Crown and unintelligent submission, a system of political snobbishness, then I am not an Imperialist, but if you understand by that term, putting into execution the idea which I find expressed to a certain extent in this paragraph, namely, that every commonwealth united under the British flag, should have a more direct action upon the foreign policy of the Imperial Government, upon the commercial and other treaties, upon intercolonial tariffs and trade, upon legislation particularly affecting the general interests of the Empire, and that in order to settle those immense hitherto unsettled tracts of what has been properly termed Greater Britain we should have a judicious and vigorous policy of immigration, then I am an Imperialist, and would condemn any such movement as, in my opinion, would not conform in any degree to the sentiments expressed in the opening paragraph of the Address. Therefore I say that those who give expression to the views contained in that paragraph should convince us of their thorough sincerity by moulding, as far as in their power lies, the opinion of their followers to the adoption and appreciation of this grand conception.

Leaving aside this paragraph and turning to the announcement of the fiscal policy of the Government, as contained in the Address, I find that the pronouncement which we find in the Speech from the Throne and the ideas also expressed in the Address do not contain what we all desire and what the country has desired since over eighteen months, and that is the principle which is to govern this work of revision upon which we are invited to proceed without delay. Is it the principle of protection or of free trade or is it what was advocated in my county during the last election, the principle of the adoption of a tariff for revenue only? It seems to me that upon this point there is a vagueness both in the Speech from the Throne and in the Address, which leaves ungratified a most legitimate desire of the business men of this country. During the last election the principle contended for in my electoral division was squarely this—a complete change in the tariff, the adoption of the tariff of 1875, the adoption of a tariff for revenue only. But, Sir, if we take into consideration what fell from the lips of the hon. gentleman who moved the Address (Mr. Russell) in reply to the Speech from the Throne—and that I think may be considered as an authorized pronouncement of the policy of the Government—what do we find? That hon. gentleman said that for years we have been building up in this country a disastrous fiscal system, a system of protection, and that now that the evils of that system have become apparent, we should proceed, not violently but slowly, to a complete change. There are vested interests, there is a revenue which must be obtained, we must guard those interests, we must provide that revenue, but the ultimate object which the Government should have in view is a gradual return to the system of free trade as that system obtains in England. This then is to be the policy of the Government—not an immediate sacrifice of the great interests which had been built up under the preceding policy but a gradual movement towards a policy of free trade as adopted in England. Now, I have no hesitation in saying that that announcement is, to any constituency which has industrial interests at stake, a very grave announcement indeed. To stand up here and uphold a diametrically opposite theory to maintain that the policy which has been followed by preceding Governments during the last eighteen years is the right and proper system, would, it appears to me, be eminently futile in view of the announcement made. What we are going to do then, if we are to place absolute reliance upon what has been stated by the mover of this Address, is to curtail and abandon the system of the National Policy and to proceed through a system of a tariff for revenue only, to the gradual establishment of the policy of free trade. And this, Sir, we are going to do in the face of what all other countries are doing, in the face of the adoption of an entirely different policy by the United States, in the face of the adoption of an entirely different policy by France, by Belgium, by Germany, where it has contributed to such an extent to build up the great industry and power of that country, in the face of the adoption of a

different policy by Russia, Norway and Sweden, Spain, Italy and Portugal. We are going to follow, in other words, absolutely in the wake of England. That is to be our "ultima Thule," but not proceeding as they did in England by beginnig with protection until the results of that policy have been to place the country, as it did England upon a pinnacle of industrial supremacy, and then adopt another policy; but now, at the present time, when we are in the very infancy of the development of this country to start out and gradually gravitate towards a policy of free trade, laying open our markets to the industrial rivalries of the foreign countries which I named a moment ago. For my own part, I do not believe, that, in matters of fiscal policy, there can be any absolute principle, any absolute policy. The fiscal policy of any country has to be governed by a variety of considerations, by considerations of its natural resources, of its circumstances, and the industrial capacities of its inhabitants as well as its industrial power and wealth. For instance, Russia is a remarkable example of the policy of adopting an "a priori" policy in regard to fiscal matters, Russia is a country of enormous natural resources and possesses great wealth and a large population. Russia failed, nevertheless, to show that she possessed one of the necessary ingredients for the successful adoption of a protective policy. There is no industrial capacity among its inhabitants. What is the consequence? The adoption of a protective policy in Russia has resulted in the establishment within that Empire of a large number of strangers who alone are qualified to develop the industrial wealth of the country and who are enriching themselves at the expense of the inhabitants. Conditions not precisely similar, but in many respects analogous exist in Turkey. On the other hand, you find in Belgium and in the United States immense natural resources, wealth, and a population industrially inclined; and magnificent results proceed from the adoption of a protective policy. What I contend, is that we possess immense natural resources and a people fitted to develop them, and we are dealing on the right hand and on the left with people who surpass us in industrial power. Under these circumstances, it seems to me, that everything points to the necessity for the adoption of a protective policy, to the necessity of avoiding at the present moment, situated as the country and the population is, everything that will lead us towards the adoption of a tariff for revenue only. Of course it is claimed that the adoption of a tariff for revenue only or of a free trade tariff stimulates foreign commerce. Foreign commerce is undoubtedly a source of wealth. But, Sir, if we consult statistics and other data we find that, having tried both systems, under the system for revenue only we have not had the foreign commerce which has come to us under the system known here as the National Policy. If you turn to the statistics, Sir, you find that under the system that prevailed here from 1874 to 1879 the imports of this country amounted to $609,000,000; whereas, under the system which prevailed from 1879 to 1884, under the protective policy, our imports exceeded that figure by over $77,000,000. Under the protective period, we had imports for home consumption amounting to $687,000,000. That, it seems to me, indicates conclusively, that foreign commerce, for countries such as this is not diminished, but on the contrary, is increased under a protective system. The system which was defended by the mover of the Address, very far from discriminating against the classes and in favour of the masses is a system in exactly the opposite direction. If you look at the statistics you will find that under the revenue policy which existed here previously, a policy which began with an ad valorem duty of 15 per cent, subsequently increased to 17 per cent, we paid during one year of the period during which that policy prevailed, about 43 per cent upon the value of the sugar, 35 per cent upon the value of the importations for rice, 25 per cent upon the value of the importations for molasses, 23 per cent on tea, and 10½ per cent on the total imports of coffee—all articles of the first necessity, articles consumed by the masses and since admitted free to this country.

There is another point to which I wish to draw your attention in regard to the policy which, if we can place reliance on the words which fell from the lips of the mover of the Address, we are going to adopt under this Government. I refer to the enormous increase of our own country's power of consumption since the adoption in this country of a protective policy. The statistics show that in 1881 the value of Canadian manufactured products consumed in Canada was $309,676,068. In the ten years which followed, under the prevalence of that policy this increased to $475,445,705. But there was no diminution on the value of foreign goods imported into Canada. The value of goods brought in 1881 was $91,611,604, and in 1891 we find it to be $113,345,124, showing the increase power of consumption in this country without any decrease in the imports during the prevalence of this tariff which has brought such prosperity of this country. It has been urged, and I think that was one of the arguments of the mover of this Address, that the adoption of this policy amongst its other evil effects, has had as a result the creation of combines and monopolies. The creation of combines and monopolies, if they exist, can be reached by legislation. They afford no valid reason for changing a policy which in other respects has been beneficial to this country. It has also been said that the people of the west desire a change in the

tariff, desire a return to a tariff for revenue only. But, Sir, I claim that the interests of the people of the east should also be consulted. If at present there is no great industrial development in the west, and if at present the interests of that portion of the community claim a reduction in the tariff, these people must not forget the sacrifices which the older provinces have imposed upon themselves for the building up of that country. They must not forget that at a future time they themselves may be glad to see their industrial life developed; and, under any circumstances, they should bear in mind that as the interests of the east are certainly larger and more considerable, they deserve, it seems to me, a larger share of consideration. What we want is not the destruction of the National Policy; what we want is a larger market; what we want is an increased population; what we want particularly in this country is an improved system of immigration to settle the country in order to afford a market for the immense products which are the result of the present industrial life of the country. Well, Sir, it being admitted that in the past our immigration system has been defective, as the results have proved, and I must say that I regret it keenly, still neither in the Speech from the Throne nor in the Address in reply to it, do we find any reference whatever to an improved system of immigration. Neither is there in that Address anything about what was much talked of in the province of Quebec during the last election, an improvement in our trade relations with the United States. We were told time and again during the last election, that no sooner would the present Government be in power than they would send missionaries to the United States to interview the American Government as the party then in power was said to be unfavourable to improved trade relations with the Americans; and we were told that as a result of those missions we would unquestionably have increased facility for trade, and better markets for our produce. But, Sir, there is nothing about that in the Speech from the Throne, nor in this Address. It is true we have had missions to the United States, in fact we have had missions almost everywhere, and I think we may claim for this Government that if it has no other quality, it may be qualified as a missionary Government. But from the absolute silence which we find on the Treasury benches in regard to these various missions, I think we may fairly conclude that they have been unsuccessful in every quarter. As regards the repeal of the Franchise Act, I must say that I feel inclined to concur with what is said in the Address. I believe that the time has come for the repeal of that Act, provided that the franchise is not placed under the control of the provinces. Surely, we will not place the franchise which is to command the formation of this House under the control of the provincial legislatures. Any system would be better than that. While reserving a consideration of this point until we have the Bill before us which the Government promises, still I may say now that I will never assent to any system which will place the franchise under the control of the provincial legislatures. Then there is mention made of the Intercolonial Railway being extended to Montreal. Now, Sir, anything which this Government can do to benefit the city of Montreal will receive my support. I believe Montreal has never been fairly treated in the past by any Government; but it remains to be seen whether this particular measure is exactly the one which we require. I find by the papers received to-day that a very important body in the city of Montreal, La Chambre du Commerce, views that measure most unfavourably. There must be some reason for that. In another paper I find a condemnation of what is called the Greenshields deal, whatever that may mean. But it is only fair to wait and see what this proposed improvement is. Certain it is that the city of Montreal, the commercial metropolis of the Dominion, has for many reasons large claims upon this Administration. We require increased port facilities, we require increased dock accommodation, we require a free port and we require a bridge. Now, there is nothing about any of these great projects, so much spoken of during the last election, in the Government's programme, and yet the Government received a large and generous support from that district and from that city. Have the hon. gentlemen who represent the city of Montreal and its vicinity presented the important, the just claims of that great city to the Government, and if they have, has the Government turned a deaf ear to their demands? We will see later on. But I have heard it said time and again by gentlemen on the other side who came from that part of the country, that Montreal requires better treatment, and we will wait and see if the Government intends to deal out justice to that great city. As regards the development of the canals, I have not a word to say. If that work is properly carried out, it will benefit the country at large. I now come, Sir, to the question of the school settlement, a delicate question, a question upon which, although during the last election it was referred to on more than one occasion in my constituency, I remained utterly silent during the last session of this House, and I remained silent from a motive which I indicated to this House, and that motive was that I desired to give the leader of the Government a fair, frank and entirely just opportunity of carrying out those pledges which, on more than one occasion, both he and his followers made in the province of Quebec. I feel now, Sir, it

would be unjust to my native province, and unjust to my constituency, which has followed this controversy most carefully, not, at all events, to express an opinion on that part of the Address which refers to the settlement of this question. There is one thing which appears to me perfectly clear, and it is this: that it is impossible to say that the Government has fulfilled its pledges —at least that it has fulfilled those pledges which the leader of the Government, and those who follow him made repeatedly during the last election to the people of the province of Quebec, who were supposed to be particularly interested in the settlement of that question. That I believe the Government admits; it admits that it has not carried out its pledges, but it declares that it has done its best. What were those pledges? There was a most distinct pledge from the leader of the Government in the province of Quebec that full and ample justice would be done the minority in the province of Manitoba. That pledge was distinctly made by the leader of the Government in the city of Quebec and elsewhere. He was in favour of the adoption of a policy of conciliation; but he stated in the clearest possible terms that he was determined that there should be a full and entire restitution to the minority in Manitoba of the rights of which they had been shorne by the School Bill of 1890; and that pledge went to this extent, that although he was not in favour of the Remedial Bill, he was aware that the constitution gave him that ultimate recourse, and that if the method of conciliation to which he intended to devote his attention failed, then, unquestionably, he would use the reserve power which, under the constitution, is centered in the federal Government, and which he was pledged to use, if necessaary. That was not only the pledge of the Liberal leader, but the pledge of every one of his supporters, made time and again through the whole of the contest which led up to the election of June, 1896. It is a pledge contained in every one of the speeches, contained in the Liberal press of Quebec in the most clear and unmistakable terms, and it is the pledge which many of those hon. gentlemen were not content with giving on the hustings, but which in the most clear terms they reduced to writing, and they stood pledged and they stated positively that they would see that the grievance complained of by the minority would be absolutely and thoroughly removed, and that if it was not removed by the methods of conciliation, it would be removed under the power which the constitution gave to the federal Parliament. They went further. In the province of Quebec there was most severe and bitter criticism of the methods adopted by the preceding Government for the settlement of this question. The sincerity of every one supporting the Government of the day was impugned. What was stated? It was stated that that Government had purposely neglected to disallow the Act of 1890 complained of. It was stated that this was done with an object. It was stated that during six years the party had been divided on the question; and in my constituency and in other constituencies it was stated in my hearing repeatedly that the Remedial Bill had been abandoned by the Government purposely when they had over forty majority behind them, and it was proof of their insincerity. Much more was said. Was it not said time and again, was it not thrown up to me repeatedly in every meeting that the Remedial Bill did not go far enough, that it was utterly unsatisfactory; that it presented to the minority the shadow while it withdrew from them the substance of their rights; that it contained no grant which would enable the minority to support their schools, that it gave them the right to open their schools, but schools could not be conducted without money, and we had refused them a school grant, without which schools could not be supported? Why, Sir, that Remedial Bill, or rather a facsimile of it, as it had been written over and corrected by the then Deputy Speaker of the House, was exhibited at every meeting. We have as you are aware, Mr. Speaker, what is called in our province during an electoral contest, the sac à flobage. It is what is called in English a punching bag, out of which, at every meeting a facsimile of the Remedial Bill was taken, and the electors were told that this wretched piece of paper, scrawled all over, constituted the charter of the rights of the minority, but that even this Bill had not been passed by the then Government, although it had a majority of forty members; and further, that if the Opposition were put in power they would not give them a shadow of their rights, but the whole of them, without any exception. And to make assurance doubly sure and to show in what manner the policy of conciliation would be carried out, in every constituency, and in my constituency particularly, at every meeting we were told that no sooner would the present leader of the Government be put in power than he would institute a great inquiry, and at the head of the great commission, composed of good and moderate men and just men, there would be Sir Oliver Mowat. And when the electors inquiringly asked who this man was, they were told: this is the man who procured for the Catholics of the province of Ontario the whole of their rights and more than their rights; that he was the man who was going to preside over that great question, who would ascertain all the facts and would see that every single right of which the minority had been deprived would be restored to them. That pledge was made most distinctly, and that certainly is one of the pledges which has not been redeemed, and the consequence of which non-redemption are patent to-day. It was certainly within the power of those

gentlemen to redeem their pledges as regards the proposed Mowat inquiry. They could easily have carried out that part of their pledge, and yet they failed utterly, and, in fact, made no attempt to do so. This is a shame, because the result of the inquiry would undoubtedly have been that the minority would, at all events, have had the opportunity of being heard and of showing exactly what their position was; and if we are to believe what we are told, this settlement which we are asked to sanction was made without the minority being even consulted Well, that part of the pledge which I claim was undoubtedly in the power of this Government to carry out, they have failed in. They have failed also to carry out the pledge made under the serious circumstances which I have indicated ; that they would restore to the Manitoba minority the plenitude of their rights. What we have to inquire therefore is this : Does this settlement contain such a restitution of rights as a fair-minded man, having regard to the circumstances, can consider as satisfactory. I am prepared to say this. If this settlement does concede to the minority some valuable rights, if it does concede some of the privileges taken away in 1890, then it deserves at any rate to be weighed, and as at the present moment we are told that this concession is but an instalment of what is going to follow, then most certainly if the concession does contain some valuable restoration of rights it deserves our most serious consideration. In order to appreciate the value of this concession it is necessary to lay down some principle of appreciation, and some criterion upon which to judge its value. To my mind the best criterion, the best means of judging of the value of this concession, having in view the whole circumstances of this case, is the religious belief which led the minority to claim the rights which they possessed during twenty years and of which they have been deprived.

Now, Sir, what is the belief of that minority ? That belief so far as I am competent to state it, may be briefly given as this. It is a belief that for the primary education of children it is necessary that the schools should have an essentially religious character. I am not here to defend it or justify it, but I simply say now that is the belief. The primary education of the child, according to the belief of the minority, can only be proper and suitable if during the whole time devoted to instruction the child receives a certain amount of religious instruction, or in other words, that the instruction must have an essentially religious character. After the child has received that primary training which is deemed essential, he may follow a course of instruction in which the religious element plays a less conspicuous part. He may later on, when he becomes a youth, receive a course of instruction from which the religious element is still more absent, but as I understand it, during the term of primary education, during the formation of the child, it is the religious belief entertained by the minority that that instruction should be of a religious character throughout the whole time that it is given. That belief, if I mistake not, is not confined to Catholics ; it is shared by another very important Christian denomination, namely, those who belong to the Anglican communion. Now, giving that as the cause of the claim which this minority has made, what do we find to have been the consequences of that belief. These consequences showed themselves at the time of confederation. One of the chief difficulties which those who undertook to carry into execution that great project had to encounter, was to provide constitutional safeguards for those who entertain that belief. And later on, when the province of Manitoba was admitted into confederation, there is no doubt whatever but that the object of section 22 of the Manitoba Act was to safeguard constitutionally the privileges in regard to education of those who entertain that belief. The best proof that that was the understanding of those who took part in the forming of the compact under which that province was admitted into the Dominion, was, that clause 22 was so interpreted for many years. Well, Sir, in 1890, in one single moment the whole of the privileges which were enjoyed up to that date by the minority were taken away. For my own part, and speaking for myself, I have no hesitation in saying that the Bill which in 1890 so ruthlessly and so cruelly took away every one of these privileges should have been disallowed by the Ottawa Government. Of course I know it is claimed, and on very good ground, that disallowance at that time was deemed a most unpopular measure. I have seen quoted time and again the opinion of Archbishop Tache. I believe he expressed it in writing, in a pamphlet which I have not seen, that disallowance was not a proper recourse, that it was an unpopular proceeding, and that the minority having entire confidence in the unconstitutionality of this measure would bring it before the courts to have that law declared unconstitutional once and for all ; whereas disallowance might only have led to the re-enactment of the same measure. I shall not discuss the legal fight which followed the passing of that Bill, for it is undoubtedly known to all the members of this House. One thing which is quite sure is, that the decision rendered in the first case of Logan Barrett and others against the city of Winnipeg, brought before the Privy Council, would, in my estimation, undoubtedly have been different had their Lordships had the proof before them that long previous to the entry of the North-western territory into the Dominion these separate schools received a grant from the Hudsons' Bay Company which might fairly be considered as the then government of that new territory.

But the decision rendered later in the case of Brophy was the result of a proper, patient and constitutional course adopted by the minority, and it was productive of the most valuable results for the people who had waited so long and so patiently for justice. What that decision declared clearly was that there was a grievance, that the federal power could interfere, and that it was the duty of the Federal power to remedy that grievance. Well, Sir, it is admitted that upon the efforts made by gentlemen sitting on this side of the House to give execution to that mandate, we were defeated at the general elections, and that defeat, in the province of Quebec, I attribute to the faith which the people of that province placed in the leader of the Opposition at that time, and in those who upheld him, that he would carry out the pledges made by him in unmistakable terms, that he would see to the proper carrying out of the decision of their lordships in the appeal in the case of Brophy.

Now, I have stated that it is impossible for me to approve of this settlement, because the pledges given were not carried out. I find that the minority were not consulted at the time this settlement was made. That is admitted by the Hon. Mr. Greenway himself. Speaking of this reproach—I quote from a report of his speech in the Manitoba "Free Press" of March 18th—Mr. Greenway says:

> As to the complaint that the minority had not been consulted, he replied that the only persons who could represent the minority were the party who alone could do anything for them, the Dominion Government.

This is the excuse given for that gross want of consideration for the minority.

Now, Sir, what is the substance of this settlement? Because I notice that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) speaking of it in an off-hand way, dismissed it after poking a few jokes at members sitting on this side of the House. He expressed no opinion of the intrinsic value of what had been obtained for the minority by that settlement. We have, therefore, to inquire what is the value of the concessions that have been obtained, and can they really be called concessions, having for their object the removal of any of the grievances that existed? In the first place, in certain specified cases there is the right of the parents of a certain number of children to ask by petition that half an hour after the school exercises of the day are over be reserved for religious instruction. Let me speak as a man who has had some experience in the training of children, for I occupied for twelve years the position of school commissioner in the city of Montreal, where we had to look after the education and the welfare of over 18,000 children. Let me speak from that experience, and say, in regard to the boast which is made all over the province of Quebec at the present moment that religious instruction has been resumed in the schools under the conditions stated, that this is an absolutely valueless concession. You will not find that the religious instruction of children can be promoted in any school by detaining them one-half hour after they know the school time is over. Not only is this provision not susceptible of being carried out in practice, but, if it could be carried out, it would have the effect of rendering the teaching of religion absolutely odious to the children. I appeal to any gentleman who has had any experience in the training of children. There is no value whatever in a provision of that kind. But, Sir, there is more. This provision in no degree restores these privileges for their religious belief which the minority claim. It is a conscientious and deep-rooted portion of their religious belief that the primary education of the child should be tinged with religion throughout the day; and this belief was safeguarded by the statutes of Manitoba which preceded the Bill of 1890. How can it be claimed that giving a half hour under the circumstances I have indicated, could operate as a remedy to any extent of the grievance complained of? Besides, if I mistake not, analogous provisions exist in the School Act itself. I believe my hon. friend from Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) will be able to point out that on petition—for after all these people must petition, and it is a question whether that petition will be granted—the minority could, by the School Act of 1890, claim the right to give religious instruction under circumstances which would render the action of the advisory board in refusing that privilege utterly opposed to the spirit if not the letter of the Act. That is the way the Attorney General of Manitoba interprets the law. At the time of presenting the Bill, he was asked what should be done in case such a petition were presented, and it was refused. He said:

> I suppose, under such circumstances, the petitioners would be able to insist.

This, then, is the provision made for the minority under this settlement. What they are given they could petition for before under the School Act of 1890, and circumstances could exist in which it would be unjust to refuse that petition, and it is absurd to say that the half-hour clause is a valuable concession, or a valuable part of the privileges of which the minority have been deprived by the School Act of 1890. You may ask me, Sir, what I would have considered a concession of some value, tending, in some degree, to the relief of that minority. Well, there is one very simple concession which would have been appreciated, I have no doubt, by the minority, and that is the exemption from taxation for the public schools under certain conditions. If, for instance, the Manitoba Government had agreed with the Federal Gov-

ernment that, provided the minority conformed to certain conditions with regard to public instruction, if they showed that they supported schools in which proper instruction was given, judged sufficient by the provincial government, then they would be exempt from the double taxation to which they are undoubtedly going to be subjected in the future, this Government might have claimed some credit for having obtained a concession in favour of the minority. If the minority were not compelled to contribute to the public schools when they also contributed to the support of their own schools, that would have been a concession of some value and importance. There was another course open to the Government. A grant might have been made to the voluntary schools, which the minority will have to establish, if they intend maintaining schools according to the tenets of their religion. In that respect the great and the wise men who govern Manitoba might have taken a most useful object lesson from what has been done by the Government of England. In England there are over 900 voluntary schools established by members of the Anglican denomination, and there is also a large number of Catholic schools. These schools in the past received a grant from the British Government amounting, if I mistake not, to nine shillings a head on the average attendance. Well, what have the Government done quite recently? Why, by a majority of over 200, they increased that grant by an amount, I think, of five shillings per head. This is a concession of some value, and a similar concession in Manitoba would have shown, at any rate, that something had been done for the support of the schools which the minority undoubtedly will have to establish with their own money. I contend that so-called concessions are of no value. If you will take the trouble to read the speech made by the Attorney General of Manitoba, Mr. Cameron, in presenting the Remedial Bill to the Manitoba legislature, you will find he said that the arrangement is a signal triumph for the province, and that it does not concede any important privileges. You will find that he contradicts what is stated all over the province of Quebec to-day. It is stated everywhere in the province of Quebec that this Remedial Bill has obtained for the minority exactly what the three commissioners sent by the late Government to Manitoba demanded. Mr. Cameron, however, says that that is absolutely untrue, that such a statement could only be made by men ignorant of what these commissioners demanded, that these commissioners demanded privileges which would have amounted to at least a partial restoration to the minority of their schools, whereas he succeeded in obtaining a settlement which is really something infinitesimally less. But we are told there is another aspect to the settlement. It is repeated everywhere in the province of Quebec that, at any rate, the effect of this Remedial Bill has been to introduce, in a most glorious way, the French language into the public schools of Manitoba. That is a matter upon which my hon. friend the member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) will speak with more knowledge than I can, but I find that the Attorney General for Manitoba, in his speech, says something absolutely different. What he says is that it was only reasonable, in the case of Germans, French, Italians, and aliens speaking another language, not the English language, should be instructed in the English language under the bi-lingual system, which is by far the best system of teaching that language. Mr. Cameron thus places a very different aspect upon the vaunted concession that the French language has been introduced into the public schools. And, after all, we must consider what is the interpretation placed upon these concessions by those who, under the recent statute passed in Manitoba, will have to carry them out. I have deemed it necessary to place on record my appreciation of this settlement. I believe that the minority is not satisfied, and I believe that when the full extent of that settlement and the effects it produces are thoroughly known and appreciated in my native province, it will be as unsatisfactory to the people there as it is to-day to the minority in Manitoba. At the present moment the people of the province of Quebec are not fully aware what the terms of the settlement really are, and when they understand them, they will certainly condemn it. I believe that the province of Manitoba could very well have done a little better for the minority. They might very properly have taken example from the people of Quebec. Why, during the whole of this severe controversy in the province of Quebec, where the minority is, to a certain extent, under the legislative control of the Catholic majority—at least to the same extent as is the minority in Manitoba—I deem it to be to the very highest credit of that majority that throughout the controversy, which at times has been fierce, never once has retaliation been spoken of. Not on one single occasion has it even been suggested that it was possible for the majority in the province of Quebec to take away one of the valuable privileges which we are glad to see the minority enjoy in that province. To what can that be ascribed? I ascribe it to the sense of justice of the inhabitants of Quebec. I will go further; I ascribe it to the innate chivalry of the French race in that province. They would never dream of taking such an advantage of the minority. For my part, I consider that the concessions given by the Manitoba Government to the Government of Canada are both illiberal and narrow. They are by no means generous. Why, in the province of Quebec not only, with the keenest sense of respect, has

every right and privilege of the minority been preserved since confederation, but time and again have further privileges been granted to them. Let me give you one instance which goes to prove that my statement is correct. In the city of Montreal, at the time of confederation, the school tax paid upon property belonging to Protestants was, under the law existing at the time, distributed according to population, and we, the Catholic school commissioners, derived a very considerable income from that particular tax. It was deemed that every class of the population having a deep interest in the proper education of the population, the tax derived from Catholic as well as Protestant property owners should be divided according to population. Well, Sir, as you know, in 1868 the Protestant property owners of the city of Montreal demanded, or, at least, asked, that the tax which they paid, instead of being distributed according to population should be given entirely to the Protestant school board. This was a right which the constitution did not guarantee. The granting of that right would have the immediate effect of depriving the Catholic school board of a very considerable source of income of which, at that time, we stood in great need. Was there any opposition, was there any difficulty, was there any question ? Why, Sir, this right was granted immediately. Numberless other instances might be given. What I say is that the treatment of the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec should have induced the Government of Manitoba to be far more generous towards the minority. I am, therefore, absolutely displeased with this settlement. I believe that it is nothing but the crowning violation of a number of violations of promises which have gone before it. Why, when that province was constituted, the Queen's own representative assured these people, in words which I could quote here, that every right they had had in the past would be respected. But we all know what the position of the Government of Mr. Greenway was. It is proved superabundantly by the affidavits which were filed in the appeal to the Privy Council, these affidavits tell a tale of the most gross duplicity. These men had the courage to go down and promise the Archbishop of St. Boniface that under no circumstances would separate schools be disturbed, and that is proved by the most impartial testimony. And they did not hesitate afterwards in the coolest manner to violate these promises. And what more ? It is worth insisting upon these things. In the legislature of Manitoba when the constitution was modified and the Upper Chamber abolished, the most solemn pledges were given. What did the Premier (Mr. Davies) say :

> It may be that the Council is a safeguard to the minority. He could assure the minority that their rights would never be trampled upon in this province. There would always be sufficient English-speaking members in this House who would insist on giving their French-speaking subjects their rights to protect them.

And Mr. Luxton said :

> There were some questions of sentiment which lay close to the hearts of the French people, and he could assure them that the English-speaking members would not ruthlessly deal with these, if the French representatives were sufficiently patriotic to support the measure before the House. They would recognize their generosity, and not forget it.

And what did Mr. Royal say :

> But there was something else for himself which had not been guaranteed by any Act ; he found it yesterday in the words of Messrs. Davis and Northway, and in the applause given by Mr. Brown to the sentiments of Mr. Luxton and to the expressions of Mr. Cornish.

And Mr. McKay added :

> He was very much pleased to hear the generous and just remarks of the hon. Premier, the hon. Provincial Secretary and also that of the hon. member for Rockwood, which gave the minority in the House that confidence which the members of this House, and by their vote on this Bill would express, the security they felt in the hands of that majority.

Sir, every promise has been grossly violated, pledges given have been trampled under foot. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) thinks that he can dismiss a subject of this kind with a few words of joke, which are only a reiteration of what we heard last session. That is a mistake. I believe that is a most serious matter. I believe that the honour of England is concerned. I believe that the respect due to what was promised to a poor and suffering minority by the representative of England is a serious matter for us, and I believe that when the judicial committee of the Privy Council points out what the rights of the minority are, that is a serious matter. For my own part, I do not view it as a joke at all, and I believe hon. gentlemen opposite from the province of Quebec, when the people of that province thoroughly understand what is taking place, will not treat it as a joke either. A taunt has been thrown across the floor. We have been asked to propose an amendment to this Address. I can tell you what my personal feeling on that subject is. I am not disposed, from my own part, to push the controversy to that point. There are in this House a number of generous men who, having no special or personal interest in the defence of the minority have risked their political lives upon the defence of those rights, while many others have succumbed in that fight. I feel a delicacy about asking these gentlemen to make further sacrifices. I know what public feeling is at this moment. I suppose that people are tired of this question. A number of the constituents of these gentlemen who have been friendly to the minority are anxious to see this dropped. I have re-

frained this session from saying one word on this subject to any of these gentlemen who are not of my own religious belief. I wish to place distinctly on record what I believe of the settlement. It is a fraud, a sham, and it will never satisfy anybody.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I do not intend to detain the House long, and I am sure that hon. gentlemen opposite will be very glad to hear this announcement. Still, there are certain things in the Address to which I think I should call the attention of the House for a few minutes. There is one sentiment in the Address with which I certainly concur, and that is the sentiment expressed in the paragraph which relates to the Diamond Jubilee of Her Majesty the Queen. I am proud to be here this evening as a French Canadian to testify to the loyalty of my French fellow-subjects in the province of Quebec to Her Majesty the Queen. Certainly there is no part of her wide dominions where there is more respect for her person, more admiration for her virtues, or more devotion to her Crown, than in the province from which I come. These words are not idle words spoken only in the piping times of peace; for I believe the history of this country will show that in time of war, the French Canadian race were always ready to take up arms in defence of the Crown of England. We cannot but remember that under her glorious reign we have obtained as full a degree of political and religious liberty as any people on the face of the earth enjoy to-day. The generals of the English army have conquered our native land by the force of arms, but the just and generous treatment of the Queen of England has won our hearts, in which her memory shall ever live. I hope that nothing will be spared to give this vast Dominion a fitting and worthy representation at the celebration of this joyous event, and I hope that the Premier of the Dominion will see his way clear to attend in person the ceremonies which will then take place. His presence there will be a remarkable evidence, not only of the wonderful expansion of the British Empire, but also of the union and harmony which exists amongst all creeds and all nationalities in the Colonies of that Empire. I must say that I think it could hardly be possible, if the Premier does go to England on this occasion, that we could have there a more pleasant, a more courteous, or a more eloquent representative. I wish, Sir, that I could go on in this strain, complimenting my hon. friend the Premier and his party. It would certainly be a more congenial task to me. I have endeavoured to find further points upon which I could compliment hon. gentlemen opposite. I would, for instance, like to compliment them on their political consistency; but after the Speech we have heard this afternoon from the Minister of Trade and Commerce, I find that task beyond my means. Sir, when I take up the Address which is now submitted to the House for consideration, I find that it may be divided into three parts. There are some questions in it which belong to the Liberal party, for instance, the franchise, prohibition plebiscite and extension of the Intercolonial Railway, but there are subjects which, while hon. gentlemen opposite were in opposition, they fought as earnestly as they could. Take, for instance, the enlargement of the canals. Why, Sir, we were always told that the Conservative party spent too much money on the canals, that the Conservative party was extravagant, that the Conservative party was running this country into debt. But one of the first things we see this session when business is before us, is an enormous expenditure put upon the country. "Business is business," as some of our friends opposite would say. I will not say anything about the franchise or the plebiscite just now, reserving my remarks upon these two question until they come formally before the House. But one word about the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal. I am sorry that I do not see my hon. friend from Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) in the House. I suppose that when this paragraph of the Address was drafted in the Council, that hon. gentleman was not present. How is it that we are told now that the Intercolonial Railway is to be extended to Montreal? Only last session we voted $48,000 for a station at Lévis, but if the Intercolonial Railway is extended as far as Montreal, this expenditure will be completely useless, as Quebec and Lévis will only become way-stations on the line of the Intercolonial Railway. But perhaps upon this subject also hon. gentlemen opposite have changed their minds. Now, I will ask the hon. gentlemen who represent the district of Quebec more particularly in the Administration, how is this going to benefit the district of Quebec? Is it not going to take away from us the local trade, or the trade which we have always enjoyed between Quebec and the Lower St. Lawrence, and the Maritime Provinces? And how about the Quebec bridge? That is a subject which is dear to the hearts of all Quebeckers, and if the Intercolonial Railway is extended as far as Montreal, one of the best arguments in favour of the Quebec bridge disappears. The bridge was to be built as a national enterprise, because it linked the Intercolonial Railway with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and gave one uninterrupted line of railway from Halifax to Vancouver. Why, Sir, I think the hon. member for Quebec West must have been absent when that subject came up in Council, because it was only the other day that he declared in Quebec before a large audience that he was authorized by the Government to promise one million dollars of public money towards building a bridge at Quebec. It is true, however, that my hon. friend the Minister

of Public Works, if newspaper reports are to be believed, contradicted this statement and said that the hon. gentleman from Quebec West must have been misreported, because the Government had never authorized him to make any such promise. Sir, if it were parliamentary I would ask which of the hon. gentlemen was telling the truth; but as I suppose that would not be parliamentary, I will only ask, Who is right? Was it the hon. Minister of Public Works, or was it the hon. member who represents Quebec West? I pass briefly over these subjects, and now come to the tariff. When I read this paragraph in the Address, I find in its tone a great change as compared with the statements with which we have been met for the last seventeen or eighteen years. Fancy that on the night of the 23rd June last some Grit Rip Van Winkle went to sleep, and wakened on the 25th of March, when this Speech was delivered in the Senate, he must have said that he did not recognize his Grit friends. Why, he went to sleep on the 23rd of June hearing nothing but commercial union with the United States, or unrestricted reciprocity, or tariff for revenue, and all these propositions which were made to the people of Canada for seventeen or eighteen years. Now, however, when he wakes up, he reads in the Address this paragraph which, if it means anything at all, means that the Government have changed their minds upon this subject, and intend, not to do away with every vestige of protection but simply to provide the necessary revenue, and their present intention is to introduce a measure which, "While having due regard to industrial interests, will make our fiscal system more satisfactory to the masses of the people." Sir, I once saw a play in which a very ingenious actor represented Rip Van Winkle on the stage, I believe, in the city of Detroit. Everybody knows that Rip Van Winkle had a dog, and that before he went to sleep he tied this dog to a tree. In this play which I saw, when Rip Van Winkle awaked from his sleep, he looked around him for his dog. Casting his eyes upon the tree which had grown to a considerable height, he saw the skeleton of the dog dangling from the branches of the tree far above his head. If this Rip Van Winkle, of whom I have spoken, had awakened on the 25th March and heard the Speech from the Throne, he must have looked around for the trade policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, and if so, he must have looked for the skeleton in the tree.

Now, I come to another question, an important question, which has been gone into very fully by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monck), and that is the Manitoba school question. I will not say much in regard to it, reserving to another time more extended remarks. An hon. gentleman who spoke this afternoon from the other side of the House, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), taunted hon. members on this side of the House and asked us if we would propose an amendment on that paragraph of the Speech from the Throne which relates to the school question. I may inform hon. gentlemen opposite that this question is not dead, that it is not buried, that this so-called settlement is not considered by a large portion of the population as a settlement, and we will choose our day and hour to make hon. gentlemen opposite from the province of Quebec who sit behind the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce come before the House and redeem the pledges made to their constituents throughout the province of Quebec or eat humble pie, as they have been doing ever since the Liberal party came into power. Sir, I need make no apology to the House for speaking on this question. It has been spoken of by the hon. seconder of the Address, it has been alluded to by the Prime Minister and also by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. It may be said, why does this interest in the school question exist in the province of Quebec? It is not a question of sentiment simply, it is a question of business. The minority in the province of Manitoba have, as we deem it, been ill-treated by the majority, and what has happened at the hands of the majority of the province of Manitoba may happen to the minority in the Dominion of Canada. We, therefore, say it is our right, and not only our right but our duty, to tell those who would attack our rights in the Dominion of Canada that we stand here to defend them, and we will defend them to the last. Besides, when Manitoba was taken into the confederation the province of Quebec gave a part of the means by which it was brought into the confederation. Those fertile fields belong to us Catholics and French as well as to the Protestants and English, and we are interested in seeing that no laws are passed in the province of Manitoba, if the constitution gives us the right of redress, which will prevent our people going to there to settle. Besides, as Canadians we are interested in seeing that the written constitution of this country shall not be trodden under foot. We cannot join in the hope expressed by His Excellency that the agitation is at an end. And why? Because the minority in the Dominion, and especially in the province of Manitoba, are not satisfied with the settlement. The evidence of this is found in the result of the St. Boniface election, which took place not long ago. I say even more: that the minority in Canada are not satisfied. The statement may seem strange to a good many members in this House in view of the events which have occurred since the last session of Parliament. Let me allude to some of those events. Hon. gentlemen have said that the country is satisfied, that the minority is satisfied, and they accept as evidence of that satisfaction

what happened some time ago in Cornwall, in Bonaventure and in Wright. I know nothing of what took place during the elections in Cornwall and in Wright, but I know very well what occurred in Bonaventure during the election held there not long ago; and if hon. gentlemen who know any thing about that election, about the organization of it, can take any consolation out of it, or find from it evidence that the minority of Quebec are satisfied with the school settlement, they are easily pleased. Why, everybody knows, and it has been told to this House, that a railway running from Metapedia down to Caplin in Bonaventure County, a distance of 90 miles, had been closed for eighteen months. Almost on the eve of the election this railway was run by the Government, and from almost every husting in that county during the election contest, it was declared that if the electors did not vote for the Government candidate, the running of the railway would be immediately stopped. Not only that. The county of Bonaventure, as the House knows, is situated on Baie des Chaleurs, and all those who have lands upon the bay have salmon licenses from the Government. The agents of the Government went down there and told those men that if they did not vote for the Government candidate, their licenses would be taken away. Those people were coerced into voting for the Government and for the Ministerial candidate, and if they failed to do so, they were satisfied that the railway would be shut down again and their salmon licenses would be taken away. Those are only some instances of the way in which that election was conducted by the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite.

The minority were led to believe that the Manitoba settlement is not final; and this is one of the great arguments used not only in Bonaventure and Wright—it is being used in Champlain, where an election is now going on—but throughout the whole province of Quebec. It is within the memory of all that almost immediately after last session a deputation was sent to Rome, I will not say by the Government, but by leading members of the party. The Catholic members of the Government knew full well that the settlement which they were preparing at the time would never be accepted by the minority or by the Catholic hierarchy of Canada. They knew this so well that they sent over Abbé Proulx and M. Drolet to try and convince the Papal authorities that no other settlement was possible, or at least that if this settlement was made for a time it was not final. But the mission sent to Rome by hon. gentlemen opposite, not as a Government but as individuals and for political purposes, was a signal failure, and Abbé Proulx and M. Drolet came back only to tell a tale of woe. That was not enough. The Premier of this Dominion and the hon. Solicitor General made two very important speeches on the subject before the electors, one in December and the other closely following in January. And what did they say? I read a very carefully prepared report of the speech delivered by the hon. Solicitor General in Toronto, and which was printed in "L'Electeur"—a revised edition, an edition prepared not for the hearers of the speech in Toronto, but to be read by the electors in the province of Quebec. What was the principal argument used? It was that the judgment of the Privy Council, forsooth, had not ordered the Governor General or the Parliament of Canada to restore separate schools—thereby inducing hearers and readers to believe that any concession should be accepted by the minority because they never would get anything else. I wish to answer this argument very briefly. In Brophy's case it was declared that the constitutional laws of 1890 created a grievance for the minority, that the minority had a right to appeal to the Governor General in Council for redress, and that the case was one which was a proper case for interference as set out in paragraph 3 of section 22 of the Manitoba Act. This is easily proved. Probably the House does not want any proof of it, but in view of the speeches made by the Premier and the Solicitor General it is perhaps well to refer them to pages 10 and 11 of the Manitoba school case. It is true that the Privy Council did not instruct the Governor General in Council nor the Parliament of Canada in a precise way as to the methods to be employed to redress the grievances which the Privy Council said existed as against the minority. They did not say, you shall re-enact the old school laws of 1871 which gave separate schools to the minority, but in their reasons, their lordships enumerated the grievances which the law of 1896 created. Their lordships say:

> The sole question to be determined is whether a right or privilege which the Roman Catholic minority previously enjoyed, has been affected by the legislation of 1890. Their lordships are unable to see how this question can receive any but an affirmative answer. Contrast the position of the Roman Catholics prior and subsequent to the Acts from which they appeal. Before these passed into law, there existed denominational schools of which the control and management were in the hands of Roman Catholics, who could select the books to be used and determine the character of the religious teaching. These schools received their proportionate share of the money contributed for school purposes out of the general taxation of the province, and the money raised for these purposes by local assessment was, so far as it fell upon Catholics, applied only toward the support of the Catholic schools. What is the position of the Roman Catholic minority under the Acts of 1890? Schools of their own denomination, conducted according to their views, will receive no aid from the state. They must depend entirely for their support upon the contributions of the Roman Catholic community, while the taxes out of which state aid is granted

to the schools provided for by the Statute, fall alike on Catholics and Protestants. Moreover, while the Catholic inhabitants remain liable to local assessment for school purposes, the proceeds of that assessment are no longer determined to any extent for the support of Catholic schools, but afford the means of maintaining schools which they regard as no more suitable for the education of Catholic children than if they were distinctively Protestant in their character.

In view of this comparison, it does not seem possible to say that the rights and privileges of the Roman Catholic minority in relation to education which existed prior to 1890, have not been affected.

Now, hon. gentlemen opposite sought to make it be believed by the Catholic minority in the province of Quebec and in the Dominion of Canada, that the decision of the Privy Council after all did not amount to much as their lordships did not give the precise way in which the grievances should be redressed, and while the hon. gentlemen to whom I have alluded were making these speeches in Toronto and Quebec, their press was enlarging their arguments, and saying that it was better to accept a half settlement than to get nothing at all. But both the Premier and the Solicitor General have stated that this settlement was not final. The Solicitor General said in Toronto that the Government had obtained assurances that the minority would be represented in the Council of Public Instruction, in the board of inspectors, in the board of examiners, and, taking his words as I translate them from the French report in "L'Electeur," this is what he said:

Thus the minority would be able to have their complaints heard in relation to the programme of the separate schools and the selection of books, if necessary.

These are the words used by my hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in the corrected and revised report of his speech as published in "L'Electeur." The hon. gentleman led the Catholic people of the province of Quebec to believe that the Manitoba minority were really going to have separate schools, and that this was a further concession which Mr. Greenway was prepared to make. But that was not all. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) alluded this afternoon to the occasion upon which Mr. Greenway was invited to come to Montreal. Now, Mr. Greenway's invitation to Montreal was simply done for the purpose of convincing the Catholics in the province of Quebec that this settlement was not final, and that, after all, Mr. Greenway would give to the Manitoba minority all their rights which they had been claiming for so long. And the Premier in a speech which he made in Quebec later on told the people: I insisted upon the presence of Mr. Greenway at the banquet at Montreal so that he could himself tell the province of Quebec that the settlement was not final, but that he would give to the Catholic minority in Manitoba what the Solicitor General at Toronto had promised the Manitoba legislature would give. Nothwistanding these promises and nothwithstanding these declarations which he (Mr. Greenway) made in Montreal, the Premier saw that he was losing ground every day, and that the Catholics in the province of Quebec and the Catholic minority in Canada—when I speak of the Catholic minority I speak of the Catholics throughout the entire Dominion of Canada—the Premier saw that, notwithstanding these declarations he could not bring the Catholic minority in Canada to believe that the settlement which he had made with Mr. Greenway was a settlement which commended itself to the good judgment of the Catholic minority in the Dominion. And then another step was taken. My hon. friend the Solicitor General was sent to Rome; my hon. friend the Solicitor General went on a pilgrimage to Rome. Whom was he sent by? Was he sent by the Dominion Government; was he sent by the Ministers, or was he sent by the individuals who compose the Dominion ministry? At all events, he went to Rome, and before he went to Rome he tried to use a weapon which did prove of some effect. I will not accuse the hon. gentleman of having inspired the articles which appeared in the English press at the time, because if I did so, I would be accusing him of treason to the church to which he belongs. But, coincident with his visit to London on his way to Rome, articles appeared simultaneously in the Toronto "Globe" and in the "Pall Mall Gazette," of London, threatening the bishops and the Catholic minority in this country that if they kept up the agitation they would probably lose more by it than if they kept quiet. They were threatened that if they kept up the agitation the rights that had been guaranteed to them by solemn treaties would some day or other be taken away from them. My hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) also obtained an opinion from an eminent gentleman on the other side of the water, the Hon. Mr. Blake, and, armed with this opinion, he went to Rome, or he sent it some time after he got back from Rome. However, I will refer to that opinion of Mr. Blake later on. These articles having appeared in different papers in London, some ecclesiastical authorities in England were probably frightened and pressure was brought to bear upon the papal authorities asking them to send to Canada a delegate, an envoy, to see whether or not a lesson could be read to the bishops of the minority in the Dominion of Canada. The consequence of this is that to-day a papal delegate is on his way to this country. I do not know whether I am speaking by the book when I say that one of the principal reasons for which this delegate is sent here is certainly not, as my hon. friend admitted himself when he spoke at Lorette the other day, to condemn the bishops for their attitude on this school question, or

to say that they were wrong in their mandements or their pastoral letters ; but I think I am right in saying that this papal envoy is sent to the Government of the Dominion of Canada on the promise that if he comes he will get a better settlement and better terms from the Government ; and I do not know that I am not right when I say that it was promised to the papal authorities that if this envoy came he would get better terms and a better settlement, and that if he did not get such, the Solicitor General and two of his colleagues in the Cabinet would resign. I see my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works laughing. I do not think he will resign. But, Sir, while this papal envoy is on the scene, and before he is at liberty to speak or to say what his mission is, it is given out in Bonaventure, in Wright and in Champlain, that he is sent here to bring the bishops into line and to make the minority accept the settlement ; and before he is able to open his lips, the work will be done by the gentlemen who are supporting the ministerial candidates in Champlain and in the other elections which may spring up before he has had time to speak. This is the way the so-called approval of the minority has been obtained. I say it has been obtained by false pretenses, as the hon. gentleman obtained power by false pretenses.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CASGRAIN. If the hon. gentlemen on the other side will bear with me for a minute, I am going to prove to them that they did obtain power on the 23rd of June by false pretenses. I have alluded to the opinion of the Hon. Edward Blake. I am not going to discuss the minor points of that opinion. Everybody agrees with Mr. Blake that upon the questions put to him by the Solicitor General, no other answer could be given by him than this one, that is to say, that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council never ordered the Governor General or the Parliament of Canada to restore the separate schools of 1871 as they existed prior to 1890. Nobody ever pretended that in this country.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You all did.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. CASGRAIN. My hon. friend has been asleep ; he is the Grit Rip Van Winkle. But, Sir, Mr. Blake's opinion as to the impracticability of remedial legislation, as to the question of knowing whether it was opportune at the time or whether it is opportune now to introduce remedial legislation into this House, is the opinion of a gentleman who is certainly versed in the political affairs of this country, but who has been for some years absent from Canada, and who probably is not perfectly aware of what has happened here and what is happening at the present time. . But I will call the attention of the hon. Solicitor General to this. When he put this question to Mr. Blake, and when Mr. Blake answered that one of the principal reasons why remedial legislation would not be efficacious was that no grant could be made by the Parliament of Canada, why did not my hon. friend call the attention of Mr. Blake to the Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter 54, sections 23, 24 and 25, and to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) at the time the Bill was before this House. Just let me read one of these sections, which relate to the school lands of the province of Manitoba and the Territories and to the paying out of the moneys realized from the sale of these lands. It provides that the sale shall be by public auction, and after speaking of the terms of payment, it goes on to say :

> All moneys from time time realized from the sale of school lands, shall be invested in securities of Canada, to form a school fund, and the interest arising therefrom, after deducting the cost of management, shall be paid annually to the government of the province or the territory within which such lands are situated, towards the support of public schools therein ; and the moneys so paid shall be distributed by the government of such province or territory in such a manner as it deems expedient.

Now, Sir, we held, and we still hold, that this Parliament has the right to so amend this section as to demand from Manitoba that a part of these moneys should go towards the maintenance of the schools that would have been created by the remedial legislation had it passed. It is not my intention now to compare the settlement which has been arrived at by the Premier and Mr. Greenway with the legislation which was introduced in this House by the Conservative party, nor with the terms of settlement which were proposed by Sir Donald Smith, Senator Desjardins and the Hon. Mr. Dickey. But if it is any consolation to those who represent the minority on the other side of this House, I will only remark that the Hon. Mr. Cameron, the Attorney General of Manitoba, speaking on the second reading of the Settlement Bill the other evening in the Manitoba legislature, said that there could be no comparison whatever between the settlement arrived at and the remedial legislation proposed by the Conservative party or the settlement proposed by Sir Donald Smith ; that hardly anything contained in the Remedial Bill was contained in the settlement; and that he considered this settlement the greatest triumph for the Government and legislature of Manitoba. Now, Sir, there is another part of Mr. Blake's opinion to which I wish to refer. Mr. Blake seems to question the obligation or the duty of Parliament to pass remedial legislation. Nobody in this House, and hardly anybody in the country who has studied the question, can pretend for a moment that the Parlia-

ment of Canada, after the remedial order had been passed and served on the Government of Manitoba, had not the right to pass remedial legislation, as laid down in the constitution. The judgment of the Privy Council settles that point beyond a doubt, and the hon. Premier of the Dominion, when he was sitting here as leader of the Opposition did not deny it. The only fear which my hon. friend from Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion) had was that the Remedial Bill did not go far enough. He said that this being a proceeding in appeal, as it were, if the Bill were passed, then the jurisdiction in appeal would be exhausted, and then the minority in the province of Manitoba could never get their rights. He said:

I oppose this Bill, precisely because I feel that if we were to pass it to-day, it would put an end to all possible chance of re-establishing separate schools in Manitoba.

That was his only fear. But I hold that not only had Parliament the right to pass remedial legislation, but it was his constitutional duty to do so, and I can have no better authority on this point than the utterances of a gentleman who sits in this House, and who is now removed to a higher sphere; I refer to the Hon. Mr. Mills. I have read his speech and re-read it several times, and I consider it to be an admirable 'exposé' of the constitutional doctrine on this question. What does Mr. Mills say? I will read what he said for the edification of hon. gentlemen on the opposite side. I have heard that they did not like that speech, because it was in direct contradiction to many of the theories advanced by the hon. Premier and other members on his side of the House at that time. Here is what Mr. Mills says:

Let us for a moment consider the meaning of this.

He refers to a despatch concerning the educational claims of the B.N.A. of Lord Carnarvon:

Is it a mere enabling power? What does the right of appeal mean? And what the claim to a remedial law? A claim means, not a request, but a demand resulting upon a right. Let the House mark the significance of the whole paragraph. This provision was the subject of long and anxious discussion, that Parliament would not alter, if it were susceptible of amendment, because it sets out an agreement at which the parties have arrived. It was to secure to the religious minority of each province certain rights and privileges which it assuredly would not do if the limited power entrusted to Parliament was a mere enabling power imposing no duty whatever. There is a right of appeal admitted, and there is a claim to its enforcement conceded. A claim would be no claim, if it were a mere appeal asking that a discretionary power should be used. It means much more than this. It implies that those who make it have a right, and that they are invoking the aid of the party to whom the law has committed the power of redress. A mere discretion is not consistent with a compact. It is assumed that there is a compact which is, by the law, adequately protected against successful violation by the power conferred and by the constitutional duty imposed.

And again he says:

It is essential to the due execution of the federal system of government that we should recognize the regulative authority of the supreme law. This applies equally to Parliament and to every provincial legislature. Each of them must look to the constitution as the source from which its authority is derived; and, when a Parliament exercises a power granted under the constitution for the very purpose for which it is given, no legislature, no provincial government, can have any legal or constitutional cause to complain. If the results are not satisfactory, the fault is with the supreme law, and not necessarily with those who are called upon to administer it. It is preposterous to argue that, when special circumstances arise which were contemplated by the framers of the constitution, and which call for the exercise of the power bestowed, that it is not to be employed.

And again:

The Governor General in Council has to ascertain whether the minority has appealed; whether the rights and privileges of that minority have been impaired or destroyed by any provincial authority, and if so, then there rests on him, not only the power, but the constitutional duty, to urge redress in the way that the constitution itself provides.

Therefore, I take it from their own authority that it was not only in the power of this Parliament to pass remedial legislation, but it was the duty of this Parliament to do so. But I have further authority upon this point, and very decided authority also, coming from the benches on the other side. The hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) was at one time the editor of a newspaper well known to the public in the province of Quebec and throughout the Dominion called "Le Canadien." My hon. friend had then no doubt admitted the right of Parliament to pass this remedial legislation. But that is not all. He had no doubt whatever that it was the constitutional duty and obligation of this Parliament to pass such legislation. Sir, he did not use the calm and dispassionate language which Mr. Mills used in discussing this question. I will read a few extracts from his newspaper, "Le Canadien," and you will see with what fire and enthusiasm he urged the claims of the minority at that time—not when he was enjoying the sweets of office, but when he was in the cold shades of opposition, trying to get to the place he now occupies. The hon. gentleman, in the "Le Canadien" of 8th September, 1892, said:

We know from an authentic source that desperate efforts are now being made to induce the Catholics and French Canadians of Manitoba to make new concessions. Those concessions which were made in the past have all turned against us, and it would hereafter be treason, as well as cowardice, to take one step backward.

The political party which sits at Ottawa, is under the imperative duty to render justice, whatever may happen.

Let Sir John Thompson and his colleagues show themselves energetically determined, and the reasonable elements of the population will rally around them.

This is not a party question. We are in the midst of a national crisis.

Again he says in reply to the request that the minority should make some concessions:

The constituion applies to all. We can make no further concessions in this matter of the Manitoba schools. Let us boldly arm ourselves with our right, and let us see where we stand in Canada.

Let us see if the Queen's signature is worth something when it is at the foot of documents which assure to the Catholics of Manitoba the same prerogatives which the Protestants enjoy in the province of Quebec.

That is not all. Again he said in another article:

There is no tribunal under the sun which has the right to deprive a people of its religious liberty, of its rights of existence, of its nationality. There will be no "peace" so long as we are not restored in the enjoyment of the guarantees stipulated in the constitution. Our moderation consists in the refusal of any compromise. We have the title to separate schools, and we shall have them. * * * It is not to the Catholics and to the French Canadians that moderation must be preached. When did they encroach upon the privileges of their English fellow-citizens? Because they are the minority, they are asked to submit to the religious tyranny let loose by adventurers imported here at the expense of the older provinces. It is not possible for us to give up fighting for our claims in their entirety.

That is the way he spoke in 1893. Here is another article from his pen:

The Federal Executive is the foremost guardian of the constitution, and it is in this capacity that it is called upon to intervene in the school question. The Government and the Parliament of Canada undertook, by the Act of 1870, to see that a system of separate schools was maintained in the province which they were creating. Between the population of Manitoba and the Dominion this is not a question of law; the public faith is at stake. If the authorized organs of the Dominion, that is, the Government and the Parliament of Canada, did not draft a clean and precise law, is the Catholic minority to suffer? Does this circumstance exclude the certain, incontrovertible fact of a distinct stipulation, of a positive agreement, in relation to the Manitoba schools?

The political question rises above and throws far away into the background all the technicalities and all the cunning by which Mr. Greenway intends to render illusive the primordial foundation of confederation, of the Act of 1870.

That this Act is drafted in incorrect terms: it may be, since the Privy Council so decides. But, if this be the case, then, the intervention of the Governor General and of Parliament, if necessary, imposes itself, to remedy this insufficiency.

That was the doctrine which the hon. gentleman preached at that time. No compromise whatever, no settlement to be arrived at between the Government of the Dominion and the Government of the province of Manitoba. His cry then was "No surrender," we should have all our rights or nothing at all. There were no doubts then in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite from the province of Quebec as to the right and duty of the Government. Let me quote some of their declarations, made during the election of 1896, which will be interesting reading to the House. I cannot quote all the declarations which these hon. gentlemen then made, who have been elected on the strength of them, because a good many of these hon. gentlemen kept these declarations in their pockets or destroyed them, but we have managed to put our hands on some few, which I will read for the edification of the House. I do not know if the hon. gentleman who represents Megantic (Mr. Turcot) is in the House, but I cannot refrain from reading the declaration he signed on the 9th of June, 1896, just before the election:

Considering that, by its judgment, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council has definitely decided that, in law and in fact, the Catholic minority of Manitoba have a real grievance, and that they have a right to separate schools; considering the mandement of the bishops of the province of Quebec, which imposes upon the Catholics the obligation to vote for no other candidates but those who expressly bind themselves to pass legislation restoring to the Catholic minority of Manitoba the school rights which have been recognized as belonging to them by the Privy Council in England, I, the undersigned, a candidate at the present elections, expressly and solemnly promise to demand, and to vote for, the passing of remedial legislation which will place the Catholic minority of Manitoba in the fullest enjoyment of their rights. I further promise to do nothing which would place the Government in a position in which it would be impossible for them to introduce such legislation or which might delay its passing.

(Signed) GEORGE TURCOT,
Candidate.

Ste. Julie de Somerset, 9th June, 1896.

That is not all, Sir. I hold in my hand a declaration signed by the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Godbout):

County of Beauce, P.Q., June, 1896.

I, the undersigned, solemnly and expressly promise, agreeably to the mandement of the archbishops and bishops of the province of Quebec, to support in the House any measure which will efficaciously restore to the Catholics of Manitoba their schools, of which they have been deprived for the last six years; to use every effort to obtain for the Catholics their legitimate share of subsidies for the maintenance of these schools, and to obtain from the Government of Manitoba the recognition of the principles that the education given in these schools should be controlled by the clergy.

I further promise to see that the same justice is rendered to the Catholics of the North-west. Whatever Government is in power, if the law which is introduced is accepted by the bishops, I promise to support it.

DR. GODBOUT,
Candidate.

But it will be said that those gentlemen are not lawyers, that they probably do not un-

derstand the full meaning of their declaration as to its legal aspect. But, now, I will turn to some of my legal friends, on the other side who also signed declarations to a like effect. But before doing so, I cannot refrain from alluding to the declaration, not a signed declaration, not a written declaration, but a spoken one made by my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot). He did not sign a declaration nor write one. But on one occasion, in a parish in his own county when the discussion was going on and he was hard pressed by his adversaries, being in front of the church, he turned to the church and taking off his hat he took as the evidence of the sincerity of his promises and declarations the temple of Almighty God.

Mr. TALBOT. What declaration ?

Mr. CASGRAIN. That you would vote for remedial legislation, for the law approved by the bishops. And the hon. gentleman (Mr. Talbot) went as far in this direction as any other candidate in the last Dominion election.

Mr. TALBOT. I beg to deny that statement most formally and I beg further to state that the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) is drawing freely upon his imagination in making the statement he has just made.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I have to take the statement made by the hon. gentleman, but——

Mr. TALBOT. I deny.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I will not take it back, and I say——

Mr. SPEAKER. When an hon. member distinctly charged with something that is within his own knowledge, gives the House his assurance that it is so or is not so, any hon. gentleman must accept that and take back any statements to the contrary. It is not correct of the hon. gentleman to say that he will not take it back.

Mr. CASGRAIN. What I said is that I will accept the statement made by the hon. gentleman. But how can I take it back when I believe it to be true.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has not been long a member of the House or he would understand that he must take back such a statement. He may not be convinced, but he must accept the statement of an hon. member upon such a point.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Then, I am not convinced but I accept the statement of the hon. gentleman. I will now refer to some of the legal gentlemen who gave their promises, which, I think, they will not repudiate before this House. I have here declarations not made before the church door, but signed, executed, and duly delivered by the gentlemen who wrote them. Let me, for instance, refer to the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Angers). Everybody in the province of Quebec knows the submission which he made upon this question to his bishop and the declaration he made. Here is what the member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) wrote :

I, the undersigned, solemnly promise to vote in the House according to the desires expressed by their lordships in the recent pastoral.

But that is not all. We have a declaration made by another gentleman. This declaration was made by the hon. the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), a declaration signed and delivered by him. This declaration was made out when the archbishop was not in the city of Quebec, but was on a pastoral visit in the county of Beauce, 50 or 60 miles from Quebec. The hon. gentleman, I believe, unsolicited went to the bishop and delivered to him, signed with his own hand, the following statement :—

Being sincerely disposed to put aside all party spirit and all questions of men, in order to secure the triumph of the Catholic cause in Manitoba, I, the undersigned, promise, if elected, to conform myself to the bishops' mandement in all points and to vote for a measure according the Catholics of Manitoba that justice to which they have a right by virtue of the judgment of the Privy Council, provided that the measure be approved of by my bishop. If Mr. Laurier reaches power, and does not settle the question at the first session, in accordance with the terms of the mandement, I promise either to withdraw my support or resign.

And, Sir, the hon. Solicitor General still sits in his seat, although no remedial legislation has been introduced by the Premier but a kind of settlement, a so-called settlement which settles nothing and sacrifices those rights for which the hon. gentleman was then ready to fight, has been made. I said a moment ago that hon. gentlemen opposite obtained power on the 23rd of June by false promises. Is there any reason since the 23rd of June that they should change their minds ? Have they redeemed their pledges ? Not one of those who signed these declarations has carried out his pledge, and I say again that before this session is over we will have evidence here of whether or not they are going back on their solemn promises and declarations.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Do it now.

Mr. CASGRAIN. We will do it when the proper time comes. I see my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) was disturbed by the reading of the articles which I read a few moments ago. I ask him to keep quiet. I will not read more of these at present, but I will have more for him at another time. Sir, something has been said this afternoon about the bishops seeking to coerce the minority in the Dominion during the last general election. I deny that statement most emphatically. I

would ask those who believe it to read the mandement issued by the bishops to the province of Quebec prior to the last election. I would ask them to read the pastoral issued after the election and after the settlement had been arrived at between the Premier of the Dominion and Mr. Greenway, and then show, if he can, one single word in which coercion is even referred to, or anything in these documents that can be taken as a threat by the bishops of Quebec to their people. But it seems to me there cannot be in this circumstance any criticism of the action of the bishops of the province of Quebec. I take it that the Catholic bishops of the province of Quebec and of the other provinces, are citizens of this Dominion, and they have a right to express their opinion upon questions which concern the public welfare of the Dominion. A great deal has been said about civil liberty. Even if the bishops went further than they did in their mandements or pastoral letters, I think they had a right to give to their flocks the directions which, in the preformance of their duties, they think they are bound to give. It is not taking away the civil liberty of any citizen of Canada for the bishops to tell him that on a given point which touches religion, he is bound as a Catholic to oppose such and such a measure, or to support such and such legislation. Why, Sir, we see in the papers every day that Protestant clergymen do this.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Yes, Sir, Methodists and Presbyterians do it, and you deny to Roman Catholic bishops the right to give their flocks directions as to how they should vote. When you talk of civil liberty, give the bishops the liberty which every citizen in this country enjoys. Is the party on the other side really and truly a Liberal party? If so, then I say they should not try to gag the bishops and to prevent them from expressing their sentiments upon this question. This question is a politico-religious question, and I maintain that the Roman Catholic bishops in this country have a perfect right to express their sentiments and their opinions upon that question. But if they can be criticised now, they could have been criticised in years gone by. This is not the first time that the Roman Catholic bishops of this country have addressed pastoral letters and mandements to their flocks upon great constitutional or other questions which have divided public opinion in this country. Let me refer briefly to some instances where the bishops did give directions to their flocks as to what they should support or what they should condemn. In 1775 when emissaries were sent over here from the United States asking the French Canadians to join the Americans at the time of the revolution against English authority upon this continent, what was the direction then given by the Catholic bishop of Lower Canada to his flock? Sir, it was only a few years since the fleur-de-lis had left these shores, and it seems to me that if the bishop at that time had listened to his own feelings, they would have prompted him to say: Well, England is our old enemy, England has conquered us. It seems to me that some such feelings might have rankled in his heart and inspired a desire for revenge on their English foes. But at that time the bishop, notwithstanding everything that was held out by the priest, Father Carroll, who was sent over here by the American authorities, notwithstanding all the promises which were made, that bishop then issued a mandement or pastoral letter to his flock, and he said: No, England until now has treated us fairly, let us stand by England. The emissaries of the United States were sent back, and the sole cause of their failure was this mandement issued by the Roman Catholic bishop of Lower Canada at that time. In 1812 when war was declared between the United States and England and Canada, and when England was engaged in war with almost every country in Europe, what did the bishops do? They again issued a mandement and pastoral letter to their flocks asking them to fight for England; and if the French Canadians fought as they did at Chateaguay, it was because they were inspired by their bishops and priests to do so. Then in 1837 when some of our French fellow-citizens rebelled against English authority and against the constitution of this country, what did the Catholic bishops of the province of Quebec do? They again issued mandements and pastoral letters to their flocks, and it was because of these that the fire of rebellion did not spread from one end of Quebec to the other. It was these mandements, these pastoral letters, which checked that fire, which caused almost all the French Catholic population of the province of Quebec to turn against those who had rebelled against English authority. Then in 1867 when a new constitution was given to this country, and when the Government came before the province of Quebec to get this constitution adopted, a constitution under which we have prospered, the confederation of Canada, pastoral letters were again issued by the Roman Catholic bishops to their flocks, asking them to accept this constitution as one giving them not only the enjoyment of the fullest political liberty, but also the fullest religious liberty. And, Sir, in 1885, when, in the province of Quebec, as my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works knows well, some persons were trying to raise sympathy with the rebels in the North-west, it was the bishops again who, by giving directions to their flocks, brought them back to a true sense of their duty. Now, Sir, it seems to me that, under the circumstances, in view of what has already passed in Canadian history, the

bishops cannot be blamed for taking part in the fight which is going on, and which has been waged until now upon this great Manitoba school question. They have always been on the side of the constitution ; they have upheld the constitution of this country, and what they tried to do before the election of 1896, and what they are trying to do now, is simply to get for the Catholic minority of Manitoba the same degree of protection from the constitution as is due to every other citizen in this country.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). I move the adjournment of the debate, and in doing so, I may, perhaps, be permitted to say that I do not move it for the purpose of answering the statements made by my hon. friend with reference to the Roman Catholic bishops of Quebec, against whom, or with reference to whom, I have not heard a word uttered during this debate. It seems to me the hon. gentleman has been spending his time in an idle attempt to defend people who have not been attacked. It would have been much more in order for the hon. gentleman to have turned his attention to the Conservative minority in the legislature of Manitoba, to explain their actions on the School Bill when it was before the legislature. I think, also, he might have spoken to much better effect if he had turned his attention to the organs of the Conservative party, and to their course upon this legislation ; and also to the utterances of the Conservative organs about the mission to Rome, of which he spoke some time ago, and the mission of the papal ablegate. I move the adjournment of this debate.

Mr. McNEILL. I desire to know, without intending discourtesy to the hon. gentleman who has just spoken——

Mr. SPEAKER. Allow me to put the question.

Mr. McNEILL. I was about to say, without intending any discourtesy to the hon. gentleman who moved the adjournment of the debate, that I should like to have your ruling on this point, because this is the second occasion in which we have had the same thing during this session, a thing which I have never seen before. I should like to have your ruling as to whether a gentleman who has made the remarks my hon. friend has just made, can have the opportunity of speaking again. It was always understood that it was not in order for an hon. gentleman moving the adjournment of a debate, to do more than merely make the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has raised a question of order, but it is not customary, I think, for the Chair to decide a question of that kind before it comes properly before the House. The question may be raised properly no doubt if the hon. gentleman who has moved the adjournment makes a speech again at another time after this debate is adjourned ; but that he is perfectly in order so far nobody can deny. The hon. gentleman has moved the adjournment of the debate, and if any question arises hereafter, it will be decided.

Mr. McNEILL. I desire to say——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. McNEILL. I wish to understand your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope I have made it clear. The hon. gentleman is perfectly in order to-night at all events. Whether any question of order shall be raised on it at a future time, it will be for hon. members to decide ; a decision will be given then if the point is raised.

Mr. McNEILL. I wish to know if I can raise a question.

Mr. SPEAKER. Not if it is on the same point of order. If it is on any other question, the hon. gentleman may do so.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

THE MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION—PAPERS.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I would like to ask the hon. the First Minister if he intends to lay before the House all the papers in connection with negotiations on the Manitoba school question. I have a motion on the Order Paper to that effect, but as the debate is going on, I think it would be proper for the House to be placed in possession of all the documents in connection with the case that were not submitted last session.

The PRIME MINISTER. I was waiting for the motion of my hon. friend to be made and carried. But as the motion may be deferred for some time, if it is agreeable and convenient to my hon. friend to have these papers without delay, I shall be very glad to bring them down. The motion of the hon. gentleman covers all the papers on this question which have not yet been brought down. I can bring them down probably the day after to-morrow.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I made this proposition because I saw in the reported proceedings of the Senate that these papers were to be brought down in the Upper Chamber, and I could see no objection to the papers being brought down to this House.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is not the slightest objection.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 30th March, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORTS.

The Public Accounts of Canada, for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1896.—(Mr. Fielding.)

Report of the Auditor General for the year ended 30th June, 1896.—(Mr. Fielding.)

CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION ACT.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 9) to provide for the abolition of the Civil Service Superannuation Act and for the retirement of members of the civil service.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to ask the Postmaster General if he would be good enough to state briefly the character and objects of this Bill.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In reply to the hon. gentleman I would say that, as its title implies, this Bill provides, in the first place, for the abolition of the present Civil Service Superannuation Act—not its immediate abolition or its abolition in its entirety to-day, but its abolition as regards a certain section of the civil service and as regards all new appointees, so that ultimately the Act will cease to apply.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What section of the civil service ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to briefly refer to the scheme offered to the House in substitution of the present system. The present system provides for the superannuation of officials who have been contributing for ten years or more to the superannuation fund. In the event of those officers dying in the service, their heirs get nothing. In the event of their superannuation, these officers receive an annuity during the remainder of their lives. The present scheme provides that there shall be deducted a percentage from each officer's salary, and that the Government shall fund that percentage and allow interest upon it, computed half-yearly, whilst such officer is in the service. When he resigns or retires from the service, that fund is his, but while he is in the serivce he has no claim upon it. Should he die in the service, that fund will pass to his legatees or next of kin. It proposes to repeal the Superannuation Act as it is to-day in respect of three classes of persons : First, those hereafter appointed ; secondly, those at present in office who have contributed nothing towards the superannuation fund ; and thirdly, those at present in the civil service who have contributed something, but not for ten years, to the superannuation fund. As regards the last class, the Bill provides that as regards all contributions paid by those now in the service for a less period than ten years, the amount shall be ascertained and interest computed on it half-yearly at the rate of 5 per cent, or such other rate as the House may determine, and the total sum carried to the credit of the retiring fund in respect of these particular officers. The Bill also contains a provision that, in the event of the Governor in Council being of the opinion that any member of the service is unfit to manage his affairs, should he be dismissed or otherwise, the Government may control the destination of the funds, always limited, however, by this principle, that it shall be devoted for the benefit of his wife and children or other next of kin. The Bill also provides that members of the civil service, who have been contributing for more than ten years, may, at their option, and with the consent of the Governor in Council, within three months from the passage of this Bill, bring themselves under its operation. In that event they will be treated in the same manner as those who have contributed something, but not during the full period of ten years to the fund. The reason why the period of ten years is fixed is this : under the Act at present, a civil servant who has contributed for less than ten years to the fund may be retired upon the payment of a gratuity and not of a pension. So that he does not stand in the same position as one who has been contributing for a longer period than ten years.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Of course, I have no intention of entering upon a discussion of the merits of this Bill at this time, but I may point out that the Bill seems to entirely abandon the principle upon which the policy of superannuation was based. The House is perfectly well aware that before the policy of superannuation was adopted. the disinclination of all Governments to interfere with the position and emoluments of public officers who become old and incapacitated for work, either through failing health or other reasons and to throw their families into destitution—I am not now speaking about one party and one Government, but of all—led, almost inevitably, to retaining officials who were no longer able to discharge their duties efficiently, very much to the detriment of the public service. Therefore, the policy was resorted to in accordance with the precedent of England and other countries, of making a charge upon the salary of the civil servant in order that when he was no longer capable of discharging his duties efficiently, he might be retir-

ed without his family being reduced to a state of destitution. I need not say that the cases are very few and far between in which the salaries of civil servants are not all required and all used for the daily sustenance of their families. The law was altered at no very remote period. I was not here, but I understand that the alteration was made in consequence of finding that the contribution exacted from the officials during their tenure of office was not sufficient to provide for the charges made against the superannuation fund. I believe a very marked change was made in that respect so as to render the superannuation fund, as regards all future appointees, self-supporting. Do I understand from my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) who has introduced this Bill that this whole policy is to be swept away and that we are to be brought to the position of being obliged to choose between retaining incapable officials to the great detriment of the service or reducing their families to a state of destitution? The other question is a question altogether outside—that of an insurance policy Though this might be a very wise and useful measure in itself, and calculated to benefit very much the families of persons who have been in the civil service, it rests upon an entirely different footing. The primary object of the superannuation fund, I take it, was the effective carrying on of the public service, and that was accomplished by a charge upon the salaries of officials when they were well qualified to perform their duties so as to enable a certain provision to be made for them when they grew old or were otherwise incapacitated. As I have said, I have no intention of provoking any discussion upon the merits of the Bill, but I would like to understand at the outset whether it is proposed by the Bill to sweep away that principle of providing for the efficient performance of the public service in the mode in which the Superannuation Act provided.

Mr. MULOCK. I think that when the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) sees the Bill and makes a computation he will find that the fund will be far more beneficial to the officer and to his family than the fund provided under the existing law; and I think he will find, also, that it is a measure that will be much more satisfactory to the public and to the taxpayers of Canada generally. And, further, I think it is a Bill that will secure more efficiency on the part of the officials, for it will cost the country nothing, when this Bill is in force, to retire an officer. When he is retired, he takes with him his own funds. It is no charge upon the country, and, therefore, when an officer ceases to be efficient, he can be retired and there will be a fund available for him. At present, there is a large number of the civil servants—I will not say how many, but there are many—who, for many years, have been retained in office after their period of usefulness had expired, simply because of the disinclination that every Government feels to retire worn-out officers or men who have ceased, either from preventable causes, or otherwise, to be useful to the service. This Bill will entirely obviate that difficulty. The officer will feel that there is less difficulty in the way of his retirement. His continuance of office will then depend upon his usefulness, and the Government will not be embarrassed in retiring him, inasmuch as there will be a fund available to provide for the contingency my hon. friend refers to, the contingency of a man being turned off upon an unkind world without the means of supporting himself and his family.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) in giving his explanation in regard to the Bill specified three classes of people upon whom the new Bill would have an effect. First, those who are not appointed, but must be subsequently appointed; second, those who have been appointed but who, for reasons of age or otherwise, have not been contributing to the superannuation fund, and, therefore, are not upon the list of those who may be superannuated; and, third, those who have paid to the superannuation fund under ten years. I take it that the Bill does not affect those who have been paying in for the fund for ten years or more, unless they desire to come under the operations of the new Act, and to be relieved of the obligations under the old Act. I am sure that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) sees that that would have a serious effect—at least so it seems to me—upon the income under the superannuation, payment from which must continue for a very long time, even under the Bill now proposed by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MULOCK. I may say that if those who have been contributing more than ten years, elect to come under the Bill and the Governor General in Council consents to that election, they come under the Bill and the old Act is repealed as regards them. In the event of their so electing, an account will be taken as to their contributions, interest will be allowed upon it half-yearly, and that total sum will be placed to the credit of these men as a foundation, and they will thereafter only make contributions provided under this retirement Bill and not under the other. I think that when my hon. friends study out the figures, they will see that it will be infinitely better for the officers as well as for the public. When the Bill comes before the House to be considered in detail, I will be prepared to furnish a calculation showing what the fund will amount to at different periods, every half year, for the average life of an official.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think the hon. gentleman has missed the point I was endeavouring to make, namely, that the fact of these people being allowed to retire and to come under the operation of the new Act,

would withdraw their contributions which they were compelled to make under the old Act, and would have a very serious effect upon the superannuation fund from which those who remain will have to be paid.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Those who remain are paid out of the consolidated revenue.

Mr. McMULLEN. Some two years ago I introduced a Bill of which this is evidently a recast, with some considerable improvements. At the time I introduced that Bill, the Speaker of the House met me with a point of order, saying that it required to originate with the Government. Now I congratulate the country on the introduction of this Bill. I carefully followed the leader of the Opposition in the remarks he had to make. I might say in reply, that were it not for the manner in which the superannuation system of Canada was abused by hon. gentlemen opposite, I question very much if a move would have been taken absolutely to abolish it. But the evidences of abuse that characterized the administration of that Act for the last 18 years, prove clearly that very considerable amendments needed to be made to the Act, or else it should be entirely abolished. Now the leader of the Opposition says that it is following a system that has been in existence in England for a great many years. That is very true, but at the time of the inception of the system of superannuation in England, there were not the easy and desirable modes of life insurance in existence that there are to-day. Besides, the remuneration paid to civil servants in England was exceedingly low. In England the superannuation system has been managed so as to avoid drawing upon the resources of England to a single pound. The entire sum which is paid to superannuated officers in England, is paid from the fund contributed entirely by the civil servants, not a pound is taken out of the pockets of the taxpayers of that country. Had we a superannuation system of that kind in Canada, it certainly would not have been as objectionable as the system that we have had in existence here; and had hon. gentlemen opposite allowed the Act to remain on the statutes as it was originally introduced, I question if it would not have provided a fund even for the extravagant raids to which it had been subjected. But in place of doing that, they cut down the percentage that was deducted from the salary of the civil servants to the extent of fifty per cent, and from the date of the reduction down to the present time a very considerable sum annually has been added to the drain that the people have been asked to submit to in order to keep that system in existence. Now, I contend that the time has arrived when, in the interests of the people of this country, we should abolish that system. There is no reason whatever why it should be continued. There is no class in this Dominion to-day—I challenge any hon. gentleman opposite to name the class that is better paid than the civil servants of Canada, there is no class that gets a better salary. Then I would like to know under those circumstances why it should be thought necessary to call upon the people of this country to contribute very nearly a quarter of a million annually to keep up the civil service superannuation system. I contend that the time has arrived to abolish it, and I am glad the Bill is introduced. I would respectfully draw the attention of the ex-Finance Minister to the introduction of this Bill, and to the determination of the Government to implement at least one of the pledges that they have given. I hope he will notice that, and that when it comes up for the consideration of this House he will give it his attention.

Mr. FOSTER. I have noted it.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes, I hope so. It will at least prove that after this you will no longer be able to say that the Reform party has carried out none of its pledges. We are going to carry out this pledge. Now, Sir, I admire the improvements that have been made in the Bill by the Postmaster General. In addition to the provisions in the measure I presented to the House, it deals with those who have been in the service for ten years, but have not yet become entitled to superannuation under the Act. That, I think, is a very prudent addition to the clauses of the Bill originally introduced. These men will now be brought within the operation of this Act, the sums they have paid will be placed to their credit with interest half yearly, and the amount will be kept in the meantime as a guarantee of good faith and efficient service on their part. Should they die in the service their heirs will be entitled to the money, or if they retire from the service they have a right to draw their money and do as they like with it. I think that is an additional improvement to the provisions of the Bill that I introduced some two years ago. The Minister of Agriculture made some remarks with regard to the application of the Bill to those who have been longer in the service than ten years. They are to be allowed three months within which they are to decide whether they will continue to contribute to the superannuation fund and participate in its advantages, or whether they will withdraw and have the moneys they have paid in, placed to their credit, with interest annually, as provided in the case of those who have served ten years. That, I think, is also another good provision. It leaves it optional with them. It does not force them to abandon the right they attained when they entered the service, but it leaves them the choice as to

whether they will participate in the superannuation system, or whether they will withdraw and so be able to control their own means as they like. On the whole, I heartily congratulate the Government on the introduction of this Bill. I am sure that the country will almost unanimously endorse their action in bringing a measure of this kind before the House for the purpose of wiping out a system that has been abused most scandalously within the last eighteen years, because there are men in the country who have been superannuated that never should have been placed upon the retired list, but they were placed there by hon. gentlemen opposite in order to make vacancies for those who were pressing their services upon the country. That system will now be abolished, and we shall have a different condition of things.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PROPOSED TARIFF—PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Before the House proceeds with the Orders of the Day, I wish to ask your attention for a moment to something which in one sense is personal to myself, and which, in a larger sense, relates to the affairs of the Government and the House. My attention has been called to an article which appeared this morning in the Ottawa "Citizen" newspaper. The first paragraph of this article, while it is incorrect, and unfair, and offensive, is nevertheless a comment upon a public utterance of my own, and, therefore, it may be held to come within the lines of newspaper criticism. I take no exception to that, and I would not call the attention of hon. members to this matter if the article had stopped there. But the writer proceeds to make some statements which are so grave that I think I am justified in calling the attention of the House to them. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will read the three paragraphs:

> Some other remarkable things transpired in connection with the coming revision.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the first remarkable thing?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The first paragraph is in the nature of comment upon some remarks made by me in Montreal in regard to the coal question, which have already been referred to in this House. That is comment on public affairs, and although my action is stated in a way that is most unfair and unjust, I do not take exception to that paragraph, because it may be held to fall within the line of what is commonly called fair criticism. But it is the concluding portion of the article to which I wish to call attention:

> The Kingston cotton mill, in common with other mills whose business was threatened by the declared policy of the Liberals, has been running on half-time, barely manufacturing what was required for immediate sale and consumption. Suddenly it starts into unusual activity, and is now going night and day. What is the explanation? The cotton manufacturers had an interview with the Finance Minister the other day. Did he give them a tip?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House smile, as if this was a common thing to do in certain quarters. The article proceeds:

> Further, within the past few days it is announced that forty million pounds of sugar have been taken out of bond in Montreal. This means that the dealers are convinced that the duties are to be raised on this article. How do they know? Have they been given a tip?
>
> These circumstances are most auspicious, and it will be hard to convince observers that the Finance Minister has not been guilty of a gross abuse in permitting intended tariff changes to be made known to certain favoured individuals and firms who can benefit by the knowledge. The boundless corruption to which such a practice opens the door may be seen at a glance. In any case, its injustice and unseemliness are most reprehensible.

Mr. Speaker, I am a journalist, at all events I was for many years of my life a journalist, if I am not at liberty to claim a share in the profession to-day; and I think I have a pretty clear understanding of how necessary it is in the public interest that a large degree of liberty should be accorded to the press in their criticism of public affairs, and am not likely to be in a hurry to find fault. So thoroughly do I feel the necessity of giving the greatest liberty to the press that I seldom find any fault with newspaper criticism, although it may be, and very often is very unjust and very unfair. But surely there is a line of demarkation between fair criticism and a series of accusations of the gravest character without having a shadow of foundation. The charge made in the "Citizen" is a very serious one. A man holding the office of Finance Minister could hardly be guilty of a more shameful act than that of giving private information in advance of his intentions in regard to tariff changes. If it were possible that a Finance Minister should do this thing, and did it, no language the press could employ, no words that his opponents could use, would be too strong to condemn such an infamous proceeding. Having said this, I have only one sentence to add. I state that the charge made in this newspaper, which I have read to the House, is absolutely false and is without a shadow of foundation.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman and the House will allow me, I will take this opportunity of saying that the House has heard, and I am sure the country will hear,

with the greatest satisfaction, the straightforward and emphatic denial of the hon. Finance Minister with respect with what might have been inferences drawn from the newspaper article that he read. It would be indeed, as he has said, a most infamous thing, which could not be too strongly reprobated in this House or the country, that a Finance Minister or any member of the Government associated with the Finance Minister should give the least information in any way as to any items in respect to the tariff soon to be submitted to the House. I am very glad to have heard the hon. gentleman make the denial. I read an article yesterday particularly for the purpose of giving the hon. gentleman a chance to make a straightforward denial in this House. The hon. gentleman did not take advantage of the opportunity yesterday, and did not make the denial. I wish to point out to the House that the position in which the hon. gentleman finds himself to-day he has largely brought upon himself. I am not personally aware in the history of Canada of any case when in advance of the tariff being brought down, in which a thousand interests are involved, a Finance Minister ever gave a public tip to any single industry.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. Will the hon. gentleman take his seat ?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman did give that public tip to a deputation in the city of Montreal.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. Will the hon gentleman take his seat ?

Mr. FOSTER. I will take my seat.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am sorry the hon. gentleman did not take his seat until I had asked him to do so five or six times. On the Orders of the Day being called, it is well understood that we must not have a general discussion. Personal explanations and answers given, and such remarks as may naturally arise in connection with these matters, are proper ; but I must ask the hon. gentleman, especially as he is an hon. gentleman with great experience and knowledge of the rules, to be good enough to assist me in trying to preserve what he knows to be the rules of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I will try to do so, Mr. Speaker.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Mr. MARTIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to ask the Government if the papers called for by the following order of the House have been prepared and are ready to be brought down :—

Statement showing the amount of money expended by the Dominion Government since the first day of July, 1873, for constructing, equipping and subsidizing railways in Canada, with the number of acres of land granted as subsidies, and their estimate value. Also, a statement showing separately the part of such expenditure made on railways in each province of the Dominion and the North-west Territory, deducting any sums that may have been charged against any of the provinces or the North-west Territory in their debt account with the Dominion.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). If the hon. gentleman will kindly send over a memorandum, I will attend to the matter.

REPORT.

Report of the Department of the Secretary of State of Canada, for the year 1896-97.—(Mr. Fisher.)

The Civil Service List of Canada, 1896.—(Mr. Fisher.)

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). Mr. Speaker——

Mr. McNEILL. I rise to a point of order. The point to which I wish to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, is that to which I referred last night. The point I desire to make is this : that my hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick), having moved the adjournment of the debate last night, and having spoken, it is not now competent for him to speak again in this debate. I should be very sorry, Mr. Speaker, if the House were to assume for one moment that I were so ungenerous as to desire to interpose any formal objection between the House and the explanation which the hon. the Solicitor General desires to make. All I desire to do, Mr. Speaker, is to have your ruling upon this point, which it seems to me—and I venture to think, to a good many other members of the House—is a point of very great importance. We want, Sir, to have an authoritative ruling upon the question, whether it is competent for an hon. member when he moves the adjournment for the purpose of having precedence when the debate again comes on ; whether it is competent for him to make an impromptu speech at the time of moving the adjournment, and then to claim his privilege of precedence and make a second speech when the main question comes on for debate. I think I may say that the practice has been unknown in this House before ; at least so far as my memory carries me back I have never seen, until this session, such a prac-

tice attempted during the fourteen or fifteen sessions that I have had the privilege of a seat in this House. I think, Sir, that the practice is altogether contrary to the principles upon which our parliamentary procedure is founded. I do not want to take up the time of the House, and therefore I think it is better for me to refer to the authorities. Dr. Bourinot, in his "Parliamentary Procedure," last edition, page 417, says:

If a member who moves an Order of the Day or seconds a motion, should rise and say only a word or two,—that he moves the order or seconds the motion—he is precluded from again addressing the House, according to a strict interpretation of the rules. In moving an amendment, a member is obliged to rise, and though he may only propose his amendment, he is considered to have exhausted his right to speak on the question before the House. It is usual for a member who wishes to have the floor on a future day to move the adjournment of the debate, and to give him the priority when it is resumed. The House also frequently agrees to adjourn the debate in order to allow an opportunity to a member to continue his speech on a future occasion.

It says, "the House also frequently agrees," but not always. The House does or does not agree, as it pleases. With the indulgence of the House, I take it that the hon. member (Mr. Fitzpatrick) can continue, but I take it also that it is a practice that might be subject to very great abuse, and it is a practice that the House ought to regard with very great jealousy.

If a member should move the adjournment of the debate, and the House should negative that motion, he will have exhausted his right of speaking on the main question.

Now, then, Sir, I wish to refer you further to this very authoritative and explicit statement of May:

A member who moves the adjournment of the debate, with a view of speaking upon the main question on a future day, must to obtain this privilege, confine himself to that formal motion.

Again, I find in Denison's and Brand's decisions, by Blackmore, this ruling was laid down:

If an hon. member moves the adjournment of the debate, and speaks thereon, he cannot speak again on the main question; but, if the motion is withdrawn by leave of the House, he can then speak.

It appears that Mr. Fawcett moved the adjournment of the debate, and he appealed to the Speaker whether he should lose his right of speaking on the main subject if he made one or two observations to explain why he had moved the adjournment of the debate:

Mr. Speaker said: "The hon. gentleman would be entitled to speak on the motion he had made for the adjournment of the debate, but he could not speak again on that question. If the House allowed the hon. gentleman to withdraw his motion, he might then speak on the main question."

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

I venture to submit very respectfully, Mr. Speaker, that those authorities that I have quoted practically settle this question, but I wish it to be distinctly understood that I have no desire at all to interpose between my hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) and his desire to address the House. I will venture to hope that if you, Sir, rule in the direction to which I imagine these precedents point, that the House will extend its indulgence to my hon. friend the Solicitor General and allow him to give his explanation. If the House does not do so, I hope my hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick), if he is desirous of addressing the House, will get some of his friends to move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The point which the hon. member (Mr. McNeill) has raised is an important one, and one full of interest. It is, I think, a point which is new in this Parliament. There has been some uncertainty as to the practice in that matter. From my recollection, I think that occasionally, in moving the adjournment of the debate in order to have the right of speaking first on the next occasion, remarks have been made on the main question; but I am inclined to think that this is not the proper practice. According to English precedents, and indeed as a matter of expediency for ourselves in carrying on the business of the House, it would be better when hon. gentlemen desire to move the adjournment of the debate in order to secure the right to speak first, that there should be no discussion indulged in except, of course, as to the question of adjournment. For obvious reasons, it is well to keep to that rule. I find in the 10th edition of May, it is so clearly laid down as to what the English practice is that we in this House would do well to follow it:

A member who moves the adjournment of the debate, with a view to speaking upon the main question upon a future day, must, to obtain this privilege, confine himself to that formal motion.

I know that cases have occurred in England—not frequently—and in this Parliament too, in which, when an hon. member has been making a long speech, a unanimous assent has been given that he should adjourn the debate and so secure the right to speak first on the next occasion. In England, towards the beginning of the century, Mr. Percival had spoken for three hours on a certain question, and the House expressed a strong desire that he should postpone his further remarks, and at the request of the House he did cease speaking in the middle of his address, to resume on a future occasion. In 1877, the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Costigan was making a speech—he had not spoken for three hours—and

it was nearing midnight on Saturday, when at the suggestion of the leader of the House the hon. gentleman was asked, in the middle of his speech, to move the adjournment of the debate. But those were exceptional occasions, and were for the general convenience of the House, and by the unanimous desire of the House. I do not think they establish a precedent in this case, in which an hon. member rises to move the adjournment of the debate simply for the purpose of having the right to make the first speech. Therefore, I think we had better come to an understanding that in future the rule of this House shall be as it is in England. Of course, the House may assent to the Solicitor General going on with his remarks. I hope they will do so, because our practice has been somewhat uncertain, and in this case a refusal would only cause delay, because another hon. member could move the adjournment of the debate, and so secure his right to speak.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the members of this House for the courtesy which has just been extended to me. I quite understand that it has been extended to me, because of the somewhat peculiar position I occupy in connection with this debate. I take for granted that no one will be much surprised if I feel called upon to claim some portion of the time of this House at this stage of the debate during the course of which I have engaged to a large extent the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite. I think that of all those who have spoken on the other side, one alone abstained from referring to me by name and to the position I occupy in consequence of certain pledges which were given to the bishop of the diocese to which I belong. Even the ex-Minister of Finance condescended to come down from the very superior position which he occupies in this House, to deal with me personally for a few moments. I cannot pretend to ignore what he said, because of course I felt it coming from him, and because of the way he said it and what he said. At the same time, it seemed to me that the ex-Minister of Finance might perhaps have abstained from lecturing this House and myself on the subject of political morality. I will not go further into that subject at the present time; but I will say this, that when the true history of the Manitoba school case is told, and when posterity comes to read its inner workings, it may then become known who were the secret foes and the false friends of the Manitoba minority. I shall not undertake to repeat what a colleague of the hon. gentleman said in another place when he undertook to explain what led him to resign from the former Bowell Government, nor shall I refer to the reasons which the Hon. Mr. Angers gave for resigning from that government, nor what he said about the men who surrounded Sir Mackenzie Bowell, and the position they occupied in regard to this question when to the public they professed to be the friends of the Manitoba minority. But let me come immediately to the question of those pledges; and I will at once deal generally with all the pledges that were given—those pledges that have been used by hon. gentlemen opposite as the basis of their accusation that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House occupy the positions they now occupy by virtue of the false pretenses they put forward when they went before the electors of the province of Quebec. It will not be necessary for me to recapitulate any of the circumstances in which we were placed on the eve of the last general election. It will not be necessary for me to draw the attention of this House to the pastoral letter which was issued at that time by the Roman Catholic bishops of that province. These events are still too fresh in the minds of hon. gentlemen to necessitate a recapitulation of them at my hands. On the eve of the last general election a pastoral letter, signed by all the bishops of the province of Quebec, was issued and read in all the Roman Catholic pulpits of that province, in which pastoral letter was to be found this paragraph:

> Therefore, my dearly beloved brethren, all Catholics shall abstain from giving their assistance or their votes to candidates who shall not bind themselves formally and solemnly to vote in Parliament in favour of legislation restoring to the Catholic minority in Manitoba the school rights guaranteed to them by the judgment of the Privy Council.

Now, those who are familiar with the conditions existing in our province, those who know something of the workings of the Roman Catholic Church, to which I belong, those who know something of the influence which that church possesses in the province of Quebec, will readily realize what that pastoral letter meant. And let it now be understood that, so far as I am concerned, I do not in the least object to the interference of the Roman Catholic clergy in elections, but I do object to their interfering in mere party politics. I hold that there are times when they not only have the right to interfere, but should interfere; and I am far from taking the position that this case was not one in which they should interfere. Now, what took place? Candidates of the Liberal party having given the pledges to which reference has been made during the course of this debate, in accordance with the terms of this pastoral letter, what would hon. gentlemen expect would be the result? The result naturally to be expected would be an abstention on the part of the clergy from interference between the political parties. It would naturally be expected that the Liberal candidates who

gave those pledges would be placed on the same footing as their opponents, and that the two political parties would be allowed to fight out the issues then pending between them without the intervention of the clergy. Was such the case? No. The result was—and it is well known by those who invoke those pledges to-day, and who now taunt us with having given them—that those pledges were of no avail, but that—openly and in such a manner as amounted almost to intimidation—the cause of the other side was espoused, and these pledges were set at nought and dealt with by the other side as though they had never been given at all. After having given the pledges it is said the Liberals did not live up to them. The pledge amounted to a contract to which there were two parties, and neither party appears to have lived up to it, so far as I can gather.

I now proceed to discuss my own case—and my case, I admit, is one that hon. gentlemen opposite pronounce the most aggravated of the lot. It is the one that has engrossed, at all events, the largest share of public attention. I may tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I gave the pledge which was read in the House, that I signed it, and that I gave it voluntarily. I went of my own accord to my bishop, and gave the pledge to him, as a Roman Catholic, dealing with the head of his church in the diocese to which he belonged. I gave it to him, and I mean now to stand by it, let the consequences be what they may. I am speaking for myself alone, I am dealing with the pledge I gave, and I say that having given, having handed it over voluntarily to the bishop of the diocese to which I belong, from that day to this I have never been asked to account for that pledge which I gave, nor has my attention ever been drawn to the fact, up to the present time, that I have not fulfilled it, but the pledge was delivered over to the Tory party to be made use of for political purposes. Now, Sir, I attach some value to the position I occupy in this House, not because of my personal merit, but because of the favour and the friendship of my hon. leader (Mr. Laurier); but more value do I attach by far to the good opinion of hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House—on the other side as well as on this—and if I am called upon, as I should have been called upon before, to say why I did not fulfil my pledge, I will feel that I have forfeited the confidence and respect of hon. gentlemen on both sides if I do not leave this House the very moment I am called upon to do so by the religious authorities of my church. Now, the ex-Finance Minister represented me as having gone to my bishop and as having, as he described it, in the language which he knows so well how to use, gone down on my knees to my bishop, and as having humbly—in that very humble posture which I have no doubt would befit me very well indeed—taken the pen and at his dictation subscribed to this pledge which he handed me. Why did I do that, asked the hon. gentleman. To get into this House. That was the object. Had I not done that, said the ex-Finance Minister, had I not gone and crawled in this way towards my bishop, I would never have got here. Well, let me recapitulate—and you will pardon me, Mr. Speaker, if I make a personal allusion to myself at present—the circumstances under which I ran in the county of Quebec. The gentleman who had hitherto represented the county was Mr. Fremont, and he had voted for the Remedial Bill in the session of 1896. This gentleman again presented himself for that county. I gave my pledge, which could not have had more weight with the electorate than his vote. It could not have commended me to the electorate to any greater extent than did his vote commend him, especially as the result of his vote was that, in the contest which took place between us, four clergymen in my county openly canvassed against me, notwithstanding the pledge I had given. But what was the result? I defeated Mr. Fremont so badly that he came within half a dozen votes of losing his deposit. That is how I came into this House. That is the extent to which this pledge, of which so much has been made, enabled me to gain my election. But what I said then, and what I repeat now, with respect to that pledge, is this, that I am in favour of giving to the Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba all the rights to which they are fairly entitled under the constitution, as it was interpreted by their lordships of the Privy Council. Not only do I say that, but I say that, as a Roman Catholic, it is my duty to consider that secular and religious teaching should go hand in hand. I believe that we should have religious teaching in our schools, and where it is obtainable, I believe that the separate school system is the best. That is my conviction and my belief, independently altogether of the judgment of the Privy Council, and that is what I should seek to obtain for the Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba, so far as it is in my power to do so. I may be asked naturally if the legislation introduced by the Manitoba Government gives to the Roman Catholic minority that measure of justice to which they are entitled. So far as I am concerned, I must say that I believe that the Manitoba minority will not, under it, get all that they ought to get and all that they ought to contend for. I say that now, because I cannot come to any other conclusion, but I say, at the same time, that while they do not get what they ought to have and most certainly ought to contend for, it is utterly out of the question, under existing conditions, that in this House we should endeavour, by any means in our power, to give them more than they have at present. I said a moment ago that I was prepared to give to the Roman

Catholic minority what the judgment of the Privy Council said they were entitled to under the constitution. For what does that judgment say they were entitled to? Here it is, in the second last paragraph:

It is certainly not essential that the Statutes repealed by the Act of 1890 should be re-enacted or that the precise provisions of these Statutes should again be made law. The system of education embodied in the Acts of 1890 no doubt commends itself to, and adequately supplies the wants of, the great majority of the inhabitants of the province. All legitimate ground of complaint would be removed, if that system were supplemented by provisions which would remove the grievance upon which the appeal is founded, and were modified so far as might be necessary to give effect to these provisions.

Now, what is the grievance? In a preceding paragraph, the judgment of the Privy Council points out what it is, and the grievance, as pointed out by their lordships, is that the Manitoba minority were deprived of their separate schools.

The sole question to be determined is whether a right or privilege which the Roman Catholic minority previously enjoyed has been affected by the legislation of 1890. Their lordships are unable to see how this question can receive any but an affirmative answer. Contrast the position of the Roman Catholics prior and subsequent to the Acts from which they appeal. Before these passed into law there existed denominational schools, of which the control and management were in the hands of Roman Catholics, who could select the books to be used and determine the character of the religious teaching.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Hear, hear.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is what they say, but it is a phrase among many other phrases. Listen to this:

These schools received their proportionate share of the money contributed for school purposes out of the general taxation of the province, and the money raised for these purposes by local assessment was, so far as it fell upon Catholics, applied only towards the support of Catholic schools. What is the position of the Roman Catholic minority under the Acts of 1890? Schools of their own denomination, conducted according to their views, will receive no aid from the state.

That judgment means that in so far as separate schools were concerned, they disappeared by virtue of the law of 1890, which was a law passed by the Manitoba legislature within the scope of the authority of that legislature. And as a result of the passing of that law, the Manitoba minority were deprived of a portion of the public funds.

Mr. CASGRAIN. That is a grievance.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is one grievance. The second grievance is that they were obliged to contribute to the maintenance of public schools, to which they could not send their children. So these make purely and simply a financial grievance. That being the case, how could we remedy it here? Is it within our power to remedy it by any act of ours? How could we, in any manner, shape or form give them the rights that the judges of the Privy Council said they were deprived of.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Will the hon. gentleman allow me.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Certainly.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman how he interprets this part of the judgment, the remarks of the judges of the Privy Council:

Before these passed into law, there existed denominational schools, of which the control and management were in the hands of Roman Catholics, who could select the books to be used and determine the character of the religious teaching.

This power of control being removed, was not that a third grievance? Were there not three grievances of which the Manitoba minority complained?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It seems to me that the answer to this will suggest itself to the mind of every man who patiently reads the judgment. If the House will bear with me, I would like to point out again that they say that the laws of 1890 were within the scope of the legislature. These laws abolished separate schools in Manitoba. By the abolition of separate schools a grievance was created. In what respect? They say that the abolition of the separate schools and the creation of a new system entailed an obligation upon the Manitoba minority to pay for schools to which they could not send their children, and also deprived them of the benefit of a share in the public funds. That is all it means, it cannot be construed to mean anything else. If, then, the grievance is a financial one only, how are we going to remedy it here? Was there any attempt made to remedy it by the last Government under their Remedial Bill? No attempt was made whatever because they felt that they could not do it. Not only have we this admission tacitly or by implication that they could not interfere with the financial aspect of the case, but we have that statement made by the ex-Minister of Finance when discussing this question in Cornwall. On that occasion he said:

We are charged with not giving to the Manitoba minority their share of the public school fund. Why, we might as well be charged with not exercising control over the funds of the Czar of Russia.

Showing how absurd he considered the pretensions that we here could in any way deal with the finances of the province of Manitoba. These are the words he used. I have given them textually as they appeared in the Montreal "Gazette" at the time. When the ex-Finance Minister was in Toronto, having gone to support the candidature of Mr. Coatsworth, his atten-

tion was drawn to this Remedial Bill. He said: Read that Bill from beginning to end every line, every phrase, every word of it, and you will not find within the four corners of the Bill anything that gives any financial assistance to the Manitoba minority. Now, my contention is this: I would not ask the minority of Manitoba to take this settlement for a final settlement, but I would ask them to take it in the spirit in which it is given. At the same time, I would also ask them to look about them, look in the Manitoba legislature, to look in this House, and tell us where they can get any more than is now given to them. I said I would not ask them to accept this as a final settlement, but to accept it as an instalment in the spirit in which it is given. I would ask them to accept in the spirit in which Mr. Greenway spoke, when at Montreal he used these words:

> I repeat again—and I want you to make a note of it—that we propose to work out this system in a fair and generous spirit, and not to undertake the responsibility of closing up fifty or sixty schools, leaving the children of those schools in a state of ignorance. It is they who are assuming the responsibility.

Here is what I would say to the minority in Manitoba, Mr. Greenway said:

> If they can, from time to time, suggest any way by which we can meet your views to a further extent, we shall always be prepared to consider it.

I will also draw the attention to what Mr. Greenway said when the Bill was introduced in the legislature at Winnipeg:

> Manitoba had always offered, and were still ready, to deal with every question, well-founded complaint, in a spirit of conciliation and generosity. He showed that this had been the course of the government by reading from the records of the House and the replies of the provincial government to the Dominion Government.

Again he said, and this is an answer to the hon. gentleman for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain):

> He was willing that they should have a voice in the selection of text-books, &c., and he was ready to consider the representations of any denomination which would take advantage of the public schools, and to treat them all, not only liberally, but generously. He emphasized this because it would be the ambition of his life to have this matter settled to the satisfaction of all, so that those who would occupy the place of the present generation a few years hence, would all grow up together, respecting and admiring one another, entertaining the most liberal views, and all working together and helping one another to make the province of Manitoba the best country in the world.

Now that is the spirit in which this proposition is made to the minority in Manitoba. But, if they refuse to accept it in that spirit, let them look around for their friends and tell us where they find them, tell us where they find the men in Manitoba who are going to do more for them than Mr. Greenway has done. Even take this skeleton Bill, as it has been described in this House, this hybrid measure as it has been called by one who moved the six months' hoist to try and get rid of it, and see what is said of it by Mr. Roblin the leader of the Opposition and his friends. The "Nor-Wester," his organ, speaking of the people of Manitoba, said:

> If they choose to make the necessary preparation and exert the pressure they might on the members of the local legislature, there is little doubt that they could force the Greenway Government to maintain its original position on the school question, in spite of the appeals of Mr. Laurier. Are the Protestants and the provincial autonomists of Manitoba, however, sincere in their principles? That is just the question the Greenway Cabinet is delaying the second reading of the School Bill in order to debate. Should Mr. Greenway and his colleagues come to the conclusion that the feeling of the province in favour of maintaining the integrity of the school legislation of 1890 has evaporated, they would certainly be foolish, judged from the standpoint of political expediency, in refusing to help Mr. Laurier out of his difficulties by coming to such terms as would satisfy him and Quebec. The gravity of the present crisis is extreme; and it is no wonder that the local government is anxious for delay, in order to carefully calculate chances.

Speaking of the Orange protest the "Nor-Wester" says:

> This analysis is, in the main, a correct analysis. It confirms what the "Nor'-Wester" has frequently pointed out, that the "settlement" involves the utter relinquishment of the national and non-sectarian principle of our present school system. It destroys that principle as effectually as would the re-establishment of separate schools as they existed prior to 1890, which no one has even yet proposed to do.

Now, where are the Manitoba minority going to look for assistance? Where are they going to look for comfort? Is it to the men to whose views expression is given in the articles I have just read from the "Nor'-Wester"? Are these the men to whom they must look for comfort and assistance? Are they disposed to do for them what Mr. Greenway has promised to do—treat them in a spirit not only of fairness, but of generosity—listen to any appeal they may have to make, and deal with the Bill in such a way as to remedy their grievances, and eliminate from it all those things that Catholics conscientiously object to? But if they cannot get anything from the Manitoba legislature or the Manitoba Opposition, what could they get in this House? Will hon. gentlemen on either side of the House pretend that the Conservative party is prepared to do even as much as has been done by the Greenway Government in favour of the Manitoba minority? Why, Sir, we had last night a declaration from the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), which truly expresses the position that the Conservative party occupies at the present time on this question, and which I think truly represents

the position that they always occupied, notwithstanding the apparent position they took in favour of the minority on the eve of a general election. Last night the hon. member for Jacques Cartier said, during the course of his address :

A taunt has been thrown across the floor. We have been asked to propose an amendment to this Address. I can tell you what my personal feeling on that subject is. I am not disposed, for my own part, to push the controversy to that point. There are in this House a number of generous men, who, having no special or personal interest in the defence of the minority, have risked their political lives upon the defence of those rights, while many others have succumbed to that fight. I feel a delicacy about asking these gentlemen to make further sacrifices.

Sacrifices of principle to protect a minority, sacrifices of principle to enforce a judgment of the highest court in the realm, sacrifices of principle to preserve the rights guaranteed by the constitution to the Roman Catholic minority of which we have heard so much—he is not prepared to ask them to make any further sacrifices in that direction. He goes on to say :

I know what the public feeling is at this moment. I suppose that people are tired of this question. A number of the constituents of these gentlemen who have been friendly to the minority, are anxious to see this dropped.

Not only did the hon. member for Jacques Cartier use that language in this House last night, but in the month of December last, at a meeting held in the city of Montreal for the purpose of protesting against this Manitoba legislation, for the purpose of protesting against the sacrifice of the rights of the minority in Manitoba, what did that hon. gentleman say? Quoting from the "Gazette" of the 3rd December, I find :

Mr. Monk added, that, while the minority were entitled to their fullest support and assistance in any practical way, they must be careful by their action not in any way to jeopardize the future of the Conservative party, with which many great questions were bound up.

I think that is the Alpha and Omega of their position, and is an entirely correct statement of their policy on this issue. I think if we look at the course of that party on this question in the past, if we recapitulate the facts connected with this matter from the time the judgment of the Privy Council was rendered in January, 1895, until the Remedial Bill was introduced in this House in March, 1896, we will find that from beginning to end the intention was, not to come to the assistance of the Manitoba minority, not to enforce a judgment of the highest tribunal in the Empire, not to see that the constitution of the country was kept inviolate, but the intention was to perpetuate the reign of the Conservative party, and to arrange matters in such a way that the great interests bound up with the Conservative party would be protected until the elections were over. I say you will find that to have been the case all through the history of this unfortunate question ; and you will find that when the member for Jacques Cartier used these expressions that I read to you a few moments ago, he was simply saying aloud what all the members of the Conservative party feel within themselves, and probably he was the only one that had the courage of his convictions. Now, I think that in so far as the Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba are concerned, the best advice that can be given to them, under existing conditions, is this : Without sacrificing any principle, let them accept this instalment of justice, let them accept this instalment in the spirit in which it is offered to them, let them take advantage of the occasion to find out how this Bill will operate ; and if they find it works unfairly, if they find there are grievances still to be remedied, let them call upon Mr. Greenway to fulfil his pledge, knowing that to him they must look under existing conditions for assistance, and that they have nothing to expect from anybody else in Manitoba.

Mr. IVES. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question ? I understand from the Speech from the Throne that the question is settled, but from the hon. gentleman's remarks, I take it that it is not settled.

The SOLICTOR GENERAL. I cannot prevent my hon. friend from drawing his own conclusions from my remarks. He can draw such conclusions as he likes, and I have no doubt he is perfectly honest in the conclusions he draws. Now, Sir, there are two other things that have been mentioned in this debate to which I think I may make a passing reference. The leader of the Opposition, in the course of his speech on the Address, referred to the change of solicitors that took place in London. That is a matter which naturally concerns my department, and in connection with which, in view of the statement made by a gentleman occupying the position of leader of the Opposition, I ought to give a word or two of explanation. The firm of Bompas, Bischoff & Company had been for many years the agents of the Department of Justice in London. There is no question that the relations between the firm and the department had been satisfactory ; but I fail to see therein any reason which prevents us from making a change of solicitors if we choose to do so. I fail to see why gentlemen occupying that position should be assimilated to gentlemen occupying a position in the civil service. They were not dismissed as solicitors. Nobody can pretend for a moment that any one dismisses a solicitor, but he chooses a solicitor, and it seems to me that it was quite open to us to make a change in the choice if we thought fit to do so.

Mr. FOSTER. But does not my hon. friend think, when a change is made after the person has given satisfaction, that a reason ought to be given for the change ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, nothing of the sort. I have been retained many times by men who have gone next door afterwards to employ other solicitors, and have come back to me again. It has happened a dozen times.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Is there any similarity between that act and the act of a Government dispensing with a respectable firm of solicitors who had been in the service of Canada for forty years—under all Governments ? There is no comparison between that case and the case of a client seeking the services of a solicitor one day and going for another the next day. Why, Sir, their very familiarity with the business of Canada gives an importance to their services which those of no other firm could equal.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. On that point let me draw the attention of the leader of the Opposition to this fact. What difference is there between our changing the Government solicitors in London, and changing the firm who have occupied the position of Government solicitors here in Ottawa for so many years ? I may say, further, that this same firm of Bompas, Bischoff & Company were solicitors for the province of Ontario for many years. They were changed a few years ago, but I am not aware that any great calamity occurred to the province of Ontario in consequence. There is no reason in pretending that because we employed for a certain number of years a firm of solicitors in London, we were obliged to continue employing them to the end of time. My reason for alluding to this fact now is that reference was made to the gentlemen who are now employed as agents for the Government in London, and they were referred to as men of no experience.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not say that, I said, relatively. I said they did not occupy any such position as the firm of Bompas, Bischoff & Company occupy ; but I did not say that they were men of no experience.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Of course, the relative position occupied by solicitors must be a matter of opinion. I presume every gentleman who employs a solicitor is of the opinion that he is the best it is possible to obtain, that there is no better solicitor than the one to whom he applies. Now, I would draw the attention of the House to this fact, that Mr. Russell, who is employed as solicitor to the Government in England, has been employed by the Dominion of Canada before ; not only has he been employed by the Dominion of Canada, but by the Imperial Government, on a most serious and important occasion, in connection with the Behring Sea Arbitration in Paris.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman tell us the grounds for saying that Mr. Russell was employed by the Dominion of Canada on a previous occasion ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In justification of my statement, let me read this letter :

Ottawa, 30th October, 1893.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper having brought under the notice of the Governor General in Council the services rendered by you as solicitor to the British Agent appointed in connection with the Behring Sea Tribunal of Arbitration at Paris, His Excellency has been pleased to order that the thanks of the Government of Canada be conveyed to you for the same. His Excellency is advised that you performed important duties and with great satisfaction.

As a further proof of the sense of appreciation entertained by His Excellency and his Advisers of your efforts on the occasion referred to, His Excellency has thought proper to bring the same under the notice of Her Majesty's Government.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) L. A. CATELLIER,
Under-Secretary of State.

Charles Russell, Esq., Solicitor,
37 Norfolk St., Strand, London.

That is a letter written by the Under-Secretary of State to Mr. Charles Russell.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to say that Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper did not represent the Government of Canada but the Imperial Government as agent in the Behring Sea arbitration, and that the appointment of Mr. Charles Russell was one in a very junior and subordinate position.

An hon. MEMBER. As solicitor.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But the appointment of Mr. Charles Russell was made in connection with the position which his father, Sir Charles Russell, held, who was Attorney General of England and leading counsel in the Behring Sea arbitration.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have not the information at my hands which enables me to answer the hon. leader of the Opposition. So far as I am personally concerned, I am restricted to information I can get from official documents. Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a word on another subject, and that is the subject which has been styled the mission to Rome, or the mission as told by the emissary to Rome.

Mr. FOSTER. Tell us all you did there.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I could tell you a lot of interesting things ; but I may say this in all seriousness, that I went to Rome——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. And I came back, and after I came back somebody else came. But, Sir, speaking seriously——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I went to Rome, not on behalf of the Government of the Dominion of Canada, not in the interest of the Government of the Dominion of Canada. Perhaps I have said it too often already, and I hope my remarks will not be considered too much of a personal character, and that hon. gentlemen will not believe I am continually talking about myself; I went to Rome, as I have already stated, as a Roman Catholic to bring a grievance that I felt I had in common with other Roman Catholics, before the head of my church. I will say this, that it is to me, and I believe to many others, a source of comfort, a source of gratification, to feel that while we belong to a religious body in which there are over 240,000,000 of subjects, any one, however humble he may be, can go to Rome, and within two days after he reaches there, can go to the head of the church and tell him the grievance, and he will be listened to and heard. That is what I did, and that is what I boast of. I say that any man who belongs to a church that can accomplish such a thing as that has something to boast of. There are few people perhaps to realize what the Pope's influence is. Men talk about the British Empire, about Russia, Germany and France and imagine that he has spoken of all the power there is on earth when he speaks of the Queen of England or the Emperor of Russia or the Emperor of Germany. All that influence is nothing compared with the influence wielded by him who presides at the Vatican. If the House will bear with me, I will read one or two words written by Justin McCarthy, the historian, on this subject.

Mr. IVES. Any relation of Dalton?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am sure he would be proud to claim acquaintance and relationship with the historian, because it would be something to be proud of. Justin McCarthy says:

> The Pope is understood to have an influence and the right of intervention, so far as advice goes, in every country in the world. There is not a parish priest appointed in Ireland without the knowledge and authority of the Pope. There is not a Catholic bishop made in any country of the world, civilized or uncivilized, without his authority and approval. He nominates the men who are to risk their lives in preaching the Gospel in China, and the men who are, as missionaries, to brave the terrors of death in spreading the light of Christianity over countries still less civilized and far more barbarous than China. The Vatican is compelled to have its eye and its intellect and its heart fixed on every nook and corner in the world. There is no administrative system on earth which has anything like the same widespread and watchful and necessary superintendence. The network of the papal authority has a mesh wherever men are living. The Vatican is, in this sense, the centre of the earth.

Why did I go to Rome?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Give it up.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Here is the reason—not in my words, because I cannot find words to convey my ideas to the world:

> The state has nothing to fear, but everything to hope, from the existence of the Catholic Church in their midst. She has everything to hope and nothing to fear, not only as regards her independence and constitutional liberty, but as regards the liberty of political parties, as well, to none of which does the church or the Pope desire that Catholic interests should bind themselves. The church holds herself on a higher plane and looks only to the common good, to the reign of truth, justice and peace.

That is why I went to Rome.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, Canadians of all extractions, as remarked at the last sitting of this House, feel proud to join their congratulations to those of the Government on the memorable and historic occasion of the Diamond Jubilee of our Gracious Sovereign. The long reign of our Sovereign brings back to our minds a great many recollections. However, for those Canadians who descend from the founders of the country, from those men who colonized and explored Canada, the recollections evoked on this occasion by the reign of our Gracious Sovereign are quite different from the remembrances of those of our fellow-countrymen who have only lived here for a certain number of years. We, no doubt, remember with delight that it was under the reign of Victoria that our ancestors of French origin won in all their fulness the political, civil and religious liberties which we now enjoy. But we cannot but call to mind the price at which those liberties were bought. We cannot but remember that some of our ancestors laid down their lives and shed their blood for those civil, religious and constitutional liberties, which are now so dear to all Canadians. Eternal vigilance, Sir, is the price of those liberties, so highly valued by all men who love their country. Under the Act of Union of the Canadas, our political ancestors had to struggle most strenuously for obtaining that privilege which all citizens are entitled to in a free country, that of speaking their own language on the floor of Parliament and before the legal tribunals. Now, Sir, at the time when we were struggling for and claiming our rights, we, of French descent, met with a liberal aid from fellow-countrymen of different nationalities. At the time when our fathers were claiming that important privilege, a Baldwin rose to his feet in the legislative assembly and uttered a ringing statement which I would fain hear from the lips of the hon. the First Minister and his party friends. He said:

Should I believe for a single moment that the people of Upper Canada were disposed to deal unjustly by the people of Lower Canada, I would be ashamed to be their representative. So long as similar distinctions are kept up— * * * *

He referred to the French language and to the right of speaking it on the floor of Parliament and before the legal tribunals, a right which we were then denied.

——it is idle for the Government to come and tell us that they wish to see us united.

Would that my hon. friend, the First Minister, who represents in this House the French nationality, had displayed as much energy as that noble and generous Englishman did show, when he claimed and battled for the privilege which we were entitled to and who powerfully helped in the legislature our fellow-countrymen in obtaining that privilege. Thanks to the help volunteered by Baldwin, the French tongue is now one of the official languages of this country. Another privilege, which is correlative to the one I have just mentioned, is the right of teaching that language in our educational establishments. The same remark applies to the right of teaching children the religious tenets of their parents. The hon. Prime Minister, in the course of his remarks on the Speech from the Throne, the other day, tried to impress upon his fellow-countrymen in this House and in the country at large, that the concessions he had secured from the Manitoba Government were adequate and that nothing more could be expected under the circumstances. He boasted that with these concessions, the minority had secured rights equivalent to those which had been wrested from them by the Act of 1890. The hon. gentleman has, I think, given expression to views which I cannot endorse, on the importance of the concessions which he has obtained. What was the state of affairs which prevailed under the Manitoba Act passed in 1890? Section 6 of that Act reads as follows:—

Religious exercises in public schools shall be conducted according to the regulations of the advisory board. The time for such religious exercises shall be just before the closing hour in the afternoon. In case the parent or guardian of any pupil notifies the teacher that he does not wish such pupil to attend such religious exercises, then such pupil shall be dismissed before such religious exercises take place.

What more did you secure through the so-called settlement which you now boast of as restoring to the French Canadian and Catholic minority of Manitoba, the rights which they enjoyed prior to 1890? What more have you obtained than what existed formerly? You have obtained new formalities under which the school trustees may, in the future, grant those religious exercises on the petition of a certain number of heads of families in favour of their children who attend such schools; while formerly such exercises could be authorized without any formality whatsoever. How can the hon. gentleman boast that the new Act passed by the Manitoba legislature as amending the School Act of 1890, is an important concession made to the Manitoba minority? I hold, therefore, that the hon. gentleman has obtained no new concessions in favour of his fellow-countrymen; but that which he has secured from his friend Mr. Greenway merely amounts to new formalities without which no religious exercises can take place in the schools. I am of opinion, Sir, that under the concessions obtained by the hon. gentleman from his friend Mr. Greenway, the Manitoba minority are in a worse position than ever.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). (Translation.) In that case all they have to do is not to avail themselves of such concessions.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) Why so?

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) I have just stated why. Had the hon. gentleman well caught my meaning, he would have understood section 6 which I have just read and also the concessions secured by the present Government. The so-called concessions secured by the hon. gentleman absolutely amount to nothing for the Manitoba minority; and yet, the hon. Prime Minister, at the time of the general elections in June last, as well as his colleagues from the province of Quebec, had given solemn pledges to the people of that province in order to obtain their support. Now, I will show the hon. gentleman that I am not alone in putting that construction on his utterances and on his course of action and that pursued by his political friends during the electoral contest in June last. The hon. Solicitor General has also put a construction on the utterances of the hon. Prime Minister. Let us hear what my hon. friend, the leader of the House, said to his fellow-countrymen of the province of Quebec, at the time of the last electoral contest. When addressing this House in 1896, the hon. Prime Minister stated that Parliament had the right to interfere in favour of the Manitoba minority. He then stated that, should he fail in securing an amicable settlement from the Manitoba Government, and one that would be agreeable to the Catholic minority, he would have recourse to the means provided for by the constitution:

Should conciliation fail, I will have recourse to the means provided for by the constitution, and I will exercise them fully and in their entirety.

My hon. friend, the Prime Minister pledged himself before the electors of the province of Quebec to put through a Bill, in case of emergency. Such was the statement made by the hon. the Prime Minister before the electorate of the province of Quebec, when he wished to obtain their votes. In so far

as I could ascertain from the reports of the newspapers, the hon. gentleman did pledge himself to render justice to our compatriots, either in his addresses on the floor of this House or in those made before the electors in the province of Quebec. He said :

Should I be brought into power, as I doubt not I shall be, I will settle that question to the satisfaction of all the interested parties. But, after all, should conciliation fail, I will have recourse to the means provided for by the constitution, and I will exercise them fully and in all their entirety.

At another meeting, held in the county of Portneuf, on the 20th of May, 1896, the hon. Prime Minister spoke as follows :—

I repeat here the statement I have made elsewhere in the province of Ontario, that I want full justice to be meted out to my co-religionists in Manitoba.

Speaking at Lévis, on the following day, the hon. gentleman repeated that statement, as follows :—

It is I, in last resort, with the co-operation of Sir Oliver Mowat, who will mete out full justice to my co-religionists in Manitoba.

The hon. Solicitor General, therefore, did not put a wrong construction on the utterances of the hon. Prime Minister when he stated in the course of a lecture delivered in Toronto, that the hon. leader of the House had given his fellow-countrymen in Manitoba his distinct pledge, either in his addresses in this House or before public meetings, that he would deal justly by that minority, first by conciliatory means, if possible, but failing conciliation, that he would avail himself of the constitutional means, that is to say, that he would have a Bill passed by Parliament. Now, when I hear the hon. Prime Minister state on the floor of this House that he has settled that question, I cannot refrain from putting this question to him : What have you obtained ? What concessions did you secure in favour of the Manitoba minority ? Sir, I have just put on record before this House the pledges given by the hon. gentleman ; let me now refer to the law of 1890. Under a clause of the law passed by the Manitoba legislature in 1890, it is enacted that the school trustees may grant religious exercises in those schools, without any formality. Now, under that clause, the minority enjoyed far greater rights, in respect of those religious exercises than what they boast having obtained through that so-called school settlement. Are those religious exercises granted under that settlement, to take place during school hours ? No, Sir, those exercises must take place after school hours. Therefore, we have no separate schools, where religious teaching can be given. That religious teaching, given after school hours, could take place under the law of 1890, without the help of those amendments which the hon. gentleman and his colleagues have put at the disposal of the Manitoba minority. That minority, without asking Mr. Greenway's leave, could, under that law, have schools where half an hour of religious teaching could be given. Christian ministers had without any government intervention, the right of giving religious instruction outside of school hours. Now, I would ask the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. gentlemen opposite, whether the Manitoba Government would have dared preventing the Catholic priests or the Catholic teachers from giving religious instruction in the schools ? How can it be contended that concessions have been made or that the present Government has secured religious teaching for the children of our co-religionists when that teaching must take place, as enacted under the law of 1890, outside of school hours ? Sir, the Liberal party upon two occasions since confederation climbed into power through a conspiracy. In 1874, they came into power, thanks to a conspiracy known, at the time, under the name of the Pacific Scandal ; and now, my hon. friend was borne into power, thanks to the Manitoba school question conspiracy. He is now in power to the detriment of the most sacred rights and privileges of his compatriots, the Manitoba Catholic minority ; and in defiance of the pledges given by the hon. gentlemen opposite to the voters of the province of Quebec. But the hon. gentleman was not the only one who did pledge himself to fully restore the rights of the Manitoba minority. His followers have also taken similar engagements. The hon. Solicitor General, who has just taken his seat, has felt it incumbent upon himself to make his confession. The hon. gentleman felt his duty to confess that he had signed the paper in question. Further, the hon. gentleman has taken the engagement to resign his seat in this House, should he fail in obtaining separate schools for the Manitoba minority. But he had not courage enough to resign his seat. We were told by the hon. gentleman that so long as he was not called upon to leave this House, he would remain at his post. Several colleagues of the hon. gentleman occupy the same position he is in. They also subscribed to pledges, made promises to the electors to gain their votes, and yet they have neither courage nor fair-play enough to give up the seats which they have secured through those very same promises and pledges and to return before their constituents and tell them that they have falsified the promises given them. No, none of them will have the moral courage of so doing. They will wait till Parliament expires. But then, as in 1878, the day of reckoning will have come for the hon. gentlemen opposite, when they will be asked to account for their broken pledges. Sir, nobody more shamelessly break their pledges than Liberal candidates, and we have no better proof of that than in the statements just made on the floor of

the House by the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick). There are other papers which I will take the liberty to read to the House. I hold in my hand a very explicit statement made by one of the hon. gentlemen opposite, the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Turcot), who was a candidate at the last general elections. The statement reads as follows :—

In view of the decision of their Lordships of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, who have finally pronounced on the question of law and fact when declaring that the Catholic minority had well-founded grievances and were entitled to separate schools ; in view also of the mandement of the bishops of the province of Quebec, who make it incumbent upon Catholics to vote only in favour of candidates who formally pledge themselves to vote in favour of a Bill restoring to the Catholic minority their school rights and privileges, as recognized by the judgment of the Privy Council of England ; I, the undersigned, candidate for the present election, do hereby solemnly and publicly pledge myself to demand and support in Parliament and vote for a Remedial Bill restoring to the Manitoba minority their full rights. I do hereby take the further engagement to refrain from doing anything that might be calculated to render it impossible for the Government to introduce such a remedial Bill or to retard its passing.

GEORGE TURCOT,
Candidate.

Sainte Julie de Somerset, 9th June, 1896.

We also have the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Godbout) who made a similar promise and gave a similar pledge. I may further state in the main that every one of the candidates of the Liberal party in the province of Quebec verbally, if not in writing, pledged themselves, after the example of their leader, and gave just as explicit promises as the one I have just read to the House.

Mr. DESMARAIS. (Translation.) I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, but I challenge him to prove that I have given any such pledges to the electors of the riding of St. James of Montreal.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) I expected that the hon. gentleman would challenge my statement. All the hon. gentlemen who did not sign any such pledges will, no doubt, rise in their places and tell us that they did not take any similar engagement, but public rumour has apprised us of the pledges given by those hon. gentlemen to their constituents. Let the hon. gentleman who has just interrupted me allow me to tell him this : during the late electoral contest, I had the opportunity of addressing public meetings in twelve or fifteen counties in the district of Montreal, where I met Liberal candidates of the then Opposition, and I may state that on every occasion those gentlemen did take in my presence similar pledges to the one I have just mentioned.

Mr. TALBOT. (Translation.) How do you account for their having been returned to Parliament ?

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) They have been returned, thanks to those false promises. The hon. gentlemen who now support the hon. Prime Minister in this House, and his unjust policy towards our brethren in Manitoba, those hon. gentlemen, I say, have been returned under false pretenses, and through a conspiracy entered into by the Manitoba Liberals and the Liberal party at Ottawa. For 20 years, the Conservatives had been in power in Manitoba, and the minority, during that long lease of power, invariably met with a fair treatment at their hands. The Liberal party climbed into power in Manitoba, just as the hon. gentlemen opposite in this House, through deceitful promises, which they falsified as soon as they were in office. On the very day when the Liberal party came into office at Winnipeg, the rights of the minority were forthwith assailed. The hon. Prime Minister, who was then leader of the Opposition in this House, supported by his followers and chiefly by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), asked for justice through his organs the "Canadien" and the "Cultivateur." They besought the Conservative Government to redress the grievances of the minority. And meanwhile, the conspiracy plotted by the Liberals in Manitoba and the hon. gentlemen opposite was going on. Let me substantiate my statement. One fine morning, Mr. Jos. Martin, the framer of the school law which the Manitoba minority complains of, made up his mind to run for the House of Commons in a riding of the province of Manitoba. Now, on the very day he was returned for this House, the hon. Prime Minister of the day, the then leader of the Opposition, wired him his congratulations. Later on, that gentleman came down here and took his seat in this House, and by whom was he introduced ? By the hon. Prime Minister in person. Does the House require further evidence of the conspiracy entered into by the Liberal party in Manitoba and at Ottawa ? It is to be found in the fact that the hon. Premier has thought it fit to take into his Cabinet one of the members of the Manitoba government, and the very same gentleman who had refused to redress the grievances of the minority. Now, the hon. Prime Minister will come and tell us that there was no understanding between his Government and that of Manitoba, with a view to denying the minority their rights ! I say, Sir, that there is ample evidence that such an understanding existed between them. I say that such an understanding is implied in the fact that one of the Ministers of the Manitoba Government is now a Minister in the Ottawa Ministry. When the Conservative party was in power, the hon. Minister of Public Works could not

find words strong enough to characterize the dilatory policy of the Government in redressing the grievances of the minority. What the hon. gentleman then insisted upon, was not a compromise amounting to nothing, but he then urged, in the strongest terms, the Government of the day to restore to the minority all their rights. Here is what he wrote in his organ, "Le Canadien," in its issue of 11th November, 1892 :—

The federal executive is the first guardian of the constitution, and it is in that capacity that they had to interfere in the school question.

We have here the authority of the Minister of Public Works that the Government, at that time, was bound to interfere :

My firm belief is that there will easily be found in the House of Commons a sufficient number of gentlemen willing to mete out justice to the minority, maintain unimpaired the good faith of the Dominion and cause the country to feel confidence in the honourableness of the Government, no matter what party may be at the head of public affairs. We are called upon to say whether our institutions ought to be respected and whether the spirit of our constitution ought to be violated, in order to serve the purposes of ward politicians.

Thus wrote the hon. Minister of Public Works. Now, Sir, those articles of our constitution have been infringed upon ; but let me ask, for what purposes and which is the class of politicians whose purposes have been served through the infringement of the constitution ? The hon. Minister of Public Works also gave public expression to his contempt for Mr. Greenway. And it was in no uncertain tones that he gave the description of Mr. Greenway and his government. If the House will allow me, I will just read what the hon. gentleman said of the Hon. Mr. Greenway and of his government with whom he has come to terms :

Mr. Greenway is neither a Liberal nor a Tory. He is a "vulgar political bragger," who undoubtedly pleases the majority of the heterogeneous and ill-assimilated elements of population that have flocked to the North-west. On several former occasions he has challenged the authority of the Dominion Government ; and the one great mistake of Sir John A. Macdonald was "not to have brought him to his senses" when, on the Canadian Pacific Railway question, he so flatly and boldly challenged the central power. After all, that "demagogue" represents but a few thousand voters for whom the old provinces have made enormous sacrifices ; and forsooth, our institutions, or rather our public men must have sadly degenerated when they allow themselves to be frightened out of their wits by the threats of a worthless politician and of a few unscrupulous heelers devoid of patriotism.

Such is the pass to which the Government of the day is brought ! When the Minister of Public Works wrote that philippic against Mr. Greenway and his colleagues, no doubt it was his own course of action and that of his leader which he had in view and which he meant to stigmatize with such severity. And yet, the hon. Minister of Public Works was the tool which the Government made use of for that shameful transaction which led to the surrender of the rights of the minority. But, Sir, it would be an idle task to upbraid the hon. gentlemen from the province of Quebec who support the Government with having falsified the promises made to their constituents. Now that they have been returned to Parliament, they no longer care for their constituents. They no longer make any account of their pledges. Why, Sir, it is laughing at their own promises and engagements for the hon. gentlemen opposite to cheer as they have just done, I shall not say the arguments but the captious language of the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick). That hon. gentleman has not brought into the debate a single argument calculated to vindicate the course pursued by the Government and to show that they had secured the recognition of the rights of the Manitoba minority. The hon. gentleman would have the House believe that it was nothing but a money matter. The money matter is no doubt, quite important, but there are also other questions of equal moment, such as the control over the schools of the minority, the selection of the text-books and the choice of teachers who may be called upon to teach in those schools. Sir, the present policy of the Government, when contrasted with the policy propounded by them before the electorate of this country, is quite different in its bearings. The last time I came up to Ottawa, I saw that fine structure which they call the western block, with its elegant roofing, loop-holed towers and all its architectural decorations. Upon my return to the capital for the session, that fine structure had been ruined by fire, its fine roof was no longer to be seen and the chimneys which stood denuded of their ornaments, the calcined walls told us the tale of the havoc and ravages done by the fire. That dismal sight vividly brought to my mind the fact that similar ravages and destruction had taken place in the political order, and that the same difference existed between the policy of the Liberal party propounded to the people during the electoral contest and the policy which they are now pursuing. The former policy stands to-day, like the building ruined by the fire, denuded of all its ornaments, it is completely demolished and there is nothing left but——

Mr. TALBOT. (Translation.) But the groundwork.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Yes, and that groundwork is the possession of power. Everything has been sacrificed. All the pledges given by the hon. gentleman have been forgotten, or if not forgotten, they have been ignored, and the hon. gentlemen have made up their minds to take no ac-

count of those pledges, either with regard to the school question or any other issue.

The hon. Prime Minister and his friends, when occupying seats on this side of the House, were shocked when told that contracts for public works were to be let. On such occasions, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) managed to work himself into a state of indescribable frenzy. And I could not help expressing my astonishment, the other day, at seeing him in such a good frame of mind, in view of the fact that his trip to Washington, with the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) had not been a pronounced success, if any reliance is to be put in the despatches printed in the newspapers, which are seemingly correct, as they have not been denied by the Government organ. The hon. gentlemen opposite, at the time when the Conservatives were in power, felt indignant whenever they heard of great public works about to be carried out. Shortly before the last electoral campaign, the hon. Prime Minister himself made a tour through the North-west, and the breeze of the prairies wafted the echoes of the utterances of the hon. Premier and of the gentlemen who accompanied him, and those echoes did not in the least disturb the temper of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce or of the followers of the Prime Minister. At Medicine Hat, my hon. friend, the First Minister, held out this bait to the electors of that locality. He said :

I am neither a Puritan nor a saint, I am but a man, and I have no hesitation in saying that you need public works in the North-west.

Mr. Gibson, a political friend of the hon. Prime Minister, added :

You need many things in the North-west. Your riding has not all what it should have. You need a bridge.

At Vancouver, Mr. Gibson, addressing the political friends of the hon. Prime Minister, cried out :

The Liberal party is just as much in favour of legitimate public works as were the Conservative party.

The hon. gentleman wished to allay the fears of the voters of that locality, who seemed inclined to think that the Conservative Government alone could secure for them the improvements which they needed. And the hon. gentleman exclaimed :

The Liberal party is just as much in favour of legitimate public works as the Conservative party. Any one who travels between Vancouver and Victoria may see where money could be expended to improve the approaches of the magnificent harbour of the city which serves as terminus to the Canadian Pacific Railway.

The hon. Prime Minister immediately added :

I share the opinion of my hon. friend, Mr. Gibson, that there is yet perhaps something to be done for this city. It might perhaps be proper to encourage and assist the energy of the people ; and perhaps the harbour of Vancouver could be improved with the help of the Government. I can only repeat what Mr. Gibson stated, that it will be a duty, that it will be a pleasure for the Liberal Government at Ottawa, when we come into power, to encourage all the public works undertaken for the credit and the benefit of the Canadian people, and it would certainly be in the interest of Vancouver, and of Canada at large, if the harbour of this fine city were made as easy of access as possible.

At New Westminster, my hon. friend the Prime Minister made this statement :

Extensive works are required in the River Fraser.

My hon. friend the First Minister was not shocked, when such promises were made by the hon. gentlemen opposite. Those promises were made to the electors, because they were made with the intention of galvanizing the reputation of the Liberal party, noted for their stinginess. But those promises have not been redeemed, just as the pledges made to the French Canadians, in connection with the rights of the Manitoba minority. My hon. friend, the Premier and the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), have falsified the pledges taken on that occasion as those taken under other circumstances.

As to the fiscal policy of the hon. Prime Minister, I will wait, as my colleagues, until it is introduced into the House, before expressing my opinion about it. I do not know what that policy will be. Nobody can venture to guess it. As all the hon. members know, the Liberal party and their leader have shifted their policy on fiscal matters, so as to make it utterly impossible for anybody to speak of it with any degree of certitude. It is a task of no mean difficulty to follow the various and contradictory statements made by the Prime Minister and his followers, since they have been on the Treasury benches, and more particularly previous to their coming into power. In 1890, the leader of the Liberal party was an avowed protectionist, and thus expressed himself on the floor of this House :

I have read the history of unrestricted reciprocity in this way, that each reform has cost the reformists years of labour, and those years of labour I, for my part, am quite willing to sacrifice them ; and although the Democrats might be defeated in the United States, and although Canadians might lose courage and despair of Canada, the Liberal party, so long as I shall be one of their members, shall stand by that cause, until they have won the victory. I do not expect to succeed in a single day, but I am disposed to remain in the cold shades of the Opposition until that cause has triumphed, and never will you hear a complaint in my mouth.

The hon. gentleman was at the time an out and out protectionist, and was in favour of adopting the American tariff. The hon. Prime Minister and his followers were, at that time, advocating continental protection.

They did not circumscribe their ambition to the limits of the territory of their own country; they meant to extend protection to the great American continent:

I tell you that the Liberal party will never cease agitating so long as they have not won the day, and secured continental free trade. We are asked what the policy of the Liberal party is? The policy of the Liberal party is the conquest of continental free trade. Success will surely crown our efforts at short notice; and boldly fixing our eyes upon that goal, we will go on without flinching until we have reached unrestricted continental reciprocity.

At St. Thomas, Ontario, he exclaimed:

We will not allow a single trace of protection to remain: every vestige of protection must disappear from the Canadian soil.

The hon. Prime Minister later on altered his views, and on the 12th February, 1891, he wrote to the newspapers a letter setting forth the policy of his party. I gather from it the following sentence:

The reform suggested is absolute reciprocal freedom of trade between Canada and the United States.

On the 17th November, 1891, in the course of an address delivered before a large meeting at Boston, he spoke as follows:

If you are willing to throw open to us your markets, we are quite willing to open our own markets to your own products, whether natural or manufactured. We are quite willing, when a new treaty is negotiated between the two peoples, that it should apply not only to one class, but to all classes of articles, whether natural or manufactured.

The hon. First Minister and his friends had once more changed their minds as to the best fiscal system to be applied to our country. The hon. Premier and his friends had again changed their minds on the fiscal policy that would best suit the country. The hon. Prime Minister has again changed his views on reciprocity. Protection has always been with him the enemy, and it is likely enough, after all, that his Government will have to adopt it.

The PRIME MINISTER. (Translation.) Are you not afraid of it?

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) I am afraid that, after all, the Government will be obliged to adopt it. I have nothing to fear for myself; but I fear the Prime Minister should lose his reputation, which is already materially impaired by his attitude towards his fellow-countrymen of the province of Manitoba. Here is what he said concerning protection:

Protection is a fraud; what we want is the English policy, that policy which has made England the greatest nation on the face of the globe. Free trade as it exists in Great Britain, such is the policy for which the Liberal party will fight in the future.

As will be seen, the hon. Premier wanted at any cost free trade as they have it in England. But he is very fickle in his policy; and his political views have not taken root very deeply into his brain. Shortly afterwards, he again altered his views; he no longer advocated free trade as they have it in England, but that kind of free trade which had been adopted in 1893 by the Liberal convention at Ottawa, and in favour of which, when addressing an audience in Montreal, in January, 1895, he made the following declaration:—

We aim at destroying protection; any compromise is out of question. We stand to-day before you as the adversaries of protection; that system which has been the bane and curse of Canada. The policy of the Liberal party is free trade on broad lines such as exist in England. The Conservative party believe in protection. All their hope is in protection. The Liberal party believe in free trade on broad lines such as exist in Great Britain.

Now, Sir, once the hon. gentleman got into power, he gave up all the theories which were so dear to him, when leader of the Opposition. He has abjured continental protection. He has renounced unrestricted and absolute reciprocity. He has given up free trade, as it exists in Great Britain. Such was the last policy of the hon. gentleman. I may here draw the attention of the House to the fact that the nearer the hon. gentleman approached the Treasury benches, the more he thought of the importance of creating a revenue rather than framing a tariff calculated to foster trade and commerce. A revenue policy: such was the nightmare that so long haunted their dreams. The last fiscal policy of the Prime Minister was thus defined by him in 1895, at Sohmer Park, Montreal:

We will begin by amending the tariff with a view of collecting revenue; we will try to reduce taxation to a minimum. The system now in force is a maximum of taxation, not only on the consumer, but on the manufacturer. Protection is a fine thing, but only for a few monopolists. It thwarts the development of all our great national industries. Now, I was asked what I intend doing. I just told you where we stood, and what course we mean to pursue. We will have a revenue tariff and make a clean sweep of all the duties imposed upon raw material.

Therefore, the hon. Prime Minister and his party have given up all their fads, in order to revert, now that he is in power, to a revenue tariff, which will give his Government the means of meeting the demands of his friends, which have developed to such a degree during the 18 years spent in Opposition. Such is, no doubt, the reason why in the Speech from the Throne, the Prime Minister mentions, among other things, the extension of the Intercolonial Railway from Lévis to Montreal, and the purchase by the Government of various railways. Had this occurred under a Conservative Government, what an onslaught should we not have witnessed from the hon. Minister of Trade

and Commerce, as also from the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), whom I now see sitting near the Prime Minister, and from a number of their friends! Methinks I now hear them thundering forth against the bribery and the corruption such a transaction would give rise to. Methinks I hear the hon. gentlemen speak, with the authority which they unquestionably enjoy on such matters, of the boodle which such a transaction might give the Ministers and their friends a chance of making. Now, the hon. First Minister is going to adopt the very methods which he and his friends so strongly denounced, at the time when they were in Opposition. The hon. Premier and his friends, if they wish to pursue any policy worth the name, will now have to adopt the policy carried out and developed by the late Government, and by the Ministers who preceded them on the Treasury benches. Now, that is a pretty bitter pill for the Liberal party to swallow. Just fancy the hon. gentlemen opposite, now that they are in power, being forced to adopt the platform which they so vigorously denounced for 18 years, and which they qualified as a policy that was the bane and the curse of this country. Such is the programme that the hon. gentleman and his colleagues are now going to apply to the trade and industries of our country. As to the railway policy and the public works which they so bitterly, nay more, so unjustly censured, that is the very policy which our Ministers are going to copy and pursue. The fact is that there is nothing original in the policy of the Liberal party. Should the Liberal party carry out a progressive policy, it could only be a policy which they will have borrowed from their opponents, the several Conservative Governments which have successively been in office. Now, Sir, I have just shown that the hon. gentleman and his friends, since their accession to power, have not been up to the standard of dignity which they exacted from their opponents when the latter sat on the Treasury benches. I have pointed out that their very first action was one calculated to impair, to disparage the good name of the Canadian Government in the eyes of the Canadians themselves and of the whole civilized world. What did the Government do? Contrary to their formal pledges, they have surrendered to the small Manitoba Government; a most shameful capitulation shall I call it, an appellation which best characterizes the conduct of the leader of the Government and of his supporters from our province. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman told the House that he had secured some concessions from the Manitoba Government in favour of our fellow-countrymen of that province; that he had secured an improvement in the teaching given in the North-west schools. Well, I deny that statement. I have here the statement of the Attorney General of Manitoba (Mr. Cameron), with regard to the clause concerning the teaching of the French language. Here is the statement made by that gentleman before the Manitoba legislature concerning the Bill and that section of it which relates to the teaching of the French language. The Act of 1890 contained provisions relating to religious exercises. The following statement refers to the teaching of the French language:

> Section 10 provides that wherever there are in a school ten children speaking the French language, or any other language other than the English language, as their mother tongue, such children shall be taught in French or in any other language, and at the same time in English, according to the bi-lingual method. It is absolutely necessary that in the French, German and Mennonite localities the children should be taught the English language according to the best methods, and it is a matter of experience that there is no better system than the bi-lingual system.

Therefore, we have here the statement of Mr. Cameron that under clause 10 the teaching of the French language is authorized; but with a view to denationalizing more rapidly our French Canadian fellow-countrymen in Manitoba. That is what is implied in the explanations given by the Attorney General of Manitoba; and that gentleman further stated that the transaction made with the Dominion Government—

> Is a victory for the Manitoba Government and legislature.

Now, Sir, what attitude did the Government take towards that of the United States? The hon. First Minister allowed two of his colleagues to go to Washington, and the American press brought us the faint echoes of the humiliations which those gentlemen have brought on the Canadian Government in the course of the proposals made to the authorities of the United States, in view of securing American trade. These hon. gentlemen, both in their dealings with the American Government and with the Manitoba Government have, in my opinion, pursued a despicable, and abject course of action, unworthy of a government. Their line of conduct in dealing with the Manitoba Government was mean and despicable, because they sacrificed everything; equally vile and despicable were their dealings with the American Government to whom they offered our Canadian trade, our home market. Those hon. gentlemen came back, not only without having received any favourable answer from the American Government, but even without the latter having vouchsafed any reply to their demands. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce who is so proud, so

overbearing, came back to Canada, and the newspapers since tried to pass things over in silence his visit to Washington. His visit to the neighbouring republic, his action with the American authorities was a false step, a blow struck at the good name of Canada.

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

After Recess.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are very demonstrative when one of them happens to make a good argument in their estimation, but when it comes to defend the programme which they have placed before Parliament they are very silent indeed, and so it happens that I am obliged to follow an hon. gentleman on my own side of the House. Most hon. gentlemen who have addressed the House have devoted themselves entirely to a discussion of the so-called settlement of the Manitoba school question, which in some quarters is claimed to be final, and which if I can judge by the anxiety and eagerness to discuss the question, is considered by some as not settled at all. Most of the other subjects in the Address have been left aside and forgotten in order that hon. members might devote themselves to this particular question. I may be pardoned if I also shall devote some time to the Manitoba school question, as I am probably the most interested member in this House on that matter. I shall, however, take up the subject in due course. The Address asks us in the first place, to join with His Excellency in congratulating Her Majesty on the celebrated occasion of the sixtieth anniversary of her reign. Other members of the House have joined in this expression of loyalty, and I coming from the west, can say that our people there rejoice with those in the east on this memorable occasion, and as loyal and devoted subjects of Her Gracious Majesty, we are glad to see that her reign has been so prolonged and so glorious. Now with regard to the tariff. During my leisure hours yesterday I was reading a speech made at Ingersoll by the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), and it occurred to me very forcibly, that there was a vast difference between the tariff programme announced in his Ingersoll speech and the tariff programme of his Government as foreshadowed in the Speech from the Throne. I know that certain politicians are often good acrobats and that they can jump from one opinion to another without the appearance of a change of movement, but I am afraid that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) will have to perform several acrobatic feats before he can land on the tariff platform of his Ingersoll speech. We are also told in the Speech from the Throne that we are to have a new Franchise Act, and in fact a Bill to that effect is now before the House. The new system is to consist in discarding the present Dominion voters' lists and adopting the local lists for elections to this House. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the objections urged against our present voters' lists amount to anything, these objections apply even more strongly to the electoral lists of the province of Manitoba. We are to have a different franchise for each of the provinces, because there are hardly two provinces in the Dominion of Canada which have the same franchise for elections to their legislatures. It will therefore occur, that members returned to this House in future will sit here under a different franchise, and that there will be no uniformity in the representation. That I say is wrong. There may be good grounds for making some alterations in our present system, but above all the government should try and frame an Act which would be the same throughout all the provinces of the Dominion. I may be told that the present Act does not carry out that principle, but so far as it fails in giving uniformity, our present franchise is wrong, because I believe that each member coming into this House should have the same influence and the same status before the electorate as his brother member. As to the enlargement of the canals, I approve of that, and I hope to see the day when we shall have our canal system, not only throughout the eastern provinces, but that it shall be extended so as to connect the western provinces with Lake Superior. This I know to be a very large scheme, but it is a scheme which has already attracted the attention of the people in the Canadian west, as well as the attention of the people in the western states of America. The people of Minnesota and Dakota are taking a deeper interest in the opening of a waterway through Lake Superior, down to the sea, via the St. Lawrence route. I trust that the Government will study this matter, and that in the near future the people in the west shall reap the same advantage from the enormous expenditure on our canal system as do the people of the east. Now as to the Intercolonial Railway extension, this is a local affair, but it strikes me that in that portion of the province of Quebec with the Canadian Pacific Railway on the north shore of the St. Lawrence, and the Grand Trunk Railway on the south shore, I do not see why another railway line should be built at the expense of the country generally. At any rate, I reserve my privilege of supporting or opposing any measure on this question when it is put before the House.

The cold storage system I consider as important a subject as that of the enlargement

of the canals. We must do everything possible to improve the facilities for sending our produce to the European markets ; and I hope that in connection with the cold storage proposition the Government will study the question of meat-packing in this country, so that an extensive trade of this kind may be established. We are great cattle raisers in the west, and I believe this is one of the questions that should engage the attention of the present Minister of Agriculture in connection with cold storage.

We are informed that a plebiscite will be taken on the question of prohibition. Well, Sir, I believe that before asking this country to express any views on that question, it would be proper for the Government to state what they will do should the vote carry in favour of prohibition. We have had a vote on this question in the province of Manitoba. There was one also, I believe, taken in the province of Ontario. In Manitoba the vote was taken at some expense, and the whole result was that the figures were published and the papers in connection with the vote were pigeon-holed, and that is the last we have heard of the matter. I am afraid that this promise of a plebiscite on prohibition will have the same end. The vote will be taken, and whichever way it goes, that will be the end of the matter. If we were told what the Government would be prepared to do on that question, the necessity and expense of taking the vote might be avoided.

There are two other items in this programme. One is that relating to the Behring Sea claims. We should be glad if that question were settled, as it has already occupied a very long time. We all regret to have heard of the plague in India ; and while we should be sorry to learn of the sufferings of our fellow-British subjects in that country, at the same time I think we can congratulate ourselves upon the generosity of the Canadian people in coming to the assistance of their brethren there.

Now, I have exhausted the programme which has been put before us in the Speech delivered by His Excellency at the opening of the session, having left over the school question, which I intend to deal with as briefly as possible. I am exceedingly sorry that, for the sake of a defence of his having approved of such a settlement, my friend the Solicitor General should have thought it proper to have given quotations—garbled quotations, I may say—of what took place in the Privy Council when this question was being considered by the Lords of the Privy Council. We find that the judgment contains the following :—

> The sole question to be determined is, whether a right or privilege which the Roman Catholic minority previously enjoyed, has been affected by the legislation of 1890. Their lordships are unable to see how this question can receive any but an affirmative answer. Contrast the position of the Roman Catholics prior and subsequent to the Acts from which they appeal. Before these passed into law, there existed the denominational schools, of which the control and management were in the hands of Roman Catholics who could select the books to be used and determine the character of the religious teaching. These schools received their proportionate share of the money contributed for these purposes by local assessment, was, so far as it fell upon Catholics, applied only towards the support of Catholic schools.

The last portion was quoted by my friend the Solicitor General ; but he very unfortunately—I will not say intentionally—left out the first part of this paragraph. It goes on :

> What is the position of the Roman Catholic minority under the Acts of 1890 ? Schools of their own denomination, conducted according to their views will receive no aid from the state. They must depend entirely for their support upon the contributions of the Roman Catholic community, while the tax out of which state aid is granted to the schools provided for by the statute, fall alike on Catholics and Protestants. Moreover, while the Catholic inhabitants remain liable to local assessment for schools which they regard as no more suitable for the education of Catholic children than if they were distinctly Protestant.

If to this I add the conclusion of the Order in Council passed by Her Majesty in Council, it will be seen that the contention of my friend the Solicitor General, as well as that of the Hon. Edward Blake, are in contradiction to the fact. The Imperial Order in Council begins as follows :—

> At the Court at Osborne House, Isle of Wight,
> The 2nd day of February, 1895.
>
> Present : The Queen's Most Excellent Majesty, Lord President, Marquess of Ripon, Lord Chamberlain. Lord Kensington, Mr. Cecil Rhodes.

After reciting the circumstances of the case, this order concludes as follows :—

> The Lords of the Council Committee, in obedience to Your Majesty's said general Order of reference, have taken the said humble appeal and petition and appeal into consideration, and, having heard counsel for the parties on both sides, their lordships do this day humbly agree to report to Your Majesty as to their opinion that the said questions, hereinbefore set forth, ought to be answered as follows :—
>
> (1). In answer to the first question : That the appeal referred to in the said memorial and petitions, and asserted thereby, is such an appeal as is admissible under subsection 2 of section 22 of "The Manitoba Act," 33 Vic. (1870), chap. 3, Canada.
>
> (2). In answer to the second question : That grounds are set forth in the petitions and memorials such as may be the subject of appeal under authority of the subsection of "The Manitoba Act" immediately above referred to.
>
> (3). In answer to the third question : That the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in the cases of Barrett vs. The City of Winnipeg, and Logan vs. The City of Winnipeg, does not dispose of, or conclude, the application for redress, based on the contention of the Roman Catholic minority, which accrued to them after the union under the statutes of the pro-

vince, have been interfered with by the statute of 1890 complained of in the said petitions and memorials.

(4). In answer to the fourth question: That subsection 3 of section 93 of "The British North America Act, 1867," does not apply to Manitoba.

(5). In answer to the fifth question: That the Governor General in Council has jurisdiction and the appeal is well founded, but that the particular course to be pursued must be determined by the authorities to whom it has been committed by the statute; that the general character of the steps to be taken is sufficiently defined by subsection 3 of section 22 of "The Manitoba Act" of 1870.

(6). In answer to the sixth question: That the Acts of Manitoba relating to education, passed prior to the session of 1890, did confer on the minority a right or privilege in relation to education within the meaning of subsection 2 of section 22 of "The Manitoba Act," which alone applies; that the two Acts of 1890 complained of did affect a right or privilege of the minority in such a manner that an appeal will lie thereunder to the Governor General in Council.

And in case Your Majesty should be pleased to approve of this report, then their lordships do direct that the parties do bear their own costs of this appeal, and that the sum of £300 sterling so deposited by the appellants, as aforesaid, be repaid to them.

Her Majesty, having taken the said report into consideration, was pleased, by and with the advice of Her Privy Council, to approve thereof and to order, as it is hereby ordered, that the recommendations and directions therein contained be punctually observed, obeyed and carried into effect in each and every particular.

Whereof the Governor General of the Dominion of Canada for the time being, and all other persons whom it may concern, are to take notice and govern themselves accordingly.

C. L. PEEL.

There is no doubt in anybody's mind that the Privy Council in England decided that the Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba had a grievance, that that grievance consisted in the fact that the minority was deprived of a system of separate schools which it enjoyed prior to the Act of 1890, that the appeal was well founded, and that it was the duty of the Federal Government to provide a remedy in accord with the provisions of the constitution. What has been done? The Federal Government of the Dominion passed an Order in Council based upon the decision of the Privy Council of England, and transmitted it to the government of the province of Manitoba. That Order in Council contained the following clause:—

His Excellency the Governor General in Council was pleased to adjudge and declare, and it is hereby adjudged and declared, that, by the two Acts passed by the legislature of the province of Manitoba, on the 1st day of May, 1890, intituled respectively "An Act respecting the Department of Education" and "An Act respecting Public Schools," the rights and privileges of the Roman Catholic minority of the said province, in relation to education, prior to the 1st day of May, 1890, have been affected by depriving the Roman Catholic minority of the following rights and privileges, which, previous to and until the 1st day of May, 1890, such minority had, viz.:

(a) The right to build, maintain, equip, manage, conduct and support Roman Catholic schools in the manner provided for by the said statutes which were repealed by the two Acts of 1890 aforesaid.

(b) The right to share proportionately in any grant made out of the public funds for the purposes of education.

(c) The right of exception of such Roman Catholics as contribute to Roman Catholic schools from all payment or contribution to the support of any other schools.

And His Excellency the Governor General in Council was further pleased to declare and decide, and it is hereby declared, that it seems requisite that the system of education embodied in the two Acts of 1890 aforesaid shall be supplemented by a provincial Act, or Acts, which will restore to the Roman Catholic minority the said rights and privileges of which such minority has been deprived as aforesaid, and which will modify the said Acts of 1890, so far, and so far only, as may be necessary to give effect to the provisions restoring the rights and privileges in paragraphs (a), (b), (c), hereinbefore mentioned.

Whereof the Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Manitoba for the time being, and the legislature of the said province, and all persons whom it may concern, are to take notice and govern themselves accordingly.

This was the result of the appeal made by the Roman Catholic minority to the Governor General in Council. The members of the Government sat in that case as a court of appeal. Both the Manitoba Act and the British North America Act provide for such an appeal. They provide that in case of an appeal being made to the Governor General in Council, that appeal shall be heard, and upon the grievance being ascertained and a decision taken by the Governor General in Council, then the Parliament of Canada shall be empowered to pass remedial legislation if the local legislature should fail to do so. In this case, what is the position to-day? This Order in Council is still in force. I may say more, that as it is a judgment of the Governor in Council it is still in existence and cannot be repealed, and in making the so-called settlement, which was made some time ago between the Federal Government and the local government, I agree with the hon. member for Cape Breton (Sir Charles Tupper) when he says that the conduct of the Government was unconstitutional. The Government of the day has no power to disregard the decision of His Excellency the Governor General in Council on this matter of the school question. The Manitoba legislature is well within its powers in dealing in any way with that question. But, so long as that Order in Council of March, 1896, has not been complied with by the Manitoba legislature the question is not and cannot be settled. That order, I repeat, is still in existence and there is no power to recall or repeal it. Therefore, the Government have not carried out the decision of the Privy Council, and whatever may have been done with regard to the so-called settle-

ment of the school question is altogether unconstitutional and cannot have any legal effect. Now, Sir, we have heard a good deal about certain promises that were made at the time of the general election. But I am not going into these matters. They affect more the province of Quebec. Though I take some interest in what takes place there, at the same time I leave those who have made promises to deal with the parties they have deceived or to whom they have made promises. With regard to the Solicitor General's explanation of his position, that is a matter between him and his archbishop, and I will leave him to deal with his case with his archbishop. But when we were discussing the Remedial Bill, the session before last, we heard expressions of opinion on the school question by members of this House who, at that time, were not sitting on the same side of the House as that which they occupy to-day. The hon. leader of the Government himself spoke on that occasion, and he spoke more in defence of the local authorities who were the cause of the troubles we were complaining of. He said :

Now, I ask Parliament this question : Are we, upon the complaint of the minority, unsupported by evidence, without having made any investigation—are we to be told that the laws of the majority are to be set aside ? Sir, if you tell me this, then I will say that it was a mere mockery to give to the province of Manitoba the right to legislate upon this question.

This suggestion that the hon. the leader of the Government at that time proposed, he repeated all through the campaign—that he would make an investigation and when it was closed the school question would be settled, and settled to the satisfaction, not only of the majority but also of the minority and of all concerned. The investigation never was made, but a so-called settlement was arrived at between the two Governments without ever consulting the minority which was the party most interested in the affair. And now we are told that, because the Federal Government and the local government of Manitoba representing the majority are satisfied with the compromise, the minority must be satisfied as well. On this Remedial Bill which we discussed so long during this apparently never-ending session that we had, other members also spoke. The following is an extract from the speech of the hon. member for Maskinongé (Mr. Legris :—

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the principle of separate schools has been recognized and proclaimed by the highest tribunal of the Empire, and nobody can deny this principle, which is binding to all.

I would like to ask the hon. member if, by the settlement which has been arrived at by the Government, the principle of separate schools which he seems to cherish so much has been recognized and proclaimed, and whether he is going to support this so-called settlement as against his own opinion. The hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) delivered a very long and interesting speech on that occasion, which I approved of in every way. I am in hopes that the hon. gentleman has not altered his opinion, and that he still adheres to the principle enunciated in that speech of his. He said :

I am one of those who believe conscientiously in denominational schools for Catholics and for Protestants as well, for Manitoba Catholics as well for Quebec Protestants. I believe in the inalienable right of the head of a family to decide in which school his children are to be educated, in which religion they will be brought up, and I look upon as an intolerable usurpation any attempt at infringing that right.

The same gentleman said :

After having twice run the gauntlet of the judicial tribunals, the Catholics now come before this House with a judgment of the Privy Council to the effect that their most sacred rights have been infringed upon. They come before this House asking that their schools be restored to them, that the imprescriptable rights of their conscience be respected, and that a stop be put to tyranny, under the unbearable weight of which they have too long suffered. Are we to turn a deaf ear to their prayer ? Shall we tell them, by so many words, by our votes, that might is right, and that there are no longer rights which the majority are bound to respect ? Are we, then, to shrink from the most important, the most imperative, the most honourable duty which is incumbent upon this Parliament, that of extending our protection to the minority in the enjoyment of their rights ? As for me, Sir, I say I cannot do so. Therefore, I will vote for the second reading of the Bill (the Remedial Bill), on this ground : first, that it lays down, as a principle, the restoration of separate schools in favour of the Manitoba minority. In the second place, I vote for this Bill on the further ground that it practically sanctions the principle of federal interference, with a view to the protection of the constitutional rights of the minorities. It is high time that we should loudly proclaim that principle, because we do not know when other minorities will come before this House and claim the redress of grievances similar to those of the Manitoba minority.

The hon. member concludes his remarks as follows :—

To my mind, it is beyond a doubt that, whatever favours or concessions the Manitoba Government may be disposed to grant to the Catholics in the administration of public schools, they will never agree to the restoration of denominational schools. In consequence, I have reached the irrefragable conclusion that the only remedy calculated to restore to our compatriots their schools, is a federal statute.

Well, Sir, this is the opinion expressed by an important member of this House who showed a real independence when we were considering the Remedial Bill, and I hope that hon. member still adheres to his principles and will not approve of the so-called settlement which has been made between this Government and that of the province of Manitoba. Now, not to keep the House too long, I shall come to this debate. In opening the discussion on this Address, the

hon. Premier, following the mover and the seconder, spoke as follows of this school question :—

We went to the Government of Manitoba and said to them : The legislation of 1890 has inflicted a grievance upon the minority of Manitoba. You have the authority of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council that such is the case. Repair the grievances yourselves.

Well, Sir, I am sorry that the Government has not thought proper to lay before the House all the documents in connection with that question before we were called upon to discuss it. It would have been fair that this House should be apprised of the proposals that this Government made to the Government of Manitoba, what privileges, what concessions were asked for, and what were refused. We are told here that representations were made, and that the local government was asked to repair the grievance. Well, was that in the shape of an Order in Council, or was it in the shape of a memorial ? We ought to have a copy of the correspondence that was exchanged on that occasion, so that we could judge for ourselves whether the Federal Government has done their utmost to secure the best possible settlement of this matter. The hon. Premier goes on to say :

Sir, they undertook themselves to repair that grievance. We thought, and still think—and upon that issue I am ready at any time to take the verdict of the country—that the smallest measure of conciliation was far preferable to any measure of coercion.

"The smallest measure of conciliation"—I believe that the words are well chosen, because no smaller measure of conciliation could have been obtained than that which was obtained on this occasion. We have received no concessions at all, as has been well observed by my hon. friend from Bagot (Mr. Dupont). What is the result of the settlement that has been arrived at ? But before discussing that, I will go on and quote a few more words of the hon. Premier :

I care not whether we obtained a restoration of old rights or a concession of new rights ; the only thing I care for is that, whereas, under the Act of 1890, they had not the privilege of teaching their own religion in the schools, by the concessions which have been made, whether they are concessions of new rights or a restoration of old rights, they will have the right hereafter of teaching their own religion in the province of Manitoba.

And the hon. gentleman goes on :

Well, the moment I found that the people of Manitoba were ready to make concessions which practically restored to the Catholics the right of teaching the French language and of teaching their own religion in the schools,——

"The right of teaching the French language"—I deny that under the agreement that has been arrived at between the two Governments, we have acquired a right to teach our own language in the province of Manitoba. For this statement I have the letter of the law itself, and I have also the explanation made by the Attorney General of Manitoba when he introduced that Bill ; I have the speech of the Hon. Mr. Camerou, as reported by one of the local papers, and I have reasons to believe that the report was accurate. I shall follow some parts of that speech. It begins by the statement that the present settlement is a final settlement, notwithstanding the assertion of the hon. Solicitor General, who tells us that he would not ask the minority to accept it as a final settlement but to accept it in a spirit in which it is given. Well, Sir, the spirit in which it is given is the spirit that it is a final settlement, and here are the words of the Attorney General of Manitoba, speaking in the name of his Government on this question :

He expressed the hope that the second reading, or, at any rate, the third reading, of the Bill would prove to be the final stage of what had been a very vexed and at times a very burning question.

Well, Sir, somebody is deceived, whether it is the majority of Manitoba or the minority of Manitoba who is deceived by the Attorney General of that province ; or whether one side or the other of this House is deceived by some of the members of the Government when they say that this settlement is not final, and that the minority should not accept it as such. We should be in a position to know whether the statement of one Government or of the other Government is a true statement of the facts. After discussing the provisions of the Remedial Bill to which the Attorney General of Manitoba took exception, because it re-established separate schools in full force, notwithstanding the opinion of members of this House who have pretended that the Remedial Bill was not worth the ink with which it was printed, and that it was a worthless measure in the interests of the minority of Manitoba, the Attorney General of that province said :

That measure would have re-established separate schools for the minority, and he took exception to it. He took exception, also, to the proposals made by Messrs. Smith, Desjardins and Dickey, when they went to Manitoba and asked for certain concessions.

Concessions, Sir, that they asked for without the consent and without the approval of the minority, because we were never asked our opinion with regard to their mission, we never approved either the mission or the proposals that they made on that occasion. Mr. Cameron then boasts of the views that he and his colleague at the time, the present Minister of the Interior, took on that occasion, and he boasts that they resisted the request made by the delegates, Sir Donald Smith, Senator Desjardins and Mr. Dickey, in order to protect the present system of public schools in Manitoba. Then

he spoke of this settlement which has been arrived at by the province with the Federal Government, and said :

I regard the terms of the settlement arrived at as a distinct triumph on the part of the legislature and the government.

A triumph of what ? A triumph of the majority over the minority of the province of Manitoba, and second a triumph of the local government as against the federal authorities, as against the constitution, as against the laws of the country. The hon. gentleman regards that as a triumph ; and it is a triumph. The language of the Speech from the Throne alone is proof that it is a triumph, because the wording of that paragraph of the Address is enough to satisfy us that the Federal Government has capitulated to the local government of Manitoba ; and when the Attorney General of that province terms the victory he has achieved a triumph, I believe he is right, while I am sorry to admit it.

The wording of the Address which we are called upon to pass is as follows :—

After many and protracted discussions, a settlement was reached between the two governments, which was the best arrangement obtainable under the existing condition of this disturbing question.

Is not that an admission that this Government had to submit to the dictation of the local government of Manitoba ; is not that an admission that this Government, instead of taking the constitution in their hands, instead of affirming their authority, submitted to the dictation of the prosecutors of the minority in the province of Manitoba ? How can they come and claim that they arrived at a settlement within six months after obtaining power when this settlement is really no settlement, when there is no concession granted in favour of the minority ? I now come back to the remarks of the Attorney General in respect to the provisions of this Bill. The hon. Premier said in his speech on this question delivered at the opening of the session, that by the settlement he has secured the teaching of the French language in the schools of Manitoba. Let me read the explanations given by the Attorney General of the province, explanations which are, so to speak, a part of the law, because he is the man who will put the law into operation. He made this statement :

Section 10 provides that when the pupils in the school speak French, or any language other than English, as their native language, the teaching of such shall be in French or some other language than English on the bi-lingual system. It is absolutely necessary that in French, German and Mennonite settlements the pupils should learn English by the best methods.

The teaching shall be in French. The teaching of what ? The teaching of English. I now speak the English language. I learned it from a French professor, who could not himself speak a word of it ; but he taught me the English language in French, with a grammar written in French, and thus I learned the first principles of the English language in French. But I did not learn French when I was learning English. So all that has been obtained in Manitoba, where the French language has been officially abolished by the legislature, is that the teaching in the schools of English, in the public schools, shall be in French or any other language ; and yet hon. gentlemen opposite tell the people of the province of Quebec that they have established French schools in Manitoba, or that the French language will be taught in Manitoba schools. I do not object to the teaching of the English language in Manitoba or any place in Canada, but I do not want to be told at the same time that the children are being taught French, when such is not the case, I want both languages to be placed on the same footing, wherever the teaching of them may be required and may be necessary. Hon. gentlemen opposite say, in the first place, that they have secured religious teaching in the schools. Why, the Act of 1890 provided that, if the trustees chose to do so, the last half hour of the day should be devoted to the teaching of religion in the schools. I have here all the regulations regarding the schools, and I have also the programme of study as it existed before the last legislation, and which has not been at all altered. No French books are authorized in the schools, but as a sort of consolation we are told by the Attorney General that the use of the French language will be tolerated there, because the Mennonites will have the same privilege as ourselves. It is of course a great consolation to us, who were the first settlers in that country, to know that we are to be placed on the same footing as the Russian Mennonites who have been brought into Manitoba during recent years. So much for the French language in the public schools of Manitoba. The schools to-day, with the law as it was passed the other day, are the very same schools that existed before ; the programme of study is the same ; the religion will be taught just as it was taught before, namely, during the last half hour of the day. How the clergy of the different denominations are to arrange the matter I do not know, because it cannot be expected that clergymen, no matter to what denomination they may belong, if they have seven or eight schools in their districts can divide up their time so as to give half an hour every day to each of those schools. Then, if there are several denominations the time will have to be subdivided again, in order to satisfy the requirements of each. The system is unworkable and impracticable, and it puts the law in a worse position than it was before. It does not satisfy the

minority, and the minority will not accept and does not accept it. I may tell the House that within a few months the number of Catholic schools in the province of Manitoba has doubled, and now we have more schools than we had before. And, Sir, these schools are supported by our own money. We seek no favour from the Manitoba Government for those schools, while we are called upon to pay taxes for the public schools that we have no use for. But worse than that, our own school houses that are used for teaching our Catholic children are being taxed for the support of other schools which we do not use. That, Sir, is the settlement that we are called upon to accept. That is the settlement that is given to us as a redress of the grievances that we have been complaining of for the past six years. We have been told by the Premier that if the Conservatives were in power in this House we would not get any better measure of redress than this. Sir, even if that were the case, does it prevent the present Government from doing their duty and doing it in the most liberal and constitutional way. For my part, I do not approve of any opposition to justice no matter from what side of the House justice is denied. I am sorry that I am on the side of the House where there are some influences against the ideas which I myself profess, but if the hon. Premier had not at his back a larger number of that class of people, he would perhaps have been more just in dealing with this question. It was likely because he had behind him an influential opposition to his views of justice in this case, that he could not—I will not say that he would not—do better than he has done. That, however, does not justify the stand he has taken, and I regret to see that he now seeks to defend his position by stating that he has rendered justice to the minority of Manitoba.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Carried.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. If the hon. gentleman will speak as reasonably as I have done, I am prepared to resume my seat. Well, Sir, we are told that the settlement is satisfactory because it has met with the approval of some eastern constituencies. I dare say it has, but if the position was explained to these electors as it has been attempted to explain it to us here, these people were deceived into the belief that the settlement was acceptable. They were told by the members of the Liberal party that the Roman Catholic religion was established in the schools of Manitoba, and the Liberal press in the province of Quebec went further than that, and announce that the Government has re-established French schools in Manitoba. If the people in the constituencies in which elections have recently occurred have been deceived with such statements as those, it is not to be wondered at that they returned Liberal members to this House. But, Sir, when an election was held in that constituency where the question is of the most burning interest, where the people know the circumstances, and where they feel the persecution that the Catholic minority in Manitoba suffer; when it came to an election in the most central part of the province of Manitoba, in the parishes of St. Boniface, St. Norbert, St. Adolphe and Ste. Agathe, which are included in the constituency which I represent in this House, the people of Canada saw the result. And, Sir, had not the two candidates stood almost on the same platform as regards the school question, the result would have been different still. One of the candidates, Mr. Lauzon, said that he was opposed to the settlement and in addition to that he was opposed to the Manitoba Government, and I will read to you the declaration of the Liberal candidate, Mr. Bertrand. He declared

> First.—That I have never accepted the settlement as such. It does not reinstate us in our former position. It does not remove the question from the political arena. My efforts in the House would be in the direction of improving the law, in the Catholic sense.

That is the declaration of the Liberal candidate in the electoral division of St. Boniface. He went on to make this further declaration:

> Secondly.—I assuredly expressed the opinion that it would be advantageous to give the settlement a trial. It is now forbidden to us to give or advise a trial of the same. I accept this disciplinary direction and submit to the same.
>
> I condemn the adoption of the school laws of 1890, and will make it my duty to express the blame in the House. This also applies to my first and second declarations.
>
> (Sgd.) S. A. D. BERTRAND.

Mr. Lauzon was supposed to be the candidate of His Grace the Archbishop of St. Boniface, or at least the newspapers reported him to be so, but as a matter of fact, Mr. Lauzon was the candidate of the minority, and when the other man saw that he was going to lose his deposit he made the declaration which I have read. In spite of that, he was beaten by almost two to one, and he did nearly lose his deposit. That election in St. Boniface was the expression of opinion of the parties who are most interested in that Manitoba school settlement. Sir, I will conclude my remarks by stating that the minority of Manitoba were never consulted either by the first delegation that went to Winnipeg under the late Government nor when these negotiations took place under the present Government. Moreover, while we were not consulted, we were rather sore to hear that the present Minister of the Interior, before concluding and publishing the result of the negotiations arrived at between the two Governments, went to the city of Brandon and consulted the McCarthyites, and obtained their approval of the changes that were proposed in the provincial laws, while the minority were

disregarded. Not one of them was consulted or asked whether the compromise was acceptable or not. I know that two or three individuals have expressed, either in writing or in newspaper interviews, their satisfaction with the settlement; but in all these cases we find that the parties were in expectation of positions from the Government. One aspired to be a judge; another is on the eve of entering the land office in Winnipeg; another is seeking a position in the Public Works Department, or in some other department. These are the people who have expressed their satisfaction with the settlement. Not one independent individual among the minority has expressed any satisfaction with that settlement. I am very sorry that the Government should have undertaken to put this question in such a position that a portion of the people of Canada to-day think that the minority ought to be satisfied, that the question is settled, and that concessions have been made to the minority which they should accept. There were no concessions at all, and the law is in a worse position to-day than it was. The minority are not satisfied, and will not accept that settlement.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, the hope that some hon. member from my own province, one who gave one of those famous pledges in the late election, would deem it fit to answer the address of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) determined me to keep my seat. Since none of these hon. members has deemed it fit to do so, and to redeem even in this small way a portion of the pledge he gave, it is my duty to say a few words on the questions which are mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. Coming first to that which has been the burning question in this country for so long, upon which it may be said numerous by-elections have been fought within the last few months—I mean the Manitoba school question—I would ask the special attention of the Prime Minister to the proposition I am about to make as to the constitutional position of the Government and of this Parliament upon that question; and I would ask him to be good enough to give me a reply to the question I will put. To my mind, on that question this Government and this Parliament occupy the position of the highest court of appeal; that is, it was within the power of this Government and this Parliament to remedy any grievance that was found to exist on the part of the minority of Manitoba. This Government had the right, also, to use its best offices as arbitrator between the minority and the Government of Manitoba, or, as it is called in our province, to occupy the position of "amiable compositeur." I would like to ask the Prime Minister to enlighten the House as to which position his Government took. Did they take the position of a court of appeal to settle finally, once and for ever, this Manitoba school question? Or, did they occupy the position of "amiable compositeur" in arriving at this so-called settlement? Since neither the Prime Minister nor any of his Government thinks fit to answer that question, we must be content to remain in doubt in regard to it, as we are in regard to most of the questions which are referred to in the Speech from the Throne. So that the members of this House, particularly the members of the Opposition, are obliged to regard the Government as playing with loaded dice. If the Government took the position of arbitrator, it was their duty, before arriving at any settlement, before putting the word settlement in the mouth of Her Majesty's representative, to see that it was really a settlement acceptable to the people interested. If, on the other hand, they acted as a court of appeal, and issued a judgment which all were bound to respect and follow, then there was no necessity for them to give any reason for having given that judgment, but they should have enforced the law rigorously and fearlessly on the Government of Manitoba. But the Government occupy the position of not wishing, perhaps, not being able, to say what ground they took when they agreed to this proposed settlement. What, then, is the settlement? Was there a grievance? There can be no doubt upon this point, inasmuch as the highest court in the realm has decided that a grievance existed on the part of the minority of Manitoba. What did this grievance consist of? My learned and hon. friend the Solicitor General—I am glad to see him in his place this evening, as I have a few words to address to him particularly—said this afternoon that there was one grievance. It is quite true that if you suffer from a number of small ills, you are declared ill. So the minority of Manitoba suffered from the fact that they had been deprived of separate schools, and the Privy Council decided that this grievance existed. There are three heads to the grievance, so to speak. There is, first, the privation of supervising the books to be used and the teaching to be given in the schools; secondly, they are deprived of the privilege of selecting the teachers who are to instruct their children; and, thirdly, they are compelled to contribute to other schools in which are not taught doctrines and in which are not used books which they can conscientiously allow their children to study or read. Therefore, there are three grievances. The true position of the Government was either to see that as many concessions should be given to the minority as were possible at the time, or to enforce, according to the ruling of the Privy Council, the putting back of the minority in the position they occupied before the Act of 1890 had been passed. Have the Government of the day done this? Has this so-called settlement remedied any of the grievances which I have explained? Does it, in the first place, give back to the

Roman Catholic minority of Manitoba the right to supervise their schools and the books from which their children shall study? Does it give them the right to select the teachers who shall instruct their children? Does it give them the right to support their own schools, and relieve them from the obligation of supporting other schools? We are told frequently by the Prime Minister himself that he has obtained great concessions, forsooth, because a Catholic priest or a Catholic teacher, is allowed to visit, under certain circumstances, the public school for a half hour in the day for the purpose of instructing the Catholic pupils in their faith. Think of it—to visit the schools for a half hour in the day for the purpose of instructing his pupils in their religion. The untutored savage in this and other countries recognized in the howling winds, in the shining sun, in the growing plants and trees, in the singing birds, the existence of a Deity, and bowed his head or raised his eyes in homage to that Deity. As civilization advanced, as Christianity came to be preached, different forms of the Christian religion sprang up, and in Manitoba, as in other places, different forms of the Christian religion existed in 1890. We are told to-day that each of these different forms will have the right to instruct the pupils in the public schools for half an hour in the day in its own particular tenets. What will occur when there are four or five different forms of religion in the same school district. A special hour is defined, between half-past three and four o'clock, and in that particular half hour each denomination will have the privilege of teaching its own school children in this district its own tenets. It does not require a very great stretch of imagination to think what would occur, supposing three or four clergymen, belonging to different denominations, should arrive at the same school-house, at the same half hour in the day, each anxious to teach his own particular form of Christianity to his own particular set of pupils.

An hon. MEMBER. They could saw off.

Mr. QUINN. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman who makes that suggestion is liable to saw off anything, even his religion. We all know how anxious school children are to be taught their religion. We all have been to school, I hope—some of us have, at any rate—and we all know, when that hour came during which it was the duty of our master to give us religious instruction, how pleased we were to take advantage of it. We all remember how anxiously we looked forward to it, and how we were prepared to give up all pleasure and everything else in order to rush into that particular portion of the school which was set apart for religious instruction; and this Government, in its wisdom, has selected that particular hour for religious instruction to the Catholic pupils in Manitoba, when all the Protestant children will be out playing hockey or football or lacrosse or some other game. Imagine the grave attention of these boys of the Manitoba minority as they hear their fellows out playing football or hockey; imagine how attentively they will listen to the words of wisdom that fall from the lips of the priest or other teacher of their religion. Is it not a farce to think that any church would be satisfied with such a meagre teaching under such circumstances?

Then we have the declaration of the hon. First Minister that he is satisfied so long as he knows that the French language, which he professes to hold so sacred, is to be preserved to the French Canadian minority in Manitoba. Is it possible he could be sincere in making such a statement, when, by the very act of which he speaks, it is not the French language that is to be taught in these schools, but the French language is to be used as a vehicle for the teaching of the English language. I do not object at all that every citizen in this country should learn the English tongue. I would like to see it made compulsory on every child to learn both French and English. I would like even to see it made possible for every child to learn other languages as well, to learn Latin, Greek, and German; but when it is pretended that the present system secures to the French Canadian minority of Manitoba the preservation of the French language in that country, that certainly is a vain boast, and the hon. gentleman, in making it, was not dealing fairly with the people to whom it is addressed.

Now, my hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) spoke with that courage, openness and frankness as a Catholic which I expected from one of his nationality. He declared himself, in the most formal manner, as subscribing to the principle that secular and religious teaching should be given in the same school. He told us further that he does not claim that this settlement is a final one. He said, to use his own words, that the minority have not got what they are entitled to, and what they ought to contend for. In that he followed in the footsteps of the hon. First Minister who has told us that the settlement does not give as much as he would like, but that, under the circumstances, it was the most he could get. Yet both these gentlemen do not hesitate to put into the mouth of the Governor General the hope that this settlement will put an end to an agitation which has impaired the harmony and impeded the development of our country, and will prove the beginning of a new era to be characterized by generous treatment of one another, mutual concessions, and reciprocal good-will. If, as the hon. Solicitor General has said, the Catholic minority in Manitoba has not got what they are entitled to and what they ought to contend for, how, in the name of common sense, can it be contended that this settlement is a settlement at all? If they

have not got what they contend for, and if they accept the advice of the Solicitor General that they ought to contend for more, how can the Government, with any show of sincerity, claim that this remedial legislation is a settlement at all? But my hon. friend again says, in speaking of the pledge, that famous pledge which he gave to his constituents, or, as he says, to his bishop, that neither party lived up to the pledges given before the election. Now, I concede to my hon. friend the right to speak for one of the parties to the pledge. I concede to him the perfect and absolute right to admit—and he is the only party who can admit—that one of the parties did not live up to its pledges, and that one is himself. But how can he say or what proof has he given to this House and the country that the bishop of his diocese did not live up to any pledge given? It is true he has said that he has never been asked for an explanation of his conduct, that is, in breaking his pledge, as he has admitted doing, but he says that his pledge has been handed to the Tory party for political purposes. But this is the gentleman who concedes, as he did, to the bishops, the right to speak and to order on any question, even a political question if it touches on a matter of religion. My hon. friend also spoke about having gone to Rome and about having come back again and about somebody having followed him. Well, with regard to the somebody who followed him I have here a very interesting article in the London "Tablet," a leading Roman Catholic newspaper which, I think, will be very instructive to the House, and certainly of great interest to the members of the Government if they will only bear with me while I read a portion of it:

Monseigneur Merry Del Val will sail to-day on board the "Umbria" for Canada, and never has a vessel carried so rich a freight of hopes for the peace of the Dominion. The Apostolic Delegate goes out as the representative of the Sovereign Pontiff to aid in settling the question which has been a trouble to Canada for seven years and embittered her public life as nothing else has done. We have seen that what is known as the "Laurier-Greenway Settlement," is unacceptable, because, however it might work in particular localities, it is based upon a system which has been condemned by the Holy See. It is months ago since we announced that that "settlement" was to be regarded as an arrangement which was tentative, rather than final. We spoke of it as intended to serve as a basis for further negotiations, and not at all as standing, necessarily, for the last word of concession. This view of the situation was somewhat hastily challenged by critics, who, perhaps, forgot that London, the sensitive nerve-centre of the Empire, was quite as likely to be well informed as to the objects and policy of the Government at Ottawa as cities situated on the Red River or on the St. Lawrence. At any rate, it is now happily admitted in Canada that the question is still open, and that no party is irrevocably committed to the terms of the settlement arranged between Mr. Laurier and the Prime Minister of Manitoba. Thus, the Conservative "Monde" says: "Les libéraux, M. Laurier en tête, et tous ses serviles organes en queue, ont essayé de chanter une nouvelle chanson. Le règlement n'était pas définitif; il n'était qu'une base de règlement sur laquelle les parties intéressées pourraient discuter et parvenir à s'entendre." Even more direct testimony is afforded by Mr. Laurier's own organ, "Le Soleil," which, after admitting that the present proposals are regarded as unsatisfactory, says: "But we have not reached the end, and we have good reason to hope that further negotiations may yet result in an honourable settlement." The mere fact that forty-five members of the Senate and Commons of Canada, including four or five members of Mr. Laurier's Administration, have associated themselves in a common request to the Holy See to send an apostolic delegate with powers to deal with this question, was, of itself, a sufficient indication that the time for negotiations was not yet ended. For it is obvious that, if Monseigneur Merry Del Val were to find himself obliged to leave Canada with his work undone, and to report that he had been unable to secure for the minority in Manitoba their reasonable rights, he would, at any rate, leave behind him a united Catholic party, and a party united in opposition to the Government of Mr. Laurier.

It must clearly be borne in mind, in any estimate of the present situation in Canada, that the Government at Ottawa is kept in power absolutely by the votes of the overwhelmingly Catholic province of Quebec. In the six Protestant provinces the two great political parties, as far as their representation in the Federal Parliament is concerned, are almost equally divided. Catholic Quebec gives Mr. Laurier the support of 50 out of 65 members, and that majority of 35 keeps the Liberal party in power at Ottawa. This help of the Catholic province was given to Mr. Laurier in the full faith that he would secure redress for the Catholics of Manitoba, and because he stands pledged to his promise of May 7 to bring about a settlement which should be "à la satisfaction de toutes les parties intéressées," and, failing that, not to hesitate "à exercer ce recours constitutionnel que fournit la loi—recours que j'exercerai complet et entier." These words of the Prime Minister stand on record; but his followers in Quebec are even more deeply pledged. The great majority of the members returned by the Catholic province signed a promise by which they solemnly undertook to resign their seats if the Government failed to see justice done to the Catholics of Manitoba. In joining in an invitation to the Holy See to send out an Apostolic Delegate to Canada, these men have burned their boats behind them. They are bound, either to secure for the oppressed minority in Manitoba such terms as, in the opinion of the representative of the Holy See, they are entitled to, or else to withdraw their support from Mr. Laurier, and so wreck the Liberal party in the Dominion. The very fact, however, that Monseigneur Merry Del Val goes out with the cordial assent of all the Catholic members of the Government, is itself a sufficient proof that it is confidently expected that an honourable and satisfactory arrangement will be arrived at. We are convinced that Mr. Laurier is personally anxious for such a result; and, certainly, his highest duty, his honour, and his political interest, all combine to point out to the Liberal leader the path in which he must tread. Happily, if the Parliament of Manitoba should, contrary to expectation, persist in refusing further concessions, and so compel Mr. Laurier to redeem his pledge to use the powers of the Federal Govern-

ment to the utmost, he may rely upon the loyal co-operation and support of the leaders of the Liberal party. But Mr. Greenway must recognize by this time that the public opinion of the whole Dominion, as expressed by the leaders of both parties at Ottawa, is against this intolerant attempt to rob the Catholic minority of their separate schools. So far, he has successfully asserted the independence of the province, and withstood the action of the Parliament of Canada, and he may well be satisfied with his achievement. He has now to deal at Ottawa with men belonging to the same political party as himself, and must understand that, if he refuses to come to terms, he is signing the death-warrant of the Liberal party in federal politics.

This editorial of the "Tablet" closes with the following significant sentence. Speaking of the opposition to the Remedial Bill proposed in 1895, it says :

The Liberal party, when opposing the Bill, explained that they did so solely because they believed they could secure the same object by other means. Those other means are now on their trial. If they fail, Mr. Laurier is bound, by every consideration of duty and honour, to revert to the policy of his opponents, and so to give effect to the judgment of the Governor General as ratified in Parliament by the vote of March 20th, 1896.

Mr. HUGHES. May I ask the hon. member a question, as I did not quite catch his statement ? How many members of the House and how many members of the Cabinet signed the memorial to the Pope ?

Mr. TALBOT. Give the names.

Mr. QUINN. It is reported here that 45 members of the Senate and House of Commons, and four or five members of the Government, signed the memorial.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). It is a great shame.

Mr. QUINN. Now, I wish to draw the particular attention of the hon. the Solicitor General to this article, as I understand —probably I have been misinformed on this point—but I understand that during his visit to England, which was merely the beginning of his trip to Rome, he made the editor of the "Tablet" his particular confidant on public questions. My hon. friend spoke about his trip to Rome, but he forgot to mention one little incident, and that is that before going there he secured the services of the Solicitor for the Dominion of Canada. It is quite true that he probably did not go to Rome for the purpose of forcing any legal process against the Vatican in favour of my hon. friend, or in the name of the Dominion Government, but to introduce my hon. friend ; but with that wisdom which is characteristic of my hon. friend the Solicitor General, he thought it would be wise to have the son of one occupying such a high judicial position as the Lord Chief Justice of England, an eminently and properly respected member of my church, to use as his sponsor before the Vatican. He did so ; but before doing that, he addressed, I believe, a request to the counsel, the one-time counsel, of the minority of Manitoba, that he would give him his opinion as to what the settlement really meant, and if it went as far as, in his own judgment, the Privy Council intended it should go. I had the honour to ask in this House—the question is not on the paper I see, but it will come up—if my learned friend would be good enough to give the House a copy of the letter which he addressed to that gentleman. It would be very interesting, not only as throwing a certain light on this question, but interesting also to legal members of the profession in the House, who are numerous, and to whose attention I would like to draw the action, both of the hon. the Solicitor General and of the hon. gentleman who gave his opinion on that question, and who tried to minimize, in the letter which he published, the effect of a judgment which had been rendered in favour of his clients. It is the first time in the history of the profession—and I have now to criticise the action of that learned gentleman, the Hon. Mr. Blake, with a good deal of diffidence—but I think I am safe in saying that this is the first time in the history of the legal profession that any member of it has tried to minimize the effect of a judgment that has been rendered in favour of his clients. I merely mention this en passant, and will now recur to the visit to Rome which my hon. and learned friend described. He went to Rome, introduced, as I have said, or accompanied at any rate, by Mr. Charles Russell, not only accompanied by, but I think he left, Mr. Charles Russell in Rome to watch his interests after he left there. He went there ; and he says that he did not represent the Government of this country, that he did not represent the Parliament of Canada, but he went as a humble member of the church to ask for something. That something was granted—because I accept the explanation of the hon. gentleman, I accept it fully, frankly and fairly, but at the same time it requires that one should be able to believe a good deal. He went there, he says, not using his position as Solicitor General, not using his position as representative of Canada, not using his position as a member of this House, but as a private citizen clothed merely in the garb of an every-day commoner, as a pilgrim, as has been suggested to me, who approached the Throne of the Vatican to make a complaint against his bishop, or archbishop, and ask, not a judgment, not that the complaint be heard in Rome, not that the Pope should decide, but that an apostolic delegate should be sent from Rome to Canada to decide between the Solicitor General and his bishop. But I accept, of course, the explanation of the hon. Solicitor General, and I believe, because I am possessed of that credulity, that his state-

ment is absolutely and perfectly correct. Now, my hon. friend has also been ringing the changes upon this settlement, and every member of the Government has been trying to make the people believe that the settlement is everything they claim. They are evidently not satisfied to let it go on its merits before the people; and there has not been a by-election held in any part of the province of Quebec where they have not had several members of the Cabinet, and any number of members of the House of Commons, there to try and convince the people that this settlement is the best and only settlement that could give the minority of Manitoba their rights. If, on its very face, it bears the stamp of such goodness, why all this argument? Why is it necessary to enlighten the people? The document itself, surely, ought to be sufficient to tell them that, because the people of the province of Quebec know a good thing when they see it; particularly they know a good thing that gives them the rights to which they are entitled; and they know, Mr. Speaker, and they will prove their knowledge, too, when the proper time comes, that which deprives them, or any of their brothers, of the dearest rights that it is possible for them to possess as citizens of Canada. Why then should it be necessary to go to all those pains to prove that this settlement is so good? Now, Sir, I have to say, not that the hon. Solicitor General has falsified the record, because that would not be right, but he has suppressed some of the circumstances connected, for example, with one of the hon. members of this House, concerning an expression that was made use of by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). You remember with what force he turned to his followers on the Government side of the House, and read the declaration of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier at a certain meeting that was held in Montreal some time ago; you remember the stress that he laid upon the language of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier who had stated that it would not be advisable any longer to continue the agitation on this Manitoba school question. But he carefully suppressed the fact that this speech was delivered before an association of political clubs held in Montreal, which were convened for the purpose of deciding whether it would be advisable at that time to start, throughout the whole province of Quebec, a political agitation upon the question of the Manitoba schools; and my hon. and learned friend from Jacques Cartier took the reasonable position, took the broad position, took, I think the proper position, for any member to take when the public mind is excited—he advised his political friends not to throw the country into a wild political agitation on this question, but to wait until the proper time would come when the passions of the people would be calmed down, and when the question could be considered coolly and deliberately by the people generally. This is the portion that my hon. friend the Solicitor General did not disclose to his followers, and I think if he had done so, the cheers and applause that greeted him, would have been turned in favour of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, who preached toleration, who preached quietness, at a time when the people were ripe for revolt.

But, Mr. Speaker, there are other questions besides the Manitoba school question upon which the Government really played the game again with loaded dice. The Prime Minister said, in answer to the leader of the Opposition, that the whole country understood the position of the Government in regard to the tariff changes that are to take place. He said that of course there may be on this side of the House some doubting Thomases. I would not like to say that the Prime Minister was in the position so eloquently described by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), when he spoke of Rip Van Winkle; but surely the First Minister cannot have been asleep during all this time; at all events, he has not been asleep during the last few days, for we have seen him in the House, and he must have recognized in the corridors, in the hotels and on the streets of Ottawa a number of business men and manufacturers who wear upon their countenances that haggard look which indicates bad business and uncertainty. They came here to try and obtain information from the Government as to what the tariff changes would be. Surely the hon. gentleman has been in Montreal during the last three or four months. If so, he cannot have been blind to the fact that in one district alone six factories are closed, which gave employment to 3,000 hands. Fifteen thousand people in Montreal have been destitute this winter owing to the uncertainty which exists in the mercantile community as to what the changes in the tariff will be. Hon. gentlemen opposite may smile; but I speak of what I know and from information gleaned from the leading manufacturers of Montreal, who have stated in the newspapers, in answer to demands for work, that much as they would like to give employment to the people, it was utterly impossible to do so when they did not know whether they would be able to manufacture goods under the new tariff or not; that it would be madness to risk their capital in manufacturing goods unless they could sell them at a profit; that they were not running their manufacturing establishments as charitable institutions, and that however much they wished to give employment to the labouring classes they would not do so at the risk of their fortunes, and they would not do so until the Government had declared its tariff. This is not mere hearsay; there are the

facts as they exist to-day. It is quite true that one of those factories, the Canada Sugar Refining Co., opened up for a few weeks; but the day before yesterday, or rather the 23rd instant, it closed finally until the tariff changes are made known. The Montreal Rolling Mills, Peck, Benny & Co., and three other institutions of the same kind are either totally closed or are running one-half or one-quarter time.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). As they do every year.

Mr. QUINN. The Minister of Public Works says as they do every year. I thank him for the interruption, because it is not as they do every year, and I stake my reputation on the statement.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to ask a question.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They told me so themselves.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). What I wish to ask is this: Is it because Peck, Benny & Co., the Montreal Rolling Mills, and other iron manufacturing companies have large stocks of goods on hand which have been accumulating during the last two or three years that they are stopped now; or is it simply because they do not want to manufacture until the tariff changes have been announced? I know something about the matter.

Mr. QUINN. I will answer both questions. I will answer first the Minister of Public Works, who says these establishments have closed as they always do. It is quite true, I admit, that those manufacturing establishments close for a month or six weeks around Christmas or New Year, but invariably they have opened before the 1st of February, and this year they have not opened. In reply to the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood), who asks whether those factories are closed because they have large stocks, or because they are waiting to learn the tariff changes, I am in a position to make this statement. It is quite true they have large stocks, but I accept the statement of the manager of the rolling mills, with whom the hon. member is well acquainted, Mr. McMaster, who in the public press of Montreal stated that notwithstanding the fact that they had a sufficient stock to supply the demands of their customers for the moment, they would have opened their establishments for the purpose of manufacturing more were it not that they were uncertain as to what the tariff would be. I think I must have satisfied the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood), as well as my hon. friend.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I know more about it than you do.

Mr. QUINN. Being an Irishman, I would not have the temerity to assert that I know more than anybody else, but I simply gave the source of my information, but I should be very glad to hear the hon. gentleman after I have finished.

But there is another question that is worthy of consideration. I think I have demonstrated to the satisfaction of the House the truth of what I have stated, and I feel somewhat proud of the turmoil, as I may term it, which I have raised on the other side of the House. I think it is proof that I have given some facts to hon. gentlemen opposite to roll under their tongues in regard to the tariff, and I will now proceed to deal with another question which was referred to, or which came up in the course of the discussion by the Prime Minister, that is the subject of employing emissaries and spies under the title of commissioners to investigate the conduct of different employees of the public service. It was distinctly and flatly denied by the First Minister, and he spoke about the inadvisability of sending out emissaries and spies. I do not know what they could be called in the language of my hon. friend; but I will give the House an idea of some of their acts, as by their acts members may judge them. I know, I think everybody knows, something regarding a certain commission appointed to investigate matters concerning the Kingston penitentiary.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. You will hear about that later.

Mr. QUINN. They were not intended to be emissaries or spies, but they were appointed under the title of commissioners. What the object was I do not know, and that is known only by themselves and by the Solicitor General. What their acts were I know something of. They seem to have directed their attention to that particular branch of the community to which I belong, and for which I am proud to claim the hon. Solicitor General, the Irish Catholics; and this inquiry was in regard to employees of the Kingston penitentiary. The mode of procedure was unique. I have had some experience in criminal courts. It has always been the proud boast of every one living under the British flag that whenever any charge is made against him, he is given a fair chance to answer it. One thing they have done is to send at different times two or three members of the commission to the city of Montreal, who come armed with a document which they have received from my hon. friend the Solicitor General appointing them. They say to the witnesses brought before them: We are commissioners; you have had such and such transactions with this penitentiary; you have given money to so and so employed there; we have got proof of it, and you might as well make a clean breast of it and tell all you know, or else you will go to jail yourself. This, of course, may not be the conduct of an emissary or a spy, but

it is the lowest order of—what shall I call it—the out-west detective business.

Mr. TALBOT. A cowboy.

Mr. QUINN. Yes, cowboy. I never heard of such a state of things occurring in any country, and I only state what is absolutely true and correct for the information of my hon. friend the Solicitor General, who I know would not countenance such proceedings.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). I will not accept that information as correct.

Mr. QUINN. I will give him the names of the gentlemen who were approached in that way. Not only have these commissioners sat in Kingston with closed doors——

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The hon. gentleman promised to give the names and we should have them.

Mr. QUINN. I will give you the names.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Right off.

Mr. QUINN. Oh, no.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name, name.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has the floor, and I think the interruption is going a little too far. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) is very good-natured about it and does not complain, but I think it must be rather embarrassing to him.

Mr. QUINN. We have been told that we have rights here, and I would like to know by what right I can be compelled to give the name.

Mr. McGREGOR. It is cowardly of you to say that you will give the names and not keep your promise.

Mr. QUINN. I must appeal to the Chair for protection against such remarks as those made by the hon. gentleman ; I do not know where he comes from, but I suppose it is from the far west. I ask that the hon. gentleman be compelled to withdraw the word "cowardly."

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not catch the word, nor do I know what hon. gentleman is said to have used it, but if any hon. gentleman did use the word he should, of course, withdraw it.

Mr. McGREGOR. If it is unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. QUINN. I was about to say that I should be very happy to give the names to my hon. friend the Solicitor General, of the firms who have been approached in this way, but he will see that it is impossible for me to give in a public place, particularly in the House of Commons, the names of gentlemen who consult me professionally in matters of that kind. These commissioners do not follow the procedure of the public courts of our country. They do not hold open court ; they proceed on the style of the old inquisition with closed doors. They summon witnesses before them, examine them for three or four hours, tell them they have proof of what they charge and that the witnesses should not deny it, and when they have brow-beaten and cross-hackled the witnesses and bull-dozed them, they adjourn for two or three days in order to try and get, not proof, but suspicion upon which to cross-examine these men again. Up to the present time one man has been dragged before them four times, and his examination has not yet been concluded. I appeal to hon. members of this House, if there is any word in the English language which can characterize such conduct ; the most applicable expression would be that used by the leader of the Opposition when he called these men emissaries and spies. The records of no tribunal in any country in the world will disclose such a state of affairs as that which exists in connection with the investigation into the Kingston penitentiary.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I feel that I have occupied a much longer time than I intended to, when I rose to address the House. I speak simply from conviction. I speak on this subject, not as a follower of any particular party, but I speak as one who stands by a principle, prepared to fight for that principle, prepared to exact the enforcement of that principle, and not satisfied with a compromise on the question of principle. I cannot conceive how any men recognizing the principle which has been declared by the Prime Minister and by the Solicitor General, can in their consciences satisfy themselves by saying, that they have compromised with the Hon. Mr. Greenway upon such a question. Compromises may exist on the every-day questions of life, compromises there may be in matters which are not of very great importance, but wherever a vital principle is at stake, such as the principle of the religious training of the youth of this country, it is not only wrong, but I say it is criminal, for any men to accept a compromise upon it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). Mr. Speaker, if it suits the hon. gentlemen opposite to fight over again the battle of the Manitoba school question, I, for one, do not feel inclined to find any fault with them. On the 23rd of June we fairly knocked out these hon. gentlemen, and since that time we have fairly licked them in every encounter we had with them. We are prepared, we are ready, we are anxious to repeat the dose every time they like to have it, and when they feel that they have got enough of it no doubt they will tell us. Sir, a great deal has been said as to the settlement of the Manitoba school ques-

tion itself, but the Government has been specially assailed on what I might call incidental grounds. The leader of the Opposition in his speech on the Address, in those stentorian tones that we admire in one of his age, accused us of having sent an emissary to Rome, and he was cheered when he uttered that statement. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) went even further and said that we had violated the constitution of Canada, and that we had acted in a manner derogatory to our duties as Ministers of the Crown. In other words, we have been accused of violating our duties as Ministers of the Crown in appealing to the Pope for interference. These accusations have been made against us previously in the public press with a view of appealing to Protestant prejudices against the Government, and responsible men like the leader of the Opposition have now repeated these accusations on the floor of this House. I thank the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) for having done so because it has given us an opportunity of stating our case before this Parliament, before the British Empire, and before the whole civilized world. We have nothing to hide on that point; we have nothing to conceal. Permit me to say first that this Government as a government had nothing whatever to do with the appeal to Rome that has taken place. But I frankly admit, and I take my full share of the responsibility, that a group of Roman Catholic public men belonging to the Liberal party took the means or securing the coming-out to Canada of a papal delegate. A good deal has been said, by people who profess to know everything about it, in regard to the request that has been made to the Pope. My hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) stated in so many words that we appealed to the Pope to help us to settle the Manitoba school question. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Quinn) has repeated the same statement. In the Tory Protestant press the statement has been made that the Liberal Government of Canada, headed by that Roman Catholic Laurier, has appealed to the Pope to help him in the settlement of the Manitoba school question. Sir, as I have said, I take the full responsibility of my signature to the document that I am now going to read:

To His Holiness Leo the XIII.:

Most Holy Father,—We, the undersigned, members of the Senate and members of the House of Commons of Canada, and representing therein the Liberal party, present ourselves before Your Holiness as respectful and devoted children of Holy Church, to complain of the existence of a state of things which, if allowed to continue, might be extremely dangerous to the constitutional liberties of this country, as well as to the interests of the church itself.

Your Holiness has already been made aware of the conduct and attitude of certain prelates and of certain members of the secular clergy who, during the general elections in this country, in the month of June last, intervened in a violent manner in restraint of electoral freedom, taking sides openly for the Conservative party against the Liberal party, and going so far as to declare guilty of grievous sin those of the electors who would vote for the candidates of the Liberal party.

Sincerely attached to the institutions of our country, which insure to us Catholics the most complete liberty, we respectfully represent to Your Holiness that these democratic institutions under which we live and for which your Holiness has many times expressed sentiments of admiration and confidence, can only exist under perfect electoral freedom.

Far be it from us to refuse to the clergy the plenitude of civil and political rights. The priest is a citizen, and we would not, for a single instant, deprive him of the right of expressing his opinion on any matter submitted to the electorate: but when the exercise of that right develops into violence, and when that violence, in the name of religion, goes to the extent of making a grievous sin out of a purely political act, there is an abuse of authority of which the consequences cannot but be fatal, not only to constitutional liberty, but to religion itself.

If, in a country such as ours, with a population consisting of persons of various creeds and wherein the Protestant denominations are in the majority, Catholics did not enjoy, in all matters relating to legislation, the same political freedom as their Protestant fellow-countrymen, they would ipso facto be placed in a position of inferiority, which would prevent them from taking the legitimate part which they are entitled to take in the government of the country, with the possibility, moreover, of conflicts between the various groups of the population which history shows to be ever fraught with danger.

Then again, an active and violent intervention of the clergy in the domain of political questions submitted to the people must, of necessity, produce against the great mass of the Catholic population a degree of irritation manifestly prejudicial to that respect which religion and its ministers should ever inspire and command.

Some twenty years ago, His Holiness Pius the IX., your illustrious and lamented predecessor on the Pontifical Throne, acting through the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda, deemed it his duty to put a stop to certain abuses of a similar character, and forbade the intervention of the clergy in politics. This prohibition was generally respected so long as His Eminence Cardinal Taschereau was able to guide the church in Canada, but since old age and infirmities have paralyzed his guiding hand, the abuses to which Your Illustrious Predecessor had put a stop, have begun again, and threaten once more to create trouble among us and to compromise, not only Catholic interests in this country, but the peace and harmony which should exist between the various elements of our population.

Again affirming our absolute devotion to the faith of our fathers and to the church of which you are the Supreme Head; affirming our respect and attachment for the person of Your Holiness, our attachment to the interests of our country and to the Crown of Great Britain, its ægis and protector, we beg that Your Holiness will renew in our behalf the most wise prescriptions and prohibitions of Your Predecessor; protect the consciences of the Catholic electors, and thus secure peace in our country by the union of religion and liberty—a union which Your Holi-

ness has many times extolled in those immortal encyclicals whose precious teachings we desire in all things to follow ; and, lastly, grant to the children of the church, now addressing Your Holiness, the Apostolic Benediction.

Ottawa, October, 1896.

Sir, this document, I am not afraid of saying—I am proud to say—has been signed by forty-five of us. I say as a member of this Government that I signed it, and I am proud to say so. This document speaks for itself. You do not find in it one word about the Manitoba school question. We have appealed to Rome, as it was our right to do, from the attitude of certain members of the Roman Catholic clergy. We have appealed for liberty—for political freedom. Yesterday my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) asked the question, "Why did you not appeal to the courts of the land ?" Sir, we are Roman Catholics and if we are able to settle our family difficulties among ourselves, is it not better ? But why did we go to Rome ? My hon. friend the Solicitor General alluded this afternoon to the collective mandement which was issued during the last general election, and quoted the most important part of it. The bishops declared in that document that a remedial law was the only means by which the Manitoba school question could be settled. That mandement was read from all the pulpits in the province of Quebec. But, I must add—and my friends from the province of Quebec will bear me out in this —that this mandement does not give any idea of what took place in that province. That mandement is a mild document by itself. What took place in Quebec ? In several dioceses the fact of voting for Liberal candidates became a grevious sin—a crime. I am sorry that my hon. friend from Montmorency brought that question before the House. I am sorry to have to give the explanations which we are bound to give in order to put ourselves right before Canada. In the dioceses of Chicoutimi, Rimouski, Nicolet and others, it was said over and over again in the pulpits that it was a mortal sin to vote for a Liberal candidate. You seem to be surprised that in such a position some members of Parliament signed pledges. My only wonder is that many more did not sign them. But, speaking of these pledges, what took place ? Every Tory candidate took the pledge, and nearly every Tory candidate was licked in good shape and form, and some of our friends who were unwise enough to sign the pledge had a narrow escape indeed. But, Sir, the general election passed. What took place afterwards ? The papal delegate gave an interview which has appeared in the public press, in which you will find that he admits that the First Minister of this country was accused in Rome to the papal authorities of being a Freemason. Five bishops went to Rome, and several of them accused the Liberal party of being an anti-religious party. But they did something more. They said that at the head of affairs was a bad Roman Catholic, while at the head of the Opposition was a very pious man indeed ; and, of course, it was better to replace at the head of affairs that very bad Roman Catholic by that most pious man.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to accuse the five bishops who went to Rome, or any of them, of having said that the First Minister of the Dominion was a Freemason or a bad Catholic?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no hesitation at all in answering my hon. friend. A few days ago, the Bishop of Chicoutimi was interviewed, and in the public press he stated that he had himself told the papal authorities that Mr. Laurier knew so little about religion that he did not expect anything more from him than neutral and godless schools. I say, on my responsibility here, that some of the bishops told the Pope himself and the Propaganda that the hon. gentleman who is at the head of affairs today is a very bad Roman Catholic indeed and a Freemason. My hon. friend was accused in Rome of these charges, and the papal delegate is my witness. He was so accused before the papal authorities, and the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) was put in contrast with him as one of the most devout men that ever lived under the sun. Well, the bishops came back from Rome—let my hon. friend from Montmorenci (Mr. Casgrain) listen carefully to me now—they came back with the solemn pledge which they had obtained from the court of Rome that no delegate would be sent out, and they immediately issued circulars which every one has read, in which the Manitoba settlement was denounced as a shameful capitulation. And mind you, when the bishops were in Rome, that settlement had not yet been concluded. These circulars were issued, and those in the press and on the hustings who dared to discuss that settlement and to approve of it were simply destined to political annihilation. I am sorry my hon. friend from Chicoutimi (Mr. Savard) is not in his place to-night, because he would feel bound, I am sure, to relate the scene that took place in his own diocese. I will not refer to it, because the hon. gentleman is not in his place, but I shall refer to things that are of public notoriety in the province of Quebec. I am a newspaper man, and my son publishes a paper of which I am the political editor. Would you believe me, Sir, without any trial, without any warning, without any explanation being asked for, my son's paper was placed under the ban. That is to say, in the diocese of Chicoutimi, there is not one Roman Catholic who goes to confession without being asked if he is a subscriber to my son's paper. The "Soleil" was under the ban in the same way and so was "La

Patrie." If the answer is in the affirmative, the man is told that he has to send back the papers or that he will be refused the sacraments of the church. Sir, I am a Roman Catholic, I know the principles and the tenets of my religion, and I say that never, in the history of ecclesiastical abuses, has such a thing taken place. I am a Roman Catholic because I feel that I can be a good Roman Catholic and a good British citizen, and it is on that ground that I say now that those abuses are not known in Rome. If they were known, the Pope, who is an enlightened man, who is one of the broadest public minds of the day, would put a stop to it. We appealed to Rome under those circumstances. We were being prevented from discussing any more the political questions of the day in the province of Quebec. Let us not lose sight of what took place only a few days ago at the election in Bonaventure. It was not known, and it could not be believed in Quebec, in certain quarters, that a papal delegate would be sent out here. In the French Tory press, we were told every day: The Pope knows you, you are a discredited party in Rome, you will never get a delegate here. The election in Bonaventure came on. His Lordship the Bishop of Rimouski, telegraphed first to my hon. friend whom we are so proud to see among us to-night (Mr. Guité) that he wanted to see him in Rimouski. My hon. friend was very busy indeed looking after votes, and he replied to his lordship that he could not leave his country, but would be glad to receive any written communication his lordship would be pleased to send him. Two or three days after, his lordship kindly sent the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Guité) the following document:—

The Laurier-Greenway settlement of the Manitoba Catholic school question having been judged to be unacceptable on the authority of the bishops, I solemnly pledge myself, on my faith and my honour, to vote in the House, without restriction whatever, if I am elected member, against this settlement, or against any other which will not have been accepted by the same religious authority, according to the terms of the constitution of Manitoba and of the judgment of Her Majesty's Privy Council.

As a devoted son of the Catholic Church, I pledge myself to absolutely prohibit all who act for me in this present electoral campaign, whether on the hustings or in conversation with the voters, to utter one word in favour of the Laurier-Greenway settlement or of the trial thereof, because it is not accepted by religious authority. Therefore, I have signed this pledge to the satisfaction of Monseigneur the Bishop of Rimouski, at Metapedia, March 6, 1897, in the presence of the Rev. Messrs. Th. Landry, director of the seminary, and F. X. Ross, missionary of Metapedia, who have signed with me.

Sir, the priest who took that document to my hon. friend told him at the same time, in the presence of witnesses, that if he did not sign this document, on the following Sunday there would be a mandement denouncing him and the Liberal party. My hon. friend declined to sign the document. His answer to His Lordship was: I am a free citizen; I am a Roman Catholic, but I cannot alienate my liberty; I want to be a free man in the House. And, Sir, he was elected by 900 majority. My hon. friends on the other side of the House were nobly represented in Bonaventure. The ex-Minister of War (Sir Adolphe Caron) was there, and he advised his candidate to take the pledge, and his candidate did take the pledge. My hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) was there also. Of course, I know him so well to be a pious Roman Catholic that I do not wonder at his position. He also advised the Tory candidate to take a pledge. But seriously speaking, we appealed to Rome because we felt that we could not any longer stand such a state of affairs. Sir, I alluded a moment ago to the fact that certain of the bishops had made it a mortal sin to vote for the Liberal party. My hon. friends of Protestant persuasion may not understand fully the meaning of those words. A man to whom the sacraments are refused is a man who cannot be buried in consecrated ground. He is a disgraced man before his countrymen and cannot live among them. Practically he is a doomed man. I ask my hon. friends on the other side of the House. I ask the hon. leader of the Opposition, is he prepared to uphold such a state of affairs. It is very well to taunt us with having gone to Rome. We went to Rome for liberty; the allies in Quebec of the hon. leader of the Opposition have gone to Rome against liberty. I do not wish to traduce the bishops of my church here. I respect my church, and it is because I respect it that I am so sorry to see that designing men have been able to deceive men of good faith, such as the bishops are. It is our right, Sir, to go to Rome. The days when Roman Catholics in the British Empire did not enjoy the same privileges as their Protestant fellow-citizens are passed, we are on an equal footing with our friends of Protestant persuasion. We have a right to practice our religion, and among our rights is the right to communicate freely with the head of our church. This is not the first time in the history of the world that the Holy See has sent a delegate to an important country. Is it not a fact that a few years ago Archbishop, now Cardinal, Satolli was sent to the United States. I followed carefully the mission of Cardinal Satolli in the United States. Before 1892 the same abuses that we now complain of existed on the other side of the line. Some of their bishops had become tyrannical towards their clergy and towards their flocks. Men of foresight, like Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Ireland, went to the Pope and told him that such a state of affairs could not last, that the Roman Catholic religion could not stand

it. And the Pope sent Cardinal Satolli. The United States people are a great people. They received Cardinal Satolli with honour. I had the pleasure of meeting him for the first time at the opening of the Chicago Exhibition. There he was given a very prominent place indeed, and the speech of the day was made in the large Auditorium by Archbishop Ireland. I have confidence that the mission of the Papal delegate will be fruitful of good results.

I am told that Mgr. Del Val is a man of great ability, and though young, of experience. They would not believe in Rome, Sir, that such abuses existed here as do exist. Speaking on my responsibility, I say that when the cardinals were told that the sacraments of the church were refused to people because they would not give an engagement to vote against such and such candidate, these cardinals would not believe it; and it was because they would not believe it then that the Papal delegate has been sent here.

I will now, with you permission, say a few words about the settlement itself. I had the good fortune to go to Manitoba before that settlement reached a final stage.

I wanted to be on the spot and to see with my own eyes the state of affairs. Gentlemen opposite have stated to-day that the Roman Catholic minority was not consulted. Let us understand each other. By "Roman Catholic minority," I never understood the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière). I know that hon. gentleman too well. I know too well the role that he has played in Manitoba, to think even for a single moment of taking advice from him. I went out and consulted the real, genuine representatives of the Roman Catholic minority. I will say more—I consulted His Grace Archbishop Langevin. It has been stated over and over again that he was not consulted. That is not the fact. Of course, I may say immediately that this Government never has agreed that this settlement should be dependent upon the approval or disapproval of His Lordship. But his views were ascertained. I had four long and pleasant interviews with him. Some other Roman Catholic people, important men, also had interviews with him. We tried our best to know what he wanted. We took information from him, and what did I find from his own lips? I found that out of 100 Roman Catholic schools that existed in 1890, 51 were closed. 51 French Canadian schools were closed. I asked his Grace, How is it that during these six long years a generation of young children has been growing up without an education? The answer of his Grace was perfectly frank—"We have no financial means to sustain our schools." Well, as I said, I had four interviews with him. At the last interview he stated very frankly to me that he would not accept anything less than separate schools. I had nothing more to say, because I knew that separate schools could not be obtained. Sir, the settlement stands to-day before Canada as it is. I am amazed at the lack of knowledge displayed by some Roman Catholics in this Parliament. They tell us that the schools of Manitoba as carried on under the laws of Manitoba, as amended, are godless schools, schools which Roman Catholic children cannot possibly be allowed to attend. Well, Sir, we live in a country where there is a province called Ontario. In that province, as every one knows, there are two systems of schools, a system of separate schools and one of public schools. In the public schools no religious teaching is allowed except after school hours, and only once a week. Clause 101 of the regulations of Ontario which I hold in my hand, are to this effect: Religious teaching is allowed in the public schools of Ontario, after school hours, once a week. Now, Sir, would you believe me when I state that in that province, out of a Roman Catholic school population of 80,000, nearly 50,000 Roman Catholic children attend the public schools with the permission of the bishops? What answer can be given to these facts? Facts are better than arguments. But there is more than that. I say that the Church of Rome does not forbid public schools, very far from it. A few years ago a council of bishops was held in Baltimore, and after Cardinal Satolli came to the United States in 1892, the fourteen propositions on education which had been adopted by the Baltimore council, were laid before him and were revised by all the bishops of the United States under the guidance of Cardinal Satolli himself. What do we find in those propositions?

> The Catholic Church in general, and especially the Holy See, far from condemning or treating with indifference the public schools, desires rather that, by the joint action of civil and ecclesiastical authorities, there should be public schools in every state, according as the circumstances of the people require, for the cultivation of the useful arts and natural sciences.

There is more than that. Archbishop Langevin, during his speech during the election of St. Boniface lately, stated from the pulpit that any man who voted even approval of the school settlement, would be refused the sacraments of the church. Will you permit me to read this proposition which, I say again, has been revised by Cardinal Satolli and adopted by all the bishops of the United States:

> We strictly forbid any one, whether bishop or priest—and this is the express prohibition of the Sovereign Pontiff, through the Sacred Congregation—either by act or by threat to exclude from the sacraments as unworthy (parents who choose to send their children to the public schools). As regards the children themselves, this enactment applies with still greater force.

The bishops of the United States and Cardinal Satolli seem to have foreseen the case

we have before us to-day. In the United States, as I have said, they have sanctioned the public schools, provided they were supplemented with religious instruction. What were the means suggested by these eminent bishops :

The first consists in an agreement between the bishop and the members of the school board whereby they, in a spirit of fairness and goodwill, allow Catholic children to be assembled during free time and taught the catechism.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Does the hon. gentleman see a great difference between the state of things in the United States, where the constitution does not guarantee to the Catholic minority separate schools, and the state of things that exists in Manitoba, where the constitution does guarantee separate schools to the minority of that province ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Surely my hon. friend does not conclude that because in the United States separate schools are not guaranteed by the constitution, it would be a mortal sin to send a Roman Catholic child to a public school where there is religious instruction.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Circumstances alter cases.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Will my hon. friend rise in his place in Parliament and state that sending his child to a public school where there is religious instruction, would be a mortal sin ? He will not say that, nobody will say it. Then, if nobody would dare to rise in this House any say that, why are we denounced in the province of Quebec as heretics and worthy of eternal damnation ? Mr. Speaker, I will say no more on the school question. It has been said that the public are tired of that question. Well, we are not tired of it. Some of our hon. friends opposite do not seem to realize the currents of public opinion. The days are gone by when the people of the province of Quebec could be deceived and treated as my hon. friends opposite would wish them to be treated. I say that more progress in the ideas of liberty and freedom has been made in the province of Quebec during the last ten years, than in any other province in the Dominion. When I started out from my parents' farm I entertained then and entertained later many of the doctrines now held by many of my Roman Catholic friends in the clergy, and it is on that account I forgive them many things. Sir, the Roman Catholic clergy of the province of Quebec is composed of good men, of moral men, there is not a more moral body of men than the priests of the province of Quebec ; but I am bound to add at the same time that those men have been brought up, as it were, within closed walls, and some of them have become the unwilling tools of such men as those who sit on the opposite side of the House. The hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) stood up and said : I come to defend the rights of the Roman Catholics. There is no one on this side of the House who is not prepared to give the Roman Catholic clergy their full share of liberty. But I know what our friends opposite have in their hearts. They are a discredited party, they are a doomed party. Their only hope of salvation and redemption, if there is any redemption for them, is to succeed in dragging the Roman Catholics at their tail. They will, however, not succeed in doing it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Those who laugh last generally laugh the best, and so far we have laughed the last and the best. Some other questions have been dealt with in the course of this debate. Our hon. friends on the other side of the House doubtless expected we would make great fools of ourselves on the tariff measure. They will be badly sold. I have had a good deal of experience in public life. I have known a great many public men, and I may frankly say that I never sat side by side with a safer body of men than those on this side of the House. All my colleagues are safe men. We will not destroy any legitimate industry or trade ; but we are bound to alleviate the burdens of the people, and we will do so. Hon. gentlemen opposite would be delighted if we were to precipitate a crisis. Consider the language used by the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Quinn). He said that many mills are closed. But the hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that they are closed because they have large quantities of stock on hand, and also because every year they are closed for a certain period. The hon. gentleman is a very good lawyer, but I am afraid he is not a very good business man. I say the tariff will be a safe one. The commercial community feels it ; there is a feeling of greater confidence all along the line. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat has alluded to inquiries that have taken place on accusations made against public servants of the Crown. I know that some inquiries have been held, and perhaps out of those inquiries certain developments will occur which will not please hon. gentlemen opposite. We have not acted rashly ; we have dealt very leniently with our public servants.

An hon. MEMBER. Too leniently.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I hear an hon. member say "too leniently." I ask my hon. friend to bear with us. It would be an unwise act to go forward rashly in such a matter. There are some very good public servants. There are, however, public servants who are not so good ; and speaking for my department, I know

that during the last eight months I have dismissed a great number of them, and yet the service is as well conducted, or better, although I have nearly fifty public servants less. We cannot be accused of being rash and acting unfairly when we discharge unnecessary employees. In some other cases I know that men who have been connected with the Conservative party and interfered violently in elections, have been dismissed. It is not a pleasant thing to dismiss public servants, especially when they have been for a long time in the service. But our opponents will bear with us when I say that we owe it to ourselves to protect ourselves in this matter. We are not going to allow ourselves to be put in the hands of our enemies. Speaking for myself, I say this, that when I find out that one of my employees is not loyal to me, I will dismiss him right off. It seems to me that a Minister of the Crown, having a large department to administer, has at least as many rights as the manager or a great corporation. The manager of a great corporation, if he has no longer confidence in this or that employee, even if he cannot give the reason for it, and only entertains a suspicion in regard to him, will simply dismiss him. I claim the same right, and I know of some such cases. I am sorry to have detained the House so long, as I did not expect to speak at length. But I want to say this, that this Government has come into power with flying colours. Hon. gentlemen opposite, however, declare that we carried the last elections by false pretenses. How can this be said? Is it not a fact that on the school question the Premier of the day moved the six months' hoist to the Remedial Bill, in a manly way. We were all proud of his action. We have carried the day. Where did we carry the day especially? In the French province of Quebec. We desired to follow the policy outlined by him. What was it? The present Prime Minister stated that he desired to secure harmony and wanted good will to prevail between all the citizens of Canada, and this grand and broad minded policy was accepted by the majority of the good citizens of Canada. Some of my own opinions have been quoted. I have changed my views on many men and on many things, and I am very glad of it. But the point I desire to make is this: The province of Quebec has changed its mind. Progress has been going on steadily. Sir, I do not to-day recognize the province of Quebec of twenty-five years ago when for the first time I went into journalism. Progress has been going on, going on fast, and it will go on faster during the coming years. That progress has been going on in this direction: the French people of the province of Quebec desire to mingle, to be friends with their Protestant fellow-citizens. The policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite is to estrange the races in this country; they want everything separate; I want union everywhere. Why should we not be friends and brothers in this Dominion of ours? Why should not my children and your children mix together and love each other? I stand in my place in this House, not hiding my views. I am a Roman Catholic, I know the feeling in Quebec. I know that the young generation is anxious for friendship with their friends of English origin. I know that the young generation is determined to have freedom of the press, freedom of speech, political freedom in every shape and form. Our hon. friends opposite do not recognize that feeling, and that is the reason why they were so badly defeated on the 23rd of June. Sir, it is the reason why, if they were going to appeal to the province of Quebec to-morrow, there would not come back five of the party opposite to this Chamber.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise with the intention of making a speech at this hour of the night, and I have no speech to make. I rise with some hesitation, because what I shall say, I know will not please some members of my own party. But, Sir, I think it due to myself and I think it due to my constituents to say, that I have no sympathy with a good deal that has been said on this side of the House with reference to the Remedial Bill. I have belonged to the Conservative party ever since I entered politics and I claim to belong to that party to-day, but I claim that this is a question which, with me at any rate, is above party. It has been said, and I do not propose to discuss that question, that the party to-day in power got a majority in Quebec on false pretenses. About that I know nothing: but if they did get into power on false pretenses they can answer to those who voted for them. All who were in this House during the last Parliament know my views upon the Manitoba school question. I opposed the Remedial Bill; I voted for the six months' hoist, and I did so because I was opposed to all interference with Manitoba. I said at the time, that if the question were to be settled it could best be settled by Manitoba itself.

Now, Sir, I am not going to pronounce on the settlement that has been made nor to speak as to its details, because I hold that it is none of my business. Manitoba has made the settlement, she is responsible for it, and she has passed the necessary legislation. If the Government in this House brought in a Remedial Bill, then it would have been time for me to consider the matter, and probably I should take the same ground as I did before, and vote against it. I think all hon. members know that I would be very glad to see the day come when there would be no separate schools in Canada, and I believe, Sir, that day will come not by violence, not by compulsion, but that it will come of the free-will of the Catholic population themselves. There are Catholic

countries where there are no separate schools, and where the children all go to school together. That state of things it is my hope to see in Canada. As I have said, I am not concerned at this moment to discuss the details of the arrangement made in Manitoba. The people of Manitoba can pronounce on that themselves when they have an opportunity. If they are not satisfied with what the Greenway Government have done on this subject, they can turn them out and put others in their places.

Sir, as far as the Dominion Parliament is concerned, in my opinion, the time has come when this question should be dropped. A settlement has been made, arranged between the present Government and the Government of Manitoba, a law has been passed in Manitoba, and, so far as I know, all has been done that can be done. At all events, this House is not asked to pass upon it here. I believe that the country is tired of this question. I believe the country wants this Parliament to turn away from this question now, and take up other questions which are of importance to Canada, and which ought to be discussed here. I therefore say that if there should be any resolution brought up condemning the Government for this settlement, I shall support the Government. I do not say that because I want to go against my party; not at all. I say it because I feel it due to my position on this question, and I say it further because I believe that I am pleasing my constituents, the men who sent me here.

Mr. HUGHES. No, you are not.

Mr. CRAIG. Some gentlemen can not only speak for themselves, but for others. I am speaking for myself and for those who sent me here, and I do not think the gentleman who has interrupted me did send me here. I am only a young politician, but I think it would be the part of wisdom for the Conservative party to drop this question. Some of them may not agree with me; they have the right to their opinion, but on this question I must claim the right to be independent, and to have my own opinion, and to express it, because it is a question on which I feel strongly. At the last annual meeting of the delegates of my riding, I stated that if any member of the Conservative party brought forward a resolution condemning the settlement of the school question—a settlement made without any Bill being brought before the Dominion Parliament—I would vote against my own party on that question. I can tell the House that my statement on that matter was endorsed by the convention. I therefore think I am perfectly safe in saying, that in speaking as I do, and in announcing the action I propose to take in this matter, I am not only representing my own views, but I am representing the views of my constituents. Mr. Speaker, I shall say nothing more; I have said in very few words and very plainly what I intend to do. I have said it so that both sides of the House may know where I stand, and exactly how I am going to act on this question.

Mr. McINERNEY. Mr. Speaker, It was certainly not my intention to take part in this debate, and for various reasons. In the first place, although it is not perhaps very interesting to the House, I have been suffering for a few days from a very violent cold, and am not in a position either to do justice to myself or to please the House. But I think I would be wanting in a duty to myself and to a large part of the people of this country if I were to allow the speech delivered by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) to pass without notice at my hands. From the acclaim and the applause which that speech received at its close, one would imagine that the Government had reserved their big gun for the end of the debate, and had fired it off at the very last moment, as the curfew bell is tolled in the evening, so that they might all get in out of the cold. Nevertheless, I am not of the opinion that the speech of the hon. Minister of Public Works is going to have a great effect in this country in favour of the Government of which he is a member; for I think I can see the object and the intention of that speech. The hon. gentleman has himself admitted that it has been his purpose to get into Canada a delegate from the Holy See for the purpose of investigating certain matters of a quasi religious nature, and the hon. gentleman, finding that the ablegate is now in this country, and can only decide in one way upon the questions that may be submitted to him, and finding that he has nothing to gain by courting the friendship of the church or of the ablegate, turns to reviling the hierarchy of Canada, both by innuendo and by open accusation, against the interests of a church, upon which, if he is a faithful member of it, he should be the last man to cast a slur. What does he say of the bishops of Quebec? What had we heard already from another Catholic member of the Government about the bishops of Quebec? The hon. Solicitor General was bold enough to say that he had kept his part of the contract to which he was a party, but that the bishop of his diocese, the Archbishop of Quebec, Archbishop Begin, one of the most learned men of the whole hierarchy of Canada, had not carried out his part of the contract. That is the declaration of the hon. Solicitor General. I will deal with a few of the remarks of that hon. gentleman at a later stage; but I may en passant that there is no member of this Government whom I am proud to see occupying a position of emolument and honour than the hon. Solicitor General. I have known him for many years, he was a friend of my early boyhood, and I have watched his course upwards with considerable interest. I believe

him to be a gentleman of considerable ability, I have always believed him to be a man of honour, and I shall still cherish that belief until the time comes when I shall expect him to carry out the promise he made to the Archbishop of Quebec, and the promise he has made to this House to-night. When that time comes, I shall watch with interest the action that will be taken by the hon. Solicitor General. But at the present time I must direct my remarks to the few observations made by the hon. Minister of Public Works. After the statement that forty-five Liberal members of the Senate and the House of Commons had signed a petition to Rome, had been read to this House from the London "Tablet," the organ of Cardinal Vaughan and the Catholics of England, then the hon. Minister of Public Works, from whom wild horses would not have drawn the secret before, gets up, and in a fine frenzy reads the petition in favour of liberty and religion which he and forty-four other gentlemen signed. Now, Sir, I will ask the hon. Minister of Public Works if that was the only petition to Rome that he signed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. I did not sign anything else, and nobody has signed anything else.

Mr. McINERNEY. Will the hon. gentleman answer this other question? Will he tell me that he does not know that other charges and other petitions were signed?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I never signed anything else.

Mr. McINERNEY. Do you know other documents and other charges that were signed?

Mr. LISTER. You are not in a magistrate's court.

Mr. McINERNEY. I am not in a magistrate's court, I know, but there should be no equivocation. The hon. gentleman who has interrupted is a past graduate in a police court, I understand, and not only that, but I think he would pass for a first-class bully in a ring.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order. Take it back.

Mr. McINERNEY. I did not say that the hon. gentleman was a bully in the ring, but that he might pass for one.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman must withdraw the expression entirely.

Mr. McINERNEY. If I have gone too far, I shall certainly withdraw anything of an offensive nature. I am very sorry the hon. gentleman interrupted me because he and I have always been on the most friendly terms, and I do not want to say anything to irritate him, but I wish him to understand that the interruptions which the hon. gentleman makes are of a nature calculated to call out the retorts to which he objects. The hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) has not denied that documents were sent to Rome other than the one he presented to this House.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I state again that to my knowledge no other charges were made.

Mr. McINERNEY. Hon. gentlemen in this House have informed me that other charges were made, that charges of a specific nature against the Catholic clergy were made, that members for different counties in the province of Quebec had made charges against certain members of the clergy of that province. I am bound to take the statement of the hon. Minister, but I must confess to my surprise that, with his great knowledge of everything that transpires in this country, he is so ignorant of those other charges, and declarations, and petitions which have been forwarded to Rome. The hon. Minister of Public Works is endeavouring to appeal to the Protestant sentiment of the country against the Catholic sentiment; and in order to provide a basis for his appeal, he told us that a newspaper owned by his son in Montreal was put under the ban by the clerical authorities, and he also told us that "L'Electeur" had been put under the ban by these authorities. But he did not tell us the circumstances under which these papers were suppressed. In the first place, it must be admitted that the Catholic Church in the province of Quebec stands in a peculiar position in Canada. It has certain treaty rights in that province, which it may possibly not possess in the other provinces, but the Catholic Church in the province of Quebec, as in any other part of the world, has the right to hold certain opinions, beliefs and doctrines, and her clergy have a perfect right to forbid their flocks from reading papers or other publications which are dangerous to morals, which are subversive of the doctrines of their church, which are of an insidious character, teaching doctrines that destroy the very foundations of religion and morality in the state. It is true that shortly after the bishops came from Rome last fall, they put under the ban "L'Electeur," the most prominent Liberal paper in the Quebec district. Why did they do it? Was it because "L'Electeur" taught any political doctrine? No, Sir, I shall tell you why. Mr. L. O. David, a prominent Liberal in Montreal, issued a pamphlet called "The Clergy and its Work in Canada," in which he advanced doctrines, not only dangerous to religion but to the state as well. He advocated this doctrine among others, that it is perfectly justifiable for a people, if they are not satisfied with the laws of their country, to seek redress in open rebellion by force of arms.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I beg to tell my hon. friend that he is altogether wrong.

Mr. CASGRAIN. He is perfectly right.

Mr. McINERNEY. The hon. Minister of Public Works made a most brilliant speech, and he should certainly allow me now to say a few words in reply. I state here, from my knowledge of the facts, that Mr. L. O. David laid down that doctrine in his pamphlet, amongst others. The Catholic clergy of this Dominion—and in that they are in accord, I believe, with the clergy of all other denominations—do not believe in any such doctrine. They do not believe that the people in a constitutionally governed country have the right to seek to right their grievances by force of arms, but they believe that the proper mode for them to seek redress is through the constitutional channels. Under our system of responsible government, the people have the right, through their representatives in Parliament, to seek redress of grievances, and certainly have not the right to seek redress by force of arms. It was for laying down this dangerous doctrine that Mr. David's pamphlet was denounced. But what did "L'Electeur" do? It printed that document, word for word, in its columns, in the face of this declaration of the clergy. Now, if the book in which that doctrine was taught was wrong and should be suppressed, why should the newspaper that published it be not also suppressed?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). That is true liberty.

Mr. McINERNEY. It is true liberty. When true liberty is properly understood, it will be distinguished from improper license. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries may understand what true liberty is or he may not, but I can tell him this, that the authorities in state and church in this country have a perfect right to see that the beliefs of the people are not undermined in matters that are fundamental and for the good of the state. I do not think it is an improper liberty to cut down like the Upas tree, as low as it can be cut, any paper, book or document that may promulgate principles which would sap the true liberties of the people and are destructive of the true interests of the state. The "Cultivateur," that paper which is the glory of the hon. Minister of Public Works and his son, was suppressed because it went as far as "L'Electeur," and I do not wonder that the Minister of Public Works should have a grievance against the clergy and should vent his spleen against them. No doubt it is out of his great love for them that he signs his name to an appeal to the highest authority in Rome to discipline the bishops of the church of his own province. His heart is overflowing with affection for these bishops, who are great and good men, but are misled by designing politicians. I remember the time when the hon. gentleman could find no words too good for the clergy of his province. But that was when perhaps they were supporting him. I remember the hon. gentleman in 1894 denouncing the Government of the late Sir John Thompson for not having disallowed the Manitoba Act. I remember him calling upon the Government then to restore to the minority in Manitoba the rights which had been ruthlessly taken from them by that arch traitor and coward, Greenway. When the hon. gentleman had gone back on every declaration he had made, when he had become a traitor to the very cause he had sworn to defend, the clergy of his own province had a perfect right, from their standpoint, to denounce him and his friends.

The hon. gentleman takes great credit for the election in Bonaventure. I know something of that county. Its inhabited portion is a very narrow, long strip of land, only a few miles in width, running along the Baie des Chaleurs, between the foot of the hills and the sea, and inhabited by farmers and fishermen, chiefly fishermen; and the Baie des Chaleurs Railway runs along past almost every man's door. What did the Government do? They promised these people that they would run the railway as a Government work, and I am told by men who were on the spot that this was a matter of vital importance to the people. You can easily understand what a tremendous influence such an interest as that must exercise on a constituency—a railway running almost from one end of the constituency to the other and running past every man's door. Numbers of these people have construction claims against the men who built that road, and were told there was now a chance to have these claims paid.

Mr. TALBOT. The hon. gentleman has just said that the railway ran the whole length of the county.

Mr. McINERNEY. I did not.

Mr. TALBOT. And that it ran by every man's door.

Mr. McINERNEY. The hon. gentleman may have misunderstood me or I may have made a mistake. If I have made a misstatement I am willing to correct it, and I hope he will not misunderstand me. The road does not run the entire length of the county, but runs for a long distance in the county which is settled in a narrow strip.

Mr. TALBOT. What distance?

Mr. McINERNEY. Eighty miles.

Mr. TALBOT. How long is the county?

Mr. McINERNEY. I am not standing up in a class in geography just now, or I would answer the hon. gentleman. Perhaps

the hon. gentleman would state how long the county is.

Mr. TALBOT. It is 145 miles long and the road runs in it for 65 miles.

Mr. McINERNEY. But I am informed that the bulk of the population is at the end in which the road runs, that the large towns are at that end of the county. If the road runs 80 miles out of 145 miles, and runs through that part of the county which contains the bulk of the population, the proposal to take this road over was a tremendous influence brought to bear upon the people at that time. But Bonaventure was not a gain to the Government. Mr. Fauvel, the late member, carried it by over 700 in 1891, and in 1896 he carried by a large majority, though not so large as before. Bonaventure should not be a great consolation to the hon. gentleman under the circumstances. I am told that hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared by giving railway bonuses and buying railways in different counties to gain counties that have given 1,500 majority against them. It is the boast of certain politicians in this House and out of it that they are determined, by buying the Canada Eastern Railway, to secure the influence of Mr. Alexander Gibson and defeat the hon. gentleman, the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) in York. If they succeed in this thing they attribute their success to the voice of the people. Now, I am on my feet, I intend to give a little time to the matter contained in the Speech from the Throne, the Address in reply to which this House is about to adopt. The speech is fairly long, but it has been said that it is not very broad. The speech opens with congratulations upon this being the Jubilee Year, and says that the country should take means to celebrate that glorious event. I will not repeat the words of praise to Her Majesty that have been so eloquently uttered here and throughout Her Majesty's dominions. The next subject of importance is the revision of the tariff, which is mentioned in the following paragraph :

> We are pleased to learn that a measure will be submitted to us for the revision of the tariff, which it is believed will provide the necessary revenue, and while having due regard to industrial interests, will make our fiscal system more satisfactory to the masses of the people.

Was there ever a more vague, a more indefinite, a more equivocal declaration than that ? or, take the declaration of the hon. the Prime Minister, when he says that every industrial interest of the country will be protected while the burdens of taxation resting upon the people would be reduced. From that indefinite statement, he said, it was easy to perceive what the intentions of the Government were as to tariff legislation. What does the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) say ? I regret that the hon. gentleman is not now in his place. Whatever else may be said of him, he has always been an ornament to this House, one of the most learned men in Canada, a man fitted for any position, but a man who has been disrated in his own party. I may quote the declaration of Percy when he accused others of having made a conspiracy :

> To pull down Richard, that sweet lovely rose,
> And plant this thorn, this canker, Bolingbroke.

In place of Richard, this lovely rose, they have taken another man from one of the provinces by the sea. And why, let me ask, in passing, has this Cabinet been filled up with men who have not been on record in this Chamber. This party was prepared for a somersault, and knowing that they would turn traitors to the people on their tariff policy and every policy, it became necessary to have men in the Cabinet who have not been pledged in this House at least to any particular declaration of policy. That is why we see introduced into this Parliament the hon. the Minister of Justice (Sir Oliver Mowat), the hon. the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), and the hon. the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair)—able men indeed, although as to some of them the verdict of this House has not been passed, they are untried in this arena. It is fair to surmise that they are here because they are not on record in this House on this question of the tariff, and the hon. gentleman to whom I have referred has been degraded from the position of Minister of Finance because he had been too much on record upon this subject. But what is his declaration with regard to the definiteness with which this Government is going to deal with the tariff. He says that the measure to be introduced will :

> do justice to the consumer, to the producer and the manufacturer alike, and they hope to be able to produce the tariff at an early date, which will show that the Government have, to say the least, made an honest attempt to do their duty by the people, who have entrusted them with the responsibility of office.

This is a declaration from the man who, in times gone by, prided himself upon the fact that he was open and above board in every declaration he made with regard to the fiscal policy of the country. In this speech there are many things wanting. I find in it no declaration of policy on unrestricted reciprocity ; I find nothing in favour of continental free trade ; I find no declaration in favour of free trade nor any upholding of a revenue tariff or of free trade as it is in England. Will hon. gentlemen deny that they have taken on various occasions, a definite position on every one of these policies. Take, for instance, the First Minister in "Hansard" of 1891. I find him reported as saying, on the subject of unrestricted reciprocity :

> We, the Liberal party, maintain that the policy of this country must be based, not upon

sentiment, but upon business principles; and, fresh as we come from the people, I say that the only policy which will develop this country, is unrestricted reciprocity and continental free trade.

Again he says:

Unrestricted reciprocity dead and buried! I am as good an authority on this subject as Sir Charles Tupper is, and I say it is more alive than ever.

Again:

Now, Sir, we are agitating, and we have agitated, this policy of unrestricted reciprocity because we believe it to be in the best interests of this country.

Here is their declaration in 1891. Contrast it with their equivocal declaration of policy now that the party is endeavouring to turn a somersault on the tariff question and to build up the prosperity of the country by the very policy that the Conservative party has upheld since 1878. There is another question upon which these hon. gentlemen say nothing in this Address.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). It is twelve o'clock. Better move the adjournment.

Mr. McINERNEY. I have no objection to an adjournment. I would move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER. That can only be done by the unanimous consent of the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman wishes the House to adjourn, there is no objection.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am quite willing that the House should now adjourn.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

REPORT.

Trade and Navigation Returns for the year ended June 30th, 1896.—(Mr. Paterson.)

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 31st March, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

RAILWAY RETURN-FARE TICKETS.

Mr. McLENNAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 11) respecting the sale of railway return-fare tickets.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Explain, please.

Mr. McLENNAN. This Bill is a very short one, and its object is to bring about the issue of second-class return-fare tickets at the same percentage of reduction as in the case of first-class return tickets.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 10) to secure the better observance of the Lord's Day.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Bill (No. 12) further to amend the law respecting Building Societies and Loan and Savings Companies carrying on business in the province of Ontario.—(Mr. Wood, Hamilton.)

IMPORTS OF AMERICAN COAL OIL.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron) asked:

1. How many Imperial gallons of American coal oil were imported into Canada in tank cars (bulk) during the year ending 30th June, 1896? 2. What was the cost per Imperial gallon at the point of manufacture? 3. How many Imperial gallons of American coal oil were imported barrelled during the year ending 30th June, 1896? 4. What was the cost per Imperial gallon of the barrelled oil at the point of manufacture?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The importations of coal oil in tank cars and barrels are grouped together in the customs returns, so that the quantities and cost of American coal oil in tank cars and barrels respectively cannot be from all customs ports.

RICE FACTORIES.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron) asked:

1. How many rice factories are in Canada? What is the capital invested, hands employed, wages paid (according to latest information in the hands of the Government?

2. What was the number of pounds of rice cleaned during the year ending 30th June, 1896?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). 1. There are two rice mills in Canada. The Government has no special information with reference to the capital invested, or hands employed, or wages paid. 2. The Government has no information as to the number of pounds cleaned during the year. The presumption, however, being that the quantity of uncleaned rice entered for consumption would, one year with another, nearly represent the quantity cleaned. The quantity of uncleaned rice entered for home consumption during the year ending June 30th, 1896, was 13,311,090 pounds.

CUSTOMS OFFICER AT FENELON FALLS.

Mr. HUGHES asked:

Why were the services of the late customs officer at Fenelon Falls dispensed with? Was there

an investigation ? Who is now customs officer there ? Who is now performing the duties ? Has Mr. Junkin, who is reported to be customs officer, permission from this Government to act as sessional clerk in the legislative assembly in Toronto ? What other offices under this Government does Mr. Junkin hold ?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). 1. William McArthur, the late customs officer at Fenelon Falls, was employed at that place in the Department of Railways and Canals, as well as the Customs. His services were dispensed with by the Department of Railways and Canals on the ground that he was an active and offensive political partisan, and the Department of Customs being apprised of such action on the part of the Railways and Canals, also dispensed with his services as customs officer ? 2. No, so far as I am aware. 3. William Thomas Junkin. 4. William Thomas Junkin is now performing the duties. 5. The Department of Customs is not aware that Mr. Junkin is a sessional clerk in the legislative assembly at Toronto. 6. I believe Mr. Junkin is employed by the Department of Railways and Canals.

GOVERNMENT DREDGE "OTONABEE."

Mr. HUGHES asked :

Why were the services of the engineer on the Government dredge "Otonabee" dispensed with? Was there an investigation ? Who were appointed to succeed him? Why is the dredge now idle ? Did at least two appointed to succeed him fail in succession to be able to operate the dredge ? Is the dredge now idle ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The engineer was not retained in the employ of the Government for the reason that it was not deemed advisable to retain him in the service. There was no investigation. I am not aware that two persons were appointed in succession to the engineer. Mr. Groselle was appointed and not found suited to the service. He did not continue in the employ. The dredge is not now engaged, and is idle waiting for navigation to open.

ROSEDALE WORKS, TRENT CANAL.

Mr. HUGHES asked :

Why were the services of Mr. Kennedy, foreman on the Rosedale works of the Trent Canal, dispensed with ? Was there an investigation ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). It was not deemed desirable by the Government to continue Mr. Kennedy longer in employment on the Rosedale works. There was no investigation, none being considered at all necessary.

TRENT CANAL, BALSAM LAKE SECTION.

Mr. HUGHES asked :

Why were the services of George Laidlaw, timber inspector on the Balsam Lake section of the Trent Canal, dispensed with ? Was there an investigation ? Was John Shields of Toronto notified to succeed him ? Who now holds the office ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Mr. Laidlaw's services in the employ of the Government on the works at Balsam Lake section were dispensed with because it was considered proper to dispense with his services at the time. No investigation was held nor was Mr. John Shields of Toronto appointed in Mr. Laidlaw's place. No person has been in the Government employ in place of Mr. Laidlaw, and no work has been since in progress requiring the employment of any person in his stead.

Mr. HUGHES. I wish to draw the attention of the Minister to the fact that he has failed to answer an important part of the question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman may refer to a part of a question if he thinks it was not understood.

Mr. HUGHES. I draw attention to the fact that no answer was given to the question : Was John Shields of Toronto notified to succeed him ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I may state to the hon. gentleman that I cannot say that John Shields of Toronto was notified. I know that he was not appointed, and why he should be notified, if he was not appointed, is something that I am unable to answer.

DREDGING WORK AT MIDLAND.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. Did the dredge "Challenger" perform any work at the port of Midland in the summer of 1896 ? If so, how many days ?
2. Was the work for which the said dredge was sent to Midland to perform completed, and if not, at whose request was the work left in an unfinished state and was such request in writing or made verbally?
3. Did the Mayor of Midland request the completion of the said work, and if so, why was his request disregarded ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). The dredge "Challenger" worked in the harbour of Midland from the 20th of May, 1896, to the 19th of June, 1896, when at the request of Mr. Bennett, M.P., she proceeded to Penetanguishene, remaining in this latter port until the 28th of September, 1896. She then returned to Midland and worked there two days, 29th and 30th of September, when she was ordered to Collingwood to lay up for the winter. The work at Midland was left in an unfinished state, and the Mayor of that town did make a request for the completion of the same, but owing to the fact that the

dredge had been ordered to go into winter quarters, his request could not be granted.

Mr. BENNETT. I beg to call attention to the fact that the hon. gentleman has not answered the most vital part of the question: At whose request was the work left in an unfinished state, after two days had been done?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say more than I have just said, namely, that the dredge had to go into winter quarters.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, PENETANGUISHENE.

Mr. BENNETT asked:

1. How long has the position of collector of customs at the town of Penetanguishene been vacant?
2. Has any person been appointed to such vacancy? If so, who?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). 1. Since the death of the late sub-collector George Clark, which took place on the 25th January, 1895. 2. No, but the position has been temporarily filled by the employment of Mr. A. B. Thompson as acting sub-collector.

BAIE DE CHALEURS RAILROAD.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

Is the Baie de Chaleurs Railroad now being operated by the Government? If so, when was it taken over for that purpose? What have been the expenses per month of operating? What have been the receipts per month during that period?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND Canals (Mr. Blair). An Intercolonial railway train has been temporarily allowed the privilege of running daily over the Baie de Chaleurs Railway to Caplin for the public accommodation. The train commenced to run in this way on the 1st of January last:

The running expenses per month have been:

January	$3,664 26
February	2,703 41

The receipts per month have been:

January	$1,313 31
February	1,201 42

POSTMASTER AT MARSHALL, ONT.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

When was Gerald G. King appointed postmaster at Marsh Hill, Ont.? What caused the vacancy to which he was appointed? When did Mr. King cease to be postmaster of Marsh Hill? What amount has been paid to Mr. King for services as postmaster of Marsh Hill?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). There is no person of the name of Gerald G. King known to the Post Office Department.

Mr. FOSTER. May I amend the question by putting G. before the Gerald and making it G. Gerald King.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman had better let the question stand to another day.

GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS AT SUSSEX, N.B.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

Who is now the caretaker of the Government buildings, Customs and Post Office, at Sussex, New Brunswick? When was he appointed, and what is his salary?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). Sheppard Dryden was appointed on 12th January last at a salary of $200 a year, which enables me to make a saving of $280 per annum.

NEW GOVERNMENT BUILDING AT PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

Has any change been made since the last session of Parliament in the site of the new Government building at Portage la Prairie? If so, what?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). To the first question I answer, Yes. As regards the second question, a more eligible site, nearer the centre of business in the town, situated at the corner of Saskatchewan Avenue and Campbell Street, has been transferred to the department free of charge, and steps are being taken to transfer the public building to the said site.

WHARF AT BERTHIER, P.Q.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked:

What is the amount of dues collected at the wharf at Berthier, in the county of Montmagny, since Mr. I. Bouffard was appointed wharfinger? On what dates did the said wharfinger make his reports and his remittances to the Government?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The amount of dues collected was $172.22. The reports are made at the end of each month during the season of navigation, namely, May, June, July, August, September, October and November.

ADMIRALTY JURISDICTION.

Mr. GILLIES asked:

Whether it is the intention of the Government during the present session, either by legislation or otherwise, to confer admiralty jurisdiction under the Colonial Courts Admiralty Act, upon the county court judges in the province of Nova Scotia?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). The question is being considered.

POSTMASTER OF LES EBOULEMENTS.

Mr. MORIN asked:

For what reason was Charles Elie Tremblay dismissed from his office as postmaster of Les Eboulements?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Mr. Tremblay, postmaster of Les Eboulements, was dismissed for having taken an unduly active part in politics.

MAIL SERVICE BETWEEN BAY ST. PAUL AND MURRAY BAY.

Mr. MORIN asked:

Why was the contract for mail service between Bay St. Paul and Murray Bay cancelled? To whom has the new contract been awarded, and what is the contract price?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The circumstances under which the contract for the mail service between Bay St. Paul and Murray Bay was cancelled were as follows: This service being under contract to expire on the 30th September, 1892, tenders were invited, the lowest being that of Mr. Jean Bouchard, which was accepted, but the competency of Bouchard and his sureties being questioned, inquiry was made, and the inspector reported that Bouchard was quite qualified to undertake the service and that his sureties were good for several times the amount of the bond required. Notwithstanding these facts the late Government cancelled the acceptance of Jean Bouchard's tender, which was for $930, and renewed the contract then in force in favour of one Alexis Bouchard for $1,175. This renewal was made conditional upon the understanding that the lowest tenderer was to share in the benefits of the contract at this higher price. This contract for $1,170 was due to expire the 31st day of December, 1896, but on the 20th of January, 1896, nearly one year before its termination, it was renewed for four years, commencing from the 1st January, 1897, with Alexis Bouchard at $1,170, without public or other tender. In support of this renewal, the following communications are on record in the department:

16th January, 1896.

My dear Minister,—Mr. Alexis Bouchard, contractor for the mail service between St. Paul's Bay and Murray Bay, would like to renew his contract for four years. He will explain the matter to you. Please do what you can to be useful to him. He will also speak to you about Théophile Duford, of St. Paul's Bay, another mail contractor between St. Tite and St. Paul's Bay. The thing has been done before—there are precedents.

Yours faithfully,
SIMON CIMON.

ENDORSEMENTS.

It is in the highest degree important that this should be done at once, and that they should be informed of it immediately. A letter, at least.
L. P. P.

Having been made aware of Cimon's letter, I corroborate in every point. The renewal of his contract is calculated to procure for us a large number of voters at Les Eboulements and here. You might, perhaps, advise Sir A. P. to make this renewal during the election, or, at least, to write to Inspector Bolduc that such is his intention. These people will be informed of it in time, and the matter will be all O.K.
A. H. SIMARD.

Under these circumstances, the contract for the service at $1,170 was cancelled and the service put up to tender again, tenders being due 20th November, 1896, when 20 tenders were received, the lowest being that of E. Duchesne, for $650, and the contract was awarded to him. Inspector Bolduc reported that Mr. Duchesne desired to withdraw his tender and was unable to obtain security, the price being too low. Thereupon the contract was offered to Mr. E. Bouchard, the next lowest tender, at his tender price, namely, $849, and he having furnished the necessary security, the contract was awarded to him for four years from the 1st of January, 1897, at the price of $849, being $321 a year, or $1,284 for the four years, less than the price of the cancelled contract.

LIGHTHOUSE AT CAP SAUMON.

Mr. MORIN asked:

To whom has the contract been awarded for furnishing firewood to the lighthouse at Cap Saumon, in the county of Charlevoix, for the year 1897, and at what price?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The contract has been awarded to Mr. Elzear Guerin, of St. Simeon, P.Q., at $2.90 per cord, French measure.

Mr. MORIN asked:

What amount has been paid to John Warren for the construction of the lighthouse at Cap Saumon, in the county of Charlevoix? For what price had he contracted to build the said lighthouse? Has he a claim for extras? Has he been paid any money in connection with this undertaking since the first day of July last?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The amount paid to John Warren for the construction of the lighthouse was $3,700. The price of the contract was $3,700. He had a claim for extras; part of the claim, $44, was allowed, and the matter was considered settled. No money has been paid in connection with this undertaking since 1st July last.

BEET ROOT SUGAR BOUNTY.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron) asked:

How many pounds of beet root sugar were manufactured in Canada during the three years beginning 1st July, 1893, and ending 30th June, 1896? What was the rate per pound and the amount of bounty paid each year?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The following is the statement showing bounty on beet root sugar from 1st of July, 1893, to 30th June, 1896 :—

Fiscal Year.	Quantity.	Bounty.	Average rate per lb.
	Lbs.	$ cts.	cts.
1893-94	423,432	7,765 97	1·83
1894-95	1,546,527	29,449 56	1·90
1895-96	1,158,120	11,733 00	1·01
Totals.....	3,128,079	48,948 53	

BYNG INLET CUSTOMS OFFICER.

Mr. McCORMICK asked :

1. When was Peter Potvin appointed a customs officer at Byng Inlet, district of Parry Sound ?
2. Was he appointed under an Order in Council ?
3. Has the said Potvin been dismissed from the said position ? If so, when ?
4. If dismissed, was such dismissal under an Order in Council ?
5. Was any complaint preferred against the said Potvin ? If so, by whom, and whether such complaint, if any, was verbal or in writing ?
6. If any complaint was made, was the said Potvin apprised of such complaint, and was any investigation held prior to said Potvin's dismissal, if he has been dismissed?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The following is the reply to the hon. gentleman's question :—1st. Mr. Potvin was first employed as acting landing waiter at Byng Inlet on the 6th June, 1879. 2nd. No. 3rd. Yes, his salary ceased from the month of September, 1896, and he was notified of his dismissal on the 12th March, 1897. 4th. No. 5th. No, but the department was advised that Potvin had left his books and papers at Byng Inlet on the 1st September, 1896, and had proceeded to Midland to live. The matter was referred to the collector at Collingwood, who reported that Mr. Potvin had not notified him of his removal from Byng Inlet to Midland, or of the disposal of his books and papers, nor did Potvin report such actions to the department at Ottawa. Mr. Potvin had no right to leave his port without proper authority ; moreover, it appeared on investigation by the department that Mr. Potvin had been away from his office in Byng Inlet during the winter of 1895, and had received his salary for that period, although as a temporary officer he should only have been paid for the time actually employed. The department was not aware of such absence until the month of November, 1896. 6th. Mr. Potvin was called upon by the department, through the collector at Collingwood, for an explanation of his conduct for leaving his office and disposing of his books and papers without receiving the proper authority.

SAMUEL E. OLDFIELD, LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER.

Mr. McCORMICK asked :

1. When was Samuel E. Oldfield appointed lighthouse keeper at Point au Baril, district of Parry Sound, and was such appointment under Order in Council ?
2. Has the said Oldfield been dismissed from the said position, and if dismissed, was any investigation held, or was he furnished with any particulars of any complaints against him or any opportunity afforded him to meet such complaints ?
3. If dismissed, has a successor been appointed, and if so, what is the name of the new appointee, his age, and has the department any evidence as to his fitness for such position ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Mr. Samuel E. Oldfield was appointed lighthouse keeper at Point au Baril, by Order in Council of the 4th June, 1889. Mr. Oldfield's appointment was cancelled by Order in Council of the 1st February, 1897, on the ground of his having been, while lighthouse keeper, engaged in illegal fishing ; the tug "Gauthier," owned by him and others was seized and is now under seizure for being engaged in fishing with illegal nets which are wholly prohibited in Ontario waters. A full investigation was held by Captain Dunn of the cruiser "Petrel." By Order in Council of 1st March, Charles McDavitt, of Parry Sound, has been appointed. His age is a little over 40. The department has evidence that he is well qualified for the position.

AGE OF LIGHTHOUSE KEEPERS.

Mr. McCORMICK asked :

Is it the intention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to adhere to the rule adopted by his predecessor to appoint as lighthouse keepers no persons over the age of forty years ? If not, what is to be the limit in point of years, if any, in making such appointments ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Yes ; as closely as possible.

POSTMASTER AT ODESSA.

Mr. WILSON asked :

What is the name of the postmaster at Odessa, in the riding of Lennox ? When was he appointed, and who recommended him to the Postmaster General for the position of postmaster at Odessa ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The name of the postmaster is Peter A. Mabee. He was appointed on the 9th February, 1897, upon the recommendation of D. W. Allison.

JAMES GORDON NUNN, OF ST. THOMAS, ONT.

Mr. INGRAM asked :

Is it the intention of the Department of Customs to pay James George Nunn, who acted for several months as sub-collector of Customs at the port of St. Thomas, Ont., the balance of salary due him previous to his dismissal without cause ?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). With reference to that question the hon. member well knows that he makes an assertion at the end of it.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram), at my suggestion, struck out the latter part of his question and did not ask it.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. All I can answer off-hand at the present time would be, that I am unaware that the department owes Mr. Nunn anything, but I will inquire into it, and certainly if anything is due him it shall be paid.

Mr. INGRAM. Let the question stand.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. That will not be necessary because if the hon. gentleman calls at my office or asks me at any time later, I will tell him.

FISHING LICENSE FEES IN ADVANCE.

Mr. INGRAM asked :

Has the rule formerly in force in the Department of Marine and Fisheries compelling the payment of fees for licenses for fishing in advance, or at the time of delivery hereof, been abandoned, and if so, when are licenses now paid for, and are persons now permitted to fish after issuing licenses in their name but before payment of fees ?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The rule for demanding payment of the license fee for fishing in advance has not been abandoned, but on a recommendation of the Inspector of Fisheries for Ontario, it was decided that in a few cases where the fishermen of Lake Erie had been previously in the hands of United States fishermen and dependent on them for the license fees they be allowed until the month of June for paying such fees. Such persons will therefore be permitted to fish after the issue of such licenses.

CROW'S NEST PASS RAILWAY.

Mr. MACLEAN asked :

Have the Canadian Pacific Railway Company deposited plans with the Department of Railways for the construction of a branch line running through what is known as the Crow's Nest Pass, British Columbia ? If so, on what date were said plans deposited ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). They have submitted plans for deposit in the department for a line through the Crow's Nest Pass. The letter from the secretary of the Canadian Pacific Railway forwarding these plans for deposit in the department, is dated 9th March, 1897, and the plans were received in the department on 10th March, 1897.

THE TARIFF BILL.

Mr. McDOUGALL asked :

Will the Government introduce the Tariff Bill before the 13th April, the date of the nomination for the provincial general elections in Nova Scotia ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). It is not deemed expedient or according to precedent that the precise date of the bringing down of the tariff resolutions should now be announced. They will, however, be brought down at the proper time, with due regard to the best interests of the Dominion.

BEAUHARNOIS POSTMASTER.

Mr. DUGAS (for Mr. Bergeron) asked :

Whether the Postmaster General is aware that Octave Laurin, the postmaster at Beauharnois, is busily engaged electioneering through the county of Beauharnois, and especially in the post office ? If not, will the Postmaster General see that said postmaster be not an active and offensive partisan ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The Postmaster General is not aware that Octave Laurin, postmaster of Beauharnois, is busily engaged electioneering through the county of Beauharnois, whether in the post office, or elsewhere, and has no reason to suppose that he is likely to become an active and offensive partisan.

POSTMASTER OF MARSH HILL, ONT.

Mr. FOSTER. Will you allow me one moment to say, with reference to the question I put, that what I asked was whether Gerald G. King was appointed postmaster of Marsh Hill. I believe that George G. is the name of Mr. King, the G. standing for Gerald. The Postmaster General refused to answer on the ground that Gerald appears first, instead of George. Both are the names of the person indicated.

Mr. SPEAKER. I suppose it is only a question of whether the hon. Postmaster General has been furnished with the information, or whether, as he has stated, he has inquired and finds that there is no such person in the department. I do not suppose that either the hon. Postmaster General or the hon. member wishes to haggle over technicalities, and if the hon. Postmaster General happens to have the information that fits the question, he will probably give it. Otherwise, I suppose the question might stand.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am only too anxious to furnish hon. gentlemen with all the information which the department can afford; but when I am asked for information with regard to a person named Gerald G. King, supposed to be an officer of my department, I say that there is no person of that name on the books of the department. Such is the information I have got from the deputy. If the hon. gentleman wants any information with regard to a person of a different name, and will be good enough to furnish me with the name of the person, I shall be glad to give him the information.

Mr. FOSTER. Since the person is not known, I will give the information. George G. King, the G. standing for Gerald, was the member for Queen's and Sunbury, N.B., and was induced to resign his seat in order to give the present Minister of Railways a constituency to run in, and he was appointed postmaster of Marsh Hill for that purpose.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. Postmaster General has not information of any person of this name in the department, the hon. member may give the name of the person he meant, and repeat the question.

Mr. FOSTER. I have to state, then, that the person here meant is George G. King, at present senator of the Dominion.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman will be good enough to state in the proper way what he means, I will endeavour to give the answer.

Mr. FOSTER. May this question be allowed to remain, with the substitution of George G. King for Gerald G. King?

Mr. SPEAKER. I think there had better be no further discussion on it, but let the hon. member again give notice of the question in proper form.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Mr. MARTIN. I asked yesterday when certain papers regarding railway subsidies would be brought down by the Government, in compliance with an order of the House of last session; and I did not receive any reply.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I shall be very glad to furnish the information as soon as I can do so.

Mr. MARTIN. Can the hon. Minister give me any idea when this statement will be laid on the Table of the House?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would not like to pledge myself at present to any specific date. I think the hon. gentleman will have to be content with my assurance that it will be done as speedily as possible.

THE ESTIMATES.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask the Minister of Finance when we may expect the Estimates to be brought down?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). They are in a very advanced state, and I hope they will be brought down at a very early day. I am not able to state the date exactly, but it will be very shortly.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. QUINN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to explain to the House that I am reported to have stated, in the remarks I addressed to the House last evening, that the Canada Sugar Refinery closed on the 23rd of this month. I made that statement on the information which I had received, and which I believed to be accurate. I have since received other information, which I believe to be authentic, that the sugar refinery did not close on that date. I make this correction immediately, as I would not wish the House to believe that I would make any statement here that was not absolutely correct.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

Mr. McINERNEY. Mr. Speaker, when the debate was adjourned last night, I was proceeding to show the great difference that exists, between the flimsy, ambiguous and equivocal declarations of this Government on the tariff question, as contained in the Speech from the Throne, and the manly, straightforward, distinct and explicit declarations of policy on that subject made by leading members of the Liberal party in years gone by. I am strongly convinced of one thing, that the smiling cynicism of hon. gentlemen opposite, in completely changing the policy to which they have consecrated the efforts of their lives in times past, does not meet with the approval of the people of this country, and that, when the history of the tariff policy of 1897 comes to be written, the position taken by the Liberal party today will be known as the great somersault act of the Laurier-Mowat combination. Sir, I have already offered some proofs of the statement I make in that regard. I have shown that the hon. leader of the Government in 1891, as he came fresh from the people, stated distinctly to this country that the only policy which could be of benefit

to Canada was a policy of unrestricted reciprocity and of continental free trade. As late as 1891 he, the responsible leader of a great party, knowing what his responsibility was, and, I suppose able to foresee a few years into the future, made the distinct declaration that the only policy which could benefit Canada financially was a policy of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States and of continental free trade. I have other declarations of the hon. gentleman, following that very strong declaration, which I intend now submitting to the House, because I think that it is important that the attention of the people should be riveted upon the great changes in the policy of the Liberal party to-day as compared with their policy in the years gone by. Here is a positive declaration of Mr. Laurier :

The policy which we have advocated, and which we still continue to advocate, is the removal of all commercial barriers between this country and the great nation to the south. The Liberal party, as long as I have anything to do with it, will remain true to the cause until the cause is successful. I do not expect to win in a day, but I am prepared to remain in the cold shades of opposition until this cause has triumphed.

This great cause, the cause of unrestricted reciprocity, then advocated by the Liberal party from one end of Canada to the other, is not even whispered to-day in this Assembly. Not the slightest mention of it do we hear to-day. From that, I proceed to another declaration of the hon. gentleman, but this declaration concerns another policy of his, the policy of continental free trade :

The Liberal party will never cease the agitation until they have finally triumphed and obtained continental freedom of trade. We will not be drawn away by this issue or that, but, keeping our eyes upon the goal, will work until we accomplish our end. If the Reformers of these days can accomplish what they have in view—the great principle of free trade in America—they will have done to their country and the British race a service of which they will have reason to be proud.

Again, I have a declaration of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies), whose declarations it is not always easy to find, and whose declarations, when you do find them, the hon. gentleman is very often ready to declare he never made, which denial, of course, we are bound to accept in this House. That hon. Minister said :

Sir, we tender a flag of which we are not ashamed, a flag upon which is inscribed unrestricted trade with the United States.

The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce —and of him I will say this, at least, that we always know where to find him upon a policy ; that when he has a policy, he is nowise backward in making open and aboveboard declarations of it—in 1891 used these words :

But what is of even more immediate consequence, we propose to obtain for you power to trade freely with the rest of this continent, and to have leave to make the best use you can of your great natural advantages, which can only be done by full, free and unrestricted reciprocity with our kinsmen in the United States.

And further on, the hon. gentleman uttered these significant words :

If this policy does discriminate against Great Britain, we have the right to discriminate. We owe Great Britain nothing but charity for her atrocious blundering against our interests. There never was a time when Canada could not have bettered her position by joining the United States.

And the hon. leader of the Government, at Brantford, speaking on the question of free trade as it is in England, in 1894, a little more than two years ago, said :

I propose that we should follow England's example, and open our ports to the products of the world.

And later on, he said :

I come before you to-night to preach to you this new gospel of free trade. I denounce to you the policy of protection as bondage, yes, bondage : and I refer to bondage in the same manner in which the American slavery was bondage.

And again, he said :

Upon that question, I need not tell you that we stand at the very antipodes of the Conservative party. The Conservative party believe in protection, all their hope is in protection ; the Liberal party believe in free trade on the broad lines such as exist in England.

And again, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce said :

Our policy, from first to last, is to destroy this villainous protective system by free trade, revenue tariff or continental free trade.

His prophetic eye—I was going to say his poetic eye, in fine frenzy rolling, turned from heaven to earth, from earth to heaven, and he made a prophecy to his party. He said :

There are two lessons which I think the Reformers of Canada should learn. One is presented for our example and warning in the fate that has befallen the Democratic party in the United States. It shows to all who choose to read the signs of the times, that, when a party places itself at the head of a great popular movement, if that party tenders the people a stone instead of bread, it is half-hearted in the prosecution of the great aim it sets before it, and will be deservedly swept out of power by the very people who would have sustained and advanced it.

The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) speaking in the House, said :

We have been attacking this policy of protection year by year. It is a cursed system, accursed of God and men.

In Nova Scotia, the same hon. gentleman, in 1894, made this declaration :

Well, gentlemen, I need say no more. Whatever doubt and difficulties there may have been about understanding our trade policy in times past, there can be none now. Our platform is clear and definite. To-day the people of Canada stand face to face with such an issue, and the next contest is to be one between free trade and protection. * * * The policy of the Liberal party, on the contrary, is the reform of the tariff by the elimination of every vestige of protection.

What I have endeavoured to point out, and I think it is no waste of time to do so, is that this party whose leaders made these explicit, and bold, and manly, and straightforward declarations of policy within the last few years, now have not one single word to say in favour of the policy which they then propagated and advocated. There is one gentleman whom I would like to quote on this subject, because of all the strong language used in the denunciation of protection I think his takes the bakery. I refer to the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald). That hon. gentleman denounced protection as "an abomination of iniquities." I can remember the speech of the hon. gentleman. He will not deny that these were his words. Will the hon. gentleman sit quiet and swallow the sugar-coated pill of protection that will be offered to him at this session? Will the hon. gentleman sit quiet and allow the duty to be retained on oil as at the present time, or will he make a claim upon his Government, and if he fails to have that claim made good, will he take an independent and honourable stand on this question in this House?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The hon. gentleman does not mean to say that I advocated free oil.

Mr. McINERNEY. I have here the words of the hon. gentleman and can produce them.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). You produce a statement there that I was in favour of free oil. I will admit that I am inconsistent.

Mr. McINERNEY. In the "Hansard" of 1891, page 89, the hon. gentleman is reported to have gone into an intricate computation of the tremendous burdens imposed upon the people of this country by the oil duties and to have declared that it was an "abomination of iniquities." The hon. gentleman went further and said that the protective tariff was wasting millions and millions of capital;—nearly ninety millions a year, the hon. gentleman said was being wasted by the National Policy. Will the hon. gentleman rise in his place in this House and say that he is in favour of the retention of the oil duties?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I will say that in that speech which the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McInerney) has before him I declared that in my opinion the duty on oil should be reduced to about 5 cents per gallon. If he looks at the speech he will find it there, or, if he will give me the book for five minutes, I will show him the very sentence in which that statement is made.

Mr. McINERNEY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) will have a glorious opportunity after I have taken my seat, an opportunity that we will be only too glad to accord to him, with the assurance that we shall listen to him with extreme pleasure. We shall be surprised to hear, but proud to know that the hon. gentleman is a convert on this question. Why, if there was one man in Canada having a seat in Parliament whom we believed to be an out and out free trader, one who denounced protection in all its moods and tenses, it was the hon. member for East Huron. For hours and hours we have heard him fulminate against this "iniquity" of protection; and we will be only too pleased, even at this late date, to take the hon. gentleman into our fold, because it is broad enough for all of them, after all.

Now, this free trade as it is in England policy which these hon. gentlemen a few short years ago agitated in this country always struck me as being a most peculiar policy indeed to advocate here. If I know anything about the free trade policy of England it simply means that one-half of the taxes raised for carrying on the public affairs of that country is raised by direct taxation. As $400,000,000 at least is raised by customs and excise, this means that $200,000,000 is raised by imports placed directly upon the people in the form of a land tax, a house tax, a stamp tax, and other imposts of that nature. As applied to Canada it would mean that at least $20,000,000 should be raised by direct taxation upon the people of this country. That is the policy these gentlemen were bold enough to propose in this country some time ago. But I do not intend at this time to enter into a lengthy discussion of the tariff or of the propositions the hon. members here make. It will be time enough when the details of the tariff come down to criticise them, as, I have no doubt, they will deserve criticism. But I thought the House would bear with me while, for a few moments I tried to call attention to the one issue on which I thought the parties were divided, but on which we now find the party on the other side has jumped Jim Crow completely and left every vestige of their policy behind them.

There is one subject on the Address outside of the tariff that I wish to refer to for a few moments—the Franchise Act, the one great question which is at all clearly enunciated in the Speech from the Throne. Sir, I occupy upon the franchise question a somewhat peculiar position. In 1893, when I first came into this House and was accorded the privilege and honour of mov-

ing the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, I stepped aside from the matter of the Speech itself to put myself fairly on record in favour of manhood suffrage, in favour of residential manhood suffrage. I want it distinctly understood, in the few remarks I am going to make upon this subject, that this is not the first time that I have declared in favour of residential manhood suffrage. In 1894, our then respected and much lamented leader, Sir John Thompson, introduced into this House, or brought before the consideration of the Conservative party, a measure for residential manhood suffrage, in the Franchise Bill he was about to ask this House to adopt, but for one reason or another, the Bill never went through. But, Sir, I then thought it advisable, and still think so, that the Conservative party should have put itself on record in favour of residential manhood suffrage; and I now think it advisable that the Conservative party should declare itself almost to a man, as our leader has told us, in favour of residential manhood suffrage as against the peculiar patchwork system that hon. gentlemen opposite wish to put upon the Statute-book. I believe that every man 21 years of age who takes upon himself the burdens of a citizen of Canada in times of peace, and every man 21 years of age who, in time of war, may be called upon to shoulder his rifle for the defence of this country, should at least have something to say as to how our institutions should be conducted; and the least we can do for him is to give him the franchise, allow him to vote for members of Parliament to make the law which govern the institutions of the country in which he is deeply interested. The leader of the Opposition pointed out that in this country this measure would not bring the franchise to such a low level as it is in the thickly populated countries of Europe. That is so. There are a large number of agricultural people in this country who take a great interest in the political questions of the day, and we have not many of the lower classes of people in Canada. Our population is all fairly intelligent, and able to understand the public questions that may be submitted to them from time to time.

Now, I will ask the House to bear with me for a few moments while I deal with a question which has been a burning one in Canada, and which I believe may continue for some time to come to be a question of considerable importance to the electors of this country. This is the first time that I have, in this House, opened my mouth on the Manitoba school question, this is the first time that I have uttered a syllable upon it; not because I have no views upon that great question, not because I do not entertain opinions of my own concerning it, but because I knew that there were men on our side of the House from whom declarations of our policy upon that question would come with greater force than they would come from me, considering the position that this party took upon that question a short time ago. But before proceeding to speak directly upon this so-called settlement that has been made, I wish to call attention to this petition that the Minister of Public Works read to the House last evening. I said, Sir, after that petition had been read, that it came with a surprise to us, we were surprised that the hon. gentleman should have so blandly and generously given us his own name as one of the signatories to this petition, that he should have told us so frankly that forty-four other gentlemen had signed it, when before that it had been utterly impossible to drag from them by any process that was known to us any intimation that members of Parliament or public men in Canada had sent any petition to Rome to have an ablegate sent here to regulate this question. It was only after my hon. friend to my right, the hon. member for St. Anne's Division of Montreal (Mr. Quinn) had read the statement in the article from the London "Tablet," that the Minister of Public Works thought fit to take the bold front he did upon that question. I may say that the article that was read here yesterday from the London "Tablet" comes with a special force from that paper when you consider the circumstances of the case. The London "Tablet" is the leading organ of the Catholics in England, the London "Tablet" is supposed to be the organ of Cardinal Vaughan himself. When the hon. gentleman from Quebec County, the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), was in England, there can be no doubt about it that he tried by all means in his power to bring pressure upon that paper to support the settlement they were then making; because at that time the people of this country were surprised to find that the London "Tablet" advised the Catholics of Canada to accept this Manitoba settlement just about the time that the Solicitor General was in England. But, Sir, the utterances of that paper now acquire an additional significance when we know that after it was made acquainted with certain facts which it formerly ignored, that paper came out and took an exactly opposite view upon that question, and now says that Mr. Laurier, the leader of the Government, the Prime Minister of Canada, must either stand true to his pledges and the pledges given by his party on this question, or turn against him the whole Catholic hierarchy, and a large body of the Liberal party in Canada. So that paper is now informed that Mr. Laurier and his party did make certain pledges to the hierarchy of Canada. Now, passing that for a moment, I wish to come to this petition itself. We were given to understand in the press by interviews and by declarations made upon the public platform, amongst them a decla-

ration of the hon. Solicitor General, that a few Catholic gentlemen of Montreal and vicinity had proceeded to Rome for the purpose of laying a personal grievance before His Holiness. That, Mr. Speaker, was the statement that was sent broadcast throughout the country. But what have we here, Sir? We have here, in the very first sentence of this petition:

> Most Holy Father, we, the undersigned members of the Senate and members of the House of Commons of Canada, and representing therein the Liberal party, present ourselves before Your Holiness, &c.

Now, Sir, these gentlemen held out to the Holy See, so far as we can glean from their petition, that they were the only members of the House of Commons and of the Senate of Canada; but whether they were or not, that they represented in the House of Commons and in the Senate of Canada, the Liberal party on this question. There cannot be any possible doubt about that. After the Minister of Public Works read his petition, I asked him if that was the only document, or only charge, that these gentlemen had sent to Rome. The hon. gentleman did not negative the question nor deny it, but he left the inference to be drawn that that was the only statement that had been made. Well, in this very document itself is contained evidence contradictory to that inference—in the very next paragraph:

> Your Holiness has already been made aware of the conduct and attitude of certain parties.

How was His Holiness already made aware? Made aware, Sir, by documents and statements sent over to him by members of the Liberal party in Canada. Sir, if I know one fact as a fact—and I would want considerable contradictory evidence before I abandon my belief, or recede from my position—it is that many gentlemen on the other side of the House laid charges against certain individuals of the priesthood in the province of Quebec, and that in addition to the great point that they wanted to make in favour of their settlement, they wished to get an ablegate out here for the purpose of reconciling the Catholic clergy of Canada with the position taken by their leader upon this subject, and there were also many other charges which they laid before the foot of the throne at the Vatican. I should like to say here, and I desire to ask the attention of the Minister of Public Works for a moment, that I charge the Minister of Public Works that he stated in this House that unless justice was granted and the guarantees of the constitution were obtained for the French minority in this country, they would annex themselves to the United States.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I say my hon. friend is altogether wrong. I never made such a statement either in the House or outside of it.

Mr. McINERNEY. I should like to accept the statement—I suppose I am forced to accept the statement of the Minister of Public Works, a statement made by an hon. gentleman occupying a high and honourable position in this country. I should be proud to accept his declaration; but you, Mr. Speaker, will perhaps permit me to read to the House, in vindication of the charge I have made against him, certain assertions made by the hon. gentleman on 6th March, 1893, in the House of Commons, as reported in "Hansard."

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Read the whole of them.

Mr. McINERNEY. The hon. gentleman was referring to the guarantees under the constitution and to the patience shown by the French people under the wrongs inflicted on them, and he added:

> It must not be thought that these evidences of patience, of tolerance, ought always, in every case, to come from the same side. On this continent of America, it will be well never to forget it; there is much space where we could find protection, and where our rights would not be assailed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Is that all?

Mr. McINERNEY. That is enough. I have read over the speech delivered by the hon. gentleman with considerable care, in order to compare his attitude then with his attitude to-day. But while he conveyed much by innuendo, how can he explain his declaration: "There is much space in the broad areas of America for freedom, if we cannot get it here." "It is well for the people of Canada to remember it," he said. That speech, delivered in the House of Commons, I say, is a threat, that unless justice is done to his compatriots in the province of Quebec and the province of Manitoba the hon. gentleman will be prepared to lead his people either in an exodus or a rebellion against the constituted authorities of the country, to secure their protection.

Coming to the Manitoba school question and the settlement which hon. gentlemen opposite say they have made of it, I should like for a moment briefly to state what I understand the Manitoba school question to be. From 1871 to 1890 the Catholic minority of the province of Manitoba had had the control of their own schools, had levied their own taxation for the maintenance of their own schools, had had the choice of their own text books, had had the choice of their own teachers, and, in fact, a system of separate schools prevailed in that province. In 1890 that system was abolished by an Act of the provincial legislature. Then, under a clause of the constitution, as passed upon by the Privy Council, the minority was led to believe that they had a right to expect redress for their grievance, because the taking away of those privileges and rights were held to be a grievance, and it was the

duty of the Government of Canada to grant them redress. They came to this Parliament, and the Conservative party endeavoured by the Remedial Bill to give them a measure of redress of their grievances, a measure to establish separate schools to which they were entitled, in so far as it was possible for this Parliament to establish them, and restore the rights of the minority. But the Bill was not passed. The Liberal party by promising more than that measure offered, by denouncing the Government, and by going through the province of Quebec and declaring that the Bill was not sufficient, and that if they were returned to power they would fully restore to the minority their rights, they were victorious at the polls, and they have proved either false to their pledges to the people of the country at large or to their pledges to the minority. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us they have settled the question, and they ask us to accept the settlement made. They not only ask the minority of Manitoba to accept it, but they ask common-sense and thinking men in every part of Canada to accept it as a final settlement of the question, as stated in the Speech from the Throne. Is it a settlement of the question? The only way it can be a settlement of the question is that it shall be a settlement on its merits. Is it a settlement on its merits? I think not, for it ignores the principle of separate schools, which was accorded to the Roman Catholic minority of Manitoba between 1871 and 1890; and all the benefit it confers is that it secures a half hour for religious teaching after regular school hours, which is of no practical advantage, as has been shown in this debate. What does it mean? It simply means half an hour each day for religious teaching after the school is out. That is to say, that a clergyman can go there and teach religion during half an hour. It is understood, at all events in my province, that a clergyman often has six or eight schools in his ecclesiastical parish. How is it possible, even if he has no other duty to attend to at that time, to give religious teaching in six or eight schools during the same half hour on the same day? But what right has any legislature to impose such a duty on a clergyman? Why should he enter the school and teach religion there, and, indeed, it imposes on the clergy a burthen which they are not called upon to undertake. As regards the towns, when we speak of the great benefit conferred on the minority by the settlement which allows them to have a Catholic teacher, I wish to say that I look upon that provision as a tyrannical part of the law. If I were a Protestant, I should look upon it as a most tyrannical part of the law. Why should a law be placed on the Statute-book providing that no one but a Catholic should be employed in schools in any case? I say that the Government has done this: they have put one thing against another, they have tickled the Catholic palate with one bit of legislation and have tickled the Protestant palate with another; but I wish to say as an independent man on the floor of the House that when it distinguishes between people belonging to different religions, and declares that Catholic teachers only under certain circumstances shall be employed by school trustees, it is a tyrannical and unjust law. This is held to be a tremendous boon to the Catholic population of Manitoba, that where there are, in a town, ninety-six children of school age belonging to the Catholic Church, and when, in a rural district there are sixty children of school age able to attend school, a Catholic teacher shall be employed. I wish further to show that not only is this settlement deficient on its merits, but that even the leader of the Government, and the Government itself, as far as we have had the expressions of the Government in this debate, have declared that they do not themselves believe in the settlement. What is the declaration of the hon. the Prime Minister? He said that he did not get all he desired. Well, Sir, he either desired more than justice or got less than justice; he either desired more than he had a right to or got less than he had a right to. He therefore compromised on a question of principle, for political safety. Also, I charge the hon. the leader of the Government that he has trafficked with a question of principle, that he has compromised on this question, and that he has not stood true to the pledges and the declarations that he has announced to this country during the last five or six years.

But, Sir, he is not the only gentleman who says that they have not got all they desired and have not got enough. Has the hon. the Solicitor General declared that this is a final settlement? Has the hon. the Solicitor General declared that this settlement is one that he can accept? No, Sir; the best that he will do is to advise the Catholic people of Manitoba to accept this as a settlement now, and then to rely upon the generosity of Mr. Greenway for further concessions in the future. Rely upon the generosity of a man who a few short years ago robbed these people of their rights under the constitution; rely upon him for generous treatment and generous concessions, because, forsooth, at a banquet given to the leader of the Government at Montreal at which Mr. Greenway was present—and present for a purpose—Mr. Greenway in order to smooth down the French Canadian people that he saw surrounding that table held out certain hopes of future concessions to the people of Manitoba. I wish for a moment to draw the attention of the House once again to the extraordinary pledge of the hon. the Solicitor General. In the few remarks that I made last night I said that there was no man in the House for whom I had a higher personal regard or friend-

ship than for the Solicitor General, and that is true. But, Sir, I find in this pledge of his a strange declaration for a public man to make. It is this :

I, the undersigned, promise, if elected, to conform myself to the bishops' mandement in all points and to vote for a measure according the Catholics of Manitoba that justice to which they have a right by virtue of the judgment of the Privy Council, provided that the measure be approved of by my bishop. If Mr. Laurier reaches power, and does not settle the question at the first session, in accordance with the terms of the mandement, I promise either to withdraw my support or resign.

We have that pledge and that statement of the Solicitor General read in this House. We have had the pledge here face to face with him, but we have now in addition to it the further admission of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) : Unless this statement is satisfactory to my bishop I will resign. But how does the hon. gentleman try to straddle the fence again on this question. He told us that as an honest man, looking upon this as a question of principle, he voluntarily went to Archbishop Begin of Quebec, and offered him this pledge which has been published before the country. He tells us that he offered the pledge as a question of principle believing he was doing what was right as a high-minded public man. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) told us shortly afterwards that he was at liberty to disregard this pledge or contract—he held it was a contract—because he did not receive his quid pro quo. It was not then a question of high political morality for him ; it was not a question of principle for him, but a question of political support, and because he did not get the political support that he thought he was bargaining for he held himself free to throw up the whole contract. Let me ask then : did the hon. Solicitor General when he went to his archbishop, go for the purpose of taking a stand upon a high question of principle ? No, Sir ; for he has admitted to the House by his own statement, that his object was to try and obtain political support, and he turns around coolly afterwards and says : But the bishop worked against me. He makes a charge deliberately against the Archbishop of Quebec. He tries first to have us believe that the archbishop agreed to support him, although there is not the slightest evidence of that. Mr. Fremont who had gone through the fire and furnace on this question, who although a Liberal voted with the Conservative party on this question ; Mr. Fremont was a candidate in the district. The people of Quebec knew perfectly well that Mr. Fremont was true upon that question, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) would not have had a ghost of a chance of election if he had not gone to the archbishop and made this pledge that has been produced. But the hon. gentleman coolly tells us that the archbishop did not support him, and the next moment he tells us that he almost beat the other fellow out of his boots, and that Mr. Fremont only saved his deposit by six votes. Then we have it, that the Solicitor General is a man of wonderful power and strength in the district of Quebec ; it is a wonder that he did not come here before.

Sir, I think it but right that the conduct of the Solicitor General in this matter should be called to public light. What position is he in ? He has gone on a certain mission, and anybody with half an eye can see that its purpose was to obtain time, to try and get time, to try and stave off the declaration of his bishop that the settlement was unsatisfactory because when that declaration is made the hon. the Solicitor General as an honest man must resign his seat in this House. His object was to stave off that declaration, and so he took a pilgrimage to Rome, and having returned he thinks now that he can wipe out his pledge, and wipe out all the principles that he announced on this question, by reading from Justin McCarthy's work a sentence or two upon the great intellectual power of the Pope. He offers this as a sop to the Catholic people of this Dominion for the betrayal of their interests and their rights in his pledge upon this question. Sir, I still entertain the hope, I would be surprised if the hope is not realized, that the hon. the Solicitor General will see his way clear, when this question is decided or reported upon by the ablegate—and it can only be decided in one way—I trust the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) will see his way clear to make good the pledge given to the Archbishop of Quebec and repeated again upon the floor of Parliament. I, as a personal friend of the hon. gentleman, would like to see him take that course. But the hon. the Solicitor General was not the only gentleman who gave this pledge. The hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Godbout) gave the pledge. The hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux), who seconded the Address last year, gave the pledge.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Read my pledge.

Mr. McINERNEY. The pledge as I have it is in these words :

I the undersigned candidate in the county of Gaspé, do solemnly promise to vote in the House according to the desires expressed by their lordships in the recent pastoral.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I beg to say that I never signed that pledge. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. McInerney) will allow me I will tell him this. On nomination day at Percé, my opponent Dr. Ennis, who was fighting the sacred cause of Conservatism tried to use religion as a means of carrying the election. He was offered by me to sign a pledge of which the hon. gentleman has only read the first paragraph. The pledge I offered to

the Conservative candidate reads as follows :—

I, the undersigned candidate in the county of for Gaspé, pledge myself to follow the mandement of the bishops of the province of Quebec on this question. I also pledge myself to repudiate Sir Charles Tupper, leader of the Conservative party, who declared that a French Catholic should not be Premier of this Dominion.

And my opponent refused to sign this pledge and I refused also. It is easily seen why the Conservative press published only part of the document.

Mr. McINERNEY. That is a very frank explanation, and I suppose we are bound to accept it. But has the hon. gentleman told us that he did not sign any pledge at any time during that election ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Never.

Mr. McINERNEY. Did you ever take a pledge, Sir ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Never.

Mr. McINERNEY. Well, I understand that the hon. gentleman offered to sign the pledge which I have read. I do not make the declaration outright ; but when an opportunity is offered, I think I shall be able to adduce evidence to show that the hon. gentleman did offer to sign that pledge.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Never.

Mr. McINERNEY. If the hon. gentleman made no pledge, then he cannot break any pledge ; and that is the difference between him and the hon. Solicitor General.

Now, Sir, I have stated that this settlement is neither good in itself on its merits, nor as judged by the opinion of the Premier or his following, nor is it acceptable to the minority. I take it that there must be two parties to a settlement. I do not see how a matter can be settled unless the two parties to it agree to have it settled. In this case the two parties were the Greenway government and the minority in Manitoba. In order to effect a settlement, both of these parties should be agreed upon it. I could understand the hon. leader of the Government giving a verdict or a judgment as a jury or a judge between two parties, and one party not liking it. But I cannot understand a case being settled when one of the parties is dissatisfied. It is as if I owed you, Mr. Speaker, a thousand dollars, and you had a judgment against me for it, and the leader of the House came to me and offered to settle the matter. He comes to me, and says, "Give me thirty pieces of silver, and I will settle the matter for you :" and he takes the thirty pieces of silver to you as a full settlement of your thousand dollar claim against me. You are not disposed to accept it, because you have a judgment for your full claim against me. Still, the hon. gentleman turns round and says, "I have settled it completely." There used to be a way to settle coffee by dropping an egg into the coffee pot. I can understand the leader of the Government standing over the coffee pot, with Mr. Prendergast standing on a two thousand dollar pedestal beside him, and the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) and the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion) and others behind him, while he takes up a robin's egg and drops it into the coffee pot, and says, "See, gentlemen, I have settled it." That is about the kind of settlement the hon. gentleman has made of the Manitoba school question. Now, Sir, this settlement is not satisfactory to a large part of the people of this country. It is not only not satisfactory to the minority, but it is not satisfactory to the French Canadian people ; nor is it satisfactory to many other right-thinking men, of all shades of politics, all denominations, and all nationalities in this country.

We are told that the recent elections in Wright and Bonaventure have proved that the French Canadian people are in favour of the settlement. Well, Sir, if the French people of this country had declared openly in any large majority for this settlement, it would possibly be well for us to say very little about it. But I have still to see evidence to convince me that the French people of Canada can be satisfied with any such settlement as this. I spoke last night of the county of Bonaventure. I wish to speak now of the county of Wright. Who represented Wright in this House last year ? Mr. Devlin, who took a strong stand on this question ; and is there any doubt in the mind of any thinking man that Mr. Devlin was prepared to come here and refuse to support this settlement ? Can there be any doubt that he notified the leader of the Government that he could not come into this House and support it ? And then Mr. Devlin was appointed to office. Perhaps his circumstances compelled him. I will not make any charge against him. All I know of Mr. Devlin is that on the floor of this House, when he had anything to say, he said it like an independent man, and judged questions of this kind by what he thought was right. I only wish I could extend the compliment to some other gentlemen on the other side of the House. I entertained the hope that many men in the Liberal ranks, before they met this Parliament in session, would have either tendered their resignations, or would have given it to be understood publicly that this settlement could not be accepted. But we are told that the election in Wright county with its large majority clearly proves that the French people are favourable to this settlement. The majority in Wright has increased, it is true, but still the total vote polled is about six hundred less, I understand, than the vote polled in the general elections, and we had it stated broadcast in the press of the country, and not contradicted, that a

large number of men from the neighbouring town in Wright county was brought over here and given employment on the roof of the building that was recently burned. I am not going to say that the people of Wright sold themselves openly in this contest; but a friend of mine put it in this way. He said that the hon. Minister of Public Works was a much maligned and slandered man. He had heard it stated, and he had read, that the Minister of Public Works had a whole brigade of the electors of Wright at work on the top of the Western block; but on the twenty-third of March he went there and he could not find a single elector of Wright on the work. It happened to be election day in the county of Wright, and the men were attending to their election duties, as they had a right to do in their own county.

There has been a delay in the rendering of the judgment of the hierarchy of Canada on this question. Some people have ventured to say—I believe the statement has been made in this House—that the bishops of Canada have no right to express an opinion on this question at all. I cannot understand how any intelligent man could take that stand. If the rights of the Catholic minority of Manitoba have been invaded, who should stand as the advocates of these rights, who should declare whether the people have been reinstated in these rights or not, if it be not the Catholic bishops? Suppose, for a moment, the rights of the Anglican community in Canada had been invaded or that the rights of the Methodist community had been attacked, would anybody deny to the bishops of the Anglican Church or to the Methodist Conference the right or the duty to declare that their people had not been treated fairly? I think not. The charge is, moreover, hurled against the Roman Catholic bishops that they alone have taken a stand on this question, that no other clergymen of other religious denominations have declared themselves upon it. That is not so. There are Protestant members in this House who have told me and on whose statement I rely—and I know it apart from their statement—that in their own constituencies, conferences have been held by the ministers of various denominations among Protestants, in which these ministers denounced any attempt to pass a Remedial Bill, in which they denounced any effort to remedy the injustice inflicted on the minority. Have we not all heard of the declarations of the Rev. Mr. Douglas and of the Rev. Dr. Carman on this question? Do we not know that the Evangelical Alliance denounced the Government of Sir John Thompson for even attempting to give back to the minority of Manitoba any particle of their rights at all? Let us be honest. I do not think that I am making any vain claims when I say that I know of nobody more fit to tell the Catholic people of Canada whether their religious rights in the matter of education have been restored to them than the bishops of the Catholic faith. But it was thought necessary by the Government to delay the decision of the bishops on this question, and what was done? Mr. Drolet, a gentleman of Montreal, who was formerly a Papal Zouave, went to Rome, carrying, I suppose, the petition which the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) read to us last night. He was followed by the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick). On their way to Rome they sought to obtain influence with the Papal Court, they sought again, through Cardinal Vaughan and the London "Tablet," and Lord Russell, influence with the Court of Rome, and the means they took are known to all. They appointed the legal firm of Day, Russell & Company, of which Mr. Charles Russell is a member, the agents of the Canadian Government, and Mr. Russell went to Rome with Mr. Fitzpatrick and stayed there until the ablegate was on his way or about to start on his way to Canada, and then cabled out that he was on his way. Why did the Liberal party desire that an ablegate should be sent to Canada? Because delay was of the very highest importance to these men. The elections in Bonaventure and Wright were about to be contested. The local elections in the province of Quebec were soon to be brought on, and these gentlemen thought that as long as they would delay the pronouncement of the bishops of Quebec on this question, they would be safe. They desired to be able to say to the French Canadian Catholics of Canada, as they did say to them in Bonaventure: The Pope is on Mr. Laurier's side in this question, see how he snubs the bishops of Canada by sending out an Ablegate to discipline them. That was the canvass made among the French Catholics of this Dominion; and that is why it is the cue of hon. gentlemen opposite to attempt to hang up this decision of the bishops until the local elections in the province of Quebec are over. That is politics, you may say. Well, it may be politics; but if politics have sunk to such a depth that men who oppose and denounce their clergy, will, for the purpose of getting political advantage, endeavour to secure the visit of an ablegate from the Papal See in order to delay a pronouncement on the part of their bishops until the elections are over, then I must say that politics in this country, under the control of hon. gentlemen opposite, have sunk to a very low depth indeed. We will, however, have a decision on this question from the Catholic hierarchy of Canada. There cannot be much doubt about that, and the question I put to the hon. members from the province of Quebec is: are they prepared to abide by that decision when given, or will they be led into a cul de sac by the Liberal party in this country?

An hon. MEMBER. En Anglais?

Mr. McINERNEY. A blind alley, and the hon. gentleman is likewise a blind ally. I believe that in good time, sooner perhaps than many expect, this country will tire of men as reckless in their promises and as reckless in their breaches of faith as they will be reckless in their expenditure of public money in order to maintain themselves in power. The cement of office may unite them for a season, but parties held together by interest are bound to fall apart on principle, and there will be offered in Canada a repetition of the spectacle that was presented in the United States when a great party, recreant to its trust, false to its promises and platform, was, at the first opportunity that offered, hurled ignominiously from power.

Let me say one word to my hon. friends, the Conservative members of this House and the members of the Conservative party in Canada, and to them I would say that their true position is to stand staunch and steadfast by the principles they have enunciated and fought for—the principles they have suffered for—the principles of eternal justice incorporated in the constitution, in that constitution which, when this deluge of discord shall have ended will still endure as the ark bearing the covenant between these different provinces in sacred security for ever more.

Mr. MACLEAN. I desire to take up the attention of the House for but a very few minutes. I wish merely to say that I repudiate any responsibility for what might be construed as an attempt to introduce again a measure coercive of Manitoba on the school question. I desire to repudiate the responsibility for any such action or desire on my own behalf as a Conservative coming from Ontario, and further, to repudiate any connection with anything which might be construed to imply that Ontario Conservatives are not in sympathy with the people of Quebec in any attempt they may make to protect their civil liberties. I have every sympathy with what has been said concerning the attempt now being made by the representatives of the province of Quebec to vindicate their civil liberties. These people have not only my sympathy in that attempt, but in my newspaper I have backed them as well as I could. This school question, in my opinion and I believe in the opinion of all Conservatives in the province of Ontario is a question that has been settled for ever. While the minority of Manitoba had a grievance—and I believe the highest court of this country decided that they had—and while that grievance was sought to be remedied under the constitution, the question was still an open one; but now that it has been settled by constitutional means, we have not the right to bring it up again. With us, different from what is the case under the constitution of the United States, our Government must assume the political responsibility of every action taken by this House. For the administration of the constitution, no matter what the courts have decided, the Government, the dominant party, is responsible. The courts may have decided that the minority had rights which had been taken away, but the restoration of those rights was a matter of policy, a matter of responsibility; and that responsibility I am glad to know, from the approval of hon. gentlemen opposite, they are prepared to assume. I am glad to see that even the Prime Minister accepts that responsibility of the settlement which has been made. The Liberals, as a party, accept the responsibility of the settlement.

And, speaking of parliamentary responsibility, I come to another point. After what was said in this House yesterday by the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), after what was said by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), after the reading of that celebrated document last night, I say that the Government and their party must take full responsibility for that mission to Rome. They cannot escape that responsibility. They have said that it is on behalf of their party that they went there, and, seeing that we are governed by the principle of parliamentary responsibility, they must accept that responsibility before the people. They say that they went to Rome to vindicate the civil liberties of the people of Quebec. Mr. Speaker, while I sympathize with them in their efforts to conserve their political liberties, I do not agree with them in the authority to which they went to protect those liberties. It is not in St. Peter's, it is not in the Vatican, it is not on the Seven Hills of Rome that the political, the civil liberties of British citizens are conserved. If there is a temple sacred to British liberty, if there is a place where our rights are to be protected, that temple is within these walls of Parliament. The shrine of our liberties is on the floor of this House, and we, the members of this House are the sacristans of that temple; we are the priests, the ministers at this shrine; we, worthy or unworthy as we may be, are the men who must protect the civil liberties of the people. What will happen to gentlemen on the other side if it turns out that the delegate now in this country does not come to their relief, and does not pronounce in their favour and guarantee the civil liberties which they now profess they seek to protect. They will have to come back here to defend and protect those liberties if they are assailed. If they do come to Parliament I will aid and support them in doing what they should do now here, and not outside, to protect the liberties, not only of the people of Quebec, but of the people of all Canada. I must take objection to the statement of the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) last night in the comparison he made between His Holiness and Her Gracious Majesty. We who are Canadians say that

there is no one but Her Majesty to appeal to in the protection of the civil liberties of British subjects the world over. She is the guardian of our civil liberties, not His Holiness of Rome; and, as a Conservative, I hope to have the support of all the Conservative party in at least making that statement. And there were names mentioned in that statement in regard to civil liberty. I have the greatest respect for the present Pope of Rome. He is known to be a liberal man. But the Liberals must invoke some other name in regard to liberty than that of Pio Nono. When we read the history of the unification of Italy, when we recall the names of Garibaldi and Mazzini, and other heroes of that struggle, he is not the man whose name should be quoted by the Liberal party in the vindication of the civil liberties of the people of this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is all I have to say on the school question, but I think it is very important, and I think I speak the views of the great bulk of the Conservatives of Ontario in regard to that question. From this I wish to pass to another point in the Address, and, just for the moment, to look at the pledges of hon. gentlemen on the other side. In 1887 there was a conference in the city of Quebec of representatives from the local governments in the Dominion of Canada. These gentlemen, after long consultation at the Ancient Capital, reached certain conclusions in regard to the Government of this country, and they drew up a paper which was signed by them. The first name appended to that document appears as O. Mowat, Prime Minister of Ontario and Attorney General. There is a great group of Prime Ministers' names appended to the document. I only recognize one Prime Minister in the country, and that is my hon. friend oppcsite (Mr. Laurier). But the first of the number of these petty Prime Ministers whose name appears here is O. Mowat. That gentleman has begun already to repudiate his former title of Prime Minister, for in a letter to his successor, he addresses that gentleman as "My dear Mr. Premier." The next is the Hon. Mercier, Prime Minister of Quebec, and Attorney General, of whom nil nisi bonum. The next is W. S. Fielding, Prime Minister of Nova Scotia, and Provincial Secretary; and the next is Andrew G. Blair, Prime Minister of New Brunswick, and Attorney General. We have now here a Government which includes three of these Prime Ministers of provinces at that time. Being associated with the Prime Minister in the carrying on of the Government of this country, they are bound, if they are honest men, to stand by their records in that celebrated document. What does that document call for? Among other things it declares that they pledge themselves to the conservation of provincial autonomy against federal power. But the British North America Act, according to them, is obscure, and must be revised and amended. Since they have got into this Cabinet and this Parliament, these three celebrated Prime Ministers have not brought forward a measure to either revise or amend the constitution. I wish to direct attention to two or three of the most important planks of their platform as presented in this document. These three Prime Ministers declared that they were in favour of reappointing the subsidies given by the Dominion to the provinces, and increasing them very much. They are going not only to increase the revenues of Canada, if they can get control of her affairs, but they are going to divide them at once among the provinces in much larger proportion than at present. The leading organ of the party at that time expressed its views in regard to the division of the money in this way:

> This skilful scheme is fair all round, and will do financial justice to Ontario for the first time since soon after confederation. The actual increase of provincial revenues under the proposal would be: $581,700, or 28 cents per head, to Ontario; $337,959, or 24 cents per head, to Quebec; $162,457, or 37 cents per head, to Nova Scotia; $130,000, or 40 cents per head, to New Brunswick; $70,000, or 65 cents per head, to Prince Edward Island; $100,000, or $1.51 per head, to Manitoba; $65,000, or $1.31 per head, to British Columbia. The greater per capita gain of the smaller provinces is due to their disproportional allowances for civil government and legislation, which allowances are based on recognition of the fact that the expenses of civil government and legislation are disproportionately large per head when population is small.

That was their main contention, that the revenue of this country had greatly increased, and, therefore, that when they came to power it was their intention to distribute this increased revenue among the various provinces. Are they prepared to do so now? Have they brought forward any policy to-day on that line? I say, no. Then these gentlemen, meeting as representatives of the provinces, undertook to deal with the trade affairs of this country, and they passed a resolution in regard to unrestricted reciprocity which they declared was the policy of the meeting of all the Premiers of the various provinces; and in connection with that, here is what their leading organ said on the subject:

> It will no longer be possible for the most fatuous ringsters to indulge in that assertion. Five provinces have stated distinctly that nearly the whole Canadian people wish for unrestricted reciprocity. This should have a large influence upon the commissioners about to meet in Washington. They cannot now doubt what Canada wants. The British representatives cannot but perceive that the Ottawa Government, if it pretends that Canadians in general do not wish for commercial union, does not represent the Dominion truly. And the Ottawa Government, if it wishes to escape from the wrath to come, will load Sir Sackville West up the other way from Mr. Chamberlain, and endeavour to bring about continental free trade.

That was the policy these hon. gentlemen had then. Have they any intention now of bringing forward any such policy ? Now, Mr. Speaker, they had other planks in this meeting of the provincial premiers, they had one in regard to insolvency, and if hon. gentlemen opposite have any real intention of benefiting the commercial interests of this country, if Sir Oliver Mowat wishes to make good his pledges which he then gave in that convention, it is his duty to-day, in another Chamber, to bring forward a measure dealing with insolvency in this country rather than the measure which we have now before us dealing with the franchise, which will be of no practical benefit at the present time. Sir, I submit that hon. gentlemen opposite have no intention of carrying out the pledges they gave at this interprovincial conference. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I just wish to reiterate what I said before, namely, that we in Ontario consider the school question settled. We sympathize as far as we can with the people of Quebec in their efforts to maintain their civil rights ; but if they wish to vindicate them, we feel they ought to vindicate them in this Chamber and not by a roundabout mission to Rome.

Mr. MacPHERSON. My first words in this House will be words of apology for taking up time that could be employed very much better, as I think that the discussion has been sufficiently prolonged already. Still, I have heard a great many things spoken in this debate to which I wish to draw attention. From the opposite side I have heard things, some of which are new, and some of which are true ; but the great misfortune is that those things which are true are not new, and those which are new are not true. I am sorry to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have not followed all the intricacies of the debate on the Remedial Bill or on the school question ; but I have read enough to lead me to believe that the settlement arrived at between the Government of Manitoba and Government of the Dominion is a right and proper one, and one that ought to be accepted by the people of Canada. I have before me the judgment of the Privy Council of Great Britain—I am not going to read the whole judgment, but I will read one clause towards the end of the judgment which is to my mind exceedingly plain :

It is certainly not essential that the statutes repealed by the Act of 1890 should be re-enacted, nor that the precise provisions of these statutes should again be made law. The system of education embodied in the Act of 1890, no doubt, commends itself to, and edequately supplies the wants of, the great majority of the inhabitants of the province. All legitimate ground of complaint would be removed, if that system were supplemented by provisions which would remove the grievance upon which the appeal is founded, and were modified so far as might be necessary to give effect to these provisions.

Now, my opinion is that the legislation which has been enacted meets this clause in the judgment of the Privy Council. I may say with reference to the remarks that fell from the hon. member for Kent, N.B. (Mr. McInerney) that I understood him to state, though perhaps I was mistaken, that the Minister of the Interior desired to obtain the assistance of the "Tablet," the organ of the Roman Catholic people of Great Britain and of Cardinal Vaughan ; and I understood him to say that this was withheld. Now, Sir, I secured only recently a copy of the "Tablet," and from that, without wishing to weary you with quotations, I will read one article which, to my mind, puts the whole situation in a nutshell. I may add that the gentleman who writes the letter referred to here, seems to have the same opinion of the matter that is held by the hon. leader of the Opposition. The article goes on to say :

We publish elsewhere a long letter from a "London Priest" upon the Manitoba school question. We have no wish to anticipate anything that "A Catholic Canadian" may have to say in reply, but it is probably desirable that we should at once intervene to correct what seems to us a mischievous delusion.

I may here remark, parenthetically, that many members of the Opposition have been trying to make those mischievous delusions permanent, but in this I am positive they will not succeed. The article goes on :

It is worse than useless, it is misleading, to talk in this connection of the violation of "fundamental laws," or to speak as if "a formal treaty, like the Manitoba Act, involving the honour of the Federal Government and the word of the Queen," had been "torn to shreds." The clauses in the Manitoba Act which govern the situation, are these two :

"1. Nothing in any such law shall prejudiciously affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law or practice in the province at the union.

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

The "Tablet" then goes on to say :

The judgment of the Privy Council, delivered in July, 1892, decided that the first clause does not cover the case of the separate Catholic schools in Manitoba. We may regret the effect of the judgment, but it is obviously idle for any individual to set up his own interpretation of a statute against that of the highest tribunal in the Empire. The decision of the Privy Council is final, and we must, therefore, take it that the Manitoba legislature, when it abolished the separate school system, was at least not acting ultra vires.

Mr. QUINN. I should like to ask the hon. gentleman to give me the date of the "Tablet" from which he is quoting, as I

think it will be found to coincide with the visit of the Solicitor General.

Mr. FRASER (Guysboro'). And that is the organ of your church.

Mr. MacPHERSON. I regret that while during the last session of Parliament the leader of the Opposition was very ready to stop any hon. member from interrupting a member who was making his first speech on the Opposition side of the House, to-day he has not shown the same alacrity. Still, for the information of the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Quinn) I may mention that the date of this particular number of the "Tablet" is February 13th, 1897. The article goes on to say:

The second judgment of the Privy Council, delivered in January, 1895, decided that the second of the clauses of the Manitoba Act quoted above, was applicable to the case of Catholic schools, even though the rights affected had been acquired through legislation of the province after the union. But we only prepare disappointments for ourselves, if we exaggerate the effects of this decision or read into it a meaning which it does not possess. The Catholic minority is entitled to lay its griefs before the Federal Parliament. The Federal Government must hear the appeal, but as unfettered discretion as to what it shall do. To talk, therefore, of the violation of "fundamental laws," or of a "former treaty" being "torn to shreds," is merely irrelevant rhetoric.

This has a suspicious flavour of the language frequently used by the hon. the leader of the Opposition.

"A London Priest," however, is mistaken in his fact, as well as in his law. He says, "There is the province of Quebec to be reckoned with, specially by Mr. Laurier, who has been placed in power by Quebec." The province of Quebec, with all the facts of the controversy before it, has already spoken, and with unmistakeable clearness. It has supported Mr. Laurier, though he opposed the Remedial Bill, and given him 55 out of 62 seats. Common charity requires us to believe that, in supporting Mr. Laurier in this overwhelming way, the Catholic province acted in the belief that the Liberal party would obtain better terms for the Catholics of Manitoba than it was possible to get by attempting to coerce the province. We have already said that we regard the terms provisionally suggested by Mr. Laurier and accepted by Mr. Greenway, as unsatisfactory, in that they failed explicitly to recognize the principle of the separate Catholic school. But the end is not yet; and we have strong reason to hope that further negotiations will still result in an honourable settlement. Meantime, we believe, for our part, we can best help forward this issue by getting rid of dangerous illusions as to legal rights which have no existence in fact.

That statement, Mr. Speaker, seems to me to put the present situation in a nutshell. I regret exceedingly that so much time has been wastefully used in discussing this question during the present session. I understood before I had anything to do with Parliament that it was thoroughly discussed from beginning to end, and that the people had become wearied of it. A great deal of the discussion was unnecessary and pernicious, and I was sorry indeed when the leader of the Opposition started it once more. I am also sorry to think that in debating the Speech from the Throne so much time has been devoted to this question to the exclusion of other subjects. But there is no evil without a benefit, and I was delighted and charmed to find that the member for East Durham and the member for East York—and you, Mr. Speaker, know that the wise men come from the East—possessed sufficient manliness to rise in their places and tell the hon. leader of the Government that they would not support him on that issue. I do not know whether they were bold under all the circumstances, but feeling they might have been ruled out of the party they showed a great amount of courage. It may be, however, when we consider the position of their party, they felt that the leader of the Opposition is not in a position to rule them out for the simple reason that if he did so his party would number very few members.

I will now refer to the Speech from the Throne as it affects the tariff. And I draw attention to the fact that the leader of the Opposition takes great credit to himself as a supporter of the National Policy—I understand in fact that he considers he inaugurated it. One point to which the hon. gentleman drew attention was that the excess of exports over imports during the National Policy period had very greatly increased. When this policy was introduced the principal benefit claimed for it was that it would bring our markets closer home; that the towns and cities would grow in population and would consume the agricultural products of the country. Does the result show that this prophecy has been fulfilled? Why, the hon. gentleman says the exports have increased, although we were led to believe at the time the country was asked to adopt the National Policy that the condition would be otherwise. Instead of considering that the National Policy has been advantageous to the country, I hold it has thrown Canada back at least twenty-five years. Evidence is to be had of that fact. The argument put forward by its promoters has proved to be a delusion, and this so-called National Policy has nothing to commend it but its high-sounding name. The school question together with the National Policy constituted two of the great issues submitted to the people during the last election, and I will refer for a moment—I hope not offensively—to the result of a meeting held on 20th June when the honoured leader of the Opposition made his last dying political effort in the city of Hamilton. On that occasion the leader of the Opposition arrived in the city with great flourish of trumpets. Naturally he made his last effort in the city which he considered to be the home of the National Policy, the city which has been over and

over again stated to be the Birmingham of Canada. What was the result? No one can question that the people of Hamilton by their votes showed that they were satisfied neither with the National Policy nor with the Remedial Bill. There is no doubt whatever of that fact, and I am convinced, and I have had many occasions to meet workingmen, that while some of the manufacturers were willing and even desirous to continue the National Policy, the working-classes were thoroughly dissatisfied with it, because the large wages promised under protection had not been realized. I may add that during that election it was possible for our friends on the Reform side to occupy as committee rooms no less than three or four factories which had been built under the National Policy. The leader of the Opposition I understand is still uncertain as to how the result reached on 23rd June came about; he cannot yet make out how such an enormous change in public opinion occurred. I find that many matters have been explained in this discussion into which it is not needful that I should enter; but in my opinion there were three or four causes. The first was dissatisfaction with the National Policy, the second was the Remedial Bill, the third was differences in the late Cabinet and the members thereof. I am reminded by the remarks made by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) about Rip Van Winkle, that when he awakened after his prolonged sleep he found a dog hanging on a tree. It brings to my mind an incident which I read about some considerable time ago in one of the English papers. Mr. Labouchere was speaking at a meeting and during the course of his remarks he had occasion to mention the name of Mr. Chamberlain, the member for Birmingham. One of his audience indiscreetly called out "Judas"; whereupon Mr. Labouchere said: My friend who has called out "Judas" does no honour to his memory, for Judas after he betrayed his Master, did not go out with the high and mighty, with the nobility of the land; he did not sit down with the high priest Caiphas, but quietly and very respectably and very decently, and very properly, he went out and hanged himself. I have had hopes that during the last election a similar fate—not similar physical fate, but a similar political fate—would have happened to the gentlemen who deserted their Premier. Unfortunately, however, many have been chosen and only one left, and from what I have read of parliamentary history the one who was left out of the House was one whom we all admired and who would have done credit to the Conservative party.

I may go further in my reference to tariff matters and say that in the coming tariff I hope the modifications will be of such a character as to benefit the farming interests of the country. There is no question but that during the last eighteen years, under the National Policy, the farmers have suffered to the betterment of the manufacturers; not all manufacturers but some favoured few who have succeeded in acquiring a great deal of money. In other words, under the National Policy as it existed, the classes have been benefited to the injury of the masses. Now, Sir, the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McInerney) was kind enough to talk about the Government, and he called it the Laurier-Mowat Government, and he spoke of it turning a somersault on its tariff policy. As far as I can make out, it ill becomes the member for Kent to make any such reference, for I am credibly informed that before he became a Conservative he had four times been a Liberal candidate. If that was not a somersault I do not know what is.

Mr. FRASER. Four somersaults.

Mr. MacPHERSON. Yes, four somersaults. In addition to that, the hon. gentleman (Mr. McInerney) was talking out of term, because we have no idea yet what sort of tariff the Government is going to bring down, except that it will be in the line of a reduction in many cases, and an amelioration of the condition of the people generally. It is such a tariff that we are looking for, and if we get it we shall have cause to thank the new Government. I am sure they have given serious thought, and gone to a good deal of pains in endeavouring to remove everything of an evil character from the present tariff, and that must have been a difficult task because there are very many things of an evil character in the tariff with which we have been burdened. We have had a good deal of discussion anticipatory of the tariff, and that discussion I consider to be a waste of time, because when the tariff is brought down we shall simply have a repetition of the same talk. I do not wish to make any sort of comparison between persons, because comparisons are odious, but I cannot abstain from saying that if we had fewer lawyers in the House it might be better.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. MacPHERSON. I only said it "might" be better, but it might, on the other hand, be worse. Without wishing to give offence I must say that I believe that too many opportunities are taken advantage of by lawyers in this House to bandy words backwards and forwards across the floor. I do not wish to lecture them, but I must say that there are many business men in the House who are anxious to get back to their means of livelihood, and who have other things to do than to sit here for four or five months listening to idle talk. I trust that those lawyers in the House who speak a great deal may see their way to curtail their remarks in the future. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that in preparing a tariff we

have, no doubt, to consider the action of our neighbours to the south, and I am sorry beyond measure to find that in legislating lately, the United States Congress has shown a distinct antagonism to Canada. For a nation of sixty or seventy millions of people to show this antagonism towards a small country of five or six million inhabitants is by no means magnanimous, and is in singular contrast to the action of Great Britain, in every instance where she has had to deal with smaller powers. If the American people have an idea that by legislating in this way they are likely to coerce us into a union with them, they are making one of the grandest mistakes they ever made in their lives. The people of Canada will always be willing to be led in the right path, but the path to the United States is not the right path, and under no circumstances will our people consent to be driven. The more any people or any nation tries to drive Canadians, the less likely are they to go. I can speak feelingly on this subject, because I know that in years gone by there was a considerable annexation spirit prevailing throughout Canada. I come in contact with people from different parts of the country now, and I have discovered that some who held such feelings in the past have completely changed their views. Men who at one time thought they would send their children to school in the United States now feel that under no circumstances would they do so if they could help it. In addition to the antagonism shown to Canada by the fiscal policy of the United States we have also the Alien Labour Law, and I understand that a measure of retaliation in that respect is likely to be brought down here. I am sorry that I cannot agree in toto with any legislation of this character because I consider that a smaller nation is unable to retaliate against a larger one, and would be more likely to get hurt in the end. Undoubtedly the United States deserves no better treatment from us, and if they persist in going on with the Alien Labour Law it might be advisable for us to take action here. I have still hopes that the present Ministry will be able to arrange some measure of conciliation between Canada and the United States, a measure that would be satisfactory to both and promote a better feeling between the two countries.

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

After Recess.

Mr. MacPHERSON. Mr. Speaker, lest there should be any doubt as to my views on the question of retaliation in regard to the Alien Labour Law, I wish to reiterate what I said before six o'clock, to the effect that it is desirable, if possible, not to adopt extreme measures, and that every effort should be made to meet the representatives of the United States in a spirit of conciliation. But I am inclined to go so far as to say that if these efforts should prove ineffectual, I should then be disposed to support a measure of retaliation in the shape of a Canadian alien labour law.

Mr. Speaker, I have come away, unfortunately, without my scrap-book, and I have no doubt many hon. members will be highly pleased at being saved from the reading of extracts, which is too frequently a part of the debates in this House, a practice which I hope will soon be given up and be replaced with what is in reality debating.

For some years past the late Premier of the Dominion, the hon. leader of the Opposition has been endeavouring in Great Britain to bring about what he calls Imperial federation, but what I will call a will-o'-the-wisp. It strikes me that the only way in which such a thing can be accomplished is by the colonies adopting the same fiscal policy as that which prevails in Great Britain. Until we are prepared to do that, it is idle to speak of the matter. Everyone knows that the great Napoleon referred to England as a nation of shop-keepers; and such being the case, notwithstanding the friendship they entertain for the colonies, they are not going to deal with people from whom they do not get any benefits in return; and such benefits we can never expect to realize until we can prove to them that our trade and that of all the other colonies will equal the trade of Great Britain with the rest of the world. That I consider rather a hopeless task, and therefore I shall expect to hear very little of Imperial federation for some years to come. The great British nation, although indisposed to deal with colonies or foreign countries except to their own advantage, have within recent years shown a distinct feeling of friendship towards Canada and all the other colonies. This is evidenced by the invitation which has been extended to all the colonial Premiers to take part in the Queen's jubilee celebration; and I can only add my own to the good wishes of the previous speakers and say that we all desire that the presence of our Premier in Great Britain will be an era in the history of Canada, and I trust that the Opposition, with their usual loyalty—at least, that loyalty of which they have so frequently boasted—will assist in expediting the business of this House, so as to enable him to get away in time for that celebration.

I am delighted to find that, instead of following the will-o'-the-wisp of Imperial federation, the present Government have taken up some practical measures, which I trust will be carried to a successful issue—such measures as the provision of cold storage, in the able hands of our Minister of Agriculture, and the establishment of a fast line of steamships. I do not by any means say that I advocate a speed of twenty-two or twenty-three knots an hour: but there is room for faster and better steamships

than we now possess. Another important measure is the enlargement of our canals. Whether these measures are within the power of the Dominion of Canada, in view of its present enormous debt, I am not at present prepared to say; but if they can be carried out successfully, I look upon them to some extent as necessities, in view of the antagonism of the United States, which will only drive us further away from them, and lead us to feel that our great market is that of Great Britain.

The next measure promised in the Speech from the Throne is one to repeal the Franchise Act, a most monstrous Act, which has been in existence for years to the prejudice of our party, and for the benefit of our opponents. I am pleased to feel that that Act will soon be abolished, and a superior franchise adopted in its place. I know that the members of the Government are desirous of giving us the improvements and reforms we require in this respect, and I trust that they will go as far as they can towards manhood suffrage, with one man one vote.

There is one subject referred to in the Speech from the Throne in regard to which I am sorry to say I cannot so cordially support the action of the Government: I refer to the subject of prohibition. I feel that prohibition, if carried out, will be a direct interference with the liberty of the subject, besides which it will affect our revenue so seriously that it will be difficult to devise means for making up the loss. I look upon Great Britain as being not only the home of freedom, but as possessing the best fiscal policy possessed by any country in the world; and I find that recently, when a deputation of temperance people waited upon the Chancellor of the Exchequer to ask for the removal of the tea duties, he politely but firmly declined to accede to their request, on the ground that if those duties were removed, the temperance people would not pay their fair share of taxation. They do not drink spirits, neither do they smoke tobacco, and if they were relieved of the duties on tea, they would practically contribute nothing to the revenue. For that reason, among others, I am opposed to prohibition coming into force, and I doubt if a plebiscite is likely to be a success. I hope for failure for it, at any rate.

Referring again to the school question, the member for Kent, N.B. (Mr. McInerney), said before six o'clock that he was still not satisfied that the French Canadians were favourable to the present Government. It amazed me to hear any member of this House expressing such an opinion in the face of the enormous majority obtained by the present Government in the general elections in the province of Quebec, and in the face of the results of the elections which have since taken place. Would it be necessary, in order to convince the hon. gentleman, that one should rise from the dead? If so, I think less of the intelligence of that hon. gentleman than I did before. The hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig) and the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), who have boldly announced their want of allegiance to their party and their leader on the subject of the school question have probably already realized the resemblance of the hon. leader of the Government to Shakspere's description of Cardinal Wolsey:

> Lofty and sour to them that loved him not,
> But, to those men who sought him, sweet as summer.

Although I understand that the hon. member for East York is in no way connected with business, I appreciate his desire for the early production of the tariff. But the paralysis of trade to which he has referred is only of a temporary character. And it is better that in any changes or any tariff we may have, we should have permanence. Many people in this country, notwithstanding this temporary paralysis of trade, feel hopeful, simply because of the change brought about on the 23rd of June last. Although nine months have elapsed, reasonable men throughout the country wait patiently for the coming tariff changes, knowing that hasty legislation might result, as it so often did during the administration of previous Conservative Governments, in many errors that continually required correction and frequent changes which were injurious to the trade of the country and productive of great loss to both merchants and manufacturers. We want no hasty legislation, but expect and will get, righteous administration from the present Government, which will bring about good-will among all people, peace, plenty and prosperity throughout the country, and lead to a degree of happiness that we have not experienced in the past eighteen years, and thus make the people thankful for the result of the last election on the 23rd of June, 1896.

Mr. WALLACE. I did not intend to take part in this debate on the Address, because I find that lengthy debates on the Address lead to no very satisfactory conclusion, and besides the questions that are referred to in it are usually brought before the House later in a more tangible shape—in the form of Bills or resolutions—to be dealt with specially by the House, and on such occasions there is better opportunity to express one's views on these subjects. But there is one question that has apparently attracted the attention of those who have taken part in this debate, and as that question may not come before the House again in any other form, and as this may be the only opportunity afforded us to express our opinion upon it, I take this opportunity to do so, and shall confine the few remarks I propose to make to-night to that question alone. It has been discussed a good deal in this House and out of it, whether the Remedial Bill presented

to the House by the late Government, or whether the settlement made by the Manitoba legislature is most favourable to the Roman Catholic Church. Well, as you know, Sir, we all paid a good deal of attention to the Remedial Bill during the first session of last year and became quite familiar with its contents—or, at least, we supposed we had—and I have no hesitation in saying that the evidence appears to me to be overwhelmingly in favour of the contention of the hon. leader of the Opposition that the Remedial Bill presented to the late Parliament at its last session was a measure more strongly calculated to answer the purposes of the Roman Catholic church and to establish a system of separate schools in Manitoba than the settlement made by the local legislature. I will go further and say that, in my opinion, there is a very wide difference between the two measures. As has been pointed out by the hon. leader of the Opposition in this debate, the peculiar feature of the Remedial Bill presented to the last Parliament was that it established a complete system of separate schools in this country. What are the clauses ? I will just trespass upon the time of the House for only a few moments in reading the clauses as stated briefly by the hon. leader of the Opposition. He said :

> The Remedial Bill proposed to constitute a separate school board of education for the province, to be composed of a number of persons, not exceeding nine, all Roman Catholics. This board was to have control of the separate schools, and, among other things, to select the books, maps and globes, to appoint a Roman Catholic speaking both French and English as superintendent of separate schools.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> To select all the books, maps and globes to be used in the schools under its control ; provided, however, that no book, map or globe other than books in history, morals or religion, shall be selected, unless such books, map or globe has been authorized for use either in high or public schools of the province of Manitoba, or is now, or hereafter shall be in use in any of the public or separate schools of any province of the Dominion, or books published in any country.

Other clauses gave most complete power to this separate school board to control the educational system of the Roman Catholics of Manitoba. It was true that the Bill was defective in one particular. It is true that it did not provide sufficient funds for the carrying out of this programme, but it is also true that the last clause of that Bill provided that further legislation might be enacted to carry out its provisions—not to restrict any of the clauses but in order to give the Government power, at a later date, to raise money from any source where money could be legally raised for the support and maintenance of these schools. It is clear to my mind, at any rate, that the Remedial Bill was one that gave more power for the establishment of a school system satisfactory to the Roman Catholic hierarchy than the Bill enacted by the local legislature.

There is a number of clauses in the Bill enacted by the local legislature of which I do not approve, and which I would most determinedly oppose, if that enactment had come before this Parliament. But, in the first place, it does not come before this Parliament, and, in the next place, it goes before the people of Manitoba, who, we have always contended, are the proper parties to enact this legislation. We have always contended that it was dangerous and unusual and unprecedented for this Parliament to attempt to enact school legislation when ample powers had been given to the province to do so, and when there is no province in this Dominion that would legislate unfairly against any portion of the people, or legislate to do them injury, but rather that they recognized that their duty was to legislate for the whole people, the majority as well as the minority. A settlement has been made of this question by the province of Manitoba. They have the power to do what they please in the matter. They could give ten times as much privileges to the minority in Manitoba if they saw fit to do so, and it would be largely their own business. They, at any rate, have settled the question. There are clauses in that Bill that, if I were there, or if the question came up here, I would oppose. There is the clause, for instance, compelling, in certain cases, the employment of a Roman Catholic teacher in a school, which means that a Protestant teacher may be dismissed from that school and a Roman Catholic put in his place, not because the Protestant teacher did not do his duty, but arbitrarily and unnecessarily. There are other clauses equally objectionable to which I shall not at length refer, because they do not come immediately before us for consideration. But we were told that when this legislation was passed in Manitoba, it was to be a final settlement, that we should never hear of it again, that the Parliament of Canada was to settle down to its legitimate measures of dealing with the important matters affecting the people of Canada, affecting the prosperity of the country and its future. I think the whole country would rejoice to believe that this matter was out of our way altogether. But, Sir, I never shared so very cordially such bright anticipations. I knew the history of our country in the past, and I was not so sure that the predictions that had been made by the Premier and other members of the Government would be verified. And to-day what do we see ? We see the time of the Parliament of Canada for the first week taken up almost exclusively in the discussion of this question—not brought on by us——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentlemen may say "Oh, oh." I say that so far as those who think as I do on this question are concerned, I believe that this afternoon

was the first time this session when any of us addressed the House on the subject. Therefore, it is that I say that the discussion has not been brought on and continued by those who think and act on this matter as I do. I have said that, remembering the history of our own country, I was not so sanguine as the Premier was that this question was settled now and for ever. Consider the history of our own province of Ontario. Hon. George Brown, the leader of the Liberal party in this province, and in the provinces of Canada was a gentleman who, during the whole of his political career had shown a most determined resistance to the principle of separate schools in Ontario. He had fought that question with great vigour and great success. I remember very well reading the speech he made in agreeing to the article of confederation which included the establishment of separate schools in Ontario. In explaining and defending his course in this respect he said: I have opposed the establishment of a separate school system in this country; I have fought against that in every hustings in Ontario. You ask me why I yield to the establishment of a separate school system in Ontario and to make it a part of the Confederation Act. In the first place, everybody must make some sacrifice in order to carry this great measure of confederation. But the important reason was the establishment of this separate school system, which, it was expected would not extend very much through the province of Ontario, was a final settlement of the question. The hierarchy of the province accepts this as a final settlement of the question and it will never come up to disturb us again, as the hierarchy will ask no more. For these reasons I have agreed to the proposition. This was the explanation given by Mr. Brown. But look at the subsequent history of Ontario. The Government of Sandfield Macdonald, himself a Roman Catholic, refused to give the hierarchy concessions and to extend the separate school system and make the law, as they said, more effective, say what George Brown had said—that this was a final settlement at confederation and that they had no right to propose to open up the question at all. He therefore refused, and he met with the determined opposition and was defeated at the next election largely through the influence of the church which opposed him because he refused to open up that question. In a short time, the present Sir Oliver Mowat became Prime Minister of Ontario. Session after session there were concessions made to the hierarchy. The separate school law was amended year after year, and was made to conform to the wishes of the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church in violation of the pledge that has been given, the open pledge that had been made that the terms allowed at confederation were to be accepted as a finality, which pledge induced Hon. George Brown to accept it and make it part of the Confederation Act. And to-day we find history repeating itself. After the Premier has told us, after the Ministers have told us that this question was settled for ever and would come up no more, after the legislation has been adopted in Manitoba and the provincial legislature prorogued, we find a gentleman coming out from Rome in connection with the matter. We are told that he comes out to settle domestic difficulties. But if we examine the matter we shall find that he comes not alone to settle domestic difficulties, if such there be, not alone as spiritual adviser of his people. If that were the role in which he came, those not of that faith would have no reason to interfere. But, does this gentleman come on any other mission? Let us take his own evidence on that point. But before I do that, let me remind the House of the fact that after that settlement had been made between the two Governments, after legislation had been promised by the legislature of Manitoba, which legislation has now become law, what do we find? We find delegation after delegation going away, what for? To seek the foot of the throne? To bring grievances to the attention of the head of the British Empire? No, but going to the Pope of Rome for assistance, advice, or instruction. The first to go was, I think, Abbe Proulx. The question was brought up last session, I think, and the Premier said that he had nothing to do in sending Abbe Proulx, and, of course, that statement was accepted. After him we find Mr. Drolet going, and after him, Mr. Russell, and after him the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) one of the members of the Government. We find them all stating that they go there as private citizens, for the good of their health merely to take a trip to Europe, to recuperate their exhausted energies, and fit them for the next meeting of Parliament. But the news comes out now that these men went there with one object in view—to see the Pope with regard to affairs which, I say, should never have been submitted to the arbitration or settlement to anybody outside British dominions. Our constitution provided ample powers for settling every question that comes before the Parliament or people of Canada. And, when they went to Rome for this purpose, they went to Rome violating the privileges which belong to the people as British subjects. And a member of the Government committing the Government and the people of Canada to a course which I, for one, will certainly not approve of, and which, I believe, will not be approved by the people of Canada. Now, the result of these missions is the presence of a delegate or ablegate—delegate I think they call him, Mgr. Merry del Val. He was interviewed in New York and this is what is reported of him:

The ablegate would not say why he regretted that action had been taken, or whether it was

understood at Rome that nothing would be done by the legislature pending his arrival. The impression was conveyed that such action was regarded as discourteous, in view of his appointment, not that its legality was questioned.

Now, is not the position one for most serious consideration ? We have here the legislature of Manitoba legislating on a political question entirely within their power when they choose to legislate upon it after coming to a settlement that is satisfactory to the Government of the Dominion which has powers under the constitution which we need not refer to, should the province refuse to act. It was a settlement fairly satisfactory to the Government of Canada, a settlement that was satisfactory to the people of Manitoba as represented by their legislature. Now a delegate from Rome is sent out here by the Pope, and what does he say ? Why, he says substantially : You should not have settled this question, the legislature of Manitoba should have adjourned for a week, or for a month, when they heard I was coming, they should have suspended their business and waited from day to day until I arrived to settle this important question for them. If he does not mean that, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what he does mean. It is a case to which the history of Canada furnishes no parallel ; and so far as I know the history of no British possession for hundreds of years furnishes no parallel to the position which was taken by this delegate coming to Canada to regulate, control, manage and dictate the course that the people of Manitoba should take in their own local affairs. Why, Mr. Speaker, we protested against the hierarchy in the province of Quebec interfering in the case of a sister province ; we protested against this Dominion Parliament interfering with Manitoba, because we said the people of Manitoba are citizens of Canada, loyal and patriotic as ourselves, desirous of promoting the best interests of their country, and they will do nothing to injure the material interests and the moral interests of the province of Manitoba. This Parliament had the power, no doubt, to interfere ; but we said it was unwise and injudicious to exercise that power which, under certain circumstances, we might exercise. Then, Sir, why did this delegate come to Canada ? One after another of those ambassadors from Canada have spoken ; the last one, the Solicitor General, I assume, unless I have evidence to the contrary, on behalf of the Dominion Government. At any rate, such was the statement of the Minister of Public Works last night. I did not hear him speak, but I have his speech before me, in which he says that he signed the petition to Rome as a member of the Government, not as a private citizen, not even as a member representing a constituency that might have authorized him to do so, but as a member of the Government of the Dominion of Canada, representing all classes and all portions of this Dominion. Here is what he says :

> This document, I am not afraid to say, I am proud to say, has been signed by 45 of us. I say, as a member of this Government, that I signed it, and I am proud to say it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. He did not say he signed it as a member of the Government. Read it again.

Mr. WALLACE. I am going to read for the hon. gentleman's benefit, not my own :

> I say as a member of this Government that I signed it, and I am proud to say so.

As a member of the Government, he signed it. Who authorized him, Mr. Speaker, to speak for this Parliament of Canada, for the people of Canada, in signing a document in which he says :

> We, the undersigned members of the Senate and members of the House of Commons of Canada, and representing therein the Liberal party, present ourselves before Your Holiness.

Well, at any rate, he says that he represents the member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) if he does not represent the member for West York (Mr. Wallace). He represents the Liberal party, but he does not represent me in the matter. Now, Sir, they complained of the conduct of the hierarchy in certain matters. But what did the Solicitor General tell us last night ? He said that he did not object to interference by the hierarchy. He quoted a portion of the Address issued by the hierarchy in the province of Quebec. I will read the clause over again. This is what I most strongly object to, but which the present Government, represented by their Solicitor General, do not object to :

> Therefore, my dearly beloved brethren, all Catholics shall abstain from giving their assistance or their votes to candidates who shall not bind themselves formally and solemnly to vote in Parliament in favour of legislation restoring to the Catholic minority of Manitoba the school rights guaranteed to them by the judgment of the Privy Council.

Mr. Speaker, during the session of a year ago, we protested with all the vigour we could against that mandement issued by the bishops, against their assumption of power to interfere with the electorate of this country. Now, I am not going to inquire as to whether the people object to this mandement, or whether the hon. gentlemen redeemed the pledges which they made. That is somewhat of a domestic matter that I am not going to interfere with at present ; that can be settled in other ways. But that is what we protested against, it is what we understood the present Government then in Opposition protested against—the assumption of the hierarchy to dictate to a single elector in Canada how he should record his vote. They have their spiritual powers over the people, and no Protestant wishes to inter-

fere with them in the exercise of any of their just rights, but we do protest in the strongest manner against their attempt to dictate to the electors, and to say how they shall vote on any political question, or for any member of Parliament. They have no right to attempt that dictation, or to threaten the people with all the powers of their church on refusal to obey them. But the Solicitor General does not object to this. He says:

Let it now be understood that, so far as I am concerned, I do not in the least object to the interference of the Roman Catholic clergy in elections.

This, then, was all right according to him. He did not go to Rome to object to their course in dictating to the people, because the Solicitor General says that course was all right. What more did he say:

But I hold that there are times when they not only have a right to interfere, but they should interfere; and I am far from taking a position that this case was not one in which they should interfere.

He says here is a case in which the clergy have a right to interfere, they did interfere and there is no wrong done. Then what did he go to Rome for? Was it to find fault with the clergy, as they say, or as the Minister of Public Works said yesterday afternoon, "To assert our freedom"? Nothing of the kind. Here is the specific statement of the Solicitor General of Canada, not that he went to Rome to assert their freedom—because he says the Roman Catholic clergy have a right to interfere in certain cases, and this case was one of them. But what did he say further:

It would naturally be expected that the Liberal candidates who gave these pledges——

And he mentions himself as one who gave a pledge:

—would be placed on the same footing as their opponents, and that the two political parties would be allowed to fight out the issues then pending between them, without the intervention of the clergy. Was such the case? No.

Then it resolved itself into a question of good faith as to whether the bishops carried out their part of the bargain. Surely that is not a matter in which the people of Canada are interested; but that is only an excuse. But there is another matter. He wants this papal delegate to be brought out to Canada, not for the purpose of settling those domestic disputes, not for the purpose of reprimanding the bishops, because he assumed that the bishops did right. Then what for? Why, to do what the delegate, on his arrival in Canada, expresses surprise about, namely, because the local legislature of Manitoba had had the audacity to go on and transact their business, to enact their laws, knowing that he was on the broad Atlantic coming over to settle it for them himself; that is all. The Solicitor General said that question was not finally settled. Here are his words:

So far as I am concerned, I must say that I believe that the Manitoba minority will not, under it, get all that they ought to get, and all that they ought to contend for.

This was said yesterday, after the legislation had been passed, and passed with the concurrence of this Government. It was in strict accordance with the arrangement made between the two Governments. If that arrangement were made, if the matter was settled, why did we find the hon. Solicitor General stating as follows:—

So far as I am concerned, I must say that I believe that the minority will not under it get all that they ought to get and all that they ought to contend for. I say that now, because I cannot come to any other conclusion; but I say, at the same time, that, while they do not get what they ought to have, and most certainly ought to contend for, it is utterly out of the question, under existing conditions, that in this House we should endeavour, by any means in our power, to give them more than they have at present.

In the future there will be more still, he indicates, showing the great danger which I have always anticipated, namely, that this is only considered an instalment. I will not say that the Government have not acted in good faith, believing that this would be a settlement; but here is a member of the Government stating that he is not satisfied with the settlement and that he does not think the minority will rest under it, but at the same time he advises them to rest on their oars for the present. That is the position of affairs, as I gather it from his statement. I see in the "Globe" to-day a repetition of the statement made by the papal delegate in England, in New York, and yesterday in Montreal. What does he say? He says:

I express regret, certainly; but it would not be correct to say displeasure. You must understand that I have seen nothing of what has appeared about me. I believe there have been all sorts of rumours, but, naturally, I give no attention to them.

Then the reporter asked:

You understand that the school question is settled: that the Manitoba Government has accepted the arrangements suggested by the Hon. Mr. Laurier, and that the question may now be said to be removed from the political arena?

In reply the delegate said:

Might there not be such a thing as an amendment?

That is the point exactly. The session of the local legislature has been closed. But trails will be laid and arrangements completed for reopening the question at the next session, because the delegate already suggests that there might be such a thing as an amendment; and will he not be able to use such influence as to induce the legis-

lature of the Government of Manitoba to grant further concessions, to bring in some further amendments? I consider, Mr. Speaker, that the whole thing is wrong from beginning to end, that this gentleman has no right to come here in the capacity in which he has announced himself—not in the capacity in which we may imagine he has come—to settle this question, and he says the Manitoba legislature, as a matter of courtesy, might have waited until he arrived. He said further:

> Well, all I said, and all I thought, was that the Manitoba legislature might have waited my arrival before proceeding to deal with the matter finally. Understand that I express no opinion as to the question itself.

We understand that. We do not know what position he may take on this question; but he comes here, according to his own statement, made in England, later in New York, and in Montreal yesterday, and considers that the Manitoba legislature should not have closed their business and gone home, but have adjourned from day to day, and hour to hour, until he arrived. Why? Was it to obtain knowledge in regard to their own affairs? They know their business much better than he would know it after six months or twelve months' residence. They know the people, and their wants and desires. They have consented to make concessions, which they say will satisfy the minority. I do not know whether they will do so or not, and I have nothing to do with that matter; but here we have interference by a papal delegate in local legislation by the people of Canada. The hierarchy in the province of Quebec attempted to interfere in the last election, and according to the accounts, they met with disaster, because we are told this settlement does not meet their approval. Then if it does not meet with their approval, if after the desperate conflict they waged they found themselves worsted in the end, I think we may fairly conclude that the people of Canada, who would not submit to the hierarchy here, will not submit to a delegate sent by the Pope of Rome for a similar purpose, to endeavour to intimidate them, to coerce them into adopting legislation which would be inimical to their interests and to which they are unalterably opposed. I will not occupy much more of the time of the House, but I thought it my duty to refer to this matter because no other opportunity might have been given. But before I resume my seat I will refer to another subject allied to this, and which is one of very considerable importance. There was a newspaper in the province of Quebec which I understand was an ardent supporter of the present Government. A mandement or command was issued forbidding the people reading that newspaper, forbidding the owners publishing it, forbidding printers, pressmen and reporters and all the staff from doing their ordinary day's work under pain of the terrors of the church to which they belonged. Why, Mr. Speaker, such a thing has never been known in a free country. Yet that condition was permitted, and the paper disappeared in one day. The order of the church had been given that this private property was to be destroyed, that the freedom of the people as regards reading this paper was to be taken away and that the men who were earning their livelihood by working on this journal were to be deprived of their rights. We were told that the people of Canada were too high-spirited, and too independent through their representatives in Parliament and in the Government to tolerate such a thing. But, Sir, it was done. These hon. gentlemen had a supporter of their own who was subjected to that, what I call an illegal act, and if it is not an illegal act under our present laws, then the Minister of Justice should at once prepare a Bill to make it illegal and to punish men who would be guilty of depriving other men of their freedom, of their political rights, and of their property. Apparently the power to punish such men for their wrong-doing has never been recognized. I would like to ask the Solicitor General, or any member of the Government who can speak with authority on the subject, whether the law of the land is at present able to reach wrong-doers of that description. If no reply can be given by them, I suppose there is no doubt that this Parliament is seized of the power to legislate on that matter. I say that we look to the Government to legislate in such a way as will prevent for all time to come, any man—I do not care how high an ecclesiastical dignitary he may be—from interfering with the freedom of the lowest of Her Majesty's subjects in Canada. In conclusion I wish to say, Sir, that I believe that the course a few of us took in this House during the last session was the one that the majority of the people of Canada approved of. The school question has been settled, not just exactly as we would wish, but approaching to it and on the lines of a refusal to establish separate schools in Manitoba. As to the National Policy of which we were strong advocates, why, I have been told that we have converted the members on the ministerial benches. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) who moved the Address said, that on the fiscal policy the differences between the two sides of the House will be theoretical and not practical. What does that mean? It means that they had a theory of free trade which they would not dream of putting into practice. The Prime Minister himself said, that they would adopt a policy that would bring prosperity to every town and to every part of the country, and that they would not interfere with existing industries. Why, Sir, when the Premier was speaking on this question I could imagine that the remarks

came from the ex-Minister of Finance or from the leader of the Opposition. I say again that we who took the ground that the National Policy should prevail, and that no separate schools should be tolerated, took the ground approved of by the majority of the people of Canada, and I feel sure that both of these principles will obtain in the land before many days have passed.

Mr. CASEY. The late Sir John Macdonald said on one occasion about a former leader of the Liberal party who had gone a certain distance towards reconciliation and had afterwards come out very strongly on his former lines, that after all, what that leader of the Liberal party said, was the "old Brown stuff." We have seen for a year or more the member for West York (Mr. Wallace) sailing under somewhat different colours from those which he once hoisted. During the session of last winter he was sailing under the colours of independence, but to-night he has come out in his true colours, and it is the old yellow stuff after all. He has done the Orange part of the talking while my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. McInerney) has done that share of the talking which wears the opposite colour. The result of the caucus of this forenoon is evident. The party is reunited; they intend to do in the future as they have done in the past, and to continue riding the old rocking-horse with a head at each end; one head where the tail usually is, and another where the head ought to be. This animal will be teetering up and down with a graceful ease of motion, and it will appear to those opposite one end of it that it is making progress towards Rome, while the other end will appear to be cantering towards Derry. That has long been the policy of that often disrupted and often united party, and I am not surprised to see the old rocking-horse to the front again.

My hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) has certainly not done credit to that intelligence which he showed in previous sessions when dealing with this question of the Manitoba schools. He undoubtedly did develop a great talent for independent consideration of that subject, and he went so far as to ostensibly break with his leader. It was not long after the elections, however, until we found him up in North Grey, riding the old horse again, and saying that the Protestants of Ontario must be united to keep down French domination in the person of the leader of the Liberal party. We find him to-night talking on the same lines. He has done violence to his own convictions, by charging the Liberal party with all the sins of the leader with whom he is reunited and whom he now so loyally follows. We have heard him speak of the mandement issued by the bishops, and about the ban that was put on certain newspapers in the province of Quebec, all mixed up with the question of the papal delegate, until one would think that these were the sins of the Liberal party. But, we all know that these things of which the member for West York complains were done at the instigation of his leader, and for the benefit of the party to which he belongs. Yet, this independent member for an independent constituency, who received many non-Conservative votes on the ground of his independence, now supports that leader whose actions he so utterly condemns. I say, Sir, that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) has gone back—and I use the words in their purely parliamentary sense—he has gone back to his wallowing in the old mire of partyism, and has no longer a right to the title of an independent member.

Now, the hon. member (Mr. Wallace) pretends to not be convinced, as my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) pretends to not be convinced, that the petition sent to Rome was a personal petition against personal grievances, and they both wish to hold the Government responsible for it. They talk about the Seven Hills of Rome, and about going to Rome instead of going to the foot of the Throne, in a manner that would do pretty well perhaps in an Orange lodge, but which will not do for the floor of this House because here we are at least men of the world. We know perfectly well, that there is no foundation for the assertion, that the evils complained of in this petition can be removed in any other way than by the exercise of the authority of the head of the Roman Catholic Church.

The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) says the constitution provides ample power to remedy all evils of this kind, and that this sort of thing which is complained of should be made a crime, and so on. Does he not know very well that the sort of thing complained of in this petition is something that cannot be reached by any law of the land? Can the Queen or the British constitution or the Canadian House of Commons, or an Orange lodge, or any other civil power, compel a priest to give absolution to a man to whom he declares it cannot be given? Can the Queen, the Lords and Commons, and all the other powers of the state combined, compel a bishop or a priest to give the sacrament to an individual, or a class of people, to whom they have refused it? I tell you, no; and the hon. member knows it as well as I do. However we may differ with the Church of Rome, however we may complain of it for some of its actions, if we were inclined to do so, we must admit, as reasonable men, that the only means of enforcing order and discipline in that church, or of settling differences between the clergy and the laity, rests with the Pope of Rome and his advisers. There is no other tribunal to which Catholics who feel aggrieved in regard to any question of church discipline can appeal.

I think the production of that petition last night by my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works was the very best thing that has been done during this debate. It has knocked the bottom utterly and for ever out of the shallow pretense that the Government of Canada had sent to Rome for a papal delegate to come to Canada to assist them to settle the school question. I need not read to you the terms of that petition in full. You heard it last night, and you will probably have cause to remember it, if this question lives in history. The signers of that petition, describing themselves as senators and members of Parliament, as they were, and as Catholics, as they were, proceed to set forth that twenty years ago His Holiness Pius IX. had deemed it his duty to put a stop to certain abuses of a similar character to those now complained of, and forbade the intervention of the clergy in politics. Then they say :

> This prohibition was generally respected so long as His Eminence Cardinal Taschereau was able to guide the church in Canada, but since old age and infirmities have paralyzed his guiding hand, the abuses to which Your Illustrious Predecessor had put a stop, have begun again, and threaten once more to create trouble among us and to compromise not only Catholic interests in this country, but the peace and harmony which should exist between the various elements of our population.

This is the complaint of the petitioners. Their prayer is that a similar course may be taken to that which was taken in 1877. There is not a word in the petition from beginning to end about the school question. There is not a hint that they expect the delegate to favour one party more than the other. They want him to come out to settle this question of church discipline, just as a delegate might be sent from the ruling body of the Episcopalians, the Presbyterians, the Baptists, or the Methodists to settle a question of discipline in any of these churches.

Now that I am on the much-vexed question of separate schools, I may as well, perhaps, finish what I have to say about it. While listening, rather carelessly I admit, to the speech of my hon. friend from Kent, N.B., (Mr. McInerney) this afternoon, I heard him say something about some individual who had pledged himself to support the Catholic Church and remedial legislation, and who had gone back on that pledge in consequence of not having received the support of that church. I remarked to my friend beside me, "Is he pitching into the leader of the Opposition? "No," he said, "he means the Solicitor General." "Oh," I said, "I thought he meant the other individual," because certain words which I had heard from the leader of the Opposition at the opening of the debate were still fresh in my memory. The hon. member for West York was not aware that the re-opening of this question came from that side of the House, or that his leader, on the first day of the debate, spoke to this effect :

> Whatever means were taken, the hon. gentleman knows that the support for which I had a right to look, both from a public standpoint and upon the question of principle, from the province of Quebec, I did not receive.

Still further, he said :

> At very great risk as a public man, I went forward to vindicate what I believed to be demanded in common justice by the minority under the constitution, and I was defeated, and defeated by the votes of the Roman Catholic electors of the province of Quebec.

What follows ?

> No person will be more delighted to find this question removed from Parliament for once and for ever. I am glad that the responsibility no longer rests on my shoulders, and freed from the responsibility of Government, while my views remain unchanged and my personal opinions will be always maintained, I shall not feel it in the future, as in the past, incumbent on me to make those exertions that I did make in defending rights, the protection of which under the constitution now rests upon the shoulders of the hon. gentleman who sits opposite.

It was the leader of the Opposition who told this House that because the Catholics did not support him in the last election, he washed his hands of this whole affair of remedial legislation.

The responsibility rested on the shoulders of the Government, and yet the hon. gentleman was not content to leave the question in peace. He said that on the grounds of race and religion he had hoped to get the support of the people of Quebec, and yet he did not get it. Was it because he failed to make appeals to race and religion ? Did he not declare on the floor of this House that the present Premier was a traitor to his race and his religion ? Did he not reiterate that statement and insist on having it reiterated in his organs in the province of Quebec ? Why did not the people of Quebec take him at his word, and call one man a traitor and the other man their friend ? Because they did not believe in the leader of the Opposition ; because they did not believe in his honesty or integrity of purpose. They supported the man who is believed in all quarters except the most prejudiced to have done more than could have been done by any other man to settle this school question.

I again call attention to that paragraph in the petition which states that there had been no interference in elections in Quebec since the visit of the late Bishop Conroy until the time of the late elections. Whatever action may have been taken by the bishops, and however justly it may be complained of by those parties acquainted with the facts, that action was taken at the instigation of the hon. gentleman who now leads the Opposition. It was not the habitude of the bishops to act in this manner ; it was some-

thing unexpected on their part. I hope it may be only a passing aberration from their ordinary custom. I am inclined to believe that their whole conduct complained of is nothing but a case of infectious Tupperism. I say infectious Tupperism, because we know that the bad habits of dictation, of bull-dozing—as we used to call it in the old days, when parliamentary language was freer than it is to-day—are contagious. I am sure that the bishops of Quebec, those of them who have erred in this matter, have caught the contagion from the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) and I hope that when the contamination is removed they may return to a sounder state of mind on the subject.

Now, my hon. friend from Kent, N.B., (Mr. McInerney) gave us a good many occasions for reply, but I have not the time to follow his speech in detail. For example, he made a great point about the election in Wright. He said that Mr. Devlin had resigned because he could not support the present leader of the Government. Now, it happens that Mr. Devlin himself, and the leader of the Government, who are the parties best acquainted with the facts, have both given that statement a straightforward denial. My hon. friend from Kent finds himself, with regard to that charge, in the same position as he found himself in with regard to other charges he made, that of having to retract them. He blundered into a great many charges and retracted them all. It is a good thing for an Irishman that he can speak twice, but it is not in the nature of an Irishman to make charges which have no foundation in fact. Did it not occur to him, when discussing the election in Wright, that the fact that Mr. Devlin had opposed his leader on the Remedial Bill may have had something to do with the increased majority which his successor obtained in that riding? My hon. friend said he could not account for the fact that the county of Wright was carried by a larger majority now than in June last, except in a way to which I shall shortly refer. He should remember that Mr. Devlin felt himself conscientiously bound to oppose his leader on that question. Mr. Devlin went back and was re-elected, no doubt; but when the constituency was re-opened and a new candidate presented himself, who was in thorough sympathy with his leader on that question, he was elected by a majority more than twice as great as that which Mr. Devlin had in the French and Catholic county of Wright. My hon. friend found another explanation of this great majority. He said it was due to the fact that the entire electorate of Hull were employed on the burnt building of the western block. I am very much surprised that in his eagerness to make charges, he did not imply that the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) had put a torch to that building and set it on fire just on purpose to employ the electors of the county of Wright there. There would be about as much foundation for that charge as for the others he made in his address.

There was one other choice accusation which I am not in a position to deny of my own personal knowledge, but which I will leave the House to estimate at its true worth. He told us that when the Government, as he incorrectly said, sent the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) to Rome, they bought the support of Lord Russell the Chief Justice of England by appointing his son the solicitor for Canada in England. I do not believe that half the House noticed that statement of the hon. gentleman, and I beg to call their special attention to it as a curiosity, and leave it to the House to decide what value to attach to it.

I do not propose to take up any further time commenting on the remarks of these hon. gentlemen. I have reversed the procedure of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. I have had to take the debatable matters up first, and now propose to say a few words on subjects as to which we are probably more generally in accord. It is impossible to speak on this Address without saying something about our Queen and Her reign and the Jubilee which is to celebrate that wonderful reign. Of the Queen herself no one can speak too highly. It is hard to say in which capacity most could be said about Her—whether as the Queen, the leader of society, the practical introducer of a new epoch, or as the woman. During her long reign progress has made greater strides than during any previous reign, no matter how short. Her reign has been the longest on record, and during the Victorian era have been witnessed practically all the developments and advancements that are claimed as belonging to the nineteenth century. The reign of Her Majesty has not only brought the British Empire to what is perhaps its culminating point, but has wielded a moulding force on the destinies of the world at large, which has not been exceeded in the world's history.

As to the loyalty of Canadians towards our Queen and the mother country, little indeed need be said. Our loyalty is composed of several component parts. There is the pride that we have in our historical heritage as Britons, there is the admiration we feel for the present occupant of the Throne, and there is besides that element of chivalry and romance with which we, at a distance, look upon everything connected with the older land. It is probably that distance from the scene which prevents any of that friction that appears to exist in British politics from extending to our shores, which makes the loyalty of the colonies generally more romantic than that of any class within the British Isles themselves. I am happy to hear that loyalty voiced by our fellow citizens of

French extraction, in spite of the efforts made by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), the other evening, to make us believe that French Canadians were a disloyal people, un-British in their sentiments.

Mr. MONK. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I do not remember saying that at all. I simply quoted the utterances of some of the Liberal papers.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman read extracts from a large number of newspapers which, he said, represented the sentiments of the people of Quebec, and tried to create the impression—as he undoubtedly did on many members who do not know the French Canadians—that there was a strong vein of disloyalty to British institutions existing among that people. In spite of his efforts to malign those fellow-citizens of ours, we feel that their pulse beats in union with ours in this affection for the motherland. Why should there not be unity in this respect? Why should not our friends of direct Norman and Breton extraction feel sympathy and unity with their kindred who have come to Canada through the British Isles? Is it not from Normandy that the proudest families of Britain claim their descent? Is it not well known that the people of Britanny are one in blood with the Celtic population of the British Islands? Why should not the Normans and Celts who talk French, in Canada, feel a community of sentiment and interest with the Normans and Celts who talk English in Canada. I do not see why that unity should not exist. I believe that the state of things which has lately been inaugurated will do more to promote that unity than anything that has ever taken place. When we consider the attitude of that population under the intense strain that was put upon them during the late election, do we not see the old British qualities cropping out, the qualities that we are too apt to claim as being purely British? Do we not see that instinct for individual liberty, that resistance to dictation which John Bull is too apt to claim as his alone? We are proud to recognize in these related races the related qualities.

We have had a good deal of discussion about the celebration of the jubilee. The Government have not yet told us how we are to be represented on that occasion. I hope we shall be represented on a scale commensurate with our importance. I do not believe that it will pay to save a little expense if thereby we are going to lose any of the éclat of the occasion as a people. A suggestion was made to me by the by, the other day, that has apparently been made to others in the House, by a good friend of mine in London, Ont., a gentleman well known to many members of this House. He thought that one of the best contributions that we could make to the military pageant would be to send a strong detachment of our North-west Mounted Police. I would commend this suggestion to the only Minister (Mr. Sifton) whom I see present, at the moment, as worthy of consideration by himself and his colleagues. My friend pointed out that nothing could be more reassuring to the intending settler, the man not accustomed to go far from home, than to see a magnificent body of men mounted on magnificent chargers, and to be told that these were not regular soldiers, not even volunteers, but the ordinary police of the country who guarded the settlers from Indians, Yankee whisky traders, and that sort of cattle.

We in Canada hope to have a celebration of our own. We have not only a jubilee occasion but we believe we have a jubilee Government, one that has the qualities in it required for a celebration of this kind. It has not reigned for sixty years, but we do not know what may come to pass—some of them are young men yet. One member of the Government reigned for twenty years in his native province, and he seems quite capable of putting in fifteen or twenty years more in the Dominion Government.

There is in the minds of the people in Canada a turning towards the production of new wealth out of the ground in various ways. Capital exists in plenty in the country, the outlet alone has been wanting, and this has produced hard times. Manufacturing, under the hot-house system to which it has been subjected, has been overdone. Farming has been overtaxed. Lumbering has been as fully developed, perhaps, as there is room for. There remains the production of new wealth by mining, boring for oil, and other methods of that sort. A large area of our country ought to be further developed by the construction of railways. I do not wish to din too many suggestions into the ears of the Ministers, no doubt they hear a great deal on this question every day. But I would urge upon them that in the matter of railway development and affording facilities for opening up the mineral wealth of the country in all directions, they may find generosity to be the true economy. It may be that they will find an example by reversing that of Pharaoh—they may find that considerable expenditure in the lean years may hasten the return of the fat years. At all events, I beg to offer my own personal opinion that it is not an improper governmental function to tax posterity a little, if necessary, to put money in circulation at a period when times are hard, and when a small expenditure of public money may lead to a large development of national wealth.

In the years when the National Policy was first in existence and was producing, not protection, but a very large revenue, we were too extravagant in expenditures

of this kind; we threw away our wealth as though it were never coming to an end, and, perhaps, contributed unduly to inflate the good times then existing. But now, without rushing to such extremes, I believe that a very generous expenditure on objects of that kind will add greatly to the population, wealth and prosperity of the country. I have every confidence in the men who rule the great spending departments, and I believe they will look upon all suggestions of this kind, as they are considered in detail with a friendly eye.

I have alluded, in passing, to the mining prospects of this country. I do not want to say too much on that point for fear I may be told that I am merely a mining boomster. But I do believe that it is our duty as legislators to impress upon the people of this country that we have a vast heritage of that kind. Now that there has been a change in the ruling powers of this country, now that the dark cloud which hung over us so long has passed, people are beginning to take a brighter view. It is possible to make people believe there are good mines and good lands, and everything good in Canada, and I do not believe that by encouraging that opinion by every rational expenditure, we are running any great risk of inducing an unfounded boom in mining matters. Mining is an industry which very soon finds out whether there is anything to support it or not. People do not buy mines and hold them indefinitely for a rise in price, but they seek to find out as soon as possible if there is anything in them, and if not they pass to somewhere else, and if there is, it is an addition to the wealth of the country. I think that investment in mining is as legitimate as in manufacturing, farming or other things in which capital is now largely employed. I hope to see, in the near future, Canada recognized by the nations of the world as being, what I believe she is, the richest mineral country on the face of the earth.

I think that I may say without violating confidence, that I had private intimation some months ago of the report of a very distinguished European expert who was sent to British Columbia to report on what he saw there for the benefit of European investors, and he informed the person through whom I got the information that when he went home he was going to report to those who sent him that all the fabulous things he had ever read of in fiction were surpassed and outdone by what he found actually to exist in the mining districts of British Columbia alone. We all know that it is not our only mining field, we have plenty more. But I believe it will be found that the precious metals, the iron and copper which exist at the boundary line in British Columbia, which exist in the Cariboo, in the Slocan, and at the extreme northern boundary of British Columbia on the Yukon River, extend all the way between those points also, and that we have a strip of mineralized territory there equal in extent to all the other mining districts of the world, and not inferior perhaps in the richness of its minerals. I hope that this golden era will be fully developed under the auspices of the golden Government which now rules the destinies of Canada; and I hope that not only those who believe in that Government and its golden principles, and in its golden future, but those who are opposed to them, will share in the great prosperity which will be brought about by their exertions.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. I had not expected to take part in this debate, but the discussion has taken a turn that I did not anticipate until I heard the speech of the hon. the Minister of Public Works last night. I confess that I admire the frank and fearless manner in which he handled the question, and in which he discussed the trouble primarily created for him by the member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), and subsequently created for him by my hon. friend the member for St. Anne's Division of Montreal (Mr. Quinn). Now, reverting to this so-called mission or excursion to Rome, it seems to me that those of Her Majesty's subjects who happen to be Roman Catholics, retain all their spiritual rights when they exercise their civil rights in this Parliament, or as members of a government. Among the spiritual rights that these gentlemen have is the right to appeal to the head of their church against interference with those same spiritual rights. Such an appeal is not a civil matter. It is not, I hold, within the province of this Parliament to say to any member or to any Minister who may be a Roman Catholic that he has no right to carry his spiritual grievance to the head of his church at Rome. So long as our political troubles are settled here in Ottawa, I care not where the spiritual troubles of my Roman Catholic friends are settled. I certainly think that it was time they appealed, even if their hope was that their appeal might interfere with the use of hell and damnation as campaign arguments on behalf of certain so-called Conservative candidates in the province of Quebec. I am firmly of the opinion that no man, no religious authority seated anywhere on top of this God's earth, has a right to interfere in the politics of this country. If this Government had made the Pope a party to this Manitoba school settlement, I would have opposed the Government and voted to condemn that Government. If this Parliament proposed to ask the mediation of the Pope, it goes without saying that I would protest against such a proposition to the utmost of my power. But I am not going to vote, supposing that it came to a division, in favour of the false doctrine that this Parliament has anything whatever to do with any of its members in connection with their church affairs, even if the mem-

bers are in charge of the business of this country. Just now let me say a word in connection with the paragraph in the Address that refers more particularly to the school settlement. I do so because this morning I happened to receive a copy of the Manitoba School Bill, which, as I see by the papers to-night, has been assented to by the Lieutenant-Governor of that province. I was much interested in it, and read it carefully. With regard to this so-called Manitoba school settlement. I come, so to speak, from the walls of Derry to protest against it. Hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who have spoken against this settlement, come, so to speak, from the gates of Rome. They have objections to the settlement and so have I They object to it because it does not go far enough, and I object to it because it goes too far. The opinion of those members on this side who oppose this settlement establishes a sort of cross roads where extremes, or shall I say extremists meet, and both march forward shoulder to shoulder against a settlement that is objectionable to both. I have no hesitation in saying that this so-called settlement, arrangement, adjustment, compromise, call it what you will, is unsatisfactory to me. I have read some of the clauses of the Bill that has been passed and assented to by the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba. I believe that no man or woman in Canada should be employed in, or excluded from, the public service on account of that man's or woman's religious belief; therefore, I object to the clause which provides that under certain circumstances teachers of a certain religious belief shall be employed. That clause is in direct conflict with my ideals of what is right and just. I object further to another clause. I think it is clause 10 in the Bill, which provides for the instruction of children in language other than English. I hold that it is unwise to perpetuate differences of language in this country. On this point also I find myself at war with this Manitoba school settlement. I cannot say that this settlement is in compliance with all the principles that I was sent here to uphold. But the question is this: What have I to do, what has this House to do, with the way that Manitoba chooses to deal with her own business? I was elected to protest against this Parliament's interference with Manitoba when Manitoba was doing right; and I hold that this Parliament has no right to interfere with Manitoba even when, in my opinion, she is doing wrong. It may be, as some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have suggested, as some of the newspapers in the province of Quebec have suggested, that the hon. the First Minister has not kept his promise to the people of Quebec. Well, I cannot see how this House is to be turned into a tribunal for the trial of a suit of breach of promise brought by the people of Quebec against the First Minister. If the people of Quebec have been deceived, the people of Quebec will sooner or later meet their deceivers at the polls; and in the meantime, if the statements of my hon. friend from Montreal are correct, that they know a good thing when they see it, they ought to be dead sure that they are not being deceived again. If the people of Quebec have any idea that the Conservatives of Ontario sympathize with this attempt to keep the Manitoba school question alive on the floor of active politics, they are deceived. The people of Quebec are deceived if they think the sympathies of Ontario Conservatives went out to their leaders who fought a losing fight in Bonaventure against the very principles of civil liberty. I speak for a constituency which has been Conservative since confederation, with one exception, and is Conservative still. I think there are thousands of Conservatives in Ontario who believe it is about time that the Conservative party dropped the Manitoba minority out of its affections, for sympathizing with minorities is a weakening disease. When the Conservative party first undertook to sympathize with the Manitoba minority and became affected with that sympathy, the party was strong and robust, even a giant in size. Now it is reduced to a shadow, a skeleton, through sympathizing with the minority and now it is a minority itself. I can tell the leader of the Opposition that the minority in this House can supply its leaders with a home market for all the sympathy they can raise and manufacture, and the same minority want a good deal of care and wisdom which has been wasted on the minority in Manitoba. If I had a vote in Manitoba I would raise my voice against this so-called settlement. This compromise strikes at two principles to which I owe allegiance, and if I had a seat in the Manitoba legislature I would vote against the settlement; but as my seat is in this House, I will try and attend to my own business. I do not approve of the manner in which the Manitoba school question has been buried; but the chief point about it is that it is dead. And it has not been buried on the instalment plan, as was suggested by one of the speakers in the House yesterday evening. The Conservative party, I hope, are not willing to become a party of political body-snatchers, wandering around the graveyard of parliamentary history seeking to resurrect old and buried quarrels. The Conservative party cannot take the Manitoba school question out of the graveyard in a hundred years, but the Manitoba school question can keep the Conservative party in that graveyard for more years than I want to see it stay there.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, in rising to address this honourable House for the first

time, I cannot help but feel somewhat timid at the bold attempt I am about to make in using a language with which I do not consider myself sufficiently familiar. However, I trust my efforts will meet with the indulgence of English-speaking members as regards the numerous mistakes I may make in the use of a language which it is my ambition to speak more correctly. Many statements made on the floor of the House since the opening of the session have struck me most unfavourably. The principal argument that was used against the Liberals was that we assumed power under false pretenses. This argument leads me to go back during recent years to the constituencies as they were then and recall the different issues on which that great fight was fought. We Liberals of the province of Quebec, at least,—and I think it was so contended in all other parts of the Dominion—contended that the National Policy had not made the country prosperous. Not only did we present that view, but the same argument was used throughout the Dominion. We took parliamentary statistics and we proved that the National Policy had not increased the population of the Dominion in proportion to its indebtedness. We proved, moreover, that the National Policy had not made the great farming community any richer than it was when the policy was inaugurated. We proved, also, that the taxation imposed in order to maintain hot-house industries bore more heavily upon the consumers, upon the labouring community and particularly on the poorer classes than it did on the richer classes. We also proved from letters written and read in different countries throughout Europe that settlers, who had come to this country were not satisfied with the existing state of things, and that letters written by them to their friends abroad tended to prove that they were brought to this Dominion by false reports, and that present conditions were not what they expected to find. The verdict which was rendered on 23rd June last clearly proved that what we asserted at that time was correct. No one will pretend that the people could have been deceived on these matters, and that they would have accepted our arguments had they not been based on facts. On the other hand, what were the promises made by the Liberal party and its supporters? Our promises were that we would reform the tariff, that we would do something regarding the Superannuation Act, that we would abolish the Franchise Act and endeavour to administer the affairs of the country with more economy than had hitherto been exercised. I think the Speech from the Throne is ample proof that the Liberal party has decided to carry out the promises made to the electors at the last elections. Consequently, I am now able to say that those hon. gentlemen who have asserted that we assumed power under false pretenses have drawn largely on their imagination, and there is proof that our arguments against the former Administration were based on facts we have established and that we intend to carry out the promises made to the electors as shown by the Speech from the Throne. I think the assertion that we have assumed power under false pretenses falls flat in the face of these declarations. I am free to draw the conclusion from the speeches made by hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House that the principal attack was made on the French Liberal representatives from the province of Quebec. I infer from many of the speeches made, that the great grief of the Conservatives now is, that they were transferred from one side of the House to the other through the influence of the large Liberal representation from the province of Quebec. We have been taunted on many different grounds. The Conservatives have in the first place accused the Liberal Government of being composed of men who expect to keep power, or at least who expect to solve the problem of the school question, by sending, what they called, emissaries, missionaries, pilgrims, and so on to Rome. But these gentlemen of the Conservative party who so accuse us, seem to forget that the first pilgrims who went to Rome were not sent by us. It is most assuredly a fact that those who first went to Rome about the school question had nothing whatever to do with the Liberal party of Canada. I think there is one man whom we can charge the Conservative party with sending to Rome and that is the Hon. Senator Landry. I should like to know who sent Senator Landry to Rome? One would think that the interests of the Conservative party were well enough served at Rome by the different members of the episcopacy who remained there for months, without the necessity having arisen of sending over Senator Landry to re-inforce them, and to give strength to their assertion. We do not claim Senator Landry as one of us, and we have every right to surmise that when Senator Landry went to Rome he was sent there by some of the leaders of the Conservative party.

Now, Sir, during the last campaign throughout the province of Quebec, the ugly part of the fight was, as we pretended at the time and we still pretend, the intervention of some of our bishops and priests. We Roman Catholics found it very awkward to fight a double battle against the Conservatives and against the clergy. We could very easily resist the arguments of our political opponents, but when it came to take up arms, as it were, against those to whom we owe the greatest respect and admiration, we found it very unpleasant indeed. After all, Sir, have we not the right to accuse the leaders of the Conservative party of being the cause of this interference. Have we not seen in the newspapers since the last election, a declaration

from the hon. the leader of the Opposition expressing his disappointment at the returns from the province of Quebec, and saying that he had been deceived by the figures which the hon. Senator Angers had given him. I have seen it stated in the papers, and it has not been contradicted, that he anticipated in the province of Quebec, through the influence of the bishops and the mandement, the large majority from that province which had been promised him by his confreres representing Quebec. As I say, Sir, we had to resist this interference of the clergy, and we resisted it in the best way we knew how. We have been taunted in regard to pledges which we made during last election in order to save ourselves, and in order to carry to a successful issue the fight we had undertaken. The hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) charged me with having signed, or with having made before the different churches in my county, solemn declarations that I would favour legislation restoring to the minority in Manitoba all their rights, and legislation which would be approved by the episcopacy of the province of Quebec. I have in my hand the declaration that I made, and which I did make at the time because I thought it was proper for me to do so. Here is the way I spoke before the electors of my county:

I solemnly declare that, if I am elected, I will favour any legislation based upon the judgment of the Privy Council.

That is the declaration I made and that is all the mandement asked me to make. I never added that I would favour legislation approved by the bishops of the province of Quebec, because I considered that if I could not come into this House as a man free from shackles and fetters, it was far better for me to stop at home and mind my farm. And more than that, Mr. Speaker, at the time that the clerical battle was raging against us in the province of Quebec, some of our friends in the city of Quebec proposed to issue a declaration signed by all the Liberal candidates, to send that declaration to the bishops, to have it endorsed by the bishop, and then to distribute it to all the priests of the province of Quebec. When this declaration was made to me I at once declared that I was against it, that I would sign nothing of the kind, that I was willing to stand by our political programme, and to fight the battle as free men ought to fight it. That is the stand I took, and although I am one of the youngest members, and although I was but a debutant in politics at the time, I can flatter myself that my opinion prevailed and that the declaration was not signed and that we did not consult anybody as regards our rights and our liberties. The hon. gentleman from Kent, N.B., (Mr. McInerney) stated this afternoon, that in the county of Bonaventure the Liberals declared that the Pope was with them on the school question. Well, Sir, I was in the county of Bonaventure for seventeen days, and I had the honour of speaking over twenty times before Protestant and Catholic audiences, and I never heard a statement of that kind made by any one of us. I did hear a statement of a somewhat similar kind made, but I heard it from the pulpit and in an entirely different connection, and I heard it applied to the Consevative party. The hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) was then in the county of Bonaventure fighting the battle for the Conservatives, and in his presence the curé of Paspebiac stated from the pulpit: That the Pope was against the Liberals and in favour of the Conservatives on this school question issue.

Now, Sir, to give another proof that I did not pledge myself to anything that would bind me down or deprive me of my liberty in this House, the fact is, that my own parish priest, a particular friend of my own, who had promised me and promised friends of mine to support my candidature, declared that he could not support me because he considered that the pledges I had given were not sufficient. This is another proof that I have not signed the pledge or made the promise before the different churches of my county that I have been charged with. I should certainly conclude from these declarations that a friendly priest would have been satisfied, and would have supported my candidature, as he had promised to do at the beginning. Now, I come to the county of Bonaventure, about which very much has been said. What did we see at the nomination at Caplan at the beginning of the campaign? The Conservative party was there represented by Sir A. P. Caron, the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), and Mr. Lawrence Stafford, who in the last election opposed the hon. member for Portneuf (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière); and they are now surprised at the result of the election in Bonaventure. They say we also carried that country by false pretenses and false promises. But if you had seen the candidate whom they brought into the county to oppose our friend Mr. Guité, you would not have been surprised at the defeat they got. They brought there a man who was sick both in mind and body—a man who could not stand on the platform and explain to the people why he was there; a man who fought in two elections under the standard of the Liberal party, and who, after that party went down in the last provincial campaign, thought proper to go over to the other side. The indignation of the people on nomination day proved to be so great that this brave man, this knight-errant, who has represented nearly all the counties of the province of Quebec, and who now represents Three Rivers, could not find a

back door wide enough to get out of the county. You never saw a man skip over snow banks or climb over fences as quickly as he did. And now these gentlemen are surprised at the defeat they got in that county. They say that we told the people that if they did not vote for the Government, the Baie des Chaleurs Railway would stop running. I went through the length and breadth of that county twice, and was present at nearly all the meetings, and I never heard from our side a declaration of that kind. I have also heard a statement made in this House that the railway had been opened for the purpose of carrying our election ; but we were told by the Minister of Railways to-day that the railroad was opened on the 1st of January, when the late Mr. Fauvel was in the full enjoyment of health. It was not until the latter end of February that his death took place. Consequently, that charge is utterly devoid of all truth and sincerity. We fought the battle in March, and the road had been opened on the 1st of January, when there was no idea of a Federal election at all.

Now, the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) has been in the county of Bonaventure before the recent campaign. He was there in 1894, when we had a provincial by-election. At that time he promised in three or four parishes of the county, to settle some seignorial claims which the electors were very eager to see settled. He went down there and promised to settle these claims, in order to carry the county in the Conservative interest ; but that promise was never realized. In the recent election, he took good care not to go back to any of these places, although the people expected him to come and tell them why he had not carried out the promise he had made to them. I am surprised to hear the hon. member making such attacks upon his fellow-members from the province of Quebec who are not of the same political opinions as himself. If he were present in the House, I would like to ask him why it is he is now a member of the House of Commons instead of being a Minister of the Crown in the province of Quebec ? I would like to ask him if his presence here is a proof of the confidence of the other Ministers of the Crown in the province of Quebec in him ? His ambitions were not satisfied. He had hopes at one time to be more than he is to-day ; and finally when he found that these hopes could not be realized, he resigned his seat in the local House, and ran in Montmorency for the Federal House. It is true, he succeeded, but he was one of the few who survived in the last struggle. Now, to show how disinterested, how intelligent and how free the population of Bonaventure County is, I will give an instance of the way in which the recent battle was conducted in the interest of the Conservative party. In the Catholic electoral divisions the battle was left entirely in the hands of the priests. The only places where we could hear the supporters of the Conservative party were in Protestant electoral divisions. Elsewhere the priests fought the battle for them. In the pulpit, where we could not answer them, they made the most terrible charges against the Liberal Government in connection with the school settlement. They went so far as to say that the Liberal party would never complete the railway in the county of Bonaventure ; and in one of these parishes, Paspebiac, where I was, I know positively that the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) spent the whole of a Saturday afternoon with the priest. On the Sunday following I heard from the pulpit the most terrible charge that was ever made from the pulpit against the Liberal party in regard to the settlement of the school question ; and I have reason to infer that the words which the priest uttered in the pulpit were put in his mouth by the hon. member for Three Rivers. My reason for saying so is that, at the time, the hon. gentleman was sitting in a front pew of the church, wearing his eyeglass, and turning round now and again to the congregation, and grinning with satisfaction at the words which were so well said in favour of his party.

Now, I should like to ask the hon. member for St. Anne's Division of Montreal (Mr. Quinn) whether, in quoting from the London "Tablet," as the organ of Cardinal Vaughan, he meant to state that the article which he read was approved by the Cardinal or written under his dictation.

Mr. QUINN. My recollection of the statement which I made is that it was an article appearing in the London "Tablet," which is the organ of Cardinal Vaughan, and that the position it occupied in the church was such as to commend itself to the attention and even to the great consideration of the hon. Solicitor General on his arrival in London.

Mr. TALBOT. That is not exactly the answer which I was hoping to get, but I am satisfied with it, because I wish to say to the hon. gentleman that the article he read was written in Canada and sent over to England. It is an anonymous article, but supposed to have been written, and stated in the paper to have been written by a Canadian. The inference from the hon. gentleman's remarks was that it was authorized by the editor of the paper, whilst it appears to be simply an expression of the opinion of a Canadian.

Mr. QUINN. It is an editorial article.

Mr. TALBOT. I shall give the hon. gentleman proof that it is not so. We heard a good deal from the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) about the St. Boniface election, which, he argues, showed that the Catholic minority in Manitoba are not

satisfied with the school settlement. When we consider that out of the 900 voters on the lists in St. Boniface less than 600 cast their votes, and when we take into account the strong pressure which was brought to bear on this election by the religious authorities in that district, have we not every reason to suppose that if the electors had been left free to cast their votes as they chose. The remaining 300 would have voted for the Liberal candidate.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. They could hardly have done that, because quite a number were dead.

Mr. TALBOT. Over 300 did not vote, and they were not all dead.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. There were as many votes cast in that election as in the previous one. Of course, there is always a certain number in every election who abstain from voting, and it is not on record that on any occasion all the voters on the lists have voted. Nor were there 900 voters on the list either.

Mr. TALBOT. There were 900 voters on the lists which it was supposed would be cast in that election, and the Conservative press boasted that at least 600 of these would be given to the Conservative candidate, as a protest against the school settlement, whereas only 596 voted altogether. If it had not been for the strong influence brought to bear upon the electorate, I do not think there can be any reasonable doubt that those who did not vote abstained from voting because of that influence, and would have voted in favour of the Liberal candidate had they been free. The hon. gentleman went further and declared that both Mr. Lauzon and Mr. Bertrand were on the same platform. Well, I find in the Winnipeg "Daily Review," of Friday, March 26th, that all the Catholics who voted in favour of Mr. Bertrand had to obtain a paper from their archbishop before they could receive the sacraments of their church, and this paper reads as follows :

> M..... regrets the past, and is well disposed to take the advice of his archbishop in circumstances where the Catholic conscience is concerned. Any priest can hear him in confession.
>
> ADELARD, O.M.I,
> Arch. of St. Boniface.

Unless those who voted in favour of Mr. Bertrand obtained a paper of that kind they could not receive the sacraments of their church, and furthermore were threatened by the archbishop himself with being deprived of Christian burial in consecrated ground.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. No such declaration was ever made by the archbishop that anybody who did not vote according to his advice would be deprived of Christian burial.

Mr. TALBOT. The statement was published in the papers and never denied, and we have the authority of a reporter, who said that the archbishop of St. Boniface did not deny it. At any rate, we have here the proof that when the hon. member for Provencher said that Mr. Lauzon and Mr. Bertrand stood on the same platform, he was incorrect, because those who voted for Mr. Bertrand had to sign a paper of regret and receive an acknowledgment of such admission by the bishop before they would be allowed to participate in the sacraments of their church.

Now, it appears that we French Catholic members of the province of Quebec stand in a very peculiar light in this House, considering the pledges which we made and which we did not carry out. I can say for myself, that before I came to this House this session, I visited my county throughout its whole length. Out of thirteen parishes I visited twelve, and I addressed three large meetings. At these meetings I spoke of this school settlement, and received the unanimous approval of my constituents of the stand which I am now taking and which I have been taking on this very question. And I therefore feel warranted in saying that if I have obtained the approval of my county in this matter, any other member for the province of Quebec would receive the same approval under similar circumstances. Some hon. gentlemen find it strange that we should have to sign these pledges. I find it much more strange that those who did sign pledges such as have been read to the House were met with the bitterest opposition. We have, for instance, Dr. Vaillantcourt, who was the Liberal candidate in Dorchester. Dr. Vaillantcourt was made to sign a pledge of that kind and, though an election by acclamation had been promised him, he was surprised on the day of nomination to find an opponent nominated, and that opponent eventually defeated him. We have the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Godbout) who, we are told, signed a pledge of that kind. He also met with the bitterest opposition though he had every right to expect after signing that pledge that at least there would be neutrality on the part of the clergy of his county. We have also the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Angers) who had exactly a similar experience. But there is another point. In the mandement of last summer, the bishops made an appeal to the liberal-mindd, right-thinking Protestants. And yet we find that the hon. member for Portneuf (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbiniere) met with the bitterest opposition of his county in the person of Mr. Stafford on the ground that he was a Protestant. The hon. member for Portneuf stands today in the province of Quebec as the most liberal-minded of men. In his county of Lotbiniere we find in every parish proofs of his liberality and benevolence to religious institutions, that is, to Catholic institutions, for there are no others in the county. I think that under the circumstances he should

certainly have been understood to be one of the fair-minded Protestants referred to in the mandement.

Now we have heard a good deal about dismissals, emissaries, and spies. During the late election every man who took a share in the campaign must remember perfectly well—at any rate I speak with certainty of my own district—that emissaries were sent to different parishes where there were relations of employees to find out what were the political leanings of these relatives; and, in every instance, where it was found that they were Liberals they were threatened that if they voted Liberal, their relatives who were employed by the Government would be dismissed. In my own county several electors were prevented from casting votes for me and did not vote at all, because they were afraid that they would suffer through some members of their families, who, unfortunately, happened to be employed by the Government at the time. Under the circumstances as I know them to be, I think it is not at all just to find fault with the members of the Cabinet in reference to dismissals. For my part, I went pretty far with the hon. the Minister of Railways. I wanted to get dismissals, but he would not meet my wishes. I held inquiries and proved that certain gentlemen had been offensive partisans. But, in spite of the proof I made, I found that the hon. the Minister of Railways was very reluctant to dismiss, and in fact in three cases he refused to grant me the dismissal. I think that this is ample proof that this Ministry has not been tyrannical in the changes that have been made among office-holders since they came into power. Before I take my seat I wish to make a declaration and I think that in doing so I am an echo of what is thought by the French Liberals of Quebec. In the position we took in the last campaign upon the school question we unfurled to the breeze of peace and harmony the broad standard of unity and good fellowship, which will cover with its ample folds all men of good-will. We planted that standard on the rock of strong logic and reason, against which the storm of passion will blow in vain and the waves of sectional prejudice and narrow-mindedness will fruitlessly exhaust their fury. We are proud of what we have done, as we feel that we have helped to destroy many prejudices which existed not only in the province of Ontario but in all the other provinces, the majority of whose people profess a different religion from ours.

Mr. CLANCY. In case hon. gentlemen on either side should fear that I intend to inflict a long speech upon the House, let me give at once the assurance that I shall speak only for a few moments, and, probably, upon one question only. Having made that statement I may be excused from paying attention to the remarks of the hon. gentleman who just sat down, notwithstanding what he said in closing. He has told the House that the Ministers have adopted a policy against dismissals since coming into power. He stated that he brought evidence against certain officers. He was the accuser, he was the witness. And, notwithstanding this the Minister refused to dismiss in three cases. The House must conclude that the Minister did not believe him. I may be excused if I agree with the Minister, and, therefore, would hardly be justified in taking the time of the House in replying. As a new member of the House I have witnessed to-night a scene that is most unusual. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has given the clergy of Quebec a rather doubtful character. I fancy that when his remarks are read in the newspapers the people from one end of Canada to the other who have little information of the state of things in the province of Quebec will be puzzled to know whether the statements of the hon. gentleman are true or not. If his statements are true the charge is a very serious one for the clergy, and if they are not true, it is a most serious thing for any hon. gentleman to make such a charge in this House. He has given a certificate of character to the clergy which, if true, is perfectly disgraceful.

Mr. LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend says "hear, hear." I hope that when I get through I shall have his approval as I have at this moment. I take it from that "hear, hear," that he holds the statement to be true in details. I take it as a complete endorsation of the remarks made by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot). That hon. gentleman said that he had made a pledge upon his honour as a man to his constituents. He felt some pride in not having made that statement to the clergy of the province of Quebec. But he did make the pledge that he would support the claims of the minority in the province of Manitoba upon the lines of the constitution. Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) says "hear, hear." I asked the First Minister if this statement to which he has assented, by implication, at least, by putting it into the mouth of the representative of Her Majesty—I ask him: Is that in essence, in truth, stripping it of all technicalities that may surround it, a fair fulfilment of a promise of that kind? Perhaps my hon. friend will say, Hear, hear. I shall not now enter into a discussion of separate schools, whether it was wise or not to ingraft them upon the constitution, or whether it would be a proper thing to agitate in the future for an amendment to the constitution wiping away all such guarantees. That question is not before the House. But I wish to say that whatever opinion may be held on the question; whatever might have been present in the minds of the framers of the constitution, that provision was passed in open

daylight, it was discussed in this House, it was not surreptitiously carried through the House. Let me ask what led up to this. Hon. gentlemen have said that it was the Conservative party that gave rise, to some extent, to this unpleasant agitation in the country. Now, Sir, was it or was it not the Liberal party who first introduced legislation in violation, in defiance, of the constitution? Was it not a section of the Liberal party who did that? What was the attitude of the hon. gentlemen opposite? Just so long as the Government were led by the Conservative party they were either silent or they were condemning the Conservative party for not taking a more active course for the purpose of doing away with what they said was a violation of the rights of the minority. They were very outspoken at that time. They declared that the Conservative party should have disallowed that Bill. The First Minister was last session asked this question: Would you approve of the disallowance of that Bill; do you think it would have been a proper thing to do? What was the hon. gentleman's answer? Why, he said that was a doctrine of the Conservative party. I ask hon. gentlemen if that is a fair argument. He was pinned to one thing or the other, it was either right or wrong to disallow that Bill. The hon. gentleman knew well what the conclusion of that argument would have been; he knew that it would have been a complete vindication of the course of the Conservative party. Well, we have had examples of the results of disallowance before. There was the case of the Streams Bill passed by the Ontario legislature. Every time the Bill was disallowed it was re-enacted; and every time this Manitoba legislation was disallowed it would have been re-enacted. An unseemly agitation would have arisen, and I am not sure but what the people of Manitoba might have fairly complained if you had swept away from that province a school system suited to their wants. I say hon. gentlemen have been inconsistent from first to last. If they were in power they surely would not have disallowed that Bill. Now, let me go further. During the time that the Conservative party was in power, when some action was taken because a strong pressure was brought to bear upon them, a pressure even enforced by hon. gentlemen opposite, what took place? Why, Sir, we had the unseemly spectacle of one of the Ministers of Mr. Greenway coming down and taking part in the Haldimand election, when a member of the Conservative Government went back for re-election. Was there ever in Canada a more unseemly or a more indecent piece of political strategy than that? True, the leader of the Government did not have anything to say, but the Liberal press and the Liberal party backed up that course. What followed? The legislation was wholly within the rights of Manitoba, and relief from the Governor in Council could only be reached in consequence of that Act being within the power of the Manitoba legislature. If it were not within the power of Manitoba to pass it, the ordinary tribunals would have dealt with it, and it would never have reached this House. The Act would have been a nullity, and we should never have had any difficulty with it. But it was because they went beyond the bounds of the restrictions placed upon the provinces in matters of education. I say that while the Manitoba legislature was clearly within its legislative rights, no person knows better than the hon. gentlemen opposite that it was a gross violation of the constitution. Now, Sir, when the hon. gentlemen came into power they were in what position to go to the Government of Manitoba and ask them to retrace their steps. The people of Manitoba were committed strongly against establishing separate schools of any description whatever; there is no doubt that Mr. Greenway went to the people of Manitoba to get their sanction upon that question; and there is no doubt that the Liberal party in the Dominion came into power after having made declarations that the minority should have relief from the position that they were in. Mr. Greenway went to the country on the platform that there should be no receding from the position that he had taken in the legislation of 1890. Well, the hon. gentlemen said to the people: Let us get into power and there will be a settlement. They have come into power, and let us see what took place. The hon. gentlemen came face to face with their pledges and they were bound to redeem them; they were bound to use every means possible to bring about a settlement that would restore their rights to the minority of that province. When that came about, what did the hon. gentleman do? He stood on the ground that had been occupied by Manitoba during the previous year, that there should be no separate schools under any consideration in the province. The people there murmured against such a settlement. But the hon. gentleman found themselves in a difficulty; and what did they do. They made an appeal to Rome. They appealed to Rome —for what? To sanction a settlement that the people refused to accept, a settlement that the minority had declared, so far as expressed words could declare, to be a very improper settlement. Let me ask the hon. gentleman now if he would have been willing as an old and influential member, as the most influential member of the Liberal side of the House, and as the hon. gentleman who now has the weight and prestige of being First Minister of the Dominion of Canada, to have asserted if the Conservatives had made such a statement? Would he not have been the first one and would not have his friends generally throughout the pro-

vince of Quebec have been not complaining against the bishops and sending to Rome to protest against help being furnished the Conservative party, but would they not have been carrying the torch of denunciation from one end of the province to the other if a settlement of that kind had been arrived at. The position taken by hon. gentlemen opposite is rather a unique one. We have heard for the first time a declaration, and it was drawn out by a very tedious process, as to the position of the Government on this question. It has been stated that the hon. gentleman sent emissaries, if I may use the word—and I do not use it in an offensive sense—to Rome. For what? Why, for the purpose of making an appeal for the religious liberties of the people of the province of Quebec. Was there a petition signed by the great electorate of the province of Quebec; was the great electorate consulted as regards the petition; were they suffering individually as citizens of this country from the oppression of a church; was this course adopted with the design of punishing men because they were Liberals or was there any other question put forward for the purpose of hiding the real issue? The petition was signed by 45 members, one hon. gentleman declaring that he signed it, and was proud to have signed it as a Minister of the Crown. He had a perfect right to sign it as a Minister of the Crown, but when the hon. gentleman tried to make the electors believe that they would shake off their ministerial garb, leave their gowns at the door, and go on a mission and present a petition in behalf of the great electorate of Quebec and for religious liberty, and disassociate themselves and their position for that of the Government, I doubt whether the electorate would believe him. Is it a reasonable thing I ask—and I put it to hon. gentlemen opposite in this way—to believe that those hon. gentlemen had behind them, and were conscious of having behind them all the power and influence of the Government.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman says "Hear, hear." I am glad we now have his assent by implication at least, that the First Minister signed the petition as Prime Minister of Canada. And for what purpose? Because he was languishing, because he was desirous of protecting the liberties of the electorate of the province of Quebec; or because he wanted that petition to help him out of the hole. Let us see whether it is not a question after that fashion.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. You were in the hole then, when the petition was signed.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend is speaking from that side of the House, and I will take him as the authority for the moment. Let me call attention to this; the object of the petition is to complain against the undue influence exercised by the hierarchy in the province of Quebec. They are interfering with whom? They are attacking the Liberal party. I am sure the hon. gentleman who interrupted me feels at the bottom of his heart that the bishops of Quebec are persecuting the Liberals for the sole reason that they are Liberals. I ask if the hon. gentleman believes that. Or is it rather that the action taken by the hierarchy, whether rightly or wrongly it is not necessary to discuss at this particular moment, involves the persecution of the Liberal party; or did they raise their hands in protest against what they believed to be the narrowing of the rights and liberties of their fellows. Which does he think to be the case—I will await his answer. The hon. gentleman and his friends are all silent. He is in the hole now, as a hon. friend besides me suggests. What followed? Those hon. gentlemen are playing the role of martyr now—they are martyrs before the country. They made a strike for religious liberty. We have entered into a period of intellectual emancipation, as the House was told yesterday by the Minister of Public Works. He said that the province of Quebec now is quite different from what it was when he entered upon newspaper work there. I do not know whether that improvement is attributable to the hon. gentleman, or whether the people became enlightened apart from the hon. gentleman's efforts. But the people of Ontario to-day are led to believe—I ask the First Minister to say "hear, hear" to this statement, because it has gone abroad—that the people of the province of Quebec are no better than serfs, that they possessed no political liberty, that the head of the church forced them to sacrifice their religious liberty if they dared by word or act to assert their political rights. I want to know if the Prime Minister is prepared to give his assent even by a "hear, hear" to a proposition of that kind. If hon. gentlemen opposite want to play the roll of martyrs, they know too well that they are martyrs without having been persecuted, that they are crying out without having been hurt, and their policy is to tell the people of Ontario that for the first time a Frenchman and Roman Catholic in the Dominion has risen against tyranny and has made a strike for religious liberty. That is what is to be said in the back school houses of my province. Let me state what the position is. The bishops have cornered, they say, hon. gentlemen opposite; but have they not tried to corner the bishops? They complain that the bishops have restrained the people in the exercise of their liberties. Let me ask if there is any foundation whatever in the charge that the bishops have restrained hon. gentlemen opposite in their political liberties? Does their action not mean that the minority were not able to accept, otherwise than by

sullen submission, the settlement arrived at. It is not necessary for me to attempt to discuss details of that settlement. I have no hesitation in saying in the first place, that this House has no right to dictate what kind of a public school system the province of Manitoba may have. That is a matter belonging wholly and solely to the province of Manitoba, and if it were left to me—I wish to be broadly understood—to, for the first time—independently of all the circumstances that surround the case of Manitoba, if it were proposed at the solicitations of any person in the Dominion of Canada, for the first time for this Parliament to fasten a school system of a sectarian or even partly sectarian character upon a single province in the Dominion of Canada, I should feel it my duty to oppose and to vote against any such proposition. But, Sir, permit me to point out the danger that must arise from a settlement of that kind as applied to the case of the province of Ontario and the province of Quebec. It is well known in the province of Ontario that we have two school systems side by side; one a voluntary system, and the other a system of the state. One system may come and go just as it suits the convenience of those by whom it is permitted to be put in operation, and the other, day in and day out, no matter what takes place, the state system stands out boldly and must be maintained. Now then this Government, in the case of the province of Manitoba have for the first time laid down the foundation of a dangerous proposition, under which the rights of minorities are for ever gone. I say this independently altogether of the details of the settlement. I would like to know where the security of the minority in Quebec is now? I would like to know where the security of the minority in the province of Ontario is now? If any invasion of the rights of the minority in either province should occur, the case which arose in the province of Manitoba can be cited, and we will be told that the province of Manitoba passed an Act clearly within its legislative rights, but not less a violation of a constitutional compact. We will be told that there was a plan hatched out, or rather let me say, there was a settlement reached, utterly at variance with the spirit of that constitution and we will be asked, what is the use of complaint. We will have clearly laid down a principle which may be cited in every case, and under which the minority in any province may have its rights swept away by the same process, when it may suit the interests of any political party in Canada to do so. I ask the Prime Minister: If the same case arose in the province of Ontario to-morrow, could he recede from the position he has taken in the case of the province of Manitoba? If the Conservatives were in power he would give us a little trouble, but if the Liberals were in power the hon. gentleman would do what he and his friends have done in this instance. It does seem to me, Sir, that a very dangerous principle has been laid down for the first time in the constitutional history of Canada. I know the two school systems that obtain in the province of Ontario, and I know that nothing could be more dangerous to the minority in that province, than that such a principle should have been adopted. Under this principle the minority could be deprived of the rights they have now, and then let me ask what would be the position in the public schools? The public school system would be crippled, and the foundation for serious strife would be laid down. We would have strife in the election of school trustees, and strife in the election of municipal councillors who establish a school section, for the mere accident of whether there were twenty-four or twenty-five Protestant or Catholic children must determine the fate of all the others. The principle is fraught with difficulty, and with strife, and with discord in every feature. I ask, is there an hon. gentleman in this House from the province of Ontario, however he may be opposed to separate schools in principle and however strongly he may advocate their abolition, who would assent in Ontario to a settlement of the kind now made, and remembering all the strife that it would give rise to, would exchange it for our present school system in that province. I care not how strongly he may take the ground that separate schools are a mistake and should be abolished, I venture to say that there is not an hon. member in this House from the province of Ontario who would accept a settlement of that kind, with its insecurity, its invasion of rights, and its other defects. Hon. gentlemen opposite are asking for peace, and they have chosen an appropriate time to seek for that blessing. I say too: Let us have peace, but let us have peace in fact and not in name. Let us have peace on grounds that are sanctioned by honour, by justice, and by the fulfilment of these pledges in the broadest sense. Let us have such peace that every man may feel, that while there may be a sacrifice of opinion there shall be no sacrifice of honour. That is the only kind of peace that can be perfect. Let me for a moment call attention to the position of the Government and some of its Ministers. We have the declaration of the First Minister that this is not a final settlement, and we have also the declaration of the Solicitor General to the same effect. I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton): Is it a final settlement? I would like to have his opinion on that; because we have not yet had his declaration as to whether it is a final settlement or not. I imagine that the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Macpherson) would be shocked if he thought it was not a final settlement, and the "Globe" newspaper

would be shocked if it believed it were not a final settlement. Everybody is shocked that it is not a final settlement except those hon. gentlemen who are conscious that they have not fairly fulfilled their pledges. The hon. the Solicitor General has endeavoured to relieve himself from his pledge by a most extraordinary plea. He states that he is willing now, and that he shall always contend that the Manitoba minority should have such rights as are guaranteed them under the constitution and as defined by the judgment of the Privy Council. But, the first task that the hon. gentleman sets before himself is to show that the minority have no rights. He endeavours to show that it is a mere financial grievance, and it would be impossible to remedy even the grievance that is stated by the Privy Council to exist. And the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) throws up his hands in despair and declares that the judgment of the Privy Council is impossible of being carried out, and he therefore gives it up. That is his excuse for not redeeming his pledge. It is a most ingenious excuse; it is one few men would have thought of, it is worthy of the hon. gentleman who is in a close place and who must realize the serious consequences of taking such action.

In this jubilee year of Her Majesty, I repeat let us have peace; let us have that peace that Canadians are proud of; let us have peace with honour; let us have peace so that we who live, and I hope shall continue to live, under the folds of the British flag may feel without suspicion, that our flag gives full and complete liberty to every citizen of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. MAXWELL moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 1st April, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 13) to amend the Criminal Code 1892, for the purpose of making more effectual provisions for the punishment of seduction and abduction.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Mr. CLANCY.

CARRYING THE MAIL AT MURRAY BAY.

Mr. DUGAS (for Mr. Morin) asked:

What is the name of the lowest tenderer for carrying the mail between the wharf at Murray Bay and the post office of that locality?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The lowest tenderers were A. Tremblay and L. Trudel, whose tenders were equal.

DISBANDMENT OF THE GARRISON BATTERY OF ARTILLERY.

Mr. BRODEUR (for Mr. Langelier) asked:

Is it the intention of the Government to take any measures, and if so, what, in the matter of the complaint of Captain D. Morgan, relating to the disbandment of the Garrison Battery of Artillery No. 3?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). No. 3 Quebec Garrison Battery having become non-effective, it was gazetted out on the 17th December, 1892, and Lieutenant Morgan was necessarily removed from the list of officers of the active militia. Mr. Morgan's several complaints have been thoroughly investigated and reported upon, and it is not the intention of the department to take any further steps in this matter.

B. C. SOUTHERN RAILWAY.

Mr. WALLACE (for Mr. Maclean) asked:

Whether it is the intention of the Government to disallow an Act passed by the legislature of British Columbia in the 59th year of the reign of Her Majesty Queen Victoria, entitled "British Columbia Southern Railway Aid Amendment Act, 1896"?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). So far as the Government is concerned, this is purely a local Act, and it is not the intention of the Government to disallow it. I may say further that the Government has received no complaints against that Act.

JOHN CROWE, INDIAN AGENT.

Mr. McNEILL asked:

1. Has Mr. John Crowe, recently Indian agent of the Saugeen reserve, been informed why he has been dismissed? 2. If not, why not? 3. Of what offence has the Government adjudged him to be guilty?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). Mr. John Crowe has not been informed as to why he was dismissed. He has not been informed of the reason why he has been dismissed because he has not asked for the reason. He was officially advised on the 12th February, 1897, of the fact of his dismissal, and on the 15th of that month he acknowledged receipt of the notification, and thanked the department for the kind consideration received at its hands during his tenure of office. He was

dismissed because it was clear from a report of Mr. Inspector Macrae, who held an inquiry into charges made against Mr. Crowe, that Mr. Crowe had acted very irregularly in the conduct of the business of the agency, and showed himself unfitted for the position he held.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT MORRISBURG.

Mr. REID (for Mr. Broder) asked :

Whether it is the intention of the Government to install David Halliday, who was duly appointed by the late Government to the position of collector of customs at the port of Morrisburg, or will the office be filled, as at present, by an official from Montreal or elsewhere?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). It is not the intention of the Government to appoint Mr. David Halliday collector of customs at the port of Morrisburg. In answer to the last part of the question. I would say that that subject is under the consideration of the Government.

TENDERS OF THE SOULANGES CANAL.

Mr. WALLACE (for Mr. Maclean) asked :

How many tenders were received for sections 4, 5, 6, 7, of the Soulanges Canal? Who were the tenderers? What was the aggregate amount of each tender? How many tenders were received for section 12 of the Soulanges Canal? Who were the tenderers ? What was the aggregate amount of each tender?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I have no objection to inform my hon. friend as to the number of tenders received on these sections of the Soulanges Canal. As to sections 4, 5, 6 and 7 there were 17 tenders in all. As to section 12, there were 13 tenders. The other questions, I do not think I could properly answer now. It would not be in the public interest until the contracts are not only awarded but actually executed, to make any statement as to the names of the tenderers or as to the respective amounts.

Mr. WALLACE. Will you give us the information later ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will be happy to do so later, if the hon. gentleman will repeat the question.

BRIDGE OVER ST. LAWRENCE AT QUEBEC.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked :

Is it true that at a meeting held recently at Quebec, the hon. member for Quebec West declared that he had been authorized by the hon. the Premier or by the Government to say that the Government would aid to the extent of a million dollars in the building of a bridge over the St. Lawrence at or near Quebec ?

2. Was the hon. member authorized to make this declaration either by the Premier or by the Government ?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to aid in the building of the said bridge, and if so, how, when and to what extent ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Mr. Speaker, the Government cannot say whether it is true or not true that the member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) made the statement mentioned in the first paragraph of this question. On the 9th September last the Government made the following declaration on the floor of the House with respect to this question :—

When any responsible persons, or company, submit to the Government that they are prepared to undertake the construction of a bridge over the St. Lawrence at Quebec, the Government will be disposed favourably to consider the project, with the view of determining how far it should receive material assistance.

This was the policy of the Government, and no one was authorized to make any contradiction of that statement of policy.

MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked :

His Excellency the Governor General having informed the House " That after many and protracted discussions a settlement was reached between the two governments which was the best arrangement obtainable under the existing conditions of this disturbing question " (the Manitoba school question), will the Government inform the House what were the propositions made to the Government of Manitoba, what concessions were asked for, and which of these, if any, were not granted?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The negotiations were verbal ; there is no record of them. The papers connected with that subject will be brought down.

THE VICTORIA BRIDGE.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called I should like to ask the Minister a question, if he feels inclined to answer it off-hand. I notice in the newspapers several telegrams and announcements as to the Government having passed an Order in Council granting $300,000 to the Grand Trunk Railway for the rearrangement of the Victoria bridge. Has that Order in Council been passed, and if so, will the hon. Premier bring down the papers without a motion being adopted by the House.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). That is one of the questions I could not answer off-hand.

Mr. FOSTER. It has gone through without the hon. gentleman being aware of it.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Russell for an Ad-

dress to His Excellency the Governor General in answer to his Speech at the opening of the session.

Mr. MAXWELL. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to and I have read with a great deal of interest the Speech from the Throne. It is to me one of the brightest, and I think one of the most hopeful speeches that has ever been submitted to this House. It is patriotic in tone, for I think it does not matter on which side of the House we may sit, we can all agree on this, that the expressions used in regard to the Diamond Jubilee of Her Majesty the Queen are both graceful and felicitous. It is likewise touched with a spirit of progress. We are told in it that we are to have some amendments made in the tariff. I think it matters little what our views may be in regard to protection and free trade, we are all deeply interested in the people, especially at election times, and we all sympathize with any effort put forward to lighten the burdens the people are carrying at the present time.

We are also led to believe that something radical will be done with respect to the Franchise Act. Now, if I know anything at all of the temper of the people, I do not know of any single person out west at least who will shed one tear over the removal of the present Franchise Act. The Speech also speaks of conciliation and of peace. Nor does it matter what our views may be with respect to the Manitoba school question, for I believe we are all more or less anxious that a reign of peace should come and that the bitterness of the past should cease, and that all the different units of this fair land may dwell together once more in the spirit of unity, of love and of peace. Take it all in all I think it is a Speech which will commend itself to the hearts, to the hopes and to the aspirations of the people of Canada. I said I had listened to the Speech itself. I also listened to the speeches of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I have tried to gather up the wisdom which has been dealt out to us in copious draughts. I do not think I am much wiser than I was before, but I have tried to take in all that has been given. It is evident there are great differences in the views presented by the different speakers, and as I listened to the principal speech and to the views enunciated and the programme laid down by hon. gentlemen opposite, I felt these differences, and I felt that comparing these views with the views held on this side of the House they are radically different, radically different in their inception, and in their consequences. And that reminds me of a story which I heard not long ago of two gentlemen who were discussing a particular question. One was old and the other was young. The old man had a squint eye, and never looked a man straight in the face, as hon. members can well imagine. After discussing the question for a considerable time they grew excited, and the old man said: "It is no use discussing the question any further; the time will come when we shall see eye to eye." The young man, looking at the old man's eye, said, "God forbid." As I listened to the principles and policy enunciated by hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to several public question I entertained the hope that the time will never come in Canada when hon. gentlemen on this side of the House will agree with those principles or will see eye to eye with hon. gentlemen opposite.

The Speech contains a very pleasing reference to the Diamond Jubilee of Her Majesty. Those hon. gentlemen who are familiar with the poems of Tennyson will remember the poem he wrote on Her Majesty many years ago, and which is placed in the first page of his volume. I may be permitted to quote one or two lines from that beautiful poem, in which the poet almost breathes a prayer, when he says:

* * * * May you rule us long,

And leave us rulers of your blood
As noble till the latest day!
May children of our children say,
"She wrought her people lasting good;

"Her court was pure, her life serene;
"God gave her peace; her land reposed;
"A thousand claims to reverence closed
"In her as Mother, Wife and Queen."

I think that the prayer has been abundantly realized through the long, the glorious, the prosperous reign of our beloved Queen. But when we take into consideration the magnificent, the almost unexampled outburst of loyalty, the manifestation of devotion now being shown to the person of Her Most Gracious Majesty, we are tempted to ask why and for what reason the people are so devoted to Her. Now, I must say I am no particular admirer of the hereditary principle of government; I have no particular fondness for King or Queen as such. I hold that while they occupy exalted positions, they should be as man or woman worthy of the position they fill. But when we turn to Her Majesty we find one who has adorned the place she has occupied, one who has proved herself a constitutional sovereign, one who has ever obeyed the will of the people as expressed through the majority of the representatives of the poeple, one who as wife has proved faithful to him who never uttered anything that was base, while at the same time so far as her sympathies were concerned she has always been in touch with the sufferings of her people, so that to-day she commands the homage of her subjects, because of her worth of character, worth of sympathy, worth of government. So that to-day the whole Empire can sing with one voice:

Send her victorious,
Long to reign over us,
Happy and glorious.
God save the Queen !

It is particularly pleasing in connection with the celebration of the Diamond Jubilee of Her Most Gracious Majesty's reign to see that the party which has alway been denounced as being disloyal, that the party which has always been held up to the scorn and derision of Canadians, and sometimes of the old country people as well, should be the party that on this auspicious occasion will send their leader to London, and send not only their leader but the Premier of Canada to represent them there. I believe, Sir, that our leader and our Premier as well, will represent us there as faithfully, as eloquently, with as much dignity, and with as much credit to himself and to us, as any one which could possibly be sent from the premier colony.

There is another point in connection with the Speech from the Throne to which I suppose I must refer, and that is the school question. This is one of the questions that no man cares about touching. I say so because I feel that every one who justly estimates what is embedded, so to speak, in this question, feels more or less the responsibility which attaches to him when he has anything to do with a question that divides man from man, and race from race, and religion from religion. It is, however, one of those subjects which, while a man realizes his responsibility, he has, at the same time, to speak upon it according to his conscience and according to the demands of the people who have sent him to this representative assembly. I was one of those who was strongly opposed to the Remedial Bill of the late Government. I opposed that Bill not so much because of what it contained, and not so much because of what it offered to the minority, but because that Bill brought into force a weapon, namely, coercion, which all intelligent men of the nineteenth century abhor and condemn. It is agreed, and it was agreed then to a certain extent, that this was purely a Manitoba question, one which peculiarly belongs to that particular province, one which ought to have been fought out in that particular province, and one which should have been settled by the people in the province. I opposed that Bill very much on this ground, and I find my sentiment is pretty well expressed by a remark which Sir John Thompson made in connection with another difficult question which was before this House. He said :

I say that, within the limits of its authority, and subject only to the power of disallowance, the provincial legislature is as absolute as is the Imperial Parliament itself.

Now, just because that legislature was absolute, just because it had the right to deal with that question, just because its legislation had been confirmed by the highest law of the land, so I felt bound, for the sake of breaking up any tendency that might be, in the future, towards the creation of coercion in a free land and among a free people, to oppose that Bill so far as I possibly could. So far as the rights of the minority are concerned, I am just as well disposed towards the minority as any man in this House. I believe that minorities have rights just as well as majorities, and so far as the histories of all countries teach me, and I believe we will find that the right has been on the side of the minority, at least as often as on the side of the majority. But, at the same time, majorities have their rights as well as minorities. Our constitution is based upon the principle of majorities. All legislation means grievance towards those who have been legislated against, and every particle of legislation means the curtailment of some right that has hitherto been guaranteed and enjoyed. I cannot see any reason why we should legislate for minority rights in one case more than we do in others, while at the same time I say that no majority has any right to ride rough shod over the consciences, over the feelings, over the hearts and over the sympathies of a minority. It is the right of a majority at all times to so legislate as that that legislation will be, so far as they know, and so far as they see, in the best interests of the country which they love, and of the people who are part and parcel of it.

I may say, Sir, that I believe, with all my heart, in national schools. I believe in one school for the people of the country. I have seen the two systems at work in the old country and in the province of Quebec, and I have seen the other system of national schools in the province of British Columbia. So far as the separate school works, it always works in one direction, and that is to separate the people, to separate at least the children of the people. They never get to respect each other until, perhaps, they are well advanced in life ; they never get to know each other, and thus they grow up oft-times dividing more and more asunder the older they grow. This never can be the ideal so far as the people of this country are concerned, and I believe the ideal at which we all should aim is to have one school for the whole people, in which they may be educated, in which they may be drawn together, and in which they may know and respect and love each other throughout all the days of their life. It seems strange to me that the youngest daughter of this confederation should be able to teach the people of Canada a lesson so far as the school question is concerned. I can tell you here, Sir, that the province of British Columbia, of all the provinces of the Dominion of Canada, is the province which has settled the school question, as I believe, for all time. Our there we have one school and one school only. If you go

into any of these schools you will find there children of all colours; certainly you will find both Protestants and Roman Catholics sitting together. If you inquire as to the religion of the teachers we employ, you will find that both Catholics and Protestants teach there. There is no feeling and there are no prejudices against one another in British Columbia. We recognize our right to be together; we recognize our right to employ all kinds of teachers that are qualified for the position, and there is no province in the Dominion of Canada that is freer from prejudice and bigotry than is ours. Now, so far as my position is concerned, I believe in religion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. MAXWELL. I shall answer the astonishment of the hon. gentlemen in a few minutes. I am always very suspicious of men who claim to be very religious. I have had a great deal to do, in my life, with this kind of men, and I have always found that men who made the greatest parade of religion were the least religious.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. MAXWELL. I hope my hon. friends opposite will just remember that and not show their weakness in the future. I say, Sir, that I believe in religion. I am a member of the Presbyterian Church and I have been for years a minister of that church. I believe that church is second to no church in Canada or anywhere else, but I am not a bigot. I do not want Presbyterianism taught in any school with which I have any connection. I do not want my "ism" taught my children where other children are being taught. I believe that so far as I myself am concerned I am quite capable of attending to that, and I believe at the same time that my church, if it is imbued with the right spirit ought to do that business in its own interest. But I say that religion is more than "ism." It is greater, grander, wider far than any view of it. The head men of our churches—the archbishops, the moderator of the general assembly, the president of the general conference—could have settled this school question in twenty-four hours if they had been willing to do it. There should have been no difficulty in framing such an Act as would have satisfied almost every conscience in the country. But these men preferred to stand out for their "ism," and I say, "Gentlemen, if you prefer fighting, go on fighting as long as you like; but so far as my influence goes, I intend to keep you from fighting in the school." Let the school be kept free from it, and let our children there be taught such things as will enable them to become honest, industrious and successful men in life.

Now, there are various ways in which we may look at this settlement; and, for the sake of hon. gentlemen opposite, I will read a quotation from a speech delivered by Sir John Thompson when dealing with a question which the Scotch say was as "kittle" as the one we have now under consideration. He says:

> Whenever we touch those difficult and delicate questions which are in any way connected with sentiments of religion, or race, or education, there are two principles which it is absolutely necessary to maintain for the sake of the living together of the different members of this confederation, for the sake of the preservation of the federal power, for the sake of the good-will and kindly charity of all our people towards each other, and for the sake of the prospects of making a nation, as we can only do it, by living in harmony, and ignoring those differences which used to be considered fundamental. These two principles surely must prevail, that, as regards theological questions, the state must have nothing to do with them, and that, as regards the control which the federal power can exercise over provincial rights in matters touching the freedom of its people, the religion of its people, the appropriations of its people, or the sentiments of its people, no section of this country, whether it be the greatest province of Quebec or the humblest and smallest province of this country, can be governed according to the fashion of three hundred years ago.

There is both sense and wisdom in these words, and I admire the policy of conciliation which was adopted by the members of this Government. I rejoice that they had sufficient sense to meet with the leaders of the province of Manitoba, and that the leaders of the province of Manitoba had sufficient sense to meet with the leaders of this House. I rejoice that they discussed this question; I rejoice that they made concessions to each other; and I rejoice that out of the wrangles, the strife and the quarrels which we have been having there has come to us the angel of peace, and that angel is brooding over our country to-day. The settlement may not be all that we want. It may not satisfy some hon. gentlemen on the other side; it may not satisfy some hon. gentlemen on this side; but I say, take it all in all, it is a fair, a just and a statesmanlike settlement—and a settlement which I believe will stand until the voice of Manitoba shall in any way amend it. In that poem to which I have referred, you will find words like these, which show to some extent why the reign of Her Majesty has been so glorious:

> And statesmen at her council met,
> Who knew the seasons, when to take
> Occasion by the hands, and make
> The bounds of freedom wider yet;—
>
> By shaping some august decree,
> Which kept the Throne unshaken still,
> Broad based upon her people's will.

The leaders of the late Government were so narrow, so lacking in these things, that they could not see the seasons; they could not take occasion by the hands; they were unwilling to make their law broad, based upon the people's will; and so, when the

will of the people was expressed, where did they find themselves? Where they will be for a long time, until they realize that the people, and the people alone, have the say in these matters. But the leaders of this Government did take the occasion by the hands; they have made this settlement broad based upon the people's will; and I believe that the people of Canada to-day, throughout all the provinces, are thoroughly well satisfied with that settlement, and are thankful to these men for the wisdom and the tact they have displayed in bringing the different provinces once more together in harmony and peace.

Now, reference has sometimes been made in this debate to bishops and priests and ministers. I am unfortunately one of these ministers. I believe they can take their own part wherever they are. Some men are very much afraid of a minister, especially about election times. I have no fear of a minister at any time, and I have no fear of a politician at any time. A minister, whether he be called a priest or a bishop, or whatever may be his title, has just as much right to have his say in the politics of the country to which he belongs as any politician in it, and why? Because he is just as much a citizen of the country as any other man; he is just as reputable a man as any other man; he possesses just as much wisdom as the ordinary politician; and I take it upon me to say that there are few men who know the affairs of their country better than the minister or the priest or the bishop, and these men ought to have the same right and the same liberty as any other men to express their opinions on the questions of the day. Now, my hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) said that the Presbyterians were just as bad as the bishops in regard to the school question. I am aware that my hon. friend is not expected to know very much about Presbyterians. I shall be very glad to give him a little tuition, and I will not charge him anything for it. In all seriousness, however, I do not think that it can be truly said that any Presbyterian minister has ever gone out of his way to frighten, or to command, or in any way to interfere with the liberty of the subject or of the people of his congregation. I do not deny that some of us might like very well to be able to do so, especially good old Tories; but I feel free to say that, even if we were anxious to have this power, our people are too sensible to let us do it. Will you say that the Presbyterians are not religious because they are not led by their ministers? Will you say that they are not as religious men as any in Canada because they do not obey the wishes of the moderator? I believe it is just because the responsibility has been laid upon them it is just because they feel their responsibility in every vote they give and in the opinions they form and the principles which they shape, that they are to-day the religious men we know them to be wherever they may be found. Mr. Speaker, the more you coerce or drive men, the more you drive religion out of them. Put them upon their own bottoms.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MAXWELL. I know that my hon. friends are not used to that posture. They always want to be led, or to be carried, or to get on their knees, and some of them are always very devout about election times, but I say that the more you put responsibility upon men, the more you put them upon their own bottoms, the more you make them act upon their own judgments, according to their own consciences, the more you make them not only religious but conscientious in all that they say and do.

Now there is one point more which, I think, I ought to touch before I sit down, and that is the famous visit to Rome. If I were asked what I think about this, I would say frankly that I do not think it ought to be discussed in this House at all. I would resent as strongly as I possibly could any attempt to have the affairs of my church brought up for discussion in the House of Commons of Canada. I believe that this whole question is simply a question to be dealt with by the members of a particular church. It is purely a church question from beginning to end. We have church quarrels in the Presbyterian Church. These quarrels occur in every church. Some of you may have been in them; and I know it is quite customary for us Presbyterians, when we are not satisfied with our Moderator of the Sessions to go to the Presbytery, and if we are not satisfied with the Presbytery, we go to the Synod, and if we are not satisfied with the Synod, we go to the Assembly. We invoke all the powers, from the lowest to the highest, to obtain justice. Therefore, I say that if these men felt that they had a grievance and were not getting justice in the church which they love, their own church and the church of their forefathers, they were perfectly right in invoking all the powers and authorities of that church to give them the liberties they desire to possess. I think every honest man—and I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite—will say that these gentlemen had some reason to go to Rome. If it be true—I do not say that it is true because I am outside of the conflict and do not want to meddle in it, if I possibly can help it—if it be true that a man who owns a paper and in that paper seeks to express what he believes and what are the convictions of his own conscience, is liable in a moment to be deprived of his property and his revenue, I ask how can any such arbitrary exercise of power be justified? Is there a man on the opposite side who will stand up and say that that is right? If you are a member of a church,

the head of which did that to you, how would you feel, how would you squirm and growl and howl about it? Would you remain quiet in your seats? Would you not, if you knew there was some power in that church which would take that load off you, invoke that power? I believe you would, and do it speedily. And I say if men have the power, as I understand it, without inquiry into the motives, to destroy in a moment a man's living, that man is perfectly right—I do not care if he be Conservative or Liberal—if he goes to the powers that can aid him and help him out of his difficulty. Again, if it be true that these same individuals have the power, and have exercised that power, to refuse the sacraments to those who belong to that church, and if they refuse to give them burial in their holy and consecrated ground, and even go so far as to say that these people will never get to Heaven, how would you like, if you held the same views with regard to the same things, to be thus treated?

An hon. MEMBER. It would not make much difference.

Mr. MAXWELL. My hon. friend says it would not make much difference. I do not know whether it would or not, I do not know whether the hon. gentlemen opposite has any hopes, as far as the future is concerned, but this I do know that there is not a man sitting on the opposite side who, if he were to undergo such treatment would not spurn, with all the manliness of his being, any such treatment, and seek every redress possible in order to be delivered from this tyranny and incubus. So when men talk to me of going to Rome, I say let them go and come back as often as they please. That is not my business. So long as they are seeking what I believe is right, so long as I believe they are doing what is right, according to their conscience, it is no matter how often or how long these men go and stay in Rome. But it may be asked, how far do these men represent the Liberal party? Well, Mr. Speaker, these men have represented me, in all these procedings, just this much. So far as they want liberty, so far as they want freedom, so far as they desire to act according to their consciences and to vote according to their consciences and to support the men they believe in their consciences should be supported, they represent me, and I wish them God-speed and every success because I believe it will be all the better for Canada, and every man throughout this land will be free to do any act according to his conscience.

Now, I do not wish to say anything more on this point, but as I have sat and listened to hon. gentlemen speaking on this question, I would like to say to them: Now, gentlemen, if you believe all you say, if you want to support the bishops in this matter, if you want to bring in another Remedial Bill, bring on your motion. Put your thoughts into a motion and give us a chance of voting on it. So far as I am personally concerned, I tell you straight that if any motion be made upon the basis of the opinions which have been expressed on the opposite side, I shall not have the slightest hesitation in casting my vote against it.

I might go on to speak of the tariff but shall not deal to any extent with that subject to-day. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that the party on this side are theoretical and not practical. Now, when a party has been so long in power as hon. gentlemen opposite have been, and when a party has made a mess of things as the party in Opposition confess they have done, it takes the new party a long time to put things on a proper footing. I am a free trader in principle. I was brought up as a free trader: I have been brought up in a land for whose people free trade has done wondrous things. But, considering the existing state of things in this country, considering the mess which has been made of the great resources of this country by the late Government, I am quite prepared, as a free trader, to accept any lessening of the burden of taxation now resting upon the people, being confident that, as time rolls on, the Government, by economy and wise management will reduce the expenditure of this country and thus make it possible to reduce taxation more and more, until we shall be free, as we desire to be, to buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest.

In conclusion, I rejoice that we have reached such a point in our affairs as we have reached to-day. I hope, as I said before, that peace will dwell among us; I trust that the good sense of the people of Canada will loyally support everything that makes for harmony and unity among the races. I believe that, when our Premier goes to the old country to represent us there, he will represent a nation growing up into manhood, and a manhood that will not be the least among the great developed nations of the earth at the present time. Therefore, as far as my influence and my vote are concerned they shall be given in favour of the settlement which the Government has made on this school question.

Mr. HUGHES. It was not my intention, as I presume it was not the intention of other gentlemen, to prolong this debate. But, inasmuch as, during the last few days, our friends on this side of the House have been successful in unearthing a great deal that we did not know before and in bringing to light some of the means by which hon. gentlemen opposite succeeded in capturing the country on the 23rd of June last, I deem it advisable to continue the debate, in the hope that something further may be developed, something that will prove still more surprising than anything that has been brought forward and that may be of

service in the future history of the country. I have listened with pleasure to the remarks of our clerical friend from the far west (Mr. Maxwell). I have not the slightest doubt that some of the hon. gentlemen opposite thought it the best sermon they have had the pleasure of listening to for some time. Personally, I must say, I was very much pleased with his remarks in many respects. One thing about the hon. gentleman's speech struck me forcibly. He is a free trader, but he is prepared to box the compass and support the Government in any trade policy they may bring in so long as it keeps them in power: he has certain views on the school question, yet he endorses the settlement of the Manitoba school question which contains features diametrically opposed to the views he enunciated. He reminds me of the western statesman who said: "These are my sentiments, gentlemen, the sentiments of an honest man. But if they do not suit you, they kin be altered." I had intended to leave this question to be fought out by the representatives of the province of Quebec on either side of the House. However, our friends opposite have been exposing themselves most systematically and have been giving us a great deal of unwritten history which we had not previously. Hon. gentlemen on this side, also, have brought out many important facts on the situation. Therefore, as I said, I think it well to continue the debate in the hope that something further may be developed. I take occasion, in passing, to congratulate the Prime Minister upon the remarks he made in reference to the Queen's Jubilee. No man, I believe, has ever adorned the halls of Parliament who could more suitably express in chaste language his appreciation of Her Majesty's Jubilee year. But I will take the privilege of drawing the attention of the hon. gentleman to a very peculiar point in connection with this matter, and I trust that he will not think me captious in so doing. On page 25 of the "Hansard" will be found the remarks of the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) which are, in part, as follows:—

> It is a still more agreeable duty on my part to tender to the leader of the House, the First Minister, my most hearty congratulations upon the distinction which has been conferred upon Canada, as well as himself, by the invitation of the Imperial Government to take part in the celebration of the Diamond Jubilee. I need not say, Sir, that there is no person within the wide domain of Canada who will not, in my view, not feel it fortunate for Canada that on such an occasion, when so great a compliment has been paid to this country, an hon. gentleman occupies the position of First Minister who is so well able to discharge the duties incident to that hon. gentleman's position on so important and so august an occasion.

This, I am certain, expresses the sentiments of hon. members on both sides of the House. I would now draw the attention of the First Minister to what, I presume, is an oversight, although it is claimed, I am informed, by some of his friends that it is one of those very skilful expressions, common with our worthy Prime Minister, which can be translated one way in the province of Quebec and another way in the province of Ontario. On page 61 of the "Hansard," he is reported to have said:

> What he said with reference to the fact that the position which I now occupy may compel me to go to the other side of the water in order to take part in the celebration of the Queen's Jubilee this year, was not only courteous, but very generous indeed, and I am happy to tender the hon. gentleman this expression of my sincere gratitude.

I would draw the attention of the First Minister to the peculiar use of the word "compel." It is used in both ways already. Side by side with his polished remarks on the Queen's Jubilee, let me quote a brief extract from a newspaper which, I am informed, is one of his leading organs in Quebec, "Le Signal." This journal echoing, I presume, the sentiments of the Government on this question, deplores "the wind of imperialism" which is blowing over Canada. It says:

> The act of English Canadians in subscribing to the Indian famine fund, in seeking to make England the only market for our products, and in singing "God Save the Queen" on every occasion, is calculated to arouse British feeling in their hearts; but, in the presence of such a state of things, French Canadians should devote themselves more than ever to the French cause, work to elevate French education, and teach their children the love of France.

I call the attention of the Prime Minister to the very peculiar following up of his loyal remarks—with the exception of the one word "compel"—with the editorial utterances which we find in many of the leading journals which support the hon. gentleman in the province of Quebec.

The trade matters and other matters which are referred to in the Speech from the Throne and in the Address will all, I presume, come up in due course in this House excepting, possibly, the one matter of the Manitoba school question; and inasmuch as we are asked to join in endorsing the so-called happy settlement of that question, I, for one, must express my dissent from those views. I may be permitted briefly to review the history of the question. In the first place, a Remedial Bill was presented to this House, and what did it propose to give to our Roman Catholic countrymen? It gave them the one privilege of using their own taxes on their own freehold property for the education of their own children; and, of course, in connection with that, it had to confer upon them the necessary machinery whereby to collect those taxes and to manage their schools, buy their text books, and pay their teachers. That is simply what the Remedial Bill

gave to the Roman Catholic people of the province of Manitoba--the right to use their own taxes for their own schools. Not one dollar of Protestant money, either directly or indirectly, either of provincial money—unless the province chose to give it, or of Dominion money, or of local taxation money—not a dollar of Protestant money could by any hook or crook go to the support of Roman Catholic schools in the province of Manitoba under that Remedial Bill. Preceding that Remedial Bill, however, was the visit of the commissioners who were sent up by the Liberal-Conservative Government; and the offer of the commissioners may be summed up in these words: the minority agreed to accept the half hour at the close of the school day, and they agreed to accept, in cities and towns, where there were fifty Roman Catholic children, that there should be one Roman Catholic teacher among the number of teachers in that town—I presume for the purpose of giving the children of that place religious instruction occasionally. Now, Sir, I had the honour, and I claim it was an honour, of opposing that Bill, and I would have opposed the settlement of the commissioners at that time, for the reason that I believed that the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council conferred upon the Roman Catholic people of the province of Manitoba certain rights, the right to have certain grievances redressed; but those grievances did not involve the right to give instruction on intellectual or moral subjects but merely the right to have religious instruction that would be satisfactory to the parties concerned. That is the stand that I took then. I opposed the Remedial Bill on that ground. Had there been a measure, as I stated at that time, brought into this House which would have left the state in control of intellectual teaching, and have left to the church the teaching of their religious ideas, I would not have opposed that Bill. I still claim that it would have been objectionable policy to bring such a Bill into this House; still, the province of Manitoba, having refused to do anything, she certainly drew upon herself whatever this House might have inflicted upon her. I also opposed the proposition made by the hon. leader of the Opposition, the present Prime Minister of this Government. It is well-known that he moved a motion for the six months' hoist in amendment to the Remedial Bill. Well, taking the statements made in the province of Quebec, in the province of Ontario, and in this House, by the then leader of the Opposition and his supporters, I consider no other course was left to me than to vote against giving him any opportunity of settling that question. He and his friends were on record time and again as promising that in case that they got into power they would give a stronger Bill, they would give, not a half-hearted or faint-hearted measure, but a whole-hearted and a stronger measure, one that would supply the deficiency in that Bill in relation to the payment of money out of the public funds for the support of those schools. I objected to giving my own friends the opportunity of creating a system of separate schools wherein any church would have the right of giving intellectual instruction, a right which I maintain belongs to the state alone, and I certainly would once more object to giving my opponents the right to give a stronger control over the teaching of these subjects. It is not necessary that I should here enter into the arguments that our friends opposite used in all the various provinces. In the province of Ontario their watchword was: "Hands off Manitoba." "We demand the establishment of a national school system," was another of their cries; and "we will have none of this separate school business." And, Sir, they went so far as to attack the mandements of the bishops in the province of Quebec, forgetting that in the province of Ontario these gentlemen had gone to the polls under the leadership and following the battle-flag held aloft for them by the late Archbishop Lynch and my old friend the present Archbishop Cleary. These gentlemen had gone to the polls, election after election, in the province of Ontario under what they call, in that province, a "pastoral letter." It is as strong a term as the word "mandement," and if a comparison were made between the mandements issued by the bishops in the province of Quebec and the pastoral letters issued by the two gentlemen referred to in the province of Ontario, why, Sir, the mandements in the province of Quebec sink into insignificance as regards strength of language, when compared with the pastoral letters of the Ontario bishops. Yet we find these gentlemen opposite going to the polls, election after election led by the Archbishop of Toronto and the Archbishop of Kingston on this very school question. We have seen the present Sir William Ralph Meredith hounded from one end of the province to the other by the very men who to-day are pretending to stand up here and ask for freedom from clerical intolerance; while in the province of Ontario the identical arguments being used by gentlemen opposite to-day are the arguments that were stolen from the speeches of Sir William Ralph Meredith on the subject. These gentlemen, I say, in the province of Ontario and other Protestant districts, hold aloft the mandements of the bishops which, as the Solicitor General has admitted, favour their side as much as it favours the other side; and they shout: So long as a drop of covenanting blood runs in our veins we will never submit to the mandements of the bishops;—while these same gentlemen go into Roman Catholic districts and say: The Remedial Bill is no good, it does not give the Roman Catholics of Manitoba any lands or moneys to support their schools, and they have to

pay for them all out of their own taxes. Then they appeal to the Roman Catholics and say: Who gave you separate schools in the province of Ontario? Who gave you these rich amendments to the Separate School Act? Why, it was Sir Oliver Mowat and he is along with Wilfred Laurier in the present Government. Then they point out, as I already said, that Sir William Ralph Meredith and the Orangeists of the province of Ontario are the enemies of the Roman Catholic religion. Well, Sir, it is not necessary to go through all these charges; but, in my immediate locality, one of the chief charges was that I spelled Roman Catholics with a small r and a small c. Now, this is a very small matter, but I wish to take the opportunity of educating a few hon. gentlemen opposite on the subject. I also spell Methodist, my own church, and Presbyterian, the church of my clerical friend from Vancouver (Mr. Maxwell) with small letters also. I have also in my hand a paper, I believe it is the official organ of the Prime Minister, and would you believe it, Sir, in the first column I find the word Catholic spelt a dozen times with a small case letter. The rule in French is the same as in well-written English, that adjectives, once they have become nationalized, once they have become acclimated, so to speak, are spelt with lower case letters. This is a small matter, but, at the same time, it is annoying to common-sense people to hear men who should know better, talking of these trifling matters. The paper is here, and the hon. gentleman's friends in Ontario can see in the Prime Minister's own paper, this paper which runs in the line of the church, half a dozen references to the Catholic church so printed.

An hon. MEMBER. Name the paper.

Mr. HUGHES. "Le Soleil." I will now take up the consideration of what some hon. members consider to be the satisfactory settlement of the school question, the settlement brought about by the sunny ways of the First Minister. Talk about the coercion of Manitoba. I should like to ask the First Minister if when he brought representatives of the Government of Manitoba to Ottawa and gave them to understand what his wishes were, whether coercion was exercised or not? I can tell him, what he well knows, that there was coercion, and those gentlemen fought long and bitterly. It was announced that the settlement would be arrived at in a certain number of days, but it was adjourned from time to time, and those gentlemen from Manitoba, whether they were conscientious or not in their demands, and whether it is true or not that they would have no interference and did not desire the recognition of any church to be made in the settlement, gradually came down step by step until the present settlement was accepted by them. They were coerced, more than the province which they represented would have been coerced by the Remedial Bill submitted two sessions ago. What did they secure by that settlement? Half an hour of school time, which is all that any church should require. I object to any church claiming the intellectual direction of children attending school, which is a matter belonging to the state and not to the church. As regards religious teaching, that is a matter of conscience, but it should not be paid for by the state. In cities and towns where there are forty Roman Catholic children of school age they have the right, under the settlement, to have a Roman Catholic teacher. That is not so very objectionable, because probably there is no town in Canada where teachers of Catholic and other faiths are not engaged in the work of instruction. But here is one of the most objectionable points in connection with the settlement. In any rural district and settlement where there are twenty-five children of the Roman Catholic faith, it matters not how many children of the Protestant faith there may be, or whether the Protestants pay 95 per cent of the taxes, the teacher, not "may be," but "shall be," a Roman Catholic. Let us examine that provision for a moment. I can take any hon. gentleman to about thirty school sections in my own district in Ontario where under such a provision the Protestant teacher would have to be dismissed, although Protestants pay 90 per cent of the taxes. What was the old struggle in Ontario? It was against Protestants being taxed for the support of Roman Catholic separate schools. Those people are granted separate schools under the constitution; let them pay for them. We demanded that not one dollar of Protestant money should go to their support. That was an important condition in the Remedial Bill—that not one dollar of Protestant money, directly or indirectly, should be taken for this purpose. In Ontario in the old fight we demanded that if the Roman Catholics wanted separate schools, we should not pay for them and not be taxed for that purpose. Under this provision of the Manitoba settlement by which where there are twenty-five Catholic children there shall be a Roman Catholic teacher, even though Protestants pay nine out of every ten dollars of the taxes, it will be found that greater complaints will arise in Manitoba than were ever raised against the Remedial Bill. The Roman Catholic teacher will be employed, but the Protestants will have to pay by far the greater part of the fees. There is another section in this, that where there are over ten French Canadian children of school age the teacher shall give instruction in French and English. I am delighted that the French Canadian race is prolific. Two or three families could easily have ten children of school age, and if there were ten French Canadian children of school age in a school section, under the law recently passed by the Manitoba legislature, the

teacher must be able to instruct both in French and English; in other words, the English teacher would be dismissed because he would not be able to teach French, and a French Canadian would be put in his place.

An hon. MEMBER. But it would never be enforced.

Mr. HUGHES. Of course, it is useless to pass this School Bill unless it is to be carried into effect. We have to deal with the provisions of the law as we find them in the Bill. Had any one declared to the people of Canada that the Ministers of Manitoba could have been coerced, no one would have believed the statement. What did the present Minister of the Interior say? He declared his admiration for the United States because they never compromised with the Church of Rome on the educational question, because they would allow no recognition whatever of any religious body, or any interference by any religious body, it being held by them that to grant such recognition would be to permit the entering of the wedge and the whole fabric would thereafter fall. Speech after speech could be quoted to show that so long as our friends were in power the Manitoba Government was strong and unbending, the rock of Gibralter not being comparable with the attitude taken by those men; but when the genial influence of the present First Minister came over them, they came down from their perch and passed the most iniquitous separate school law in force in Canada today. There are two or three other conditions of the settlement which are not embodied in the law. Under one of these Parliament last year voted $2,000 for a French judge. Another was the translation of the present Minister of the Interior from the back place he occupied in the province of Manitoba to a seat in this House. There are other claims which have not yet been presented, but which will be presented shortly, and we are led to believe by the Prime Minister that still further concessions regarding the school question may be made. But if such remarkable concessions have been made to the Roman Catholic Church, why say some are the bishops raising a row? This is a very proper and pertinent question. I will give the explanation offered to me by a priest of the Church of Rome. First, this settlement does not in any sense carry out the judgment of the Privy Council; second, the clause providing that a Roman Catholic priest can enter a school and teach for half an hour after half-past three o'clock will lead to a similar agitation to that which prevailed, I was going to say, disgraced the province of Ontario for a number of years. They claim they do not want such an agitation, that they only want a fair settlement and do not make further demands than those to which they are entitled under the law. It is contended, on the other hand, that this settlement is not in accordance with the spirit of the constitution, and that to take Protestant money raised from taxes paid by Protestants, for the support of Catholic schools would prove a source of trouble with their Protestant neighbours, and the Catholics claimed they do not want it. It may be permitted for me to show that since this Bill has been known to the Protestants of the province of Manitoba, it does not commend itself to their good sense, and especially does it not commend itself to the Orangemen of that province. And, Sir, when it does not commend itself to the good sense of the Orangemen of Manitoba, I take it for granted that it does not commend itself to the good sense of any class of the people, because Orangemen ask for nothing but what is fair and tolerant. At a recent meeting of the grand lodge of Manitoba, this resolution was passed:

At the annual meeting of the Orange Grand Lodge of Manitoba, held in Brandon last week, the following resolution was passed:—"Whereas, this R. W. Grand Lodge, at each annual session, strengthened the hands of the government, approving by resolutions the School Act of 1890, and assured the provincial government that as long as they maintained our national schools and pursued a policy of no compromise and no surrender, this Worshipful Grand Lodge would give to the government its moral and material support. In January, 1896, and again in June, 1896, the same policy was followed out by a majority of the Orangemen of this province. Partyism was sacrificed to prevent, as many honestly thought, the coercion of the local government to restore separate schools. But as soon as the government was elected to power, the cloven hoof was exposed, and the terms of the settlement arranged between the representatives of the federal and provincial governments is one of the rankest and basest acts of duplicity in the history of responsible government, and a menace to the liberty of Protestants of Manitoba.

1st. The teaching of Roman Catholic dogmas in our schools, which was abolished by the Public School Act of 1890, is again restored by the settlement agreed to by the representatives of both governments. The principle which Orangemen were contending for, viz., that the state should not recognize any religious denomination in our schools, has been sacrificed. The Roman Catholic Church has been specially singled out for favours, while all Protestants are simply referred to as non-Catholics. One-half the time set apart for religious instruction is given to the Roman Catholics, while they only represent one-twentieth of our population, and where twenty-five Catholic children attend the public school, a Catholic teacher must be engaged to teach the religious dogmas of that denomination. This provision actually makes Roman Catholic children attending the public schools wards of the state, and gives the Roman Catholic Church the status of a state church. Again, where French-speaking pupils attend a public school, provision is made for a bi-lingual system of teaching, which will require a teacher competent to teach both languages. The great majority of Manitoba teachers are not competent to teach two languages, and teachers will have to be imported from Quebec. This provision answers a double purpose, by introducing into our public schools the dual language and Roman Catholic teachers.

"Again, settlement has other features even more vicious than the old separate school law.

The policy of Rome has ever been aggressive, Roman Catholic teachers will be scattered throughout the province and will have an opportunity of proselytizing to a much greater extent under the terms of the settlement between the Laurier Government and the Government of Mr. Greenway than ever before. Why has the Federal Government sent emissaries to Rome to obtain the sanction of His Holiness to the settlement? Abbe Proulx, Charles Fitzpatrick and Chevalier Drolet, each in turn, visited His Holiness to obtain his consent, and requested His Holiness to appoint a papal ablegate for Canada, to whom all legislation affecting the Roman Catholic Church would be submitted before being acted on by Parliament. The humiliation of our great Dominion in the eyes of every liberty-loving nation must indeed be great, when our rulers so far forget their dignity and that of our country as to endeavour to obtain the sanction of a foreign potentate before legislation is submitted to Parliament.

"Therefore, be it resolved,—That this R. W. Grand Lodge of Manitoba, assembled in the city of Brandon, hereby express in the strongest terms possible our disapproval of the so-called settlement, and denounce it as a delusion and a snare, and that we will use every legitimate and constitutional means of defeating every member of Parliament, both federal and local, who uses his influence or gives his vote in favour of the settlement, as stated in the preamble, and that we are opposed to any compromise with the opponents of our National School Act, as enacted by the legislature of 1890."

That resolution passed by the Grand Orange lodge properly recites the feeling of the people in Manitoba. We now find our friends from the province of Quebec coming here, after having captured that province by appeals not alone on the school question, but on other different questions of a disloyal nature, and they cry out for our sympathy against the bishops. Why, the Solicitor General told us that he endorsed all the bishops had done, and he thought they were perfectly right in the course they had pursued. The clerical gentleman opposite (Mr. Maxwell) declared that the bishops should be deterred from coercing men, and he stated that the Roman Catholic people of Quebec had a perfect right to go to the powers they looked to, and he endorsed the action of the Government in sending these emissaries to Rome. Sir, I ask, where is the proper place for redress of grievances in civil matters. It is in this legislative hall, or in the courts of the country. There is no grievance under British law but has its remedy. Every lawyer knows that one of the first principles of law is that every grievance has its proper redress under British law, and if the members of the Government and the people of the province of Quebec felt aggrieved, they should have had recourse to the courts of the country, and if the courts did not afford them sufficient protection, they should have come to Parliament where every civil grievance can be redressed. I have never yet found, and I presume that no member of Parliament or elector of this or any other country has ever found an offence so great, that it did not find its apologist even in the ranks of the clergy, and the apology of our clerical friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Maxwell) reminds me of the following lines:—

Where with the hymns the ghostly fathers sung
Mingled the groans by subtle torture wrung,
Heaven's anthem blending with the shriek of hell!
The midnight of Bartholemew—the stake
Of Smithfield, and that thrice-accursed flame
Which Calvin kindled by Geneva's lake,—
New England's scaffold, and the priestly sneer
Which mocked its victims in that hour of fear,
When guilt itself a human tear might claim,—
Bear witness, O Thou wronged and merciful One!
That Earth's most hateful crimes have in Thy Name been done!

And so we find here that a clergyman of the Presbyterian Church has the hardihood to stand before Parliament, and endorse the action of the Prime Minister and four of his colleagues and forty-five of his followers, in sending this memorial and these emissaries to Rome. If it were simply a religious matter, I would not care whether they went to Rome or to Mecca or to Canterbury, but I will read the first paragraph of the memorial to the Pope and hon. gentlemen will see from that, that it was not considered a religious matter but that it was looked upon as a constitutional question. The first paragraph says:

Most Holy Father,—We, the undersigned members of the Senate and members of the House of Commons of Canada, and representing therein the Liberal party, present ourselves before Your Holiness as respectful and devoted children of Holy Church, to complain of the existence of a state of things which, if allowed to continue, might be extremely dangerous to the constitutional liberties of this country, as well as to the interests of the church itself.

They say it is dangerous, not to the church, alone, but to the constitutional liberties of the country. Right on the face of it these hon. gentlemen have for all time to come set a precedent for an appeal, on the part of any political party in this country to the Pope of Rome, in matters of temporal concern.

Mr. LAVERGNE. Is not that our business?

Mr. HUGHES. It is the right of any Roman Catholic citizen to appeal to Rome in matters concerning his church; but it is not the right of any citizen of this country to appeal to Rome in matters concerning the state. It is true, in the old days an offence of this kind would have met with legal punishment—with impeachment, or some other kind of punishment. To-day such offences are punished by public sentiment in the country, and I venture to say that neither in the province of Quebec—where the bishops, to their credit be it said, have stood manfully for the constitutional decision of the Judicial Committee of the Imperial Privy Council—nor in the province of Ontario, dare these gentlemen appeal to the people to-day, to test the issue now before us. I venture

to say that at the very first opportunity the people of Canada have of expressing their approval or their disapproval of such conduct as this, public opinion in this country will condemn these hon. gentlemen most severely. Contrast the policy of the Conservatives in the province of Quebec with that of the Liberals. The Conservatives have stood loyally by the judgment of the Queen's Privy Council, while the Liberals, after using this cry to get into power, now declare that they will force into line the men who put them into office by overriding the judgment of the Queen's Privy Council and appealing to Rome. I tell them that the conduct of the bishops stands out prominently to their credit, in comparison with the conduct of these gentlemen, who have overridden that judgment by appealing to the Pope of Rome. I have listened very carefully to the speeches of all the hon. gentlemen on the other side, and not one of them has given a solitary reason for their appeal to Rome other than the design to bolster themselves in office. They have not given one solitary instance of clerical tyranny.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HUGHES. I notice that the leader of the P. P. A. organization in the Dominion, the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) cheers that statement. They have not produced one solitary instance in which the communion or the sacrament has been refused—I do not know the technical terms of these matters, and I trust that our friends will make allowance for me. They have not given one instance in which a body has been refused burial in consecrated ground. And yet gentlemen from the province of Ontario, who stand up and boast of their Presbyterianism and their Protestantism—I could name many of them—have over and over again aided and abetted the authorities of the Roman Catholic Church in forbidding their people to vote as they pleased. Even the Rev. Dr. Caven, a gentleman whom I respect very much, has more than once come to the rescue of his old friends, Archbishop Lynch and Archbishop Cleary, and worked his friends into line, to serve the purposes of these gentlemen in the province of Ontario; and Sir Oliver Mowat has done the same thing. It was all right then, when they were getting the votes. It was then our ox that was being gored; but today the shoe is on the other foot, and it does my heart good to see these gentlemen squirm under the lash of the bishops. I believe a cry was raised on behalf of the predecessor of this "Le Soleil" paper "L'Electeur," because it was brought under the ban of the church. If a clergyman of my church tried to bull-doze me, as to what paper I should read, I would very quickly turn him to the right-about.

Some hon. MEMBERS. What church?

Mr. HUGHES. This is a free country, and my religion is a matter which concerns only my conscience and my God. I venture to say that no man in the province of Quebec has ever been refused the sacrament, or has ever lost a day's wages for reading that paper. He need not give up reading it unless he likes; he need not obey his bishop unless he likes; this is a free country. Who are the gentlemen appealing to us for sympathy? Who is the man on whose behalf this appeal for sympathy is made? Mr. Pacaud. And who is he? I need not speak of his connection with the Baie des Chaleurs Railway. I will simply say that this is the man who raised the "parti-national" cry in the province of Quebec, the cry that carried Mercier into power. And what was that cry? "A bas les Orangistes d'Ontario"—"we must build up a French nation on the banks of the St. Lawrence." These were the cries raised by this gentleman who edited that paper.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Mr. Pacaud has nothing to do with that paper at all. It is owned by a company.

Mr. HUGHES. It does not matter whether or not he has anything to do with this paper. He certainly had to do with "L'Electeur." This good, pious gentleman, who has been blessed by the church, who has received some decoration or title or fixing-up from Rome for his previous services, and was afterwards forced to bring out that paper under another name—who is he? The man who drove an English-speaking girl from the post office in the city of Quebec—who attacked her in his paper until people refused to receive letters from that office. This is the gentleman we are asked to exercise our sympathy or pity for, because he has now a quarrel on his hands with the bishops who were his former friends. I say, God bless the bishops for lashing him.

An hon. MEMBER. Tell of Pacaud's stealing in the Baie des Chaleurs Railway.

Mr. HUGHES. I said I would not refer to the stealing he did in connection with the Baie des Chaleurs Railway; the country is well acquainted with the history of that transaction. Hon. gentlemen opposite will not find it easy to work up any feeling of sympathy in Ontario for this gentleman because of his present quarrel with the bishops. In his paper he has always appealed to the worst forms of fanaticism in the province of Quebec, and has always inspired hatred of everything English. It is all very well for these gentlemen, now that they are in office, to say, Let us have peace on this school question. Who kept this agitation alive? Hon. gentlemen opposite know that in one province they had one cry, and in another province they had another cry—playing everywhere upon the prejudices of the people. On some plat-

forms, it is true, leading speakers would talk of sunny ways, and of living in peace and harmony; but along the side roads and on the hustings in back districts words of hatred were used, and prejudices were appealed to, in order to secure the return of hon. gentlemen opposite to power. They must go some place else than Ontario to get sympathy for Mr. Pacaud and his friends in his quarrel with the bishops. He has stirred them up and brought the quarrel upon himself. Now, I do not think it is necessary that I should take up any more of the time of the House on this part of the question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on, go on.

Mr. HUGHES. I can, if necessary, give other and more detailed incidents in connection with the history of this agitation and the men who are behind it; but I am satisfied that the Conservative party of the province of Quebec and the bishops of that province have found out their man, and I don't think that his record is such as to entitle him to any sympathy in this House. I see my hon. friend the Postmaster General here. He is a very genial gentleman and not at all backward in the use of the most questionable means when his object is to secure an election.

An hon. MEMBER. Is he a member of the P. P. A. ?

Mr. HUGHES. I do not vouch for the fact that he has been regularly initiated and ridden the goat, but I do know that he has engineered that organization. I do know that he had a number of these gentlemen employed in the recent North Ontario election, and in his pay, establishing lodges in that constituency.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Lest the hon. gentleman's remarks might be taken seriously, I wish to say that the statement he has made is absolutely without foundation in fact.

Mr. SPEAKER. Does the hon. gentleman recall the statement ?

Mr. HUGHES. Most assuredly I must take my hon. friend's word so far as it concerns himself, but I do not think I am out of order in proving my case and in referring to what took place in the recent North Ontario election, when the hon. Postmaster General opened the ball. He was a Patron there. He sat on the platform at the opening meeting, and I have a poster here announcing that meeting, where the Patron, D. O. Currie, was assisted by the hon. Postmaster General. And as this might possibly be denied if I did not produce the bill, I show it to the House. The first meeting was held in the town hall of Scott, and was addressed by the hon. Postmaster General, and among the speakers appears first the name of Mr. Curry, whom we all know as one of the Patrons who sold himself to the Liberal party last June. The campaign was opened there by the Postmaster General, allied with the Patron organization. He did very well, he made a very nice speech, which I had reported, as I always did the speeches of these hon. gentlemen, so that we could show the public how, when they were in a Roman Catholic centre, they pleaded for the oppressed Roman Catholics of Manitoba, and how, when in Protestant districts, they took exactly the opposite line. The hon. Postmaster General will not deny that he is acquainted with a gentleman named John Shields, of "frozen whisky fame."

Mr. BENNETT. Where did they have Col. O'Brien riding the Protestant horse ?

Mr. HUGHES. They had him in Simcoe assisting them there. The hon. gentleman will not deny that he knows a gentleman named Geo. W. Dawson, who stood up in this House, within the memory of many present, and endeavoured to bring down on an hon. member of this House its censure because he had, outside these walls, spoken on matters connected with a foreign country. How is it that now we do not find any of these gentlemen seeking to obtain the censure of this House on certain members for having gone to Rome? Mr. Dawson was in there under somebody's pay. He and others of the party were very lavish with money, and the bars were running freely. There was also a young barrister from Toronto named Threlkeld, who engineered the general election in North York for the hon. Postmaster General. Then there was a gentleman named Caldwell who said: We have been sent in here by the Postmaster General, he took us down to Cornwall and Stormont, and we just doctored those old Scotchmen and Micks down there in great shape. There was also a gentleman named Switzer, who had been taken to Cornwall by the Postmaster General, and who also was brought into North Ontario with those I have named, and with others. One of these gentlemen, a man named McWhirter, obtained leave of absence from his situation in Toronto in order to go and bury a dead brother in New York.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He buried a lot of Tories in North Ontario, instead.

Mr. HUGHES. Only one member of this House from the province of Ontario has the hardihood to applaud that remark.

Mr. SPEAKER. If this case is before the courts, it is not in order to bring it before Parliament.

Mr. HUGHES. I am not discussing the corrupt practices which will assuredly interest the hon. gentleman when he comes before the courts, but I am merely speaking of his establishing those P. P. A. lodges, and that is not contrary to the election law. Mr. McWhirter came in there, and Mr. John Shields, of frozen whisky fame, Mr. Colwell, Mr. Dickson, Mr. Dawson, ex-M.P., Mr.

Switzer, and scores more, and they all went round endeavouring to establish P. P. A. lodges. They came into the gallant old township of Brock, and said they came in there under the direction of the Postmaster General. The Postmaster General was there anyway and he had brought them there from Cornwall, so they said, where they were pretty lavish of money. These gentlemen went around and they said: "Boys, you have to stand by your guns. These bishops in Quebec are just going to smash Laurier right out of power. Rama and Mara are going solid for McLeod." They flaunt the banner of Protestantism in the Orange centres. Then they would go to the Roman Catholic districts, and would say: Look at the settlement Laurier has given you, and see what a fine one it is. They would recite the various clauses of the Laurier-Greenway school deal, declare it was a grand settlement, and appeal to the Catholics on that line. There was another story which they circulated there and which even my good friend the hon. Postmaster General went so far as to endorse. It was that the Conservative candidate, Mr. McLeod was the man who had paid Margaret L. Shepard to go in there and establish P. P. A. lodges some years ago. They had active workers, Ontario officials and others, all engaged in the good cause, and who went from place to place appealing, privately, to the Protestants to elect Duncan Graham because—I do not say that the Postmaster General said this, but his canvassers did—the hon. Postmaster General wanted Duncan Graham elected so as to have another Protestant from Ontario, at any cost, as he was afraid to trust these Frenchmen behind Laurier from the province of Quebec.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Will the hon. gentleman permit me for one moment? If you will allow me, Mr. Speaker, I will say that everything that the hon. gentleman has said concerning me personally, including the last remark, is absolutely devoid of truth, if I am within the rules in saying so. The hon. gentleman is absolutely mistaken in saying that I ever made such a remark about my French compatriots. I do not intend to follow the hon. gentleman and deny anything further he may say concerning me, because I feel that in doing so, I am only encouraging him in making these inaccurate statements.

Mr. HUGHES. I have carefully refrained from saying that the hon. Postmaster General said these things. I am telling that I can produce fifty affidavits to show what his agents did——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must accept the statement of the Postmaster General on a matter which the Postmaster General knows and the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) does not know.

Mr. HUGHES. I have not charged the hon. Postmaster General with saying this. What I do say, and it is a thing which I know and the hon. Postmaster General does not, I should say, may not know, is that the statements were made. And I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, and the Postmaster General, and the hon. members of this House that the Liberal canvassers did use these statements repeatedly. So I have nothing to take back and nothing to accept from the hon. Postmaster General. I will give him one more assertion and he will not have the hardihood to get up and deny it. It will surprise many in this House to learn that in the village of Sunderland the hon. gentleman stood side by side with D. O. Currie on the platform at a meeting at which they were canvassing the people of that locality for their votes. It is a Methodist temperance locality. Mr. Currie had the hardihood to stand up and say that your order, Mr. Speaker, closing the bar here was issued in order to keep the Conservative members from getting intoxicated down below, and the Postmaster General followed this up by stating that he had issued an order in reference to his department to the effect that any officer who was guilty of a second offence against the law of sobriety must walk the plank, that he was determined that temperance should rule in his department. I give the hon. gentleman an opportunity of denying that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I never heard any such statement with regard to the Conservative members of this House made by Mr. D. O Currie or by any other public speaker on the platform in North Ontario, or in any other riding. As to what the hon. gentleman says in regard to my own department, I may say that I was requested by a gentleman in the audience in Sunderland to speak of my own department, and I did proceed to make some reference to the state of my department which I am prepared to repeat in the presence of any responsible gentleman. In the course of that explanation, I may have said—and if I did, I stated the literal truth that among the features of the department requiring organization, I found it necessary in the public interest, in connection with the railway mail service, to see to it that Her Majesty's mails were entrusted only to persons in every respect fit for that responsibility. This I found necessary because I had had occasion to suspend from duty several mail clerks—and I am sorry to be obliged to state this here, but the question has been put by the hon. gentleman—because of their having been found guilty of intoxication when in charge of the mails. For this reason I issued a general order—and I now state it publicly—that any mail clerk found under the influence of liquor when on duty or about to enter upon duty, should be suspended for a period of three months.

that his suspension should continue until he gave evidence of permanent reformation, and, if reinstated and if he lapsed, that lapse should be regarded as a practical severance of his connection with the service. That is my policy in regard to that matter.

Mr. HUGHES. I am very much pleased to hear the remarks of the hon. gentleman. But I regret that he feels called upon to apologize for making them here. If it was right to make such an announcement on the public platform at a campaign meeting in Sunderland, there surely should be no reason why he should hesitate or apologize about making it in Parliament. It just shows that in carrying on his canvass he was taking advantage of every little quirk. He could not, without apology make the statement in Parliament, but he made it on the stump for the purpose of impressing the temperance people. And at the same time his agents were out establishing P. P. A. lodges, and squandering money lavishly over hotel bars.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have denied that.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for North Victoria really must not trifle with the rules of the House. The hon. Postmaster General has denied that statement at least once. I heard him distinctly. The hon. member for North Victoria must accept——

Mr. HUGHES. If you will allow me, Mr. Speaker, I will put it in the form of a question. I would ask him and he will not dare to deny it, was John Shields—we all know him, John Shields of frozen whisky fame—or Caldwell, or McWhirter or Switzer—were these men or any of them out establishing P. P. A. lodges by his invitation or by his direction ?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman can cross-examine a Minister if he chooses.

Mr. HUGHES. He cannot deny it. And whether or not he will deny that they were establishing P. P. A. lodges, I do not know; but I do know, as a matter of fact, that they were. I merely pointed this out to show that not only in general elections, but in by-elections the same means that our friends say were resorted to in Bonaventure and in Wright were resorted to in favour of the Liberal candidate in North Victoria. And our good friend the Postmaster General came to North Ontario and visited the homes, the kitchens all round the country and displayed an interest in the canvass that no Minister of the Crown in Canada ever descended to before. He made himself the leader of the house-to-house and to meeting campaign, and he did it in order to elect a Patron in order to elect a Protestant, because they "could not trust these 'Frenchmen' who were behind them." That is a quotation, Mr. Speaker, not an original remark. More than that, I want to tell these gentlemen that the Liberal-Conservatives cause is not dead in North Ontario, or in that part of the province. In spite of all the forces against them—and I could name to you sixty-three Ontario Government officials and paid agents of these gentlemen who were in the riding, swarming all over it—the Liberal-Conservative party in that riding polled sixty more votes than it ever polled before. There is a matter that is before the courts, and which I shall not do more than refer to at the present time. It will undoubtedly furnish food for discussion at some other time. They talk about the ballot stuffing in Manitoba. Why, nothing that our Liberal-Conservative friends did there could compare with what was done on the Reform side in North Ontario. Take one case. In the village of Vroomanton on the morning of the election a stranger presented himself as a voter. He was handed what purposed to be one ballot by the returning officer, and went in to mark it. When he came out he demanded of the returning officer what he meant by giving him six ballots. The returning officer had mistaken his man. "Oh," he says, "I thought you were a friend." He handed that man six ballots. He was a Liberal-Conservative, though, and only marked one of them, and came out in the presence of all the persons assembled and returned the five ballots. During the afternoon the same officer was caught giving extra ones to another man. Throughout the riding our scrutineers trusted these people to be honest, until a few days later when they found how the thing had been done. Talk of corruption in the Northwest ! In spite of corruption in North Ontario, the Liberal-Conservative candidate, if he had his just dues on the ballots in the boxes, would now be occupying that seat.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are a great many other questions arising out of the Address. One is a remark made by the First Minister that no man should be dismissed but for cause. I asked a question in this House only yesterday, and was informed officially that four gentlemen, I think, three gentlemen concerning whom I asked, had been dismissed without cause. One day the First Minister says that no man should be dismissed but for cause, that an investigation should be held, and each one be given a chance to make a defence, that every charge should be investigated ; yet the next day or so the First Minister's statement is contradicted by one of his own Ministers who says that men have been dismissed without trial, that men have been dismissed without cause, and that the charges have not been investigated. I join heartily in the desire that mutual concessions should be made all round in relation to the different races that inhabit this Dominion. If we are ever to be a great country we must be united, although I must say that a little discussion

of this kind once in a while does not do any harm. Take the early days in English history when the old struggles between the Saxon and Norman were going on ; take the struggles along the Welsh border between Celt and Saxon, and along the Scottish border of England and Scotland, or between Highlanders and Lowlanders. I have no doubt in the world that the struggles between the various races in those days tended to bring out all that is good and all that is great in those people, and have largely assisted in placing that united race at the head of the world as it now is. So, Sir, although there may be discussions backwards and forwards, though there may be French questions and Manitoba school questions coming up, I have no fear that, if proper judgment is used in the contest, the upshot will be the ultimate fusion of the two races in the one grand and noble Canadian race.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It was not my intention to speak upon this subject, nor would I rise at this hour were it not that I intend to speak very briefly. Inasmuch, however, as I represent a Manitoba constituency. I thought it probable that I might be able to contribute something of some slight value to this discussion. It has been a matter of considerable regret to myself to observe the manner in which this question has been discussed. When this question came up in the North-west the people of Manitoba looked upon it with deep concern. The problem that we had to solve was how to establish one system of efficient schools in the province of Manitoba. You, Sir, and the members of this House, will recognize the desirability of having one system in a province that is so sparsely populated. You will understand that in districts where there may be only ten or twelve families, a few of which would be of the Roman Catholic persuasion whilst the majority were of the Protestant persuasion, it is almost impossible to establish and maintain two efficient systems of schools. Where that plan was tried we found that these schools were not properly equipped, that it was not possible to employ properly certificated teachers, and the result was that the children did not receive a proper education. That, Sir, is the principal reason why the legislature of Manitoba moved to abolish separate schools, and to establish one system of national public schools. The object was not to strike at the Roman Catholics of Manitoba, or at the Roman Catholics of the Dominion of Canada ; the sole object was to secure efficient schools for all the children in the province. I think if hon. gentlemen will bear that fact in mind from the start, they will be better able to understand this question and to deal with it from a more patriotic and fair-minded standpoint, than it has been dealt with by some hon. gentlemen in the discussion to which we have listened. It must be remembered that the Manitoba School Act of 1890 was passed to meet the wishes of a small minority who desired to have separate schools established. Now, I will ask the hon. members of this House, and I will ask the people of Canada whether it is right that because a small handful of natives—a few thousand unlettered people, forsooth, sought to fasten upon the province of Manitoba, upon that great western progressive province, a system of separate schools which would be a serious detriment and obstacle to the cause of education for all time to come, I would ask whether such a system, even if once established, by means to which I do not now care to refer although they are a matter of history, should be for ever continued. The legislature of Manitoba, representing the people of that great province, came to the conclusion that if that province, if that western country, were to enter on a career of prosperity, one of the most certain means to accomplish that much desired object would be to abolish the system of separate schools, and replace it by a system of national public schools. The province had but a limited revenue at its disposal, and the people had found it impossible to keep two systems of schools in operation. I may say, Sir, that after these separate schools were abolished, and before the struggle began to have them restored, the people of Manitoba were deeply stirred over the question and were resolute in their determination to maintain the new system in its integrity. When the question of making a settlement came up the people were prepared to make a reasonable arrangement providing the national principle in their new school system was protected. We did not oppose separate schools because we had any feelings of hostility towards our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens, but because we desired to see the best interests of that province protected, so that it might become great and prosperous. I am satisfied the House will agree with me that that was a most desirable object. Now, Sir, when the recent settlement was arranged, I may say, as one who edited a newspaper that led the fight in that province for national schools, that that settlement was not entirely satisfactory to me, that that settlement was not entirely satisfactory to a great number of the non-Catholic people in Manitoba ; but for the sake of peace and concord, for the sake of being able to live in amity with our French and Catholic fellow-citizens, we were willing to make sacrifices on many points which although important we did not probably regard as vital. I may say, for instance, that we objected very strongly to that clause which provides that Roman Catholic teachers shall be employed under certain circumstances, because we saw that it was a special recognition in law, of one denomina-

tion, and we in that western country, desiring to build up one great nationality, believed that the recognition of any denomination in the settlement was not consistent with the policy we had set ourselves out to carry through. However, we conceded that point, and we thought at the time, as we still think, that we were conceding a great deal. Then there was the question of teaching in different languages. That was another point that was difficult to accept, but when it was pointed out that it was necessary to employ other languages than English in order to impart instruction to a considerable number of children, that point also was yielded. So, Sir, I say that the people of Manitoba themselves have not felt that this settlement is all that could have been desired; and they yielded many points, as I have already said, in order to secure peace and harmony. I must say that there is no foundation for the charge that the people and Government of Manitoba conceded to the Laurier Government what they were not willing to concede to the commissioners sent up by the late Government. Almost everything that these commissioners desired, and little more, has been conceded in this settlement; and when the House understands that the majority in Manitoba have made these concessions, considerable in their view, in order to secure a settlement that would be satisfactory to all moderate men, hon. gentlemen will be prepared to look upon this question in a more conciliatory and patriotic frame of mind.

I may say further that in the Speech from the Throne which the Manitoba Government placed in the mouth of the Lieutenant-Governor at the last session, Mr. Greenway promised to administer the School Act in a spirit of tolerance, conciliation and fair-play to the minority. An expression of that kind means more, probably, than the words employed would indicate, and if these people who wish to stir up strife and keep the question alive would drop their agitation, it would enable Mr. Greenway to treat the minority in the fairest and kindliest manner. I should like to ask this House what could possibly be gained by disturbing the settlement of the Manitoba school question. People cannot possibly hope that, even if that settlement were upset, any more satisfactory conditions would be obtained by the minority. That settlement has behind it the people of Manitoba, and the people of that province, and I state it with all sincerity and definiteness, are prepared to stand by the settlement as final; and I state further, that I do not believe the people of Manitoba will ever yield another point. I do not consider any government could exist one hour if it proposed that separate schools should be restored or that settlement should be disturbed, or any further concessions given to the minority. I sat on the floor of the legislature about two weeks ago when the Bill adopting this settlement passed its second reading, and I think there were only three votes, three French votes, recorded against that settlement in a legislature composed of some forty members. That fact shows to this House and the country what the people of Manitoba think of this settlement, and, as I have said, the people of that province were never more thoroughly in earnest or more determined on any point than they are in guarding their national schools. The people of Manitoba are resolved to stand by this settlement. They desire, however, that their children shall attend the same schools as are attended by the French and Catholic children. They in that western country desire that the children should grow up learning to respect and love each other, and it is because of that great principle the people of the west are determined to stand by their public national school system. With respect to the alleged mission to the Pope, I may say that at first when I heard it spoken of, it seemed to me to be a mistake; but when I heard the Minister of Public Works read from his place the letter sent to His Holiness, I came to the conclusion that the matter had been misrepresented. I am a Protestant, but I desire to extend to my Roman Catholic fellow-citizens the right to appeal to their church on matters affecting themselves. The appeal to the Pope was not with respect to the school question whatever, but it was an appeal to His Holiness to send a delegate to Canada in order that he might settle some differences which exist between the people and the clergy of the province of Quebec. Viewing the matter in that light, I see no necessity for condemning it in any respect. I promised I would speak only a few minutes, and I have finished what I have to say. I would urge this House to think quietly and calmly over this Manitoba school question. The House should remember that this is a matter which affects the people of Manitoba and the North-west and them alone, and hon. members should say that so far as they are concerned, they propose to leave Manitoba to work out its destiny in its own way.

Mr. CHAUVIN. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, it was certainly not my intention to take part in this debate, and if I now rise in my place to address the House, it is because the words fallen from the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) and from the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) against the Catholic clergy of my province, make it incumbent upon me to reply to such attacks. The hon. Minister of Public Works won an easy triumph. We have just seen him, amidst the plaudits of those who sit around him, slinging mud at the face of the bishops of his own church. Well might I retort upon the hon. gentle-

man, by quoting the words of Count de Montalembert and tell him that those cheers were the fitting chastisement—or, to use a more parliamentary expression—the fitting reward of his utterances. Surely, the hon. gentleman must have taken to heart the lecture and the upbraiding administered to him by the hon. member who championed before this House the right of the bishops to interfere, in their capacity of citizens, in political matters, a right which they have always made use of in the general interests of the country. I am sure the hon. gentleman must likewise have keenly felt the stings of conscience, after the hon. member telling him that it was the right of every religious community to settle as they pleased their own domestic disputes. The hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) told the House, the other day, that he had gone to Rome, not on behalf of the Government of the Dominion of Canada, but in his own private capacity and that he had obtained from the Pope the appointment of a papal delegate to Canada. The hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) will allow me to dissent from him, when he boasts and assumes the credit of having been instrumental in obtaining that honour. The Pope, whose sovereignty and moral prestige are acknowledged the world over, is not likely to grant to the first comer and under the most futile pretense, such an honour as the sending of a papal delegate, as distinguished as is the prelate whose arrival in our midst has been hailed by the whole Catholic people of Quebec, and whose presence in the Capital of the Dominion, notwithstanding the murmurs which may be heard from the hon. gentlemen opposite, will be cheered within the walls of Parliament, with the same respect and admiration. Sir, it was as a member of the Dominion Government that the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) repaired to the Vatican and sought an audience from the Sovereign Pontiff, just as it was as members of this House and of the Senate, as remarked the other day by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) that those forty-five gentlemen signed the memorial to the Pope which was read in the House, the other day. Now, granting that it was in their official capacity, as members of Parliament and of the Ministry, that these hon. gentlemen signed the memorial to the Pope, and that it was on that petition that the delegate was sent to Canada, it follows as a matter of course that the Government assume the responsibility for the appointment of the ablegate. Now, as far as I gather from that memorial, the mission of the ablegate may have a two-fold object; he may have been sent here either to discipline the bishops, in connection with their interference in politics, or, if we take the statement made on the floor of this House by the hon. Solicitor General, and the editorials published in the London "Tablet," which were read here the other day, or the utterances of the ablegate himself, on his arrival in this country, when he expressed his surprise because the Manitoba legislature had passed their School Bill without waiting his arrival, he may have been delegated here in order to help the Government or certain members of the Ministry to settle more efficaciously, more easily the Manitoba school difficulty. As to his coming here to discipline the bishops, that is a matter of no concern either to the Government or to Parliament, nor would thereby the British constitution be jeopardized, as pretended by some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. Should he, on the other hand, come here to assist the Government or certain members of the Ministry, in settling the school trouble, then, I ask, why did the Government have it stated, in the Speech from the Throne, that the question was settled and that a new era was ushered in. And should the ablegate come here to help the Government in setting at rest this question, the very first words uttered by the prelate on his arrival in our midst, would go to show that he expected that nothing would be done by the Government and their allies in connection with the School Act, pending his arrival. That being so, the ablegate expected that the Government and their Manitoba allies would at least consent to a truce, either in the Manitoba legislature or in this House, on the school question. Now, I ask, why did not the Government or some of their friends, obtain such a truce from the Manitoba Government? Is it to be inferred therefrom that the Government's action was discourteous towards the eminent prelate whom they have asked the Pope to send here? Nothwithstanding the provocating and injurious words uttered on the floor of this House, the other day, by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), against the Catholic clergy of his province, I cannot bring myself to believe that the Ministry should be guilty of such a gross breach of etiquette towards so august a personage. Now, granting that the Ministry have not, wilfully, made themselves guilty of such a breach of etiquette, or that they have had nothing to do with the delay occasioned in the arrival of the delegate here, they have, to say the least, shown a sad lack of prestige and authority over the Manitoba Government, as they could not even secure from the latter an armistice, until the arrival of the papal delegate in our midst. The members of the Government who signed the famous memorial to the Pope have evidenced how little influence they enjoy on their colleagues, as they could not even succeed in prevailing upon the Manitoba legislature to adjourn their Bill, pending the arrival of the delegate. Those members of the Government, I say, Sir, have, therefore, shown their utter lack of prestige and influence on their colleagues in the Ministry. They have falsified the pledges given to the papal

delegate, who is now in our midst, just as they have set at naught the pledges given to the Catholic voters in the province of Quebec. Now, Sir, before resuming my seat, I wish to say a few words in English, in reply to those hon. gentlemen who attacked us in connection with the mission to Rome. Those hon. gentlemen who denied Catholics the right, as British citizens, of appealing to Rome and kneeling down before the throne of Peter, to beseech his advice and protection, do not understand a word of our religious and political beliefs. Those who went to Rome and who are waiting, in a spirit of obedience, for the decision of the Pope, had first appealed to and sought redress for their grievances from the highest and most august tribunal in England. The trouble is that those hon. gentlemen who charge us with lacking loyalty and fidelity to British institutions do not first begin by setting an example to us and obeying the judgment delivered in favour of the Manitoba Catholics by the highest tribunal in the British Empire, the Privy Council of Her Majesty.

I am surprised, Mr. Speaker, to see that the same men who found fault with those who appealed to Rome for guidance on politico-religious questions are the very same men who, when we appealed to the highest tribunal in the British Realm, sided with those who refused to submit to that highest British tribunal. Some may have appealed to Rome but it must not be forgotten that they first appealed to British justice to which we were willing to submit, but they are not willing to do so.

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

After Recess.

Mr. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to take any part in this debate, and I shall occupy the attention of the House for a few minutes only. I am constrained to say something, however, because the burden of the speeches which have been delivered on the Address in reply to the Speech from the the Throne has consisted very largely of comments and opinions on the settlement which has been reached in reference to the Manitoba school difficulty. In anything that I may say I do not hope to give any information to the House, but I deem it due to myself to place my opinion on record as to the wisdom or unwisdom of this settlement. I desire to emphasize the opinion that has been expressed by some hon. members on this side of the House, and to say, that so far as I am concerned, this Manitoba school question has been practically settled by the agreement which was reached between hon. gentlemen opposite and the Government of Manitoba, and by the crystallization of that agreement into an Act which has received its third reading and being passed by the legislature of the province of Manitoba.

Now, Sir, I say that this question, in my judgment, is settled, and I say it not only for the reason I have given, but also because, as I understand it, there are only two legislative bodies in this Canada of ours which have the right or the authority to deal with this question. One of these bodies is the Parliament of Canada, and the Parliament, at a recent session, a session held not more than twelve months ago, tried ineffectually by legislation to interfere with the school affairs of the province of Manitoba. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the failure which attended the efforts of the gentlemen who were then in power—efforts which were put forth, I am sure, with the sole idea of doing what they considered an act of justice to the minority in Manitoba—the failure, I say, which attended their efforts on that occasion will deter others from making similar efforts in the future in this House to coerce by legislation any of the provinces in regard to matters that have been relegated to them under the constitution. When the legislature of Manitoba enacted amendments to the school law of 1890, I felt bound to consider the character of these amendments, and having done so carefully, I am forced to the conclusion that it is my duty, as a member of this House, to support the agreement as reached, and to support the legislation which has been enacted by the province. The advantages which have been obtained by the settlement of this vexed question are not all that either side to the controversy desires; but when it is considered that this settlement is a compromise, I think that most fair-minded men will agree that it is a fair compromise and a compromise that will meet with the support of the great majority of the people of this country. It has been pointed out by many hon. members who addressed the House that there are objections to the settlement. I am free to confess that there are many and grave objections, and I refer particularly to the clause which makes it compulsory for school trustees in certain districts, and on certain conditions, to employ teachers of a particular faith. I think that is a grave objection; but as I understand the question, it was necessary in order to provide for religious instruction being given in the schools that such a condition as the one I complain of should be embodied in the settlement. It is my opinion that in the employment of teachers the trustees should have the fullest liberty. In the appointment of a teacher, his efficiency as an instructor of youth should, I believe, be the only qualification demanded from him. While I object to that clause of the agreement, still I think it is better even with an objectionable clause of that kind that it should be accepted and this school controversy settled. But while there are objectionable points in the set-

tlement, there are undoubtedly many points of advantage, and these ought not to be lost sight of. It is the recognition of the advantages that will arise from the settlement that prompts me to give it my support. In the first place, this settlement secures and guarantees to the people of Manitoba, for all time to come, the existence of a national non-sectarian system of schools. That is the main and the prime reason why I support that settlement. The people of Manitoba had the experience for many years of a dual system of education, and they found that system did not work as smoothly or as efficiently as a school system ought to work. In view of the sparse settlement of the country, in view of the few inhabitants in the country, it was believed, and events have fully justified the belief, that the wiping away of the old system and the establishment of a common national system would secure better results than had been obtained previously. This settlement, in addition to maintaining and perpetuating the system of national non-sectarian schools, also provides for qualified teachers for all the schools in the province. I am sure it cannot be said that prior to the establishment of the system of national schools in Manitoba all the teachers in that province were qualified in the proper sense of the term ; this, therefore, is a substantial advantage, and one that will be continued for all time to come. Then, the settlement provides for a rigid system of inspection, so that the schools shall be kept up to the standard. Surely that is a condition which we ought to approve of and support. The settlement also provides for the election of school trustees by ballot. Every elector in the province of Manitoba will have the right to use his franchise freely by means of the ballot, so that no coercion can be exercised over him in the discharge of that important duty of citizenship. Then, this settlement provides that the same curriculum shall be used in all the schools, which in my humble judgment is another great advantage. Further, if availed of by all the people, this settlement will enable the children of the people of Manitoba to obtain the blessings of a common school education at much less cost to the taxpayers than they could be obtained under a dual system. It brings together, too, under the one school roof the children of parents who hold diverse religious views ; and I am sure the commingling of these children, and their being brought up together from the school age will promote good feeling among the people of that province, and set an example which we in the older provinces might do well to imitate. This settlement also meets the scruples of certain classes of people by providing opportunities for imparting religious instruction ; and it makes provision for giving the children of the minority a knowledge of the language of the majority. Under all these circumstances, and in view of all the advantages which are obtained by this settlement, I feel constrained to give it my hearty support. Speaking generally, it provides for a system of national education, non-sectarian in character, that is not excelled in any province of the Dominion. Hon. gentlemen opposite ask for support of this settlement, and speak of it as being a desirable settlement ; and yet I respectfully draw their attention to the fact that gentlemen who are opposed to them in politics have time and again striven to obtain for the children of some of the people of this province of Ontario advantages such as have been secured by this settlement for all the children of the province of Manitoba, and we have been always met by the active and bitter hostility of hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends. I wonder if those gentlemen who approve of the introduction of the ballot for the election of school trustees in Manitoba will support a proposition to give all the school electors of the province of Ontario the right to elect their school trustees by ballot ? I wonder if they will demand from their friends who are in power in Ontario the same qualifications for separate school teachers that have been secured by this agreement for the province of Manitoba ? I feel satisfied that they will do nothing of the kind. Yet I feel constrained to support this settlement, because I believe it to be in the best interests, not only of the people of Manitoba, but of the people of Canada generally, that this burning subject, which has disturbed this country for the last six or seven years, should be finally set at rest.

Now, it appears from what has been said by many hon. gentlemen in this House, that while we have been congratulating ourselves on a settlement of the Manitoba school question, there is some reason to doubt whether we have reached a final settlement of the matter or not. I take it that so far as this Parliament is concerned, the matter has passed from our hands, and that any further action that may be taken in the matter or any amendments to the school law that may be required, should be confined to the legislature of Manitoba. But it appears that we have not yet reached that happy state. Within the last few months we have read and heard of delegations crossing the Atlantic and paying visits to the Eternal City, and for what purpose ? We have been assured by hon. gentlemen opposite and by their press throughout the country that this Manitoba school business has been settled ; but, we ask, why these delegations to Rome that have been crossing the Atlantic in midwinter ? We are told that they are being sent over to secure the aid and co-operation of His Holiness the Pope in settling domestic disputes in the church in the province of Quebec with regard to matters of faith and religion, with which I take it those

who are not Catholics have nothing whatever to do. But, Sir, when we examine what the distinguished gentleman and prelate who has been sent from Rome to Canada says with regard to his mission, we must come to the conclusion, as reasonable and honest men, that he has been sent out here to aid these gentlemen in coming to some further settlement or some further arrangement in connection with this school business.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CLARKE. Gentlemen say "oh, oh," and laugh. I find in the "Globe," of March 30th, reproduced from the Montreal "Herald," reports of interviews which took place with the Papal delegate upon his arrival in New York, to the following effect:

In an interview with a reporter of the "Herald," who went to New York to meet the delegate, Monseigneur Merry Del Val said: "My mission is one of peace, and I sincerely hope that it may prove successful. I shall lose no time in reaching Canada, and see the members of the Government at Ottawa very shortly."

"You intend, then, to act with the members of this Government in anything you may do in connection with this matter?"

'Oh, I should not care to say that. It will, of course, depend on circumstances entirely. Then, you see, the settlement has been completed. I said a few words about that to a press representative before I left England. That interview as published is quite correct. I certainly said that I was very sorry that the legislature of Manitoba had acted so promptly, when the Pope had decided to send a representative to Canada."

The ablegate was reported as having stated in England before he sailed across the Atlantic:

The Bill passed by the Manitoba legislature embodying the Laurier and Greenway compromise, comes to me as a painful surprise, as it can hardly act favourably towards a settlement of the question to which I am addressing myself. I think it was due to the Pope to have waited until he had time to place before the Government his views and wishes.

Now, Sir, from the speeches that have been made in this House by gentlemen who signed that famous manifesto to the Pope, and who know whereof they speak, I think it must be clear to every person in this House that this delegate has come to Canada in response to the petition which they sent to the Holy Father; and, Sir, if the Papal delegate expresses his views correctly in these interviews which I have quoted, he certainly understands that he is coming here not to settle a domestic dispute between members of the same church, but rather to aid as the representative of the Holy Father in the settlement of a matter which certainly ought to be settled by those most interested, the people of Canada, and by them alone. But, Mr. Speaker, in this same interview, the correspondent put this question:

I ask you whether your mission was undertaken with the view of approving or disapproving any settlement which the Government of the province of Manitoba might propose, or with the desire to study certain matters which appear to be at issue between the different schools of thought in the Catholic Church of Canada.

To that question the papal delegate replied:

I do not, for one moment, question the right of the Manitoba legislature to make what laws it may see fit; but in every case where a settlement is arrived at, satisfaction is established, and in this case there are certainly quite a large number of persons interested who are not satisfied with the arrangements which have been made.

I take it then that the mission of this reverend gentleman to this country has been undertaken at the special request of hon. gentlemen opposite. I take it that he has come here in response to the memorial which they sent across the Atlantic, and has come not only, if possible, to settle the disputes which exist among the faithful, but also to interfere in the legislation of our domestic affairs. As one who sincerely hopes that the settlement arrived at will be a final settlement of the whole matter, I enter my most solemn protest against the action of the Government in appealing to an authority outside the Dominion of Canada or the British Empire regarding the settlement of a matter of importance primarily to the citizens of this country.

I listened with a good deal of interest and pleasure to the forcible oration made by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) the other night in this House and his strong appeal on behalf of civil liberty, equal rights and fair-play for gentlemen holding diverse political views in the province of Quebec, and I think that to that appeal—honestly made, as I believe it was—we should not turn a deaf ear. It is regrettable that a gentleman occupying the position of a Minister of the Crown should have, from his place in Parliament, to make the statement, which the hon. gentleman took the responsibility of making, of the condition of things existing in that province to-day. I listened with a good deal of interest to the statement which the hon. gentleman made of the condition of affairs in the sister province; and I say that while we may congratulate ourselves, as loyal British subjects, upon the wonderful strides which all parts of the Empire have made during the long and glorious reign of Her Majesty, Queen Victoria, yet a dark spot in her wide dominion is this province of Quebec, if the hon. Minister of Public Works correctly presented to this House the condition of affairs which exists there at present. I notice, in the first place, in connection with this matter, that the petition sent by hon. gentlemen opposite to the Pop contains the following expression:—

The priest is a citizen, and we would not, for a single instant, deprive him of the right of expressing his opinion on any matter submitted to the electorate; but, when the exercise of that develops into violence, and when that violence, in the name of religion, goes to the extent of making a grievous sin out of a purely political act, there is an abuse of authority of which the consequences cannot but be fatal, not only to constitutional liberty, but to religion itself.

It seems to me that it is an extraordinary condition of affairs when a Minister of the Crown in Canada will appeal to a foreign authority, who is not subject to Her Majesty at all, for relief, assistance and protection in the enjoyment of his constitutional rights. Who is it that guarantees and secures to Britsh subjects their constitutional rights? Surely it is not the Pope of Rome. Surely we ought not to have to appeal to that prelate for protection in the enjoyment of our constitutional rights. So far as I know, it is a case unparalleled in modern history, that gentlemen occupying the positions which hon. gentlemen opposite do, will unite together, ignoring the courts of this country, ignoring the legislatures of this country, ignoring the highest court of the realm, the Privy Council, and address themselves to a foreign potentate to ask for relief from the grievances and disabilities under which they labour as British subjects. Our fathers long ago declared that the Pope of Rome had no jurisdiction in this realm or Empire, but these gentlemen, by their action, appear to be pushing back the hands on the dial, when we find them going to Rome for the assistance they should demand from the Parliament of this country. Quoting again from the speech of the Minister of Public Works, let me draw attention to the condition of affairs which, he says, exists in the province of Quebec. The hon. gentleman said:

We have appealed to Rome, as it was our right to do, from the attitude of certain members of the Roman Catholic clergy. We have appealed for liberty—for political freedom.

Is it not rather a strange condition of affairs when British subjects appeal to Rome for political freedom, ignoring altogether the constitution, the institutions of this country and the old land, whence our liberties have come? Further on the hon. gentleman said:

I am sorry to have to give the explanation which we are bound to give in order to put ourselves right before Canada. In the dioceses of Chicoutimi, Rimouski and Nicolet, and others, it was said, over and over again, in the pulpits, that it was a mortal sin to vote for a Liberal candidate. You seem to be surprised that in such a position some members of Parliament signed pledges. My only wonder is that many more did not sign them.

Further on the Minister of Public Works said:

I say, on my responsibility here, that some of the bishops told the Pope himself and the Propaganda that the hon. gentleman who is at the head of affairs to-day, is a very bad Roman Catholic indeed, and a Freemason.

Horror of horrors, that this charge should be made against the hon. Minister that he is a Freemason! It matters not that the Heir Apparent of the Throne is the Grand Master of that organization in England. It is said to be a crime by a large section of the people in Quebec for an hon. gentleman to be considered a member of such an honourable, noble society as that of the Ancient Order of Freemasons. Further on, he said:

I am a newspaper man, and my son published a paper, of which I am the political editor. Would you believe me, Sir, without any trial, without any warning, without any explanation being asked for, my son's paper was placed under the ban. That is to say, in the diocese of Chicoutimi, there is not one Roman Catholic who goes to confession without being asked if he is a subscriber to my son's paper. * * * Never, in the history of ecclesiastical abuses, has such a thing taken place. * * * We were being prevented from discussing any more the political questions of the day in the province of Quebec.

I am sure the hon. gentleman has truthfully and fairly told the House the condition of affairs which at present exists in the province of Quebec, and I ask him and hon. gentlemen opposite, who control the legislation of this House, are they doing their full duty as British subjects and representatives of Her Majesty in the Dominion, if they do not put a stop to the continued existence of such a state of affairs in any part of the Dominion? These hon. gentlemen control the legislation of this House, and if legislation does not exist in our statutes making it an offence against the law for any body of men to arrogate to themselves the right to dictate to any man how he should vote, should they not see that such legislation is enacted?

I say these are grave abuses that ought not to be permitted any longer in this country of ours, and if they are, in view of the statement which the Minister of Public Works has made, he and his party, as long as they remain in power, if they do not enact this legislation, will fairly and justly be held responsible for the continuation of such a condition of affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I felt it to be my duty, painful though it is, to draw attention to what I considered an unfortunate incident in connection with the school settlement. I am prepared to stand by that settlement, to vote for it here and to support it here or elesewhere. But we shall not have to wait long to see whether that settlement is to be permitted to remain as it is or whether insidious attempts will be made to destroy or weaken it and bring about some other settlement that is not now contemplated.

An election took place a few days ago in one of the constituencies of Quebec in which the candidate who afterwards proved

successful was asked, according to the statement made by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), to pledge himself on his faith and honour "to vote in the House without restriction whatever, if I am elected member, against this settlement, or against any other which will not have been accepted by the same religious authority." And further, he was asked to "absolutely prohibit all who act for me in this present electoral campaign, whether on the hustings or in conversation with the voters, to utter one word in favour of the Laurier-Greenway settlement or of the trial thereof because it is not accepted by religious authority." The hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) stated that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Guité) whom we are proud to see elected because he refused to sign that pledge, was told that if he did not sign it, "on the following Sunday, there would be a mandement denouncing him and the Liberal party in the county of Bonaventure." I say that it is a disgrace to the civilization of this Canada of ours to allow this state of affairs to continue. If these gentlemen are fighting the battle of civil liberty and religious liberty in the province of Quebec, it is their duty—a duty in which they will be cordially supported by many hon. members on this side of the House—to take the necessary steps to put a stop to this state of things. Otherwise, we cannot expect that the people of Canada will be given an opportunity, when electoral contests take place to express their opinions fearlessly as to the merits of the rival candidates and policies presented for their choice. Most heartily do we join with hon. gentlemen opposite in the reference made in the Speech from the Throne to the long and honourable career of Her Majesty on the Throne of Great Britain, and we sincerely hope that she may be spared for many years to come, to enjoy the homage of a free and contented people. But true freedom can exist only where tyranny has been banished; and, if tyranny exists in the province of Quebec the people cannot claim to be wholly free. And so, in this jubilee year of Her Majesty's reign, we should do something substantial for the benefit and advantage of the people from end to end of the Dominion, by wiping out the last vestige of clerical interference with the electors in the exercise of their constitutional rights as British subjects.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Like other gentlemen on either side who have spoken I must say that I had not intended to speak on the motion now before the House. But the discussion has taken such a course that I cannot keep silent altogether. I shall confine what I have to say to a few remarks. It has been stated here that the Liberal party gained their majority of the province of Quebec by false representation and that the promises they made went further than those made by the supporters of the late Government. As regards myself, I must say I have never taken such pledge as has been referred to. What I said to the electors of Maisonneuve, which was a Conservative constituency and was framed purposely to secure the election of a Conservative, was very plain. I have here a copy of the address which I sent to every elector of the county. I have the honour to read to the House the words I used, which are clear and cannot be misrepresented. I will read them first in French and afterwards give the translation in order that all may understand:

Je suis sûr et convaincu que Monsieur Laurier avec l'aide de sir Oliver Mowat pourra règler avantageusement le question des écoles, dont le parti tory abuse depuis six ans.

Or in English:

I am sure and convinced that Mr. Laurier, with the aid of Sir Oliver Mowat, will be able to settle advantageously the school question, of which the Tory party has made such an abuse for six years.

Where is the pledge in such a declaration I would ask hon. gentlemen on the other side? Where is the pledge except to do what was right to Manitoba and to the minority in the province of Manitoba. I have always declared that I had confidence in the leader of the Liberal party and that I was sure the settlement he would arrange with the authorities of Manitoba would be satisfactory to the minority there and to the majority of the people of the province of Quebec. The majority of the people of the province of Quebec had confidence in his declaration. In the district of Montreal, where formerly only a few Liberal members were elected, a majority of Liberals were returned to this House in the last election. Now, we are told, in the face of what has happened, in the face of the persecutions to which we have been subjected by the hierarchy, that we have no right to go to Rome and ask for the intervention of the Pope to protect, not the Government, but ourselves and our families. We are told that the ablegate who has been sent from Rome has been sent to obtain better terms in the Manitoba school settlement, and that he has been asked to intervene in this matter. I cannot understand the matter otherwise than as it is presented in the petition which I had the honour to sign; and you can read it and re-read it and not one word will you find asking the Pope to send a delegate here to obtain better terms or to regulate the Manitoba school settlement in any way, shape or manner. On the contrary, as we had a right, as Roman Catholics to do, we ask the Pope who exercises supreme power in our church to intervene in the difficulty existing among ourselves, and to try to re-establish peace and harmony among Roman Catholics. We had that right, and had we not exercised it, we should have been false to our reli-

gion. For, it is well understood, for I have heard it from eminent priests not only in Canada but on the other side of the water, that this difficulty between the clergy and the people in the province of Quebec, is doing more harm to the church than would be done by fifty years' of persecution, that the difficulty existing between the people and the clergy is driving the people from the church, and that, if this state of affairs were to continue, the result might be that half the people would be driven from the church. Had we the right, in order to protect ourselves and our families to apply to the supreme authority of our church to send here a delegate in order to investigate the facts and understand the situation ? That is the position and there is no use to try to misrepresent it. The facts are there and speak for themselves. We are told by hon. members on the other side of the House who come from Ontario that it was a mistake to do as we have done. Pretended newspaper interviews are cited. Well, we know perfectly well how most of these interviews are got up. I find one here to-night in the "Free Press," which entirely contradicts the one quoted by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke). It reads as follows :—

Being asked about the interview which is reported to have taken place with him at his arrival in New York, Monseigneur replied that he had heard that long interviews had been published in some papers, but that he had no knowledge of having spoken to such a great extent.

And to show it by example, he adds :

Being presented with yesterday's "Star," he could not keep from laughing when he read the part of the report where he was described as a short man. "Surely," said the ablegate, "I am not so small, after all, as you can see." As a matter of fact, Monseigneur is nearly six feet high, and represents, notwithstanding his youthful appearance, a fine specimen of an energetic and clever man.

Well, you see that this interview is just as credible as the one quoted by the member for West Toronto. He takes his from the Toronto "Globe," which takes it from a New York paper, while I quote this from the "Free Press," which reports a conversation that took place not later than yesterday. So that I see no grounds whatever for using this argument against us in the present circumstances. What are the facts as to this question at the present time ? As I have said, the majority of the electors in the province of Quebec had full confidence in the Liberal party in the election of 1896, and returned a majority of members supporting the hon. leader of the Government. Now, what has happened since ? Elections have taken place in the province with the same result, in spite of all the influences that could be exerted against those who represent the views of the Government. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat stated honestly and frankly that, although a Conservative, he was ready to support this settlement in its entirety, and that he would support no amendments to it unless such amendments came from the Manitoba legislature. Now, Sir, let me ask that hon. gentleman and the other members of the Conservative party now in this House : Are they not using the same kind of influence that they used during the elections of 1896 ? Are they not still using the religious cry for all it is worth ? Why, Sir, not later than last Sunday, a priest in the county of Champlain—I will give his name, there is nothing to conceal—the Rev. Mr. Lafleche, preached from the pulpit in the church of Batiscan in support of the Conservative candidate, Dr. Marcotte, who sat in this House last session. What did he say :

It has been stated by the speaker that I was educated at Nicolet College, and that there we had the catechism only twice a week. Did you ever hear anything so absurd and so ridiculous as that?

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing very extraordinary in that. In the Roman Catholic schools of Montreal, and I speak as a Roman Catholic commissioner for the last ten years, according to the rules of our schools, which are approved by the clergy, only half an hour a week, on Friday, is given to religious education ; yet here is a priest who goes into the pulpit and abuses the Liberal party and the Liberal candidate because some of the Liberal speakers have said they are satisfied with half an hour a week given to religious education in Manitoba—trying to make these people believe that the school settlement granting half an hour a day for religious teaching in Manitoba was something that should not be accepted by the Roman Catholic Liberals of Quebec. What does he say more :

No one can vote for a candidate who approves of the school settlement. To vote for a candidate who approves of the school settlement, is to vote for fanaticism, and will be equivalent to abandoning his religion. You must either follow Satan or Jesus Christ. In my opinion, Liberal Catholics stand among the friends of Satan.

That, Mr. Speaker, is a specimen of the language used in the pulpits in Quebec in order to coerce the Roman Catholics to vote for Conservative candidates. Then he goes on :

The county has been invaded by speakers who speak contrary to the doctrines of Jesus Christ. If they come to your house, set the dogs after them, chase them with sticks.

This is language that some of the hon. members on the other side of the House approve of. Thank God ! There is enough of independence, there is enough courage, among the Roman Catholic French Canadians of the province of Quebec not to stand any such language as that. Sir, everybody knows that at the present moment some of the most important mem-

bers of the Conservative party are in the county of Champlain approving of this language—I mean the member for St. Maurice and Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron), the member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), and the member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont). They approve such sermons as this, they benefit by them, and no doubt they did something to prompt them. Well, Mr. Speaker, if we had not taken the action we did, if we had not asked for justice, if we had not asked to be treated as free men, as other British citizens, we would not be worthy of a seat in this House. We consulted the people of our province, and they gave their answer. The time had arrived when the allegations made against them should cease. That was why they appealed to the supreme power to send a delegate, not to settle the school question, but to investigate certain matters and lead those people in the right way and place matters in the right course. It is not the first time that matters of this kind have been referred to Rome. Some years ago, I think ten or twelve years ago, the Pope had to send over to Canada an ablegate, Bishop Conroy. Why? At that time there was no school question before the people, but it was stated, and I heard it when I commenced public life, that in the Catholic Church it was a sin to be a Liberal of the province of Quebec. We were singled out as bad citizens; and we resolved not to continue under that reproach. We appealed to the supreme power, and we asked for a decision, and we obtained the famous decision of Bishop Conroy that it is no sin to be a Liberal. Neither bishop nor priest was condemned for having said it was a sin to be a Liberal; but they did not say so any more. We do not ask, it is not the intention of those who forwarded the petition that bishops or priests should be reprimanded. There is no need of such action; but we want to exercise our civil liberty like other British subjects, and we desire that the supreme power should inform the bishops that their action must cease. If it is fair, reasonable and constitutional, I do not see why we should be reproached for having taken this action. I recall another instance where a representative of Roman Catholics was asked to intervene in a certain political difficulty. I wish to remind hon. gentlemen opposite of the special request made by their late leader Sir John A. Macdonald, to Bishop Taché in Rome in 1870, that he would come in haste to Manitoba and establish peace and harmony among the people of that province. That action was considered wise at that time. When we asked the same right for ourselves, the course is not considered right and proper. The people of the province of Quebec have said that we were right in doing so. They made that declaration at the last election, and I am convinced from what I know of the electors that if the electors are the same in Champlain as elsewhere they will resent the injustice done to them and on next Wednesday will elect a Liberal member to sit in this House. It has been too often stated that the electors of the province of Quebec were priest-ridden, that they had no opinions of their own, that they could not be trusted to discuss public questions and pronounce on issues which were of interest to the whole country. This statement has been so frequently made by our adversaries in other provinces, that they were astonished when the people of the province of Quebec asserted themselves on 23rd June last. They did not understand it, and an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House, who certainly does not belong to our creed and nationality, but belongs to the Conservative party, proceeded almost to the length of stating that the priests were right and we were wrong in asking for our just rights and liberties. We are not here to defend those ideas, which were presented in a very clear and eloquent manner on 30th December, 1896, at a banquet given to the leader of the Government in the city of Montreal. What did the leader of the Government state there in the presence of over 700 people, most of whom belong to the Roman Catholic Church and were French Canadians? Did he draw back from the position he had taken? No; he spoke to the same effect as he had done during the elections, and he stated to the people of Montreal, to the Conservative city of Montreal, that he was not afraid of the settlement he had made with the province of Manitoba, that he stood by that settlement and would, if necessary, fall by it. Was the hon. gentleman reproached for having used that language on that occasion; did the guests on that occasion attempt to condemn him for his words? On the contrary, he was applauded by the fair-minded people of the province of Quebec, whether they belonged to the Conservative or the Liberal party. After uttering those noble words, the leader of the Government was followed by Mr. Greenway, Premier of Manitoba. What did Mr. Greenway state on that occasion in order to satisfy in the most complete manner possible the people of Quebec that the settlement was a fair one, and the only one that could be granted under the circumstances. Mr. Greenway said:

> I know I am speaking for the people of Manitoba, and I repeat again, and I want you to make a note of it, that we propose to work out this system in a fair and generous spirit, and not to undertake the responsibility of closing up fifty or sixty schools, leaving the children of those schools in a state of ignorance. It is they who are assuming the responsibility. If they can from time to time suggest any way by which we may meet their views to a further extent, we shall always be prepared, Mr. Premier, to consider it.

I think, Mr. President, you can readily understand that this is but the result of the views which I have placed before you, when I said that I was desirous that in this greater Canada we should build up the greater parts of Canada upon an amicable arrangement between all classes that go to make up our common country. We want to see our French Canadian friends in the province of Quebec, we want to see our English friends in the province of Ontario, we want to see our friends from across the water, we want to have all the people here, and with the gathering together of the races we shall have by and by a great people, because, sir, we have not only a climate to grow wheat, but we have a climate to grow men.

Reading those eloquent words, pronounced by the Premier of Manitoba, what could the electors of the province of Quebec say? Knowing the circumstances and understanding the question much better than the Conservative electors of the province, they believed that since it was impossible to get a system of separate schools, it was better they should get the next best thing, and they believed that they should accept a system which would allow their fellow co-religionists in Manitoba to be educated, and enable the French Canadian boys and the French Canadian girls to acquire such secular instruction as would fit them for the battle of life. The people of Quebec are satisfied with the settlement, which allows Catholics in Manitoba to be protected in their religion, and in their knowledge of their mother tongue as well. Hon. gentlemen opposite know very well that if they tried to call a public indignation meeting in the province of Quebec at the present moment, they would not get twenty electors to attend and to support their contention. It is all very well for some hon. gentlemen opposite to say that this question cannot be considered as settled. We know very well that whenever any other province or whenever even the Federal Government passed legislation that was thought to encroach on the rights of the French Canadian people, the representatives of the province of Quebec in the Quebec legislature always made their views known. But what have we seen on this occasion? The Government of the province of Quebec is Conservative, they have a majority of nearly two to one, but the session of the legislature has recently been prorogued and they dare not propose a vote of censure against this settlement of the Manitoba school question. Even now, Mr. Speaker, in the midst of an election contest in that province, the Conservatives dare not openly attack that settlement, and as a matter of fact they avoided it entirely in public. I know perfectly well that they are trying to use it elsewhere. They are trying to use it in this House with the object of continuing the disunion amongst Roman Catholics, and to excite a bad feeling amongst the citizens of this country generally. It is for that reason and that reason alone that the question is dragged up in the House now, and that there has been so much discussion on it in this debate. We find gentlemen on the other side of the House trying to misrepresent the judgment rendered by the Privy Council, trying to misrepresent the petition that has been sent to Rome, and trying to misrepresent the result of the last general election. I have an idea, Sir, that when this debate is finished, it will be the last we shall hear of the Manitoba school question in this Parliament. I know very well that the Conservatives in this House will not dare to propose a motion of censure on the settlement. Those men who boast of being devoted to the Roman Catholic Church, who reproach the Liberal party for having done as they have done, and who approve of the attitude of the clergy, these men, I say, will not dare to propose a motion of censure in this House, because we know and they know that they would not get ten members to vote for such a motion. As regards ourselves, we are perfectly satisfied. If the settlement is carried out in good faith, and carried out generously as Mr. Greenway promised in the Mnaitoba legislature, then we are satisfied and our people are satisfied because we know that, for the present, we cannot get more. I believe, Sir, that when this controversy is ended, as ended it will be in a short time, the people of the province of Quebec will be considered as ordinary British subjects, and that their liberty will be respected. I believe that the fight the Liberal party in the province of Quebec have made, and the victory we have achieved will be of some good, not only to ourselves, but to our children who come after us, and that it will redound also to the benefit of the country in general.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will pass from this matter and briefly refer to that paragraph in the Address which relates to the tariff. The Liberal party, as a whole, have been accused of changing their policy on this question which interests specially our mercantile community. I may say that the very first day I addressed the electors in Maisonneuve, I told them that although I was a free trader, I knew perfectly well that free trade was impracticable and that the best policy was for the Government to alleviate the burdens on the people without imperilling in any way our national industries. I stated that openly and without reserve. If at the present time, the Government, in face of the McKinley tariff in the United States, goes further than the declaration I made before my constituents, I will approve of their course. In the face of such a tariff in the United States, I believe that, as business men, we have to consider the situation in the light of the best interests of our country, whether we have free trade or protectionist proclivities. We want a common sense and business-like fiscal policy from the Government, and that is what the merchants and manufacturers of Montreal are

asking for now. Since I returned from Europe a month ago, I have met many of the business men of Montreal and the consensus of opinion amongst them is, that they do not make any difference whether the Government is Liberal or Conservative, but that if the present Government acts in such a way as not to injure our national industries they are ready to support them. That is what this Government, I believe and trust, will do, and that is what is required by the merchants of Montreal and by the merchants and business people in all parts of Canada. If the Government chooses to bring down a tariff, which may be on certain articles more protectionist than the existing tariff, I say so much the better if it is considered to the advantage of the country to do it, and then let every member of the House and every elector judge of that tariff when it is brought down.

Mr. BRODER. Mr. Speaker, the debate on this Address has already taken a wider range than any one anticipated at its inception. I wish to say something about a few questions referred to by some hon. members who have already spoken.

Now, Sir, the hon. Minister of Public Works disclaims any intention or any purpose of sending to His Holiness of Rome to ask his intervention in the settlement of the Manitoba school question. Well. Sir, if that is not the object, then the object is one still more out of the range of the hon. gentleman's duty to this country. I will give the hon. gentleman his own words to show that the object of these gentlemen in appealing to the Pope was not simply to obtain the settlement of a dispute with the clergy in the province of Quebec with reference to religious doctrine or the rights or privileges of the Roman Catholic people of Quebec, but was on the broad question of political freedom. If that was the object then, Sir, I say that every Canadian, irrespective of class or creed, ought to rise in his might against it. This is a British country, and it is willing to give to every man under its domain the liberty which he ought to have. But the hon. Minister of Public Works, speaking of this document says :

> Sir, this document, I am not afraid of saying—I am proud to say—has been signed by forty-five of us. I say as a member of this Government, that I signed it, and I am proud to say so. This document speaks for itself. You do not find in it one word about the Manitoba school question. We have appealed to Rome, as it was our right to do, from the attitude of certain members of the Roman Catholic clergy. We have appealed for liberty—for political freedom.

That is the point I wish to make. He says: "We have appealed to Rome for political freedom." Has this Government, which is clothed with the executive authority of this Dominion, dismantled itself of its duty? Has it delegated its power to His Holiness in the Vatican? Are these gentlemen not the custodians of the political freedom of the people of this country? If that was the question referred to Rome, and not the question of the Manitoba schools, then the Minister of Public Works went beyond his place when he imported into the discussion of that question in this House, this document, which has nothing whatever to do with it, and was altogether foreign to anything contained in the Address. And, Sir, there is more than that underlying this matter of appealing to His Holiness. It is done for the express purpose of helping hon. gentlemen opposite out of a difficult position into which they have put themselves. What do we find? Many of them on the floor of this House said that the Remedial Bill did not go far enough; and they went down to the province of Quebec and declared on many platforms that the reason they had voted against the Remedial Bill was that it did not go far enough. While the bishops were satisfied to accept it as going far enough to satisfy the just demands of the minority in Manitoba, these gentlemen went further, and voluntarily, according to their own statements, handed over to their bishops the pledge that they would either secure the rights of the minority in Manitoba, or vote against Mr. Laurier. Now, what is the position of affairs? The position of affairs in this country to-day is this, that the life of this Government of Canada is in the hands of the bishops of Quebec. That is the position they find themselves in, and it is because of the leniency of those bishops in not requiring them to carry out their pledges that many hon. gentlemen opposite are sitting in this House to-day. Hence they have gone to His Holiness to ask him to get them out of their difficulty. The whole move is for political effect, in the interest of the Reform party in this country. They come here with a document which they say is in the interest of civil and religious liberty; but in that document they say: "Your Holiness is aware that men have acted in such and such a manner in the province of Quebec." Have they one document for publication in Canada and another document sent secretly to His Holiness in the Vatican? The document read here discloses only part of their scheme which has been partly enacted on the floor of this House for the purpose of securing these gentlemen firmly in their seats. The life of the Government of this country should never be in the hands of the clergy of any church; and these gentlemen declare, by what they themselves have said, that that is virtually the position they are in. If this delegate has not come out for the purpose of settling the Manitoba school question, then why has the Hon. Mr. Greenway been invited officially, as the press says, to meet him? Has Mr. Greenway anything to do with the settlement of any disputes between members of the Roman Catholic Church? It is said

that Mr. Greenway has been sick, and has gone to his farm because his physician told him that it was not well for him to come down here yet. But he will be down here after a while ; there is no doubt about that ; and if from what the ablegate says himself, if he is reported correctly, and I believe he is, he is coming here to settle the school question. These gentlemen need not talk about civil and religious liberty, after compelling us, by putting off the meeting of the House, to wait until the ablegate could reach this country. That is the reason this House did not meet on the 11th of March. These gentlemen dare not meet the House while the bishops had those pledges in their pockets. The life of this Government could not be worth sixpence while that state of things existed. There was a fire, and I believe every gentleman in the Reform party was glad to see the delay. No, Sir, they did not want to meet the House, and so the meeting of Parliament was postponed, and in the meantime one delegate after another was sent to Rome for the purpose of getting this matter settled. It was not a question between the Roman Catholics and the bishops of Quebec, but a question between members of this House who had pledged themselves to do a certain thing, and the Government they wanted to support. That is the position these gentlemen are in, and they want to be relieved. They are afraid to stand up and do what they agreed to do, and they want a higher authority in their church to come and absolve them from the pledge which they gave to their bishops. Now, as to any question between the Roman Catholics and the authorities in their church, I have nothing to do. That is a matter of their own concern. But I was surprised to hear the hon. gentleman, who has just sat down, draw a parallel between the delegate from Rome and the mission of Archbishop Taché, at the request of Sir John Macdonald, to Manitoba and the North-west Territories in 1885, in order to endeavour to settle the disturbance then existing. Archbishop Tache was a British subject, who had the spiritual charge of those people and very great influence over them, and he went out there in the interests of harmony and peace. But these hon. gentlemen opposite did not look to British subjects to settle their difficulties. I do not care how many prayers they may obtain, my own opinion is they will require the prayers of all the churches, and I have no fault to find with them in this respect, for I like to hear sinners prayed for ; but if it is the liberty of the subject that is at stake in the province of Quebec, that liberty is in the custody of the Parliament of this country and should remain there. But if we are to accept the argument of the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Préfontaine), in which he claimed an analogy between this delegate from Rome and the mission of Archbishop Taché to Manitoba, it will put these hon. gentlemen in an awkward position. It was not a religious question which Archbishop Taché was sent out to settle ; and if we are to accept the analogy between the two cases, this is not a religious question either but a political one. Where then does the hon. gentleman's argument place him ? It places him in the position of admitting that the difficulty which they desired to have settled by Rome is not a religious difficulty at all, but a political one over which clearly no church has any jurisdiction.

We had hon. members opposite getting up and saying that the school question was settled once for all and that we could not go any further, but we would like to hear the real representative of Manitoba, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) give his opinion on the subject. What has he to say ? He has been settled in his seat in the Cabinet through this question, and we ought to learn from his lips whether it is final or not. But we have a higher authority in the Government than he, we have the hon. First Minister who said in the county of Wright, the other day, that he did not consider this as a final settlement. We have also the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) who said that this was only an instalment, and we ought to know whether the full payment is to run over twenty or thirty or forty years or how long. It is to be in yearly instalments, I suppose. This question apparently is to be still agitated. Well, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, where is the agreement on the other side of the House ? One says the question is settled ; the other says it is not. The only thing in which they appear to be in accord is in their cry which they make in concert : Oh, we want peace. It was rather surprising to hear hon. gentlemen get up last night, when the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) was denouncing certain things, as he had the right to do, and scout the idea that there was harmony on this side ; and they did this after praying for peace the whole week. They only want peace on their own side, and I hope they will pray a long time for it before their prayers are answered.

There is another point I wish to bring out, and it is this. The hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross-Robertson) made a statement last night which was cheered to the echo on the other side, and at which I was very much surprised. He said that this sympathy for minorities was a decaying disease, and it had shrunk the whole Conservative party into very small proportions. He spoke of it as a disease, and hon. gentlemen opposite, when he was deriding the idea of sympathy for minorities, cheered him to the echo. Sir, the great bulwark of English freedom is equal rights to everybody. Talk about the great jubilee we are looking forward to, is there any man who

is not proud of the prospective future as well as the past of that great Empire, and is there any one who will deny that the great source of British strength is the freedom she gives everybody irrespective of class or creed? When men are deriding the principle of guarding the rights of minorities, they forget that the great fabric of this Dominion, if it is to hold together, must be cemented by the freedom of every man to enjoy his rights no matter what may be his class or creed. The majority, Sir, can take care of itself, but the minority has rights which ought to be respected by the greater power.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I hesitated, before rising to speak this evening, for two reasons. First, because I am not familiar with the language spoken by the majority of the members of this House; and second, because I think that everything has been said of what could be said during this debate. But after the speeches I have heard, and more particularly after the speech that has just been made by the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder), I feel it my duty to illustrate in a few words what is to-day the policy of the Conservative party. We have heard the hon. member reproaching the Liberal party with having gone to Rome to seek for civil liberty for the province of Quebec. On the other hand, we have heard this evening my learned friend the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Chauvin) make just the contrary reproach to the Liberal party of the province of Quebec. He told us that we were going back on the hierarchy of our church. This is only a repetition of the old double-faced policy—one policy for Ontario and another for Quebec. In Ontario hon. gentlemen opposite ride the Protestant horse, and in the province of Quebec they would like to ride the Catholic horse, but we have put an end to that. The hon. member for Dundas eulogized the late Mgr. Taché, but I regret to say that evidently he has not read the last words which were uttered by that eminent bishop on his death-bed, when he said that he had been shamefully betrayed by the Conservative party on this very Manitoba school question. The hon. gentleman said also, contemptuously, that the Liberal party in this House remained in power because it was sustained only by the Quebec people. Sir, it is evidently a crime to-day to be sustained in this House by a majority from the province of Quebec. But was it a crime on the part of the Conservative party when, during twenty-five years they sought the support of that majority in my native province? I am too young to have any personal knowledge of it, but it is a matter of history that when Sir George Etienne Cartier was a leader of the Conservative party he used to rally round Sir John Macdonald the whole of my native province, and when Sir Antoine Aimé Dorion sat in this House, he was surrounded only by a small but gallant phalanx of ten or fifteen members from Quebec. Sir, speaking of this Manitoba school question, it is evident that Quebec—not the Liberal party but the whole province—has accepted the settlement arrived at between this and the Manitoba Government, and is satisfied that the judgment of the Privy Council has been closely followed. The Privy Council of England did not decide that we were bound to restore to the Catholic minority of Manitoba the schools that existed prior to 1890, but that we need only supplement the Greenway laws; and I maintain, in all humility, as a young barrister, that if we read carefully the conclusion of the Privy Council's judgment, we cannot fail to agree that by this settlement it has been put into effect. The law of 1890 has been supplemented by more liberal provisions, and the Catholics of Manitoba are no longer obliged to contribute for the support of Protestant schools. I agree with the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Préfontaine) that this settlement, perhaps, is not perfect. But, Sir, we often aspire to the ideal, though we do not reach it. As has been said by a French poet:

Borné dans sa nature, infini dans ses vœux,
L'homme est un dieu tombé qui se souvient des cieux.

Let me translate it:

Limited in his nature, but infinite in his wishes,
Man is but a fallen god who remembers heaven.

The least we can ask of the Conservative party, the least we can ask of the ultramontaine party of the province of Quebec and Manitoba, is to try and accept the settlement for a few months, bearing in mind what was said by Hon. Mr. Greenway at the Laurier banquet in Montreal. The least they can do is to wait and see if this settlement cannot give substantial justice, to see if it will not work for a few months or a few years. Out of this Manitoba school question has sprung up another religious agitation in the province of Quebec, and, I may say, in the whole Dominion of Canada. This is not the first time in our history that the Liberal party has been persecuted by some members of the hierarchy. For reasons that I do not understand yet, the Conservative party in our province has, for many years, declared that they alone supported and stood by the clergy. They have misrepresented the principles of the Liberal party and have sought to give to the word "Liberalism" a meaning that it does not fairly convey in this country. We Liberals of Quebec have been represented as Liberals of the French and Italian schools, though our leaders have declared again and again that we belong to the Liberal party as it is understood in England, to the Liberal party of Gladstone, O'Connell, and Russell, and those other great men who have been the pride

and honour of the mother country. From what is said by some of the Conservative members from Quebec, it would seem as if the structure of the church was too narrow to contain the members of the Liberal party, and so they wish to evict us just as the Irish tenants are being evicted by the landlords. But I am glad to say that I will remain a Roman Catholic, and come what may, I will not be evicted from my church. I am a Roman Catholic, but I am also a free man, and that is why I am a Liberal. I belong to the school of Lacordaire, of Lacordaire who said to his young fellow-countrymen that he would die a repentant monk but an unrepentant Liberal. We have listened to many severe criticisms from our opponents because we have appealed to Rome. But, Sir, we have gone to Rome to protect our civil liberty. Long ago when, in Rome the Christians were being scourged, those of them who were Roman citizens had only to announce their citizenship to secure protection. To-day, we, the Liberal members of this House go to Rome where our British citizenship will be our protection.

As to the tariff, I corroborate what has been said by the hon. member for Maisonneuve. I say with him that the Government must be faithful to the promises they have made the electorate, but they must not lose sight of what has been done lately by the United States Government. I believe that this country should adopt two tariffs, one prohibitory as against the countries that do not offer us any advantages and one that will enable us to offer some compensation to those countries that give us the advantage of the most-favoured-nation clause. It is true there is a difficulty in the way. True, it is that the mother country regulates our commercial relations with the other countries of the world and that is the reason why, for so many years, we have been excluded from the European markets. If we take, for instance, the Anglo-Belgian and Anglo-German treaties, we see that we are excluded from these great European markets. Article 15 of the treaty concluded in 1862 between England and Belgium, reads as follows :—

> Articles, the produce, or manufacture, of Belgium, shall not be subject in the British colonies to other or higher duties than those that are, or may be imposed upon similar articles of British origin.

The same clause is found in the Anglo-German treaty. In spite of those treaties I must say that to-day we have the sympathies of many eminent British statesmen. For instance, we have the sympathies of Lord Salisbury, the Prime Minister of Great Britain. Speaking on the 19th June, 1891, before the United Empire League, he said :

> With respect to these two unlucky treaties, they were made by Lord Palmerston's Government, some thirty years ago, when, I am sure, our relations with our colonies could not have been fully considered. We have tried to find out from official records what species of reasoning it was that induced the statesmen of that day to sign such unfortunate obligations; but I do not think they could have known what they were signing. I have never been able to discover that they at all realized the importance of the engagements upon which they were entering. We shall be very glad indeed to take any opportunity that may arise of delivering ourselves from these unfortunate engagements.

Now, Sir, having the sympathies of the Premier of England, we may expect that the advantage accruing from such a visit as that contemplated by the leader of this House on the occasion of the diamond jubilee, shall be commensurate with our great natural resources and commercial capabilities. I think we should bring something back from England other than reciprocal congratulations and platonic wishes, other than honours, titles or parchments. I submit that our Prime Minister would win the eternal gratitude of his fellow-citizens if he could secure from the mother country some better terms for the colonies, and especially for Canada. As to the jubilee celebration, we all concur in the paragraph in the Speech from the Throne adverting to this important and glorious event. A woman whose name is synonymous with virtue, love and charity, has presided for sixty years over the destinies of the greatest empire of modern times. At the accession of this illustrious woman to the Throne of Great Britain, Canada was misgoverned, and we were seeking representative government as the corner stone of our free institutions. What we could not obtain from George IV. or William IV., was conceded to us very freely by Her Most Gracious Majesty Queen Victoria. The dominating idea of the reign of this glorious Queen has been one of peace, of harmony, of concord and of conciliation. Shall it be written in future times that towards the end of that reign this country gave to Her Majesty the spectacle of a people constantly agitated by passions and prejudices ? I submit that we should at this period of our national life compare our country to the Ship of State so poetically described by Longfellow :

> In spite of rock and tempest's roar,
> In spite of false lights on the shore,
> Sail on, nor fear to breast the sea,
> Our hearts, our hopes are all with thee.
> Our hearts, our hopes, our prayers, our tears,
> Our faith, triumphant o'er our fears,
> Are all with thee, are all with thee.

Mr. OSLER. From business reasons I was prevented from attending this House for the first two or three days of this work. I hoped that this debate would be over before my arrival in Ottawa : but unfortunately, for some reason or other, time is still being wasted upon it in talk useless or otherwise. I will not apologize to this House for speaking upon the school question, because my remarks will be very brief.

I thought this question had been relegated to the past. The school question, I believe, has been settled, and so far as this House is concerned, settled for all time. A great deal of the time of this House seems to have been taken up in discussing matters that would be more suitably discussed at a church or vestry meetings. We have been discussing this, that, and everything, except matters that are vital to the interests of our country. I think the main point has been lost sight of in the discussion. The Manitoba people themselves are those who eventually will decide as to what is to be done with the school question or as to whether any or what changes will be made in their school legislation. Personally I feel that the settlement has gone further than I would have liked. I believe that more concessions have been made to one church than were proper, because I do not think that any church should be allowed to control the education of children in this country. Our children should be brought up together, without imbibing prejudices in school arising from the fact that they are Roman Catholics, or Methodists, or Presbyterians, or Church of England. The teaching of religion is a matter that should be attended to in their own homes, by their own mothers. I recognize that in the settlement of a controversy of this character there must be concessions on both sides. I believe that the concessions made by the Manitoba Government have gone to the utmost limit, they have gone further than I would have approved if I were consulting my own feelings in the matter. I think we can leave the settlement of this question with the greatest confidence to the people of Manitoba, and I do not think that they will allow any further concessions to be made to sectarian schools. It is a pity that we should prolong this discussion uselessly when the question must be settled in the end by the people of Manitoba. The head of the Roman Catholic Church has been brought into this discussion by some of the speakers. Well, Sir, if the Pope himself whom every one of us, I think, must respect as an individual, were to come out and settle in Winnipeg for a year, I do not believe that he could in any shape or way influence the people of Manitoba, or cause them to swerve one iota from their fixed idea that they will have national schools so far as possible. I merely wish to make these remarks to show where I stand, and as representing on this question, I believe, the views of the people of West Toronto, as well as my own views. While the settlement has conceded more than I should have liked, I think it has been a fair one, and is a compromise on both sides. As a member of this House I regret that the question of religion has been brought into this discussion. Religion is a matter that should not be brought up here; we are not here to discuss each other's consciences, or to say what the people of this country should believe, or what church they should belong to. We are here to make for them the best laws we can, to do the best we can for our country, that we are proud of; and I think that we should leave the churches to fight out their religious squabbles among themselves, while we carefully abstain ourselves from forcing religion on any one. Were the question to come to a vote, I should vote approval of this settlement, believing that it is a reasonable compromise on both sides.

Mr. McCLEARY. Mr. Speaker, at the present stage of the debate, it is neither my desire nor intention to detain the House at any length. However, I do not desire to allow the resolution which has been placd in your hands, Mr. Speaker, moved by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell), approving of the Address of His Excellency the Governor General to this Parliament to pass without giving expression to some of the thoughts that have come to me during the progress of the debate up to this hour. I have no inclination whatever to examine critically into the Address. There is very little in it to criticise adversely. We all agree with the paragraph in the Address which relates to the diamond jubilee of Her Majesty Queen Victoria, and I need hardly add any words to the loyal and patriotic statements which have been made by hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House of their attachment to the Queen and to our British Empire. Canadians have always been loyal to the British throne. While we admire and revere our noble Queen, not only because of the glory which has surrounded her reign, we admire her as well because she is the exponent of the best form of government this world has ever seen, because she is the exponent of the greatest national life this world has ever seen, a national life which for more than a thousand years has been full and ripe with grand and heroic deeds of scholars and patriots, of statesmen and warriors. So that, Sir, we have in Canada great respect and love for our noble Queen, who, as has been stated by hon. gentlemen who have preceded me, as Queen, wife and mother, has loyally and devotedly fulfilled all her duties. We have been told by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, particularly by hon. gentlemen on the Government side, that the Manitoba school question, which has been the burden of the debate so far, should be a dead issue so far as this House is concerned; that no longer should the attempt to resurrect it or speak in respect to it, that a settlement has been arrived at which relieves the minority to such an extent that it is acceptable to them. To this attitude on the matter I have no desire to take exception. If this Manitoba school question is settled and settled finally, no one will welcome the fact more heartily and readily than I shall. I

sincerely trust that the predictions which have been made by hon. gentlemen opposite from the province of Ontario and the province of Manitoba will be fully realized, notwithstanding the fact that the Solicitor General has told the House that it is not a final settlement.

But while I do not desire to discuss the Manitoba school question, I think there is a question arising out of the history of the Manitoba school question that might fairly engage the thought and attention of the House for a short time, and that is the question as to what shall be the standard of political morality in this country, as to whether it shall be right and proper for men who are aspiring to seats in the Parliament of the country, men who are aspiring to occupy the Treasury benches and form the Government, should by subterfuge and deceit gain those positions without being called to account in this legislature for their action. We from time to time in this Parliament and also in the legislatures of the provinces, pass laws regulating election matters, and we have stringent and severe laws upon our Statute-books which, when enforced, are intended to make our elections pure and right in every sense; and very recently the highest court in this country decided that the simple act of one agent treating two or three voters in a constituency deprived a gentleman who was a member of this House of his seat here. What can be said of that status of political morals in this country when men have the presumption and hardihood to come before the representatives of the people in Parliament and say: Yes, I have given a public pledge, I have given a pledge to my constituents that I will take a certain course in Parliament, but because some other one who is interested in the contract has not carried out his end of it, there is no obligation on me to carry out my pledge. I say, Mr. Speaker, it is a very undesirable state of affairs in this country if such action is to be tolerated. In my opinion, there are tens of thousands of citizens to whom it makes very little difference who the men are and by what party name they may be known who occupy the Treasury benches so long as they are capable men, honest men and men who have stood for and do stand for some political principle that is right. But I believe those same tens of thousands of people will not and cannot countenance men who by subterfuge and deceit gain position and place in this Dominion. We have heard a great deal in this House and from the press and supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite of the splendid virtues of this splendid Government, this wonderful aggregation of all the wisdom, of all the honour, of all the statesmanship which can be gathered from the four corners of the map of British North America, excelling, as they tell us, by all odds any Government that this country has ever possessed.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McCLEARY. Well, Sir, I am glad to notice that a few hon. gentlemen opposite say "hear, hear," to my statement; at the same time I do not think they believe it, and I do not think they want to endorse it. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell), who so eloquently moved the Address, represented the leader of the Government as possessing that charity which is not easily provoked, which beareth all things, which hopeth all things, which endureth all things. Well, Sir, as I heard these words coming from the lips of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Russell) it struck me that there was some truth in the statement that was made by one of the clerical gentlemen who went over to Rome a few months ago, and who on his return said: while he was speaking to the bishops at Rome of the hon. the leader of the Government, the Holy See exclaimed, that Mr. Laurier must be the only man who was preaching the Gospel in Canada. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Russell) spoke of these noble virtues of the leader of the Opposition, I thought that there must be a great deal of truth in it. But if the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) had pursued his biblical research a little further, he would have seen that the same authority who speaks so eloquently of charity being the greatest of the three graces, also says: That it is not easily puffed up. Now, Sir, I would not if I could, take one single inch away from the pyramid and pinnacle upon which the hon. the leader of the Government and the Government itself have been raised by their friends. But I will say, however, that we shall judge them by their fruits. I would rather judge them by what they really are than by any eulogy that may be passed upon them by those who are interested in them so much. Pewter as pewter is honourable and praiseworthy, but when it is attempted to be passed upon us as gold we scorn it and give it no place in our consideration. Now, Sir, the members of the Government will just pass for what they are worth, and the country will judge them not by what they have said they will be, but by what they are and by what they will perform. We have with us in the House to-night, and I am glad to see him in his seat, the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), and the few words that I have to say in reference to him will be by way of application to the issue I raised at the outset, as to what should be the standard of political morality in this country. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) has been so much associated with this Manitoba school question that it may be fairly said, that he is the product and the outcome of it. Let us consider for a few moments this so-called settlement in its relation to him, and his relation to it. In the first place, the terms of this settlement

contain an admission that the school law complained of by the minority, was, in the opinion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) open to the objections which he and his friends so long denied existed. As far back as 1894, the Dominion Governmen addressed a memorial to the Manitoba Gov ernment setting forth the complaint of th minority in Manitoba and asking for re dress. The reply was given by the hon gentleman (Mr. Sifton) and his colleagues:

That there was no ground of complaint, and consequently no change in the law could, or would, be made.

The action of the Minister of the Interior in agreeing to this settlement and taking hi seat in the Government of Canada, declares that statement to be untrue. We have, therefore, in this grand and great and pure Government, a gentleman who formerly declared there was no ground of complaint and who now, by his agreeing to a change in the law, admits that there was ground of complaint. In 1895 the question was raised in the Manitoba legislature and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) made a speech which was reported as follows:—

It is suggested that we should say what we are willing to do, but I can see no justification for the adoption of this view by the legislature. In 1890 we passed an Act which represented our views on the matter. These views have not changed. Why should we suggest a change, when we do not approve of any alteration?

But that position is now abandoned, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) has declared by this agreement that deceit and cunning were the ruling influences which operated the minds of the Manitoba Government relative to this school question On February 28th, 1895, Mr. Fisher introduced in the local legislature a resolution stating:

That the House was ready to consider the grievances, with a view to provide reasonable relief, while maintaining, as far as possible, the principle of the present Act.

The hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), then a member of the Manitoba Government, at once charged Mr. Fisher with being corrupted and bought by innuendo at least, and added further:

If we give the matter any further consideration, it would be letting in the thin end of the wedge.

Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) has not only permitted the introduction of the thin edge of the wedge, but he has allowed it to be driven home to such an extent, that we find it has elevated him out of the narrower and smaller field of provincial politics in Manitoba, into the larger and more remunerative place in the Dominion Government. Not only did the Minister of the Interior make these declarations in the legislature, but there was a by-election in Haldimand and the hon. gentleman came down there in the month of April, 1895. I had the pleasure and privilege of being in that constituency for a few days, and I can witness, that no one could be more pronounced in his determination to stand by and uphold the Manitoba public school law of 1890, than was that hon. gentleman. He declared from one husting to another, that no interference would be allowed, and that no change in the public school law of the province of Manitoba would ever be acceded to by the Greenway Government. But what do we find now? We find that he has entirely changed his mind in this regard with the new light that has come to him. When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) was in the legislature he continued his address at the time I have referred to, and he said:

As to making a compromise, that is out of the question. If the Roman Catholics were allowed the slightest latitude, they would, from day to day, renew the attack and take advantage of it. He admired the people of the United States for one thing, that they never compromised on their school law.

In the light that is now thrown upon the position taken in the legislature by that hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) on the Manitoba school question, is it too strong to say that his position was not a true one. Then, Sir, on the 20th of December, 1895, the hon. gentleman wrote in reply to the Dominion Government:

In the present case there has been no wrong committed by the provincial authorities. It is justly maintained by the legislature that the law complained of is founded on the principle of equal justice to every section of the community.

This is the last public statement that I have showing the attitude of the hon. the Minister of the Interior on this school question while he was holding the position of Attorney General of Manitoba; but as soon as there is a change in the Government of this country, as soon as there is a chance for the hon. gentleman to improve his position, these splendid principles, which he stood by from 1890 to 1896 are forgotten, and he has no hesitation whatever in going back on his record of the past, and subscribing to what he calls a settlement of the school question, providing for changes in the School Act of 1890, which he declared repeatedly was in the interest of the people of Manitoba, and could not and would not be interfered with.

Now, Sir, what I have said in regard to the hon. Minister of the Interior can be well applied to several other members of the Administration, only that they were shooting with the other barrel of the gun. Because it is only right to say, from the statements which have been made in this House since we have met, that there are many other members of the Cabinet, and scores of hon. gentlemen who support them on the back benches, who have compromised their

principles for place and position ; and this Parliament and the people of this country cannot any too soon be awakened to the serious position in which such conduct places the Parliament of Canada.

Leaving this matter for the moment, let me refer briefly to one or two items in the Speech from the Throne. Let me first say a word or two on a subject which I think should have been included in that Speech. I refer to what is familiarly known as the Alien Labour Law. The county which I have the honour to represent is very much interested in the passage of a law that would give to our fellow-citizens, our artisans and mechanics, that protection which they are entitled to as against the American law, which is being enforced every day against Canadians. I have always told my constituents that, considering what the hon. the Premier had said last session, and what he had repeated on the public hustings in East Simcoe and elsewhere during the by-elections, I had reason to hope and expect that this question of an alien labour law would receive attention at the hands of the Government this session, and that there would be a paragraph in the Speech from the Throne in reference to it. I am very much disappointed that such is not the case. However, I am glad to see that the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan) has introduced a Bill into the House on this matter ; and, although I have not seen it, I hope it contains provisions that will meet with the approval of our people. I have no sympathy with the remarks made yesterday by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. MacPherson) when he stated to this House that he considered that it would not be judicious for us to pass an alien labour law, as Canada is too small a country to retaliate successfully against the United States. I do not believe the hon. gentleman is representing the feeling of his constituents by making such a statement. In going up and down through the province of Ontario I have not come across one single man who is not anxious that an alien labour law should be placed on the Statute-book of this country—not two or three or four months hence, but now, at this session of the legislature. I have noticed in the papers supporting the Government the statement that the hon. member for South Essex is willing that the Government should take charge of his Bill—that is, if they endorse it—and that after passing this legislature it should be held in reserve until the Government sees fit to bring it into operation by a proclamation of the Governor General. I sincerely hope that the hon. member who has introduced the Bill will not consent to any such proposition. Why should we delay this matter any longer ? Is not the Government of the United States acting every day against Canadians ? Why, Sir, only the other day, since this House assembled, a young man, a carpenter, came from Western Ontario and crossed over at Fort Erie to Buffalo, where he was going to work for his brother. He was met there by Mr. DeBarry, and sent back ; and on the same boat that brought him back to Ontario, there were three carpenters coming over under contract to work in Canada. We should not permit this state of things to last a week longer, and we shall not rise to our dignity as representatives of the people if we do not see that such a law not only passes this House, but that it is made operative and effective.

Now, Sir, I want to say a word in reference to the attitude of our friends on the other side of the House with reference to this prohibition plebiscite which we are about to have. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. MacPherson) apparently does not believe in it ; he does not want it ; and if it is adopted, he does not believe the country would have prohibition. I am not going to argue the question ; but I just want to point out to the House and the country the position of the Liberal party in this regard. They are sorry now—there is no doubt about it—that they ever gave the pledge to the temperance people that they would ask for a plebiscite, and no one can read what is going on in the Grit wing of the temperance organizations of this country without seeing that they are trimming their sails. And now, was it in yesterday's "Globe" that I saw the statement that it would be impossible to enforce a prohibitory law in this country unless what—unless more than one-half of those who are entitled to vote for members to this House cast their votes in favour of it. Evidently the friends of the Government are not burdened with any great desire to have an opportunity to pass this prohibitory law.

The hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) has introduced a Bill known as the Franchise Act, concerning which the Speech from the Throne contains a paragraph. This is one of the good things that this good Government is going to give us ; it is one of the first laws that this splendid Government is going to place upon the Statute-books. Well, Mr. Speaker, if I heard correctly the remarks of the hon. Solicitor General, this Franchise Act, does not belong to them at all, but they got it from the Hon. Sir John Thompson. It appears that it was one of his Acts which he had brought before this Parliament, but which, for some reason or other, was not proceeded with. The same may be said of the Superannuation Act which the Government intend to bring before this House. That does not belong to the Government either, because no sooner had the Postmaster General introduced this Bill than the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) got up and declared that he had stolen it from him. So that after all, although we are frequently told that this Government has all the talents, it has not

as yet given us any legislation which is really the product of its own mind. Before I sit down, let me say that although I belong to the Conservative party and always have belonged to it, I am not quite sure that there is not something in the change of Government on which we may congratulate ourselves, and that is that while in Opposition, these hon. gentlemen were continually tearing down and never attempting to help in the construction of a single law of importance that ever passed this legislature, or to assist the Government of the day in striving to improve the commercial interests of the country, but were continually decrying and doing everything in their power to hinder the development and progress of the great interests of this country, these hon. gentlemen are to-day placed in a position in which they are compelled to be loyal to Canadian interests and in which they can soon be brought to task by the people if they attempt to carry out the position they formerly occupied with regard to the fiscal policy of this country. No wonder that some of the hon. gentlemen opposite are congratulating themselves on being on the Government side of the House and on being able now to speak of our country with some degree of decency, to speak of it as a country with aspirations to become a great nation. I am glad, as a young Canadian, that this state of affairs exists, and I hope that in the few years during which those hon. gentlemen will be in power, they will be able to wipe out the blot on their political escutcheon, which they have placed upon it during these years past. I have nothing further to say on the question before the House. In conclusion let me express my sincere wish that peace, harmony, good-will and prosperity may be the portion of our fair Canada in all the years to come.

Mr. FRASER. I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. BENNETT. Before the House adjourns, I desire to make a few remarks on the matter that has been under discussion for the past few days, namely, the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. A great deal has been said since this debate opened—and I suppose we shall be treated throughout this session to a repetition of the same boast—about this administration being endorsed by the country whenever an opportunity has been offered the people; and as one of the representatives of the people who has had an opportunity since the last general election of contesting a constituency in opposition to the Government, I now propose to make a few remarks to the House. The riding which I have the honour to represent, East Simcoe, was opened since the last general election, and the First Minister himself, surrounded by his cohorts, came in force into that riding, but unhappily for the Premier, he came and he saw but he did not conquer. But it was, not for want of assistance, because he was ably backed by the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), and I cannot help but think it is a most amusing proposition that the Premier has laid down, that the Government has endeavoured to carry out the principle of simultaneous elections. Now, the constituency of Cardwell was open, the constituency of East Simcoe was open, the constituency of Brant, and the constituency of North Ontario. Why did not the First Minister bring on the four elections on the same day? He did not do so because it was necessary that the plant should first be placed in the riding of Cornwall. They carried Cornwall, and I do not know anything particular to their credit in this, when it is considered that the constituency of Cornwall had been carried by the late Dr. Bergin, owing, in a great measure, to his large personal popularity and to the fact that he had the influence of the Government at his back. Backed up, as they were, by all the influence of the Government, hon. gentlemen opposite succeeded in carrying that constituency. Some more elections still remained to be brought on, but so great was the feeling produced in the constituency when this plant was moved into it, that it was decided better not to bring them on all at once. And so the political ring-master from North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) was deputed to South Brant and the Postmaster General took under his supervision the two constituencies of North Ontario and East Simcoe. Making headquarters at a point between the two ridings—it was practically an election in one riding—the Postmaster General moved hither and thither. The result was that the Opposition carried both ridings. For, while we have succeeded in carrying East Simcoe at the polls, we also succeeded in carrying North Ontario, and if to-day a gentleman sits here as representative of that riding, who was not our candidate, he owes his seat here, not to the majority of the electors, but to the kindly offices performed for him by a partisan judge. What was the result of the contest in East Simcoe? The Premier came and addressed three different meetings. The first was a large meeting in the town of Orillia. It is evident that the Premier had been duly apprised of the desperate chances of his candidate, despite the great personal popularity of that candidate, Mr. H. H. Cook. He saw that something desperate had to be done. And so all the artifices of the politician and the trained orator were resorted to by the Premier on that occasion. The meeting was attended largely by people of the agricultural class. I trust the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) will not feel at all annoyed by the reference made to him by the Premier on that occasion. The Premier deprecated the action of the Conservative Governments in their treatment of the

agricultural classes. He said that instead of taking from the toiling masses of the farmers of this country one of themselves, Conservatives had doctors and lawyers as Ministers of Agriculture. Let me quote the words of the Prime Minister as he presented the Minister of Agriculture to the agriculturists of East Simcoe on that occasion :

> We have at the present time a farmer as Minister of Agriculture ; not a kid-gloved farmer, not a fancy farmer, but a farmer who earns, and has always earned his living by the toil of his hands.

That did not have the desired effect upon the audience, for the reason that the people of that riding are a reading people. And then, I know it must have been with fear and trembling he took up what will be in future years for some of his followers, as it has been in the past for others, a very serious matter, the Manitoba school question. Doubtless, the hon. gentleman had been informed of the political complexion of the riding, that there were some 1,400 Catholic voters, of whom nearly 1,300 supported the Liberal candidate, and so the Catholic vote must be handled very tenderly and very gingerly. At the same time, he was informed that in this large riding of 7,000 voters, the Protestant party would also have to be touched very carefully. And so the hon. gentleman preached what he always preaches, or rather always preaches at this time, peace, amity and good-will among men. One would hardly suppose that he was the same gentleman who, in the campaign of 1887, attempted to rouse passions and prejudices in the province of Quebec because of the execution of Louis Riel. In the riding of East Simcoe, upon the Liberal side, there has never been an attempt to carry an election without the most violent appeals of race and religion. The result of the Premier's meeting at Orillia was that my majority in the town and township of Orillia which had almost been nil in previous elections, was increased to considerably over 100. The Premier then went to what was really his objective point in the riding, and that was the point where everything was to be turned upside down. I regret to say that his speech on that occasion was not reported in the "Globe." In all probability it was one of those speeches that it would not be well to publish in the "Globe." The solitary comment upon the speech that he made was that the Premier delivered an address that set them on fire with enthusiasm. This meeting was among his French compatriots, and they were "set on fire with enthusiasm." I have been informed by gentlemen who were in the hall on that occasion that the speech was not at all like the speech delivered here this afternoon by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), not a speech to the effect that the province of Manitoba had given a final and conclusive answer on this question, but it was on the lines of the speech of the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), to the effect that the thin edge of the wedge had gone in with regard to the Manitoba school question, that instalments had to be expected, and that it was to be hoped and expected that the instalments would be very much larger. I am delighted that the Premier came to the riding, for he was able to see that it was an intelligent and wealthy riding, and it must indeed be a sore thing for him to know that a riding of such wealth and intelligence has not endorsed the policy which his Government has followed for the last six months. But, Sir, in these days of rapid communication, it is rather troublesome that even a riding spread over 120 miles in length, such as East Simcoe is, that matters and things done in one part are known in the other parts. And so it came that we knew that while the hon. the Premier was at one end of the riding among the French-speaking people preaching peace on earth and good-will to men and advocating the Manitoba school settlement on the instalment plan, in the other end they had Col. O'Brien, the Protestant, who while a member of this House reviled Pope and Popery, asking the people to vote in favour of my opponent on the ground that I was a supporter of the Tupper Administration, which was in favour of coercive measures in the case of Manitoba. He told them also that the time had come in this country when the Premier, a French Roman Catholic, standing up as he was standing up against all the powers of Rome, should be supported to the end. The result was that the people of the riding looked upon the whole thing as a piece of political clap-trap and so, between the Protestant horse and the Catholic horse, the unfortunate candidate of the Government came rudely to the ground. The Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) was there in force, and was to be seen at all times and at all places. It mattered little to him whether he had an audience of 500 or five, and as the "Globe" newspaper said he proved himself to be a perfect prince of campaigners, I am willing that the hon. gentleman should console himself with that reflection ; but the fact is, and I say it in all seriousness, that in the ridings of East Simcoe and North Ontario this Government met with a positive and certain repulse at the hand of the electors. Well, Sir, where did they win on their merits, if anywhere ? They went into the riding of South Brant, and if any hon. gentleman will take the trouble to analyse the votes in that riding he will find some curious things. The hon. Premier, who spoke there, and other gentlemen who worked on behalf of the Liberal candidate, succeeded in converting a majority for the Conservative candidate at the general election into a majority of 400 for the Liberal candidate. And wonderful to be said, the class of electors the hon. gentlemen were able to change

was the Indian vote, in which alone there was a change of nearly two hundred; and while hon. gentlemen in the constituency of East Simcoe did reduce my majority, let me say here that the biggest part of the change some fifty odd, was made in the Indian vote in that riding, too. Well, I have great respect for the Indian voters, but it would seem that the convincing arguments hon gentlemen put forth had much more weight on the Indian element of the three ridings than on any other part of the population Now, Sir, coming down to the matter of the school question, in the last Parliament I voted against the Remedial Bill that was introduced by the Government of the day I did that believing that I was voicing the sentiments and the views of my own constituency. I did that believing that in the long run all would be well in the province of Manitoba. But, Sir, after the utterances that have been made by hon. members of the Provincial Government in Manitoba, after the utterances that have been made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr Charlton), and many other gentlemen in this House, day after day, and night after night protesting against any interference with Manitoba, I never believed that those gentlemen would sit idly by and approve of the tearing to pieces of this same Manitoba School Act without a protest and without a demur. The Act has been tampered with, the Act has been changed, and it has been changed, not in order altogether to suit the wishes of both parties—because they may not have been able to do that—but it has been done simply and solely to meet the political exigencies of a party of political opportunists. Well, Sir, these gentlemen refer in the Address to the fact that they hope, by generous treatment of one another, and mutual concessions, that reciprocal good-will will result. That seems a piece of bitter irony, to my mind, towards the hon. gentleman who sits over in the Senate Chamber, and who, day after day, and night after night, sat alongside the present Premier when the Liberals were in Opposition. I fancy that the Hon. David Mills himself thought this a home thrust at himself, because, if the hon. gentlemen had, in the fullness of their hearts, and kindness or any compassion for one who had stood the brunt of the battle here for years, they should have extended to that hon. gentleman some little consideration and some kindnesses. So, also, there was the hon. member who formerly represented Winnipeg. A seat could be got for the present Minister of the Interior, but no seat could be got for the hon. member who formerly represented Winnipeg. Well, I can imagine the reason of this. The present Minister of the Interior rather held the keys to the situation; he was in a position to concede, as a member of the Greenway Administration, to make so many concessions in order to fit himself for a place in this Cabinet; and that alone was the reason of the concessions being made by the Greenway Administration. Now, Sir, is the question settled? The Speech from the Throne says it is settled. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), who supports the Government, says to-day that the concessions made are the only concessions that will ever be tolerated by the province of Manitoba, that come weal or come woe, the province of Manitoba will stand firm to its pledges, and no more changes will or shall be tolerated. What are the remarks of the Solicitor General? Are they of the same nature? Or are the statements of the Premier himself, made in Hull a few weeks ago, at all on that line? But we are told by these gentlemen that, from all accounts, day after day, and months after months, at all events, this subject is to be made the catspaw for these designing politicians. All I can say is this that for a certain length of time the public can be humbugged, but the public cannot be humbugged for ever on the question. When one looks along the seats of hon. gentlemen opposite he can at once see, that among the representatives of the province of Quebec, the men who desire and the men who expect to remain in Federal politics, do not applaud the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for Lisgar; but they hope and they expect to see such concessions made by the Manitoba Government that they may be able to redeem the pledges that they made to their constituents. What is the position, I ask, to-day, of the Solicitor General? What is his position as a man bound in honour? He says that he has given a pledge, and on the demand that that pledge shall be carried out, he is prepared to carry it out. Sir, to my mind a pledge of honour should not require to be carried out in that way. But the hon. gentleman now, when he finds his party is not in accord with the pledge he has given, should sacrifice the position he holds in this Cabinet; and feel bound to say that the hon. gentleman's conscience would be much cleared by such action on his part. Now, Sir, my position on the Manitoba school question is just what it was before. I believed in the last Parliament that there should be no interference with Manitoba. While I believe that still, at the same time do I think it is utterly improper and utterly wrong for the province of Manitoba, from time to time to make concessions, as they have been making, which impair and interfere with the usefulness of the national schools in the province. Now, Sir, a great deal has been said in this Chamber of the presence of the papal ablegate in this country. Well, I re-echo heartily what has been said from this side of the House—because I have not heard the sentiment expressed from the other side—that there should be no interference from any power beyond the powers that be in the British realm. I think if we in Canada cannot settle these matters our-

selves, it is not within our province, not within our rights, to go to the Holy See at Saint Peter's and ask for interference there. It is true, hon. gentlemen have said that the presence of the ablegate has no connection at all with the school question. Well, time will tell. But can it be possible that this distinguished prelate has been misreported in the newspapers? Before that gentleman left Europe he stated that he considered a breach of confidence had been made by the Greenway Government in bringing down their policy on the school question before his presence in this country. Well, if time does not prove that the ablegate's mission in this country is what has been charged on this side of the House, to endeavour to conciliate and get more concessions from the Greenway Administration, then, Sir, I shall be much mistaken. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been unfortunate in their action on the tariff. The other day the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce was singularly unhappy. He was placed in a very unfortunate dilemma. Year after year that hon. gentleman has gone from one end of the province of Ontario to the other reviling and finding fault with the policy that has been in force in this country for the last 18 years. It is only fair to give hon. gentlemen opposite credit for their astuteness in that, in the recent by-elections they cribbed, cabined, and confined, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, n was kept safely out of the place. Well what is the position of these hon. gentlemen to-day on the trade question? After, for the past 18 years, taking up, one after another, the different policies of free trade as it was practised in England, commercial union with the great republic to the south and unrestricted reciprocity, and other fads —because I believe they were only fads which they indulged in at the time—the hon. gentlemen are forced to come before the people in this Dominion and do—what? Make this admission, that either they did not know what they have been talking about for the last 18 years, or else if they did not know what they were talking about for the past 18 years, then they were endeavouring to hoodwink the people of this Dominion. They must take one horn of the dilemma or the other. Every day in this House we hear reasons put forward why it is impossible for this Government to-day to interfere in the matter of the trade question by reason of the fact that the present administration of the United States have changed what was formerly a fair tariff to a too hostile tariff. Why, Sir, the Bill which goes into force into the United States today is no more a hostile tariff than was the McKinley Bill; and then hon. gentlemen opposite went around the country deprecating and denouncing the policy of the Conservative administration. They knew and must have known that the McKinley Bill was in force in that country; and yet what were they going to do? If they were placed in power, they declared they would at once change the whole fiscal policy of the country regardless of the fact that the McKinley Bill was then in force. But a new nightmare has arisen before hon. gentlemen to prevent the carrying out of their trade policy. They say that if we attempt to carry out the policy of reducing taxation, it means a diminution in the revenue of this country, and the Conservative party have plunged the Dominion into such an amount of debt that it is impossible we should diminish the revenue and be able to meet the requirements of the public service, and so forsooth, we must return the high protective tariff which has for so many years been in force in the country. The hon. gentlemen knew full well all these years what the expenditure was. They knew then, as they know now, what it was, and when they told the people they intended to make certain tariff changes, they must have had regard to the current expenditure, and must have known it was utterly impossible for them to make the changes. But during all the time during which the hon. gentlemen were in Opposition, there was one thing they did agree upon, and that was the fact that once in power they would practice economy to the bitter end. There was to be an end of travelling about the country in private cars. The private car of the past was to be a thing unknown. No longer was it to be necessary for the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to rise and ask what was the expenditure incurred in drawing private cars over the railways of the Dominion. I do not think the hon. gentleman will be troubled in that regard this session. He will take it for granted that the Ministers went about the country at their own expense. But was it not disgraceful on the part of those hon. gentlemen, especially in view of the profession made by them, and especially by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) to do what they did. A short time ago in Winnipeg the astounding spectacle was afforded not of three Ministers in one car, but of three Ministers in three cars. There are stories afloat that there is discord and disruption is threatened in the Cabinet; and if those hon. gentlemen travel about in this way and three Ministers have to go to one place in three different cars, there may be some credibility attached to the statements that are being made. But hon. gentlemen opposite are going to reduce the expense. It has always been a bugbear that expenditure has increased. I heard an hon. gentleman make the statement that he did not believe it was a crime to increase the expenditure of the Dominion and the debt of the Dominion, provided the expenditure was of a good and necessary character. And what do hon. gentlemen announce today as a platform? Hon. gentlemen an-

nounce in the Speech from the Throne that during the next two years the system of canals, known as the St. Lawrence canals, are to be deepened to 14 feet. I do not know what the expenditure in that regard will be; but from time to time I have heard statements made in this House that the amount will go up into the millions. Yet those hon. gentlemen who have preached retrenchment and economy will plunge the country still further into debt to a large amount on that score.

An hon. MEMBER. It is "blue ruin" you are talking.

Mr. BENNETT. It may be that hon. gentlemen opposite seeing the condition of the country and that capitalists are not investing their money here, think the only salvation is to get the country involved in an expenditure on public works. The Estimates will be presented after a while, and an opportunity will be afforded of seeing how much is to be accomplished in the way of economy in the public service. Hon. gentlemen opposite largely indulged in the policy of paring down the Estimates. For instance, it was stated by them that there should be a saving in the number of Ministers. Yet in an apologetic strain the Controller of Customs when visiting the constituency in which he was defeated last June, explained that while he was at present only a Controller he would soon become a full-fledged Cabinet Minister. As regards the Controller of Inland Revenue, his position will also be improved; but the Speech from the Throne contains nothing in that regard. Then we have been told all along that public expenditure has been too high, and yet in order to lessen it hon. gentlemen opposite, for political exigencies, sent Mr. Devlin to Ireland at an expense to this suffering country of $5,000 a year. But hon. gentlemen have got rid of him cheaply, for I give him credit that he kicked over the party traces, and if the hon. gentleman was here to-day he would probably again be a thorn in the side of hon. gentlemen opposite.

I now propose to refer to the Franchise Act for a few moments. I want to say here that I am one of those who believes that the expenditure should be decreased as much as possible both to the provinces and the Dominion in regard to the compilation of the voters' list; but at the same time I am prepared to say that unless the voters' lists are to be fair, honest and above board, I am prepared to endorse the spending of almost any amount of money in order that those lists shall be fair and proper. I am prepared to meet the provinces on this platform, that the provinces should try to do what is right as well as the Dominion Government, and I am prepared to stay here if necessary six months to fight a Franchise Act, which will deprive a number of electors of the right to the franchise simply to give hon. gentlemen opposite a party advantage. It is all very well to ask the adoption of those franchises which exist in the different provinces. But I ask whether it is common honesty that in the province of Nova Scotia hundreds of men should be deprived of voting at provincial elections. Why? Not because they have not intelligence, not because they do not possess proper qualifications, but simply owing to the fact of being employees of the Intercolonial Railway, and having been appointed a few years ago it is assumed that their predelictions would be Conservative? Is it right that in every town and village in Ontario where men are postmasters or custom-house officials or hold any position in the gift of the Dominion Government, those men who were appointed some years ago are assumed to have certain political predelictions and are supposed to be too Conservative and should therefore be deprived of their votes, but that every indigent, and every employee of the Ontario Government should be accorded the right of voting. As has been pointed out by the leader of the Opposition, there is no pressing necessity to-day in this country for the passing of the Franchise Act. There cannot in all probability be a general election for some three or four more years, and in the meantime let the provinces endeavour to meet the Dominion Government in a fair and just way. Let the provinces say: We will endeavour to assimilate our different franchises for the Dominion.

I know, Sir, that in the constituency which I represent, there has not been one moment's peace lost over the question of the franchise, and there have not been many moments' sleep lost over the Manitoba school question, but I tell the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, that there are hundreds of men there waiting with expectant ears to know what their employers are going to do in the coming summer. I tell the hon. gentlemen opposite that there are men whose capital is lying dormant, and that there are large saw-mills there which are not being placed in order for the coming season, and why? It is because the owners of that property do not know what this Government propose to do in the matter of the tariff. There are interests of different and diverse kinds in that constituency, and all along the line they are waiting with bated breath to know what this Government proposes to do with its fiscal policy. These industries in my riding have not been treated as the coal industry has been treated in the province of Nova Scotia. They have not been informed that their industry is not to be touched. There has been no intimation given to them, as apparently intimations have been given to others engaged in different lines of commerce and trade. In all seriousness and

soberness I do say that in that northern country there are expectant men waiting to hear what the tariff policy of this Government is to be. Why should the Government intervene and place as a buffer to the tariff announcement for the next twenty days the consideration of the franchise in this House. The franchise is not a matter of concern to the country, but the question of machinery being set in running order, and busy hives of industry being allowed to proceed as they were some years ago is a matter of the very deepest and gravest interest to our people. I trust that the Opposition will do their duty. I trust that they will insist upon their right to demand that the Government shall bring down their Tariff Bill at the earliest possible day, and so redeem the pledge given by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) a few days ago: that within one week after the meeting of the House the Government policy would be announced on the tariff question.

It would be a lack of loyalty on my part, Mr. Speaker, were I to neglect making a passing reference to that clause in the address which relates to the approaching Jubilee celebration of Her Glorious Majesty Queen Victoria. In this, which is I believe the greatest colony of the greatest Empire that the sun ever shone upon, we enjoy every right and every privilege that free men should enjoy, and the enjoyment of these rights and privileges is in the main due to the fact, that for sixty years Britain has been graced with a sovereign who has been kind to the faults of her people and tolerant in every way. And if Queen Victoria is a woman and only a woman, I believe that to her wise counsel and her sagacious judgment is due the avoidance of many difficulties and dangers which have arisen. I believe that I echo the sentiment that goes up from every Canadian heart when I say, that while we cannot hope to see Her Most Gracious Majesty for many more years sitting on Britain's throne, still we hope that those who come after to rule the Empire, may be to Canadians and to the people of the whole British domain what she has been, a good, a wise and a grand sovereign.

Motion agreed to, and, on a division, debate adjourned.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.30

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 2nd April, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CONTROVERTED ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received from two of the Judges selected for the trial of election petitions, pursuant to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, a certificate and report relating to the election for the electoral district of the city of Winnipeg, by which the said election is declared void.

Mr. SPEAKER also informed the House that in conformity with chapter 9, section 46 of the Revised Statutes, he had issued his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Mr. Speaker, I hope it will not be considered as simply using a trite saying when I state that I did not expect to speak on this question. As a matter of fact it is true, and I would not have spoken except for the extraordinary character the debate has assumed. Of course it might be expected, it always is expected that the attack made on the Government of the day by the Opposition will be in part direct at the opening of the session; but I am sure that not even the followers of the leader of the Opposition himself were prepared for so varied a bill of fare as that presented to the House. It is said among military men that one who is good in leading a charge is a poor man in resisting an attack. If anything could be more true of the condition presented in this House than that, I should like to learn it, for after all we have had speakers presenting a change of opinion since hon. gentlemen opposite came here at the opening of the present session. On the second day this House met we had and we expected to have considerable discussion about the Manitoba school question, and it was all clearly on the line of attacking the Government for not having gone far enough. But not many days elapsed before, from almost every part of the other side of the House, hon. gentlemen who rose to speak changed the whole character of the debate and the whole na-

ture of the position occupied by hon. gentlemen opposite. I read in the Conservative newspapers that the party held a caucus, and the fact was most suggestive that at the caucus the Manitoba school question was not mentioned. Why, then, is it mentioned in the House? That is what I should like to learn. Those hon. gentlemen had not the pluck in caucus, from fear of their followers, to mention it, but they seek to pretend before the country that they are still in favour of continuing the agitation, and so they speak of the question in the House. We can easily understand the character of this attack when we go back just one year. It will be within your remembrance, Mr. Speaker, and the remembrance of some other hon. gentlemen who had the honour of holding seats in the last Parliament that when the Remedial Bill was brought down, the leader of the Government spoke on that question with tremendous earnestness. The words are memorable. He was here to push the Bill; he was here to stand by the Bill; he was here to press the Bill to a final conclusion, and if necessary, physically or otherwise, he was ready to die in his place in order that the Bill might become law. It is a very curious fact that the change has been so suddenly made. I was led to believe that truth was truth on all occasions. Why, the poet, if he had foreseen the conduct of the Conservative party, would never have written these words:

Truth crushed to earth will rise again.

Truth has been crushed to earth and so far as the Conservative party is concerned it does not seem to rise again. If the position taken by the late Government on the Manitoba school question was correct, then they must accept either of the two horns of the dilemma; either they were not honest in the past or they are cowards now. If they were sincere in proclaiming the eternal principle of justice for the minority as they viewed it, what has taken place to change that eternal principle during the last twelve months? Should the action of the present Government have changed their views as to the principle, if they were sincere in upholding that principle? Has the action of the Government made that right which was before wrong, or made that wrong which was before right. I never saw such a sad spectacle in my life as that presented by the Opposition in this House. I remember the time when these hon. gentlemen were in power, and when every measure they brought forward was cheered to the echo. Whether they proposed to lower the duties or whether they proposed to increase the duties, or whether they proposed measures against the Catholics or in favour of the Catholics, they all cheered together in the one common purpose and the one hope of reward. Sir, do they cheer together now? Oh, no. I notice that the versatile member for West York (Mr. Wallace) has only a certain cheerful element in his composition, and I notice also that when the brilliant member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Quinn) speaks there are certain men in his own party who do not cheer him. The cheers are divided now. The Opposition members are few enough, goodness knows, and they could hardly give a decent cheer if they were united, but when they cannot get a combined cheer, how dreary and saddening must be their efforts at enthusiasm? Let us contrast for a moment some members on the other side of the House, one with the other. There for example is the member for Terrebonne (Mr. Chauvin) and he has for a confrere the member for West York (Mr. Wallace), and there too is the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) seated beside the versatile member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes). Montreal Centre (Mr. Quinn) is opposed by East Durham (Mr. Craig), and Kent (Mr. McInerney) is in direct antagonism to Centre Toronto (Mr. Clarke). And the same contrast which members of this party exhibit in the House is presented to the country outside. In Champlain the Government are to be condemned for not doing enough, and in Colchester they are to be upheld. In Champlain county certain auxiliaries of the Conservative party divide the world into two classes: the blessed and the accursed, and of course the Conservatives are the blessed and the Liberals the accursed. The divided action of the Opposition may be very pleasant for themselves just now, but I forewarn them of the dire consequences hereafter. In Champlain, as I have said, the Government are being condemned for not doing justice to the minority, while Mr. Muir the Conservative candidate in Colchester declares that the Manitoba school question is settled, and that he will oppose any government who will attempt to bring it up again. Where is the consistency there? Where, oh where is the compact Conservative party? Where did their disintegration begin and where is it going to end? I commend this sad spectacle of inconsistency to hon. gentlemen opposite who say that the Government have not done enough for the Catholic minority, and to the bishops behind them. Some of those hon. gentlemen blame the Government for doing too much and others blame the Government for not doing enough. What do their lordships the bishops think of that? The truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the Conservative party who having placed themselves on the shoulders of the prelates, having found they could not carry them into power, now turn around and proclaim a new and entirely different policy for the next four or five years. That conduct is worthy of the party that prepared one set of facts for Protestant electors in Ontario and another set of facts for Roman

Catholic electors in Quebec. They found that the ecclesiastical authorities were not able to keep them in power, and so they turn round and try to curry favour with, and obtain the assistance of the very opposite elements in the community. Again, some hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken have proclaimed that they do not wish to disturb the school settlement, but professing toryism as consonant with their constitution, they are not generous enough to say like men: we commend the Government for the action they have taken. The member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke) while he said that he was not going to vote against the Government, and thus gave a tip to his leader that he had better drop the Manitoba school agitation, announced at the same time that the Government were bringing out here a papal ablegate, and he sought to censure the Government for doing that. Now, it is well known that the Government have nothing whatever to do with that matter, and why is the question brought up in this House? As it is brought before us we have to meet it. I was somewhat edified by what one hon. gentleman said in answer to the charge that Archbishop Taché was sent for by the Conservative party. His excuse was, that Archbishop Taché was a British subject, and the inference from his remarks is that the Pope might lawfully send a British subject to Canada with the identical message that he sent by an Italian or a Frenchman, and it was all right if the British subject carried it. The nationality of the messenger appeared to be everything in his eye, but the message itself seems to be of no importance whatever to him. These hon. gentlemen to be consistent would not listen to a single word of revelation if it came from an Italian or a Frenchman, but if it came from a British subject they would accept it as gospel. How ridiculous it is to contend that the channel of communication is the all-important thing, and that the communication itself is of no consequence whatever. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, it makes very little difference who brings the message, if the message is a proper one to be brought. I was very much pleased with the lucid explanation given by my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Maxwell) upon that question yesterday. We both belong to the only church in this world that has representative government in every part of its organization, and as it is republican in its very essence its members have every recourse for the redress of grievances. The humblest man in the congregation has an appeal to the session, and then to the presbytery, and then to the synod, and from the synod to the representatives of the whole church throughout the country in the general assembly. His appeal is subject to the condition that every clergyman is met there by his peer, a layman, who sits in judgment not only on the laymen but on the clergyman himself. Now, if I took an appeal from one court to another, and the matter was brought up here in Parliament would it be said that the state was injured? If it should happen that a General Assembly—an assembly like the Ecumenical Council, over the whole Presbyterian Church in the world—met outside of the British realm, and I took my appeal there, would hon. gentlemen opposite say that that was wrong? By no means. I went through the various avenues of spiritual authority, until I found in the end where the matter was decided. Now, we have nothing to do with this appeal to the Pope, and it ought not to have been brought up here. But, as it has been brought up, instead of saying a single word against that petition or against the action of our French Catholic friends in the matter, the man on the other side should blush who on gala day talks about Catholic aggression, without having in his heart the kindliest feelings towards those who have been asserting their rights, and under an authority that will see that those rights are granted. It is very easy within the four walls of a lodge room to speak about Papal aggression; it is very easy on gala days, under the shade of the trees, while the sun is shining and flags are flying, to talk about Papal aggression; but it is neither manly nor the part of good citizenship to do so when men are effectually working and fighting for their rights in a way that should receive every man's commendation. But hon. gentlemen opposite never learned that generosity. They must have a fling at these men by raising the cry, "Look out, you are in danger; Rome has spoken." Now, as I say, we have nothing whatever to do with that petition. I have read a little Catholic theology, and if I interpret correctly the spirit of that theology, it will be found that the action and conduct of the clergymen of whom these gentlemen complain will receive no sympathy from that church's highest and best utterances.

But hon. gentlemen opposite say, Manitoba did too much. It is neither your business nor mine, nor the business of any member of this House what Manitoba has done. I care not if Manitoba gave separate schools to every denomination in the province; that is their business. My objection to the coercion Bill was that we in this House proposed to step in and dictate to a noble province what it should do in this respect. I believe, speaking modestly, that our fathers erred as to the true temper of the people of Canada, when with fear and trembling they made it constitutional that in certain provinces there should be separate schools. I do not say that separate schools may not be right—I think differently—or that certain people should not have the right to have separate schools; but I am ready here and now to vote that the pro-

vince of Quebec shall have just such kind of schools as she likes. I am not going to stand up here as a Protestant and dictate what kind of schools any province shall have. I say that as a sister province in this confederation, Quebec should have the kind of schools it likes, because I know that the various provinces will counterpoise each other in that respect. Is not the fact that Mr. Greenway has expressed his desire that the law shall be carried out in the best possible manner, the highest guarantee that our Catholic fellow-citizens in Manitoba can have the right done?

I remember that one of the things hon. gentlemen opposite said last year was that once the remedial order had passed, it was out of the hands of the Government. No hon. gentleman has hinted now that the legislation has passed the Manitoba legislature, the matter is out of the hands of this Government. I believe it is; but I call attention again to the manly spectacle presented by this discussion lasting six days in this House, although there is neither a leader nor a follower on the other side who ventures to move a resolution on the subject. Only yesterday Sir Charles Tupper was ready to bleed and die for the Remedial Bill, and called for the reverence of his followers for it. Now, none so base or low as to do it reverence. One year has made the great change. Where are those who pledged their faith to carry it through? and where are those who have been duped into the idea that it was alone for religious and moral purposes they took their political lives in their hands? They have learned that the whole scheme was to get the votes of our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens; and now, that scheme having failed, they will go on the other tack, and say that the Pope has sent out a delegate to settle the question, and that what he does by another he does himself. I can almost fancy them fearing that the delegate has brought from the Pope a neck-tie or something else that is Popish. I care not, speaking politically, what he has come here for. But every member of this House is interested to see what the outcome shall be for a people composed as we are of various nationalities, languages and religions, and evolved from its best growth.

The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) last night called on the Government to bring in a Bill to impose pains and penalties upon the priests and bishops of Quebec, and he said he would support it. I think I can see a Bill like that introduced into this House. Then you would hear talk about our bringing in legislation against the clergy, and there is not a real Tory from one end of this country to the other, side, whether he be Protestant, Catholic, or Pagan, who would not be found yelling from one end of the country to the other, "Look at the blow they are striking at the Catholic Church." Sir, having these various nationalities, languages and religions in Canada, we must have this growth. Just as the Bill brought down by the leader of the Opposition would have failed signally in accomplishing that which is best for this country, so any attempt to legislate against any church and to say what shall be done by that church would signally fail. Does the hon. gentleman honestly think that this Parliament ought to pass such legislation? Or is it suggested for the purpose of carrying out a scheme which is back of it, to use both forces for party advantage? It does seem to me that what we have heard both in this House and out of it for the last five years has sadly changed, when we recall the shouts that went up and the cheers that rung in these galleries as we heard the Conservative party boast of being the bold pioneers of all progress, who never went back on their word; and when we see them to-day with drooping heads and almost tearful eyes, each one in his own way playing his part in this little scheme—each one telling the Government, we must vote against you because you did wrong—one saying that they went too far, and another that they did not go far enough—because they find that the better sense of Canada is in favour of the action of the Government. A sorrier spectacle was never presented in a free country. I know not what they ought to do; I will not give them an opinion as to that; but I know that there is not much of the spirit of the race to which I belong in the leaders on the other side of the House, or they would "die game," to use a common expression.

Coming to a few of the utterances of these hon. gentlemen, I wish to speak about my good friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) who addressed us last night just before the House adjourned. He rose to speak about the signal triumph that he had achieved over the combined forces of the Liberal party in East Simcoe. I may feel pleased to think that a young man of promise like my hon. friend did achieve success, and I attribute it to his personal ability and popularity, and because he had to fight a man who, owing to his age, was unable to cope with him in any way. But then I have a shrewd suspicion that the strongest element at his back, all the time, was his vote against the late Government on the school question. So I can imagine Protestants, Tory and Liberal, saying that the man who took his life in his hands when he opposed his Government deserved success. But as I saw him rise and heard him describe his signal victory, I could not help saying to myself: how lonely! He could look nowhere to the right or the left, or the front and find a companion that had come back from the brush of battle. He stood there like the "pelican of the wilderness," or "the owl of the desert," or "the sparrow now alone on the housetop." And I thought perhaps that while, owing to this circum-

stance, a little self-glorification was pardonable as showing his individual power to do what he did and what so many others failed to do, he was very cruel on the men who had fallen in the struggle elsewhere and whom public opinion had prevented from assisting him in this House. Let us see whether what the hon. gentleman said bears that out. I have spoken about one matter to which he referred, namely, that it was wrong for Manitoba to make concessions. If my views are correct, it was not wrong for Manitoba to make any concession, but rather Manitoba had a perfect right to make all the concessions she liked. Every one of these hon. gentlemen opposite who spoke, whether he voted for or against the Remedial Bill, pitched his conclusion in the same key, and I could not help thinking how the cheerful member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) felt with the hon. member for North York (Mr. Wallace) in front of him, who was down on anything like concessions, and with the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) who was equally opposed to any yielding on the part of Manitoba, behind him. I should like to see the real physical results that ought to be produced by these men embracing one another as being engaged in so good and holy a cause. I should like to see, for example, the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder) who thundered against concession, who felt that the honour and dignity of the country was blighted because a Papal delegate had come to our shores, get down beside the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Quinn) and kindly say to him : " My brother, one in sympathy, one in purpose, one for all that makes for Canada—true, you and I do not think alike ; oh, no—but in the mainsprings of our actions and in the heart-throbbings of our religious opinions, let us unite for the glorious purpose of assisting the Conservative party. You, in your home, will tell these priests : Well, they have to say something on account of their constituencies, but remember that in order to defeat the Liberals—the foes of all that is good and progressive in this country—we should forget a little of our differences and join together." And then I can hear the hon. member for Montreal reply : " You are a man after my own heart ; I was just thinking the same thing. Oh, my good brother, may the Lord bless you in your good works, and when I read the speeches you make elsewhere, I shall wink the other eye to my clergymen, and say it is all for the good cause." Then the hon. member for Welland (Mr. McCleary) can find a friend here who will willingly take him to his heart, with all the aspirations of a fond mother—let him come and sit beside the placid, kindly, good-natured, rubicund member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière), who has been struggling with this Manitoba school question ever since I came into this House and during the whole time his friends were in power, and who went just as far as they let him to make a pretense of doing something for the minority in Manitoba. They, too, will discover that they were a model pair in this noble work of union for the common good, and, after all is said and done, will agree that, in the main, they have one purpose at least, and that purpose they will follow. Why, I was more than surprised when the hon. member for Welland spoke about the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton). The whole burden of his song seemed to be that Mr. Sifton had said so and so at another time. Did that affect the question ? What even a man may have been reported to have said at one time or another—and newspaper reports are so varied and conflicting—does not affect the real question of what was done. What sensible men are concerned with is the result. Why, we have been a week here talking about questions that inevitably must come up again for discussion. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) said that all the mills were idle pending our legislation on the tariff. Why should we not go to business ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I hear my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) say " hear, hear," yet he was so very anxious to speak last night that he could not wait. He was bursting last night with eagerness to speak, and appeared as if he could not contain himself but had to do so there and then. And since these hon. gentlemen persist in their attacks, we are perforce bound to reply or be subjected to the taunt that we are unable to answer. But why has there been all this delay ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I again hear my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) says " hear, hear." The hon. gentleman is still a lone bird on the housetop, and he feels it all the time. There is another hon. gentleman to whom I must pay a little attention, and I am sorry he is not in his place, the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes). I will preface what I propose to say in regard to him, by a reminiscence of an incident in that hon. gentleman's career. Some eight or nine years ago, the city of Toronto was all ablaze with glory to welcome the triumphant return of the Grand Old Man, Sir Oliver Mowat. He had won the battle of his native province, and Toronto the good, irrespective of party, turned out to give him a royal welcome. It was a gala day, men left their business, mothers left their homes and brought their children to do honour to the Grand Old Man. Among those who were particularly conspicuous on that occasion was the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes). All down King Street, on a caparisoned white horse, he rode, carrying a flag, and

what do you suppose was written on that flag ?

Mr. BENNETT. Business is business.

Mr. FRASER. The hon. gentleman again is wrong. There was written on it, "Mowat and victory for ever." And as the hon. gentleman waved that flag over the heads of the people, he felt that he was a prominent figure, indeed, in a grand event. But that was not all. He got tired of that particular flag, he got tired of Mowat and Victory, that was only one phase of the pulsation of his feelings, and as he came to Yonge Street, he changed his banner, he grasped another from one of the promenaders in the procession, and waved that aloft, and what do you suppose was written on the second flag. "Business is business"—oh, no, "Down with Tupper and corruption." Did his honoured leader at that time fill up the measure of his iniquity and corruption ? Does the inscription on that flag still represent the opinion the member for North Victoria entertains concerning the hon. leader of the Opposition ? I understand that the hon. member for North Victoria is taking lessons in penmanship. At present he does not seem to know the difference between a small letter and a capital, and, in case he should make a mistake he writes "Roman Catholic" with a small "r." Any one can find that by consulting the columns of his paper. Not later than January last he had something to say about his leader. Listen. In an article in which he criticises both parties—for, of course, he is above all considerations of party—he says :

> The roman catholic bishops are very clever politicians, but in the present case, their plans are too specious.

An hon. MEMBER. What paper is that ?

Mr. FRASER. I am quoting from the Victoria "Warder" of January 1st :

> Mark you, gentle reader, we do not condemn them.

Now, this is really very kind to the bishops, Now, here is the hon. gentleman's opinion of his leaders :

> The green, gaping-mouthed Tory leaders who put their necks into the noose without having any means of saving themselves.

That was his opinion of them then. When did his conversion take place ? Eight years ago "corruptionist" was the word he used, but now he applies a term I would not begin to use concerning the distinguished Nova Scotian (Sir Charles Tupper) who now finds it necessary to leave the room. "Green, gaping-mouthed Tory leaders." Whatever we may say as to their gaping the term "green" is not applicable. Who would ever think of talking of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) as "green" ? Neither does he gape, except at times when the hour is late. This may, perhaps, have reference to the year when the Remedial Bill was before this House, for I have often seen the leader of hon. gentlemen opposite gaping and afterwards going away to sleep, leaving his poor deluded followers to fight it out all night. The hon. member for North Victoria, whose newspaper I have just quoted, feels himself justified in denouncing everybody in connection with the Liberal party because of what has been done regarding the Manitoba school question. I trust that his lessons in penmanship will lead him further, and that also, while he is learning he will learn that such attacks as this that I have read should not be made upon opponents, much less upon his leader. Does any man in his senses suppose that in writing in that way he is going to overcome the effects of his own acts ? What can he think of his constituency ? No more than the hon. member for St. Anne's (Mr. Quinn) thought about the greatest Catholic paper in the world, published in the interests of the Catholics when he hinted that the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) has so far overcome the "Tablet" as to induce it to write that which is not correct. I have no such opinion of the "Tablet." Although it does not represent my views, I know that it has a reputation, and rightly so, as a power among its own readers. I think it ill-became the hon. gentleman as a member of this House—and he will pardon me for saying that much—to speak about the "Tablet" as he did. Even if the Solicitor General thought of doing such a thing as he suggests, what reason does he give us to believe that the "Tablet" could be imposed upon ? Such a suggestion was irreligious. If he were a Liberal, he would be read out of all the churches tomorrow. Such conduct in the Liberals would have to be wiped out—wiped out, more, burned out. The hon. member for North Victoria talks about the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) and his action in the late by-elections. I understood that metaphorically and in fact the hon. member for North Victoria had received a black eye in that county. I suppose he is still smarting under the mental shock and physical strain, and so felt that he must say something against the Postmaster General. Mr. Speaker, the facts are plain so that he who runneth may read, and the lesson they teach is equally plain. That lesson is that no party can live on its past in this Canada of ours, for there is here a far stronger body of sound public opinion than gentlemen opposite thought. But they pitch their tents in the graveyards of dead issues and the people of Canada would have none of them. I rejoice that there was in this people of Canada a determination to show not only that they were ready to treat men fairly and well, but that they had in them the citizenship that makes for and is capable of self-government. I fear not for the future of this Dominion. I care not now what ques-

tion may arise—we have laid deep the foundations, and in any difficulties of the future, when we are inclined to feel that public sentiment is unresponsive, we can gain inspiration for the struggle in the spirit that sent heavenward the cheers that rose throughout the Dominion on the 23rd of June. The people of Canada showed that, different though they were in race and religion, they had a common aim and purpose—not for them the narrowness that has only a glimpse of the hill-top, but the glorious light of unity and freedom upon the mountain peak. I can tell hon. gentlemen opposite—they may not take my advice, they will not take my advice, no doubt——

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FRASER. "Hear, hear" says the hon. gentleman. Let the lone sparrow on the house-top say "Hear, hear." But, whether I be a prophet or not, let me tell hon. gentlemen opposite that I believe the people of Canada are ready to give again the verdict they gave on the 23rd June, and that, if hon. gentlemen think that by keeping before the people this skeleton of an issue which is now seen to be used merely for Tory purposes, they will make the biggest mistake ever made by a party in this world. Hon. gentlemen speak of our French friends. I have only to say, that, in my opinion, last year the laymen among our Roman Catholic friends in Canada did more to lay the foundation of the nation's greatness than all the clergymen of all the denominations who are Tories first and Christians afterwards.

In the Speech from the Throne there is much that gives me pleasure. We are here assured that the plebiscite will be taken. The declaration in favour of a plebiscite was put in the Liberal platform, and Liberals understood that that pledge would be carried out. The question of restraining the liquor traffic is not a party question, and I am sure that hon. gentlemen opposite who are in sympathy with the principle of prohibition will declare with gentlemen on this side in favour of giving the people an untrammelled vote upon this great question. Then there is the question of the canals. I think last night some hon. gentleman, I forget whom, said something about spending money on the canals. Why, if I remember right, we have spent some forty-six or forty-eight million dollars on the canals, and they are not good now. Now, Mr. Speaker, the people of this country draw a distinction between an expenditure by the Conservative party and an expenditure by the Liberal party; they are not afraid of expenditure if it is made honestly and for good purposes. But what the people object to is that one dollar of money should go into anything else except the purpose for which it was voted. I am not afraid that a country with such vast resources as we have, if the money is honestly expended, will not reap the benefit from it. Then we have the Franchise Act. My good friend, of whom I have spoken, and with whom I have had such pleasant relations in this House, is ready to stay six weeks, nay, six months, lest the franchise should be touched. He will not need to stay that long, and the franchise will be changed. He will find that that matter is one that must be taken up in this House, and must be carried out. Of the tariff, I will say nothing.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FRASER. I just wanted you to say that. I think it very unbecoming for hon. gentlemen opposite to say a word about the tariff, for this reason: When the tariff is brought down, I shall discuss it as freely and as fully as if it were brought down by the Conservatives; but until it is brought down, it is exceedingly unseemly to anticipate what may never happen. If the position of the hon. gentleman and his friends is correct, we have all become protectionists. It is paeans of praise they should be sending up instead of denunciations of the Liberal party. Surely you should rejoice in the repentance of a sinner; and if we come to your views, and you always said they were for the good of the country, should you not be pleased? But still they denounce us for having made any change in the tariff. I tell hon. gentlemen opposite that there is not at all the lingering disquiet in this country that they speak about in regard to the tariff. The people of this country understand exactly that the tariff question is in the hands of a government who will do their best under all circumstances. But in the name of common decency let us wait until we see the tariff before we attack it. There are hon. gentlemen who speak on this tariff in this way, and whose views will be heard by men who are really so beclouded in their party allegiance that they may think there is some foundation for it. That is the disturbing element. Leave it alone until such times as it comes down, and the people of this country are, I am sure, confident that it will be all right. We shall then approach it as sensible men on sensible principles, and decide it as we ought. One word more, and I am done. I am sure we all join hands upon the auspicious occasion of this sixtieth anniversary of our glorious sovereign's reign. The hon. member for Welland (Mr. McCleary) hinted that we were loyal now perforce, and he was glad of it. Of course, he is glad of any force. Force is the only element known to his nature, and he is glad to find that people are made loyal by force. We did not need to be continually talking of our loyalty, and except for this supreme occasion, there would be no need to speak of it now. The people of this country, universally, are loyal to the core. His leader said so after he came from

England before the last election, and the hon. gentleman should have learned a lesson in respect from his leader. The truth of the matter is that it is gall and wormwood for them to know that the country is governed by the Liberal party in this bright year especially, which is the sixtieth anniversary of a Queen who rules the greatest country of ancient or modern times, a year in which Canada will send, as her contribution to help to swell the anniversary chorus, a Liberal as Premier of this country. Glad am I, also, that this contribution comes from Canada in the shape of a French Canadian; glad am I because nothing will show to the nations how united we are in purpose, and how anxious we are that everything that is bright shall prevail in our country. Our Premier needs no apology because he is a French Canadian, for long ago when the Liberals were in a minority, they sought, not a man who was of the majority, but the man who was best fitted to fill the place. I have said, Mr. Speaker, in this House before, and I repeat it, that Sir John Thompson never could have been Premier of Canada until the Liberals chose Mr. Laurier as their leader when they were in Opposition. His appointment paved the way for that. The fight was against Mr. Laurier in the English-speaking sections of this Dominion in the last election. I remember one man who spoke very hardly about French influence and all that, and on the 23rd of June, as the story of the country's revolution was flashed over the Dominion, he found they were in the minority. He had a good deal of shrewd Scotch sense about him, and he felt so bad that he did what no other Scotchman ever did, he went off and partook of a little liquid. Finding him on the street in this rather happy condition, he said that which was philosophical, and that which the leaders of the Conservative party ought to have remembered long before they touched the Remedial Bill. Said he: "If we had known the Frenchmen did not want the cursed Bill, we would not be forcing it on them." Mr. Speaker, on the whole I felt that he was a better leader than the gentleman who was leading the Conservative party. But be that as it may, this state of things exists. Now, it is said that the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition are going to be knighted. I will not say anything about that, because I grant no titles myself, and I cannot speak with any degree of certainty as to others. But I make an humble suggestion, that if the leader of the Government be raised to the peerage, it shall be under the name of Lord Pax. Pax vobiscum in Canada. As to the leader of the Conservative side I suggest that he be called—and I shall not leave the name to the English, or the Irish, or the Scotch, or any other language, I shall still use that language which was used in ancient times, and I would designate the leader of the Opposition as Lord Avena. Some gentlemen may not know what that means; I have no doubt about that. During his election in the county of Cape Breton he helped, so great and swelling was his heart —or rather his friends did—the poor people in that county with two cars of oats. Now, Lord Avena would be a very good title for him at the present time. But whatever title they get, whether Pax for the leader of this Government, or Avena for the leader of the Opposition, or whether neither of them gets a title, it will make no difference in the sentiments of the people of Canada.

Now, Sir, I cannot help saying one word, in connection with this glorious year, about the conduct of our neighbours to the south of us, but if they think they can get on without us, my answer is, I am sure we can get on without them. I want the closest trade relations to exist between us. But I feel this one thing, Mr. Speaker, in this jubilee year, that here we have a nation in many respects more distinctly British than many of the people in the British Isles. The majority of the people of Canada probably never had the good fortune to see our beloved Sovereign, and if I would not be considered profane, I would say, "Who not having seen, they loved." I am sure the sentiment of Canada is this, that whether peace prevails or not, God helping us, as we hope He will, the Canadian people will be a unit in their attachment, not to the Queen as a woman, though that is a strong feeling of attachment, but to the grand central idea of all that the consolidation of this mighty Empire means, with its privileges, its purposes and its results, and that Canada will be found one with the Empire. Sir, in this year we will send to England an envoy. I commiserate hon. gentlemen opposite in not being able to tell Her Majesty the Queen that the only loyal party in Canada is the Conservative party, but I am sure the leader of the Government will say that though they may have gone wrong, and to step aside is human, the Conservatives in this their deep tribulation, are learning the lesson necessary for them, and out of the fiery furnace, involving the loss of office and of supplies, they will in years to come arise, purified and better qualified to be subjects of our Queen.

Mr. QUINN. I wish to direct your attention, Mr. Speaker, to a misstatement made by the hon. gentleman in regard to remarks made by me with respect to the London "Tablet." I did not wish to interrupt his fine periods at the moment; but I could not remember having said what he attributed to me. I hold in my hand the report of my remarks in which I made reference to the "Tablet." My characterization of the "Tablet" was as follows:—

Well, with regard to the somebody who followed him I have here a very interesting article in the London "Tablet," a leading Roman Catholic newspaper, which, I think, will be very instructive to the House, and certainly of great interest to the members of the Government if they will only bear with me while I read a portion of it.

My next reference, and the only reference thereafter I made to the "Tablet" was as follows :—

Now, I wish to draw the particular attention of the hon. the Solicitor General to this article, as I understand—probably I have been misinformed on this point—but I understand that during his visit to England, which was merely the beginning of his trip to Rome, he made the editor of the "Tablet" his particular confidant on public questions.

My hon. friend, therefore, in stating that I had said anything derogatory to the character of the "Tablet," or intimated that it could be approached or purchased or used in any way by the Solicitor General did so, I am sure, under misapprehension. But it was one which I could not allow the House or the country to remain under for any length of time as regards my statement in regard to that newspaper.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I made no reference to what the hon. gentleman said when he delivered his speech. My reference was to an interruption made by him in the course of the speech delivered by another hon. member, and I answered at once by saying, "Could it be bought ?"

Mr. McNEILL. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to inflict a speech upon the patience of the House. This debate has been very protracted, and it was not my intention to have taken any part in it at all, but there have been developments of late which have led me to think that if I remained altogether silent, my silence might be misconstrued. In listening to the remarks made by my hon. friend the member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) the other night, delivered with all that trenchant edge and force which are so peculiarly his own, I carried away the impression in my mind that those sentiments expressed very much my own views, except in one important particular, to which I will refer in a moment. So far as the Manitoba school question is concerned, I desire to say that I am heartily glad that that question is settled. I desire to say further that personally I regard the settlement made as the most admirable settlement that could be made. There are some details which I myself would have preferred to see altered, but in the main I regard it as an admirable settlement. I could scarcely regard it as other than a good settlement, because it is the settlement which some of us urged from our places in this House in a previous session of this Parliament. It is the settlement which was urged on the attention of the House and of the then Government by my hon. friend the late member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), with all that eloquence and that deep learning and research and that massive intellect which always commanded the attention and the admiration of this House. Therefore, I say it is naturally a settlement that I could personally approve. But that is not the question. I take it that the question is not whether this is a settlement which commends itself to individual members of this House, but the question is whether it is a settlement that is satisfactory to the province of Manitoba. From first to last I have held that the true motto was "hands off Manitoba." From first to last I have held that the best course for Canada, for the province of Quebec, for the province of Manitoba, for the minority, the wisest, the soundest, the kindest policy was to allow the province of Manitoba to manage her own educational affairs ; and therefore, so far as I am personally concerned, if the province had agreed to restore the old system of schools, the system which was in existence in 1890, and was done away by the legislation of that year, I would have bowed to the settlement however much I might have regretted the determination of the province. The question is raised from time to time and remarks are made from time to time, that this is only an instalment we are having. When that remark is made, I ask myself, "What in the world is that to us ; what have we to do with the matter, whether this is an instalment or not ?" That is a question for the people of Manitoba to determine. If there be further conditions proposed it is for the people of Manitoba to say whether or not they are satisfied with those conditions. The principle has been established once for all by the settlement that has been made that the province of Manitoba is not to be coerced by the Dominion Parliament. I take it that we have now seen the last of any attempt on the part of this House to force its will upon any province in this Dominion in reference to educational affairs. For myself, I would say, that we ought to be thankful here as a Parliament, and we ought to be thankful this Dominion over as a people, that the dangerously strained condition of affairs that existed between the central authority and one of the provinces of this Dominion, has been brought to an end. The lesson that has been taught, the lesson that has once more been instilled I hope into the mind of every member of this House, is, that the British policy of conciliation and compromise is in all such cases as this the only true and wise policy. For my part, I sincerely hope that we have done with the school question in this House for ever. I agree with the remark made by the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) when he said, that the Manitoba school question was dead and buried. It may be said that we hear a great deal about it this session, but, Sir,

that is not the Manitoba school question that we have this session ; it is only the disconsolate wailing of the ghost of the Manitoba school question. The Manitoba school question is dead so far as this Parliament is concerned ; I am perfectly satisfied on that point. And if it is dead, it was done to death in this House one year ago, by a few, a very few members, who against great odds met it face to face and fought it face to face in this House, and slew it. Some of us regretted very much the unhappy fate that placed us at that time in antagonism with the leaders of our party. We felt that we owed allegiance to the leaders of our party, but we felt that we owed a still higher allegiance to our own conscientious convictions, and to our own country, and to our plighted faith. And, when I speak of plighted faith, I wish to say this that while I differed from Sir Mackenzie Bowell, and while I differed from Sir Charles Tupper in the course they pursued and in the policy they advocated in reference to this Manitoba school question, yet there was one thing I admired. They were so far as this question was concerned, true to their plighted word. They kept public faith. And I venture to think, Sir, that far above the Manitoba school question and far above any question touching the present peace and prosperity of this young nation, towers the question of the good faith of our public men.

Rest assured, Mr. Speaker, that no permanent peace can reside within the borders, and that no permanent prosperity can come to the people of a country whose public men lightly disregard the public pledges that they have given. Now, Sir, it is not for me to judge whether or not hon. gentlemen opposite have kept faith in reference to the question which we have been considering so much for some sessions past—I mean kept faith with their friends in the province of Quebec. That is a question for the people of the province of Quebec to decide. It is for them to say whether what has been done was what they understood their leaders to promise should be done. It is for them to say whether the better terms that have been obtained—and better terms have been obtained, and I go further and say far better terms have been obtained for the minority under this settlement than could possibly have been obtained under the Remedial Bill—it is, I say, for the people of the province of Quebec to decide whether the better terms that have been obtained are the kind of better terms that they were promised, and that they were informed by their leaders would be insisted upon. To the people of the province of Quebec, and to the consciences of the gentlemen who made these pledges to their constituents in the province of Quebec I leave that question. They know what passed. I do not.

I wish now, Sir, to refer to another matter which came before this House a day or two ago, with reference to the position occupied by the Solicitor General. The hon. gentleman the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) made some strictures upon the course of the Solicitor General ; some strictures which were very strong, which were very severe, but which on the face of it did not seem to me to go beyond what was reasonable and right in view of the condition of things which was presented to us here. On the face of the documents, I thought that what was said by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) was reasonable and fair. I believe that this House ought to be jealous, very jealous of its honour, and the honour of this House of Commons is made up of the honour of its individual members. I listened very carefully to the statement made by the hon. the Solicitor General, and I think it is only right and just that I should say what I believe in regard to that matter. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) gave a certain pledge, a very strong and solemn pledge as I understand to his bishop, and that pledge was that he would support the mandement of the bishops, and further, I understand he went so far as to say that if separate schools were not provided by this Government, if a measure to establish separate schools (if that were necessary) were not brought down by this Government, he would be prepared to resign his seat. This is how that matter occurs to my mind : If I had given a pledge that I would pursue a certain course provided I obtained political support ; if the understanding was that I should pursue a certain course in Parliament provided I obtained certain political support, and if I obtained that political support I should consider that I was bound to carry out that pledge to the uttermost. But, if on the other hand, I gave a pledge that I should pursue a certain course in view of obtaining and with the understanding that I was to receive certain political support, and if I did not obtain that political support, and if in place of obtaining that political support I obtained opposition from the quarter whence I expected that support, I should not consider myself bound by that pledge. I am not speaking now as to whether or not it was advisable to give such a pledge. I am speaking on the point of personal honour, and, so far as I am concerned, under circumstances of that kind I would not consider that I was bound by the pledge. I have thought it only right that I should make this statement, because I interposed between the hon. gentleman and the House, and also because I had before I heard the hon. gentelman's explanation expressed myself outside the House in very strong terms in reference to this matter.

Now, Sir, as I have referred to the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), there is another part of his speech which I must say I thought by no means so forcible as that in which he dealt with his pledge to the bishop. I refer to what he said with

regard to the casting aside of the eminent firm of solicitors in London who had managed the affairs of Canada so ably and so successfully for forty years. The hon. gentleman told us that the relations existing between the Government and that firm of solicitors were quite satisfactory; but he added that that was no reason why we should not make a change. Now, I demur entirely to that proposition. I say that is a very strong reason why there should be no change made. If a gentleman has carried on business for me wisely and faithfully for forty years, if he knows all my affairs, if he understands all my circumstances, if he knows the relations which exist between me and other people, I say that is a very strong reason why I should not discharge him and engage some one else. I suppose it is at this point that my Conservative instincts clash with my hon. friend's Liberal instincts; but that is how I view the matter; and, laying aside altogether the sentimental aspects of the case. I say it is no light thing to tear out of a legal office in London all the business of a great country, with its many ramifications—to tear it out of the hands of those who understand it in all its details, and who have managed it with great ability and skill for forty years, and to hand it over to some other firm. I say it is a grave thing to do; it is a thing that cannot be done without some risk to the interests of the country; it is a thing which it is inconceivable should be done or could be done without a reason; and this House and the people of this country have a right to know what the reason was, and will not be satisfied to have this matter treated in the light and flippant manner in which it was treated by my hon. friend. He assigned no reason for this change; but there must have been some reason, and we have a right to know what it was. I do not know whether it has anything to do with the mission to Rome. My hon. friend could perhaps enlighten us on that matter if he were so inclined. Perhaps I would be asking too much if I asked him to inform us frankly as to that; but it so happened that it occurred at about the time the mission to Rome took place.

Now, with regard to this mission to Rome, I would like to say a word. That an appeal to the spiritual head of the church is the natural appeal in spiritual matters goes without argument. I assume that there is no reasonable man living who would suggest for one moment that it was not a right and proper thing for our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen to appeal to the spiritual head of their church in reference to purely spiritual grievances; and, if it could be shown, if, on the face of it, it appeared in any degree plausible, that that was all the mission to Rome entailed and meant, little fault, I think, could be found with it. That was what was assumed by my hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) and from his point of view he was perfectly correct—when he said he had no fault to find. But was it on purely spiritual matters? I say no. I say that the very document which was produced in this House by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) the other night demonstrates that it was not so. I should like to know how it was that that document was produced. The hon. Minister is here, and perhaps he can tell us. It was a very strange thing, the production of that document, after the strong denials which we had heard with regard to any mission to Rome, so far as the Government were concerned. I wonder if the gentleman who shrugged his shoulders when asked whether the Solicitor General had gone to Rome representing the Government and had heard it said that he had not gone in that capacity—the gentleman who asked what the Government had said in regard to the matter—I wonder if that gentleman had anything to do with the production of this document. I wonder if it was he who said that this document must be produced. I do not know, but I shrewdly suspect that it was. At all events, the production of the document, in the dramatic manner in which it was produced, was a very curious incident. Let us look at this document, and see if there is any foundation for the statement that the mission to Rome was in connection with matters purely spiritual.

We, the undersigned members of the Senate and members of the House of Commons of Canada, and representing therein the Liberal party—

I do not know whether my hon. friend who smiles so kindly upon me accepts that as a correct statement.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I heard the document read and thought it was a very excellent one.

Mr. McNEILL. Then the hon. gentleman admits that these gentlemen represent the Liberal party?

—and representing therein the Liberal party, present ourselves before Your Holiness as respectful and devoted children of Holy Church, to complain of the existence of a state of things which, if allowed to continue——

What is it that this state of things is going to do, if allowed to continue? Just listen for a moment:

—might be extremely dangerous to the constitutional liberties of this country——

Is this purely spiritual? And yet we are told that this mission to Rome had nothing to do with politics. Have the constitutional liberties of this country nothing to do with politics? You go to the Pope of Rome and ask him to defend the constitutional liberties of Canada—those liberties which are entrusted to the keeping of the Government of Canada:

—as well as to the interests of the church itself.

So that they deliberately separate these two questions in this very paragraph. They speak, in one part of the paragraph, of the constitutional liberties of the country, and in the next clause they separate that question from the question of the interests of the church itself—from matters purely spiritual. Again, in the next paragraph, we have the following :—

Your Holiness has already been made aware of the conduct and attitude of certain prelates and of certain members of the secular clergy who, during the general elections in this country, in the month of June last, intervened in a violent manner in restraint of electoral freedom——

Then these gentlemen went to the Pope and asked him to come to the protection of electoral freedom in this country. That has nothing to do, I suppose, with politics either. Hon. gentlemen may laugh, but their laughter does not, in the slightest degree, alter the facts :

—taking sides openly for the Conservative party against the Liberal party——

That is to say you invoke his aid as a party ; you, as a party, ask him to come and help you ; you, as a party, appeal to him, to begin with, and then you ask his aid for your party in your electoral contests.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. You are trying to split hairs, and you are not making a good job of it.

Mr. McNEILL. I am sorry I do not satisfy my hon. friend, the chief whip of the Government, but I do not think I could. I am not making these observations for his satisfaction at all.

—and going so far as to declare guilty of grievous sin those of the electors who would vote for the candidates of the Liberal party.

Then again, this next paragraph :

Sincerely attached to the institutions of our country, which insure to us Catholics the most complete liberty, we respectfully represent to Your Holiness that these democratic institutions under which we live, and for which Your Holiness has many times expressed sentiments of admiration and confidence, can only exist under perfect electoral freedom.

Does any hon. gentleman on the other side mean to say that that is an appeal upon purely spiritual matters ? Does any hon. gentleman who has been interrupting me venture to suggest that that is not invoking the aid of the Pope to assist the present Government to preserve political liberty and democratic institutions ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. We want civil liberty, that is all.

Mr. McNEILL. They want the Pope to come to their aid to uphold civil liberty ! I am free to say that I believe the cause of the Liberal party, as they set it forth at the beginning of the campaign in the province of Quebec, was the cause of civil and religious liberty as against ecclesiastical domination. That is how they set out their case to begin with, and I recollect very well the utterances of the hon. leader of the Government in this House when he, in tones that thrilled this chamber and stirred the pulses of many a member of the party which is opposed to him, declared that so far as he was concerned, he would not, as a politician, as one into whose hands were committed in some share the destinies of this country, submit to ecclesiastical domination. But how are the mighty fallen ? What have we seen since then ? Why, we have seen these gentlemen marshal their forces, we have seen their forces placed in battle array, we have seen their banners displayed, and heard their trumpets blown—and what happened ? Why, at the very first shot fired from the opposing batteries, which was well directed and demolished a newspaper, the whole Liberal party turned tail and ran for shelter. Where did they run to, these gentlemen who were determined to resist ecclesiastical tyranny and domination and who had taken up arms to defend civil and religious liberty ? Why, they ran to the commander-in-chief of the ecclesiastical forces, they grovelled before him and prayed him for God's sake to intervene between them and the generals and the captains of his army whom these gentlemen, in a moment of rashness, had ventured to defy. That is what they did. That is the result of this great struggle for civil and religious liberty of which we have heard so much. Can any hon. gentleman say that the result is anything else ? Why, I recollect, or else my memory very much deceives me, reading in the principal organ in Ontario of hon. gentlemen opposite, an article which distinctly implied that a measure would be brought in to defend the liberties of those who were threatened by ecclesiastical tyranny and who were suffering from ecclesiastical domination. If my memory does not deceive me, such an article was published in the "Globe." But all that was cast aside. These gentlemen did not dare do that at all. They were very brave to begin with, but at the first shot they ran away ; and in place of defending the liberties of the people of this country, which it was their duty to do, which it is the first duty of any government to do, they betrayed the liberties of the people and capitulated to the very power which they had said they were prepared to defy and whose tyranny they had taken up arms to resist. For twice three hundred years, the British people have been fighting against the interference of that power in their secular affairs. For hundreds of years governments one after another, in the mother country, have held, as a sacred trust, the duty to protect the people of those islands from ecclesiastical

domination of this kind. These hon. gentlemen opposite had that trust placed in their hands, and how have they administered it? We have learnt from the Liberal party of Canada, as was so well said by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) the other day, that the safeguards of civil and religious liberty are not to be found in the hearts of the people of this country and in the world-famous constitution under which we live, but are centred in the Vatican at Rome. And, Sir, they were not satisfied merely with invoking the aid of the Pope in the manner to which I have referred, but they get that potentate to send here a counsellor in whom he reposes trust to assist the Government of Canada to manage the political affairs of this country. And this gentleman told us in London (and stated after he came to this side of the Atlantic that he had been correctly reported), that it was not a proper thing—I do not remember the exact words—

Mr. DAVIN. Not a respectful thing.

Mr. McNEILL. Exactly—not respectful to the Pope that the free legislature of the province of Manitoba should have dealt with the school question in view of the fact that he, the Papal ablegate, was on his way to Canada. And yet hon. gentlemen would have us believe that it was a purely spiritual matter upon which they addressed themselves to His Holiness. It will be for the people to decide that question. I venture to think that when this matter has been fully considered by the people of this country they will accord to the course that has been pursued by the Liberal party in reference to it their indignant and absolute condemnation.

Mr. McMULLEN. I had no intention of addressing the House in this debate, but it has been lengthened much more than was anticipated when the Speech from the Throne was delivered. I must say that, after listening to the utterances of hon. gentlemen opposite since this debate began, and considering the manner in which they are disposed to handle this mission to Rome, I cannot but express my astonishment at their course. The attempt is made to challenge the course pursued by the Liberals in the province of Quebec. I would like to know if any man in this House is so intolerant as to deny the right of any man, no matter to what denomination he belongs, to appeal for relief from what he believes unjust treatment, to the head of his church. Everybody recognized the Pope as the head of the Catholic Church, and I thought that the right of Catholics to appeal for the redress of their grievances as Catholics to the head of their church was recognized and would not be questioned. I would like to know why it is that hon. gentlemen opposite seek to make a mountain of this molehill. They seek to make it appear that the civil rights of the people of this country have been assailed, and that, because the head of the Catholic Church has condescended in response to an appeal of some forty-five of the church's adherents in the province of Quebec, to send out an ablegate to investigate the difficulty that has arisen, and, if possible, to settle it, the rights of all the people are in danger. This difficulty is not one between Protestants and Catholics, it is not one between Liberals and Conservatives, but it is a difficulty between the heads of the church in Quebec and their own people. Now, it is said that the political rights and privileges of the Canadian people have been interfered with. I venture to say that that is not the case, for the simple reason that, notwithstanding the appeal, the wild and unjustifiable appeal, that was made to the adherents of the church in the province of Quebec, Mr. Laurier brought to this House a very substantial following. The appeal to prejudice was not successful, and it is not because they were defeated at the polls that they laid their grievances before the Holy Father. The reason they appealed to Rome was simply that they were threatened with the withdrawal of certain rights and privileges which they enjoy as members of that church. They claimed to be entitled to the full and unrestricted enjoyment of their privileges as electors of Canada, without being subjected to disabilities in the church to which they belong; and in order to settle that question, they have asked the head of the church to send out an ablegate to hear both sides and ascertain whether the appeal of the Liberals is one that would justify him in directing that the bishops should not maintain their stand on behalf of the Conservative party in Quebec, or deny the members of any other party any other rights as members of the church. I was amazed to hear the member for West York (Mr. Wallace) state that if the rights or privileges of any individual in Canada were threatened, this House was the place to secure those rights. But these people complain that they have been denied or threatened with the denial of their rights as members of the church, such as confession, burial in sacred ground, the baptism of their children, and so on, because they had voted in favour of the candidates of Mr. Laurier. I would like to know of the hon. member for West York if he will undertake to handle a Bill in this House to right that injustice. I fancy I see him introducing a Bill to secure to the Catholics of the province of Quebec their church rights, a Bill declaring that, notwithstanding that any man during his lifetime shall have voted for a candidate of the Liberal party it shall be not competent for any priest or bishop to refuse his remains burial in consecrated ground, to refuse to baptize his children, or to hear him in confession. I would like to see the hon. member press upon the House the consideration of such a Bill. They want to exercise their privileges as they please, without being threatened by the religious

authorities of their church; and the hon. gentleman says here is the place to adjust that, this House is the place where questions of that kind should be settled, and a Bill should be introduced here to secure to these people the rights they are entitled to

Mr. WALLACE. Will the hon. gentleman permit me to say what my Bill would be? It would just have one clause, making it a criminal act for any person in Canada to intimidate or threaten any elector in any way for voting as his conscience might dictate.

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend is evidently not posted, because that is the law now.

Mr. WALLACE. Then why not enforce it?

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to see my hon. friend enforce it so as to compel any priest or bishop to admit any of their adherents to confession. I would like him to enforce it so as to secure the baptism of their children. Will he do that? I would like him to enforce it so as to secure them burial in consecrated ground. Will he do that?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN Then, Sir, he will accomplish more than any other man I ever heard of.

Mr. WALLACE. That was decided in the Guibord case. The courts decided that they are entitled to be buried in consecrated ground.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman does not want it enforced. But I will tell you what is the matter. The hon. gentleman knows that a very important day, upon which he will hold a very distinguished position, is not far off. Undoubtedly he will be called upon to make an eloquent oration, and he is loading up. He has got his text now, and his friends around him have got their text, and when the day comes they will be ready with their speeches. Sir I was amazed to find the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) following in the same line; but when I came to consider that the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) and the hon. member for West Toronto are rivals for the same position, a very distinguished position I admit, I could understand what it meant. The hon. member for West York went as far as he thought was necessary in order to outline his pronounced opposition to any interference on the part of the Pope or any other person representing the Pope; and the hon. member for West Toronto went a little further. Now, if the hon. member for West York don't look out, he may lose the distinguished position he occupies, and the hon. member for West Toronto may drop into his shoes. There is a rivalry between these two gentlemen for that office, and if the member for West York don't look sharp he may possibly find himself outgeneralled. Now, Sir, I must confess that I have been ashamed at the utterances of some hon. gentlemen opposite in trying to make capital out of this question. But it is along the line of the whole course they have followed in years gone by. A few evenings ago we were reminded of the time when Sir John Macdonald sent for Bishop Taché to go up to the North-west to settle the Riel question, giving him a full commission, sending a despatch to Rome to bring him over. Hurry home, we want your assistance, we cannot settle this difficulty without you. And he was brought here, notwithstanding the fact that the Conservative Government was supported by such distinguished individuals as the hon. member for West York. Did my hon. friend from West Toronto, who conducts the "Orange Sentinel," condemn in unmeasured terms the action of Sir John A. Macdonald at that time? No, Sir, no fault was found, there was no need of it, and why? Simply because it was done in the interests of the Conservative party, that is all. It filled the breach, it accomplished the object they had in bringing him over. It seems there are two or three parties on the other side of this House. The fact is that although we have been in session for over a week, we have not yet found out how many parties there are in the House, we do not know but that there may be a fourth. That was the reason the late Minister of Inland Revenue has been mute all the time. On the one hand he has heard the hon. member for West York denouncing in unmeasured terms the church to which he belongs; and on the other hand there is sitting beside him an hon. gentleman who declares that he was ready to die in the interest of that particular denomination, and of their schools in the North-west. While he has listened to these opposing sentiments in different sections of the Chamber, he has never said a word himself on this question. No doubt he feels exceedingly awkward at being a member of the party to which he belongs. You are a wonderful party, I admit. Although we have been here for eight days, and have heard hon. gentlemen opposite speaking first from one standpoint and then from another, one getting up and denouncing the interference of the Pope, another getting up and denouncing the Government for delay in bringing down the tariff, and another getting up and denouncing the Government for some other reason. But after all, after the caucus they have held, there is not a single man of them with enough political stamina to get up and move a resolution so that we may have a decision upon this question. Now I want to give this House a little bit of information, and I would commend it to the study of the hon. member for West York. I find it in the "Queen's Quarterly,"

a magazine published by Principal Grant, of Kingston, the Principal of Queen's College. He deals with this very question regarding the right of any church to consult its head in settling any question of an ecclesiastical nature that may arise from time to time, upon which the church has a perfect right to speak. Let me read the article :

The by-elections prove that the country is determined to give Mr. Laurier's Government a fair trial, and the arrival of a delegate from Rome proves that the Pope is inclined to believe that the bishops' representations on the Manitoba schools dispute were not "the whole truth" on the matter. Every church contains reactionary as well as liberal elements, and when one tries to crush the other, there must be protests, and these may end in schism, unless there is a calm, wise and independent supreme authority. The Anglican Church would have been split into three sections in our own day, had it not been for the Royal Supremacy. Let it not be forgotten that Protestant churches in Australia and Canada have found it convenient to appeal to their mother churches for decisions regarding local policy. When the union question in Australia threatened to divide the Free Church there, deputies presented the case to the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, and its decision was accepted in the colony. So, prior to 1875, the Old Kirk in Canada asked for a decision from the Church of Scotland regarding its union policy. If independent churches, or portions of them, found it advisable to do this, how much more imperative is it for the members of a church which glories in being one body all the world over, to take a similar course ! The dispute is one with which Protestants have nothing to do, unless the decision should raise the question of who is to rule Canada. It is unlikely that the astute head of the Roman Catholic Church will do anything to force such an issue.

Now, Sir, that is from the pen of one of the most eminent Protestant divines in this country, a man who is acknowledged to be one of the ablest men presiding over educational institutions in Canada, Principal Grant, of Queen's College. Yet, contrary to these sound opinions, hon. gentlemen opposite try to raise religious strife and difficulty, try to make it appear that the Liberal party, through its representatives from the province of Quebec, are in league with the Pope of Rome, if possible to utilize existing circumstances for the benefit of their party. There is nothing of the kind. No person can take up that petition and read it carefully with an unbiassed mind and come to such a conclusion. He may extract clauses that may be construed under the narrow-minded criticism of members like the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) or North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), but such action is like many other things I have heard of before. I heard of a man who undertook to prove out of the Bible that there was no God. He took a sentence and read that portion which said "there is no God" ; but he eliminated or held back the portion which said, "The fool has said in his heart." So the hon. gentleman and his supporters can, by extracting a clause here and there and piecing together certain sentences, make it appear that the Pope was asked to interfere in behalf of the Reform party, and to interfere in matters of state in this Dominion. The hon. gentleman gave as one reason why he objected to interference by the Pope that he was a foreign potentate, that he was head of a church which had not its centre in British territory, that he was not a British subject. I should like to know if there are no other denominations the heads of which are not resident in British territory. What does the hon. gentleman say in regard to the Latter Day Saints, who have not their headquarters in Canada, but in Utah ? Would he challenge the right of members of that body to take instructions from their heads in the United States. Then we have Jews, who have the rights of citizens as well as Christians. I should like to know whether the hon. gentleman would challenge the right of Jews to take their spiritual instruction from the head of their church, who, no doubt, is in Turkish territory, who, at all events, is not within British or Canadian territory. Then there is the Reformed Episcopal Church, which had its chief seat in the United States for many years, and the hon. gentleman did not raise any objection to that church communicating with its headquarters across the line. For years delegates were sent from Canada to meet and confer and make rules and regulations regarding the rights, liberties and privileges of that particular church. No one ever thought of raising any objection to such course being followed. Then we had the Reformed Methodist Church. For years the head of the church was in the United States. Delegates were sent there from Canada to attend conferences and make regulations and orders for the general guidance of the denomination in Canada. Was any objection raised ? None whatever, because they had not a Pope, and there was no interference in politics. Then we have Greeks here. If they became numerous, perhaps it might be necessary, in order to settle disputes, that the people should appeal to the head of their church, who is the Czar of Russia. Hon. gentlemen would be surprised perhaps if the Czar was permitted, as head of the Greek Church, to lay down rules and regulations for the denomination here, of which he is the head. The only reason why a racket was kicked up over this matter was because hon. gentlemen opposite have lost the support of French Catholics in the province of Quebec. So long as those people could be kept in line, and they steadily supported the Conservative party, there was no cause for complaint. If the Pope had sent over instructions as to how the ballots were to be marked, the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), so long as the instructions were in the interest of the Conservative party, never would have raised

his voice in opposition to the proceeding; he would have allowed him to proceed, because it would have been in the interest of the party to which he belongs. But hon. gentlemen have lost that influence and that vote has left their ranks, and the French Catholics are casting in their lot, for better or for worse—I think it will be for the better, and I am sure it will be for the better in the end—with the leader of the Reform party, who is now Prime Minister, and they will give him a fair and reasonable opportunity of demonstrating his ability to conduct public affairs. That is what they are pleading for, and they have asked that a representative of the church to which they belong come here and see to it that they are guaranteed their civil rights, and also that the rights to the sacraments of their church should not be withdrawn. These are the reasons, and they are good and justifiable reasons, why the petition referred to was presented. It is stated that the Government and the Reform party are responsible for the presentation of that petition. So far as I am concerned, I knew nothing about it; but I do not for one moment condemn those who have taken such action in their own interest and in the interest of their own religion, as well as of civil liberty. Were I a Protestant placed in a similar position, if the ministers of the denomination to which I belong, which might have its head in some other country, attempted to force me, by refusing the rights of the denomination to me and my family, to vote against a certain party, I would appeal to the highest power on earth to secure to myself and family the privileges, rights and liberties which I believe every Canadian is entitled to enjoy. The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) stated that if the appeal made to Rome was to secure the French Catholics in their spiritual liberty he would have no objection to it; but the hon. gentleman failed to show there was any other intention, nor can any hon. gentleman who reads the petition through show there is anything else asked or intended to be secured on the part of the petitioners. A certain paragraph may be construed by hon. gentlemen opposite to suit themselves, but they will utterly fail in their attempt to misrepresent the meaning of the document. I am glad that the Manitoba school question is settled, and I believe that eventually the minority will admit that the settlement is advantageous and desirable. I believe that Mr. Laurier secured for his co-religionists in Manitoba all the concessions that he could secure. I believe that he was perfectly right in doing that, and I am glad also that separate schools, as a general thing, do not prevail in Manitoba. We had a report before this House a few years ago, that there were 173 schools in Manitoba with an average attendance of only seven pupils each, and to divide a small population like that into two camps for educational purposes would either make the education of the rising generation exceedingly deficient, or else it would make it very expensive. We know that this difficulty with regard to separate schools existed in regard to Nova Scotia, and that a bitter feeling prevailed there, but we know that Mr. Kenny who was a Roman Catholic representative from that province, stated in this House, that after the experience of the Catholic minority of the manner in which the common school law had been administered in Nova Scotia, the Roman Catholics in the province, if they were offered separate schools now, would not accept them. I do believe that it is the intention of Mr. Greenway and his government to administer the Manitoba school law in a liberal and generous spirit. It is the desire of every Reformer that he should do that, for there is no Reformer in the Dominion who wishes to trample upon the conscientious rights of Catholics. We want to treat our fellowmen with the greatest amount of Christian kindliness and liberality, and no man outside of the class to which the member for West York (Mr. Wallace) belongs would like to see them deprived of their rights and privileges. After that school law has been in operation in Manitoba for a few years, and when its machinery is running smoothly, I do believe that even the member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) will come to this House, and, like our old friend Mr. Kenny from Nova Scotia, he will confess that there is peace and harmony in the province, that the Manitoba Government have administered the law with liberality and tolerance, and that he was more satisfied with the existing condition of things than if there was an agitation for separate schools. I trust that the administration of the law by Mr. Greenway and his colleagues will merit that commendation from the hon. member for Provencher, and in view of the pledge given by Mr. Greenway, I believe it is his intention to carry out the law in a broad spirit.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words in regard to the tariff. We are threatened that the business of Parliament is to be stopped until the tariff resolutions are brought down, and the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) has put several questions on the subject. It is very extraordinary how the conduct of hon. gentlemen in Opposition differs from their conduct when they sat on the Treasury benches. I have in my hand the dates on which the Budget speech was delivered to the House every year since confederation, and I challenge the ex-Finance Minister to state when he ever delivered a Budget speech within one month of the opening of Parliament. In 1878, notwithstanding the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite had declared that the country was languishing, and that it was in a perishing condition, until they announced their tariff under the National Policy, Parliament was in session for one month and three days be-

fore the tariff resolutions were brought down. Only once since confederation was the Budget speech delivered within less than a month of the meeting of the House. We have been in session only one week to-day, and the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) has twice complained about the delay in submitting the tariff policy. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) must learn to possess his soul in patience. He must give to the man who now occupies the distinguished position he once held, at least reasonable time to lay the tariff resolutions before the House. He can rest assured that there will be no such delay as he was guilty of. He will have the Budget speech within a month and even if it took longer, the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) will readily be excused if he brings it down in a perfect form and has not so many clerical errors in it as had the late Finance Minister (Mr. Foster). We hope that on the present occasion there will not be a clerical error in every item, as there used to be under the old regime. We are earnestly anxious that the business of the House should be proceeded with so as to enable the hon. the leader of the Government to attend the Queen's Jubilee in England. The leader of the Opposition has intimated an earnest desire that our Premier should go to London, and we trust that hon. gentlemen opposite will act in consonance with that desire by hastening the business of the House and refraining from useless and unnecessary discussion. I say this now because I hope that when this discussion is ended we shall get down to business and push forward the work of the session. I am quite satisfied that the Government are anxious for that, and I hope hon. gentlemen opposite are also anxious for it. The ex-Minister of Finance has promised his cordial assistance, and we expect him to implement that promise, and help us to get through with the business of Parliament, so that the distinguished leader of the Government may be able to go to England and take the prominent part which it is intended he should take in connection with the celebration of Her Majesty's Jubilee in London.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to speak further on this question. I simply thought it well to make these few remarks, and I hope that we have now heard about the end of this miserable, petty challenge of the interference of the Pope, and that hon. gentlemen opposite will find something better to engage their attention. The fact that they are driven to the desperate resort of challenging the action of those gentlemen who sent that petition to Rome on behalf of their just rights and privileges as a Christian people, and the action of the Pope in sending a man out here to inquire into the matter and report, shows very clearly that the Address contains nothing that they can reasonably challenge.

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

Mr. McMULLEN.

After Recess.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I have had the honour, Mr. Speaker, of a seat in the Canadian Parliament since the day the doors of that Parliament were first opened. I have seldom troubled the House with lengthy speeches, because I was, perhaps, not competent to interest the House with a lengthy speech. At the same time I claim that I have studied the convenience of the House in not inflicting myself more frequently upon it, and, therefore, I feel that I may rise now and ask the attention of hon. gentlemen for a short time while I say what little I have to say on the subject now before us.

Having sat in this House so long, I am proud to be able to say to-night that my opinion of the happy temper of the Parliament of Canada has not deteriorated. Even looking at the debate that has taken place, irregular in many ways as it is, I am happy to say that nothing has transpired to change my view on that point, and that, while subjects are discussed and references made here which might call forth very strong and very unpleasant expressions outside, no part of this debate has been offensive to any person within or without this House.

I find a difficulty in mapping out for myself the line that I should take in this discussion. But I will try to give expression to my views as they occur to me, and, beginning at the beginning, I may refer, at the first opportunity which I have of doing so, to the fact that I find myself on this side of the House instead of on the other side. On the 23rd of June last the elections went decidedly against the party to which I have so long belonged. The Government of which I was a member was defeated in a very pronounced way. The policy of that Government was sustained as clearly and definitely as it ever was in any previous election. Two principal features of the policy of the Conservative Government in the elections in June last were: first, the general trade policy, the policy of protection to the manufacturing industries of this country; and, secondly, the observance of the constitution of this country so far as it affected the rights of the minority in Manitoba. Now, I might have some difficulty in proving that our policy on the subject of protection was endorsed by the people of this country; but I think it is not beyond even my powers to establish that fact. That policy was clearly defined and laid down and voted upon in election after election during the previous seventeen years; it is confirmed by the commission appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite, which has gone over the country to inquire into the subject; and, so far as I have been able to draw any conclusions from the evidence given before that commission, I take it for granted that the policy of protection is the policy which the Canadian people still want.

Now, with regard to the Manitoba school question, I take the ground that our policy on that question was amply sustained by the electors of this country, and I undertake to prove that assertion, in this way. Take the different provinces; take Manitoba itself, go down through Ontario and Quebec—and "en passant" in Quebec, if you take the fact that every gentleman who was elected to support the hon. leader of the Government was pledged to at least do as much for the minority of Manitoba as we were, and pledged, as a rule, to remedial legislation, if local legislation could not remedy the evil—and you will find that the verdict of the people, on this matter, has been in favour of that policy of which we were, at that time, the honest exponents.

Now, it may be said that the Liberal leader obtained the support of the people on the trade question as well as on the school question. I am not going into that inquiry. He got their support, and, having obtained that support to carry out a protective policy, I am bound in honour to give him all the support I can, in order to carry out that policy. I do not know what the tariff may be. In my own opinion, looking forward, I would be surprised if it did not turn out to be strongly protective, and, so far as I am concerned, in that respect it would be quite acceptable to me.

With regard to the Manitoba school question, I must say at once that I had hoped that the policy of the Government would have been more in accord with what I consider has been the verdict in favour of the policy we adopted, and that a reasonable settlement would have grown out of it. That brings me to the paragraph in the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, in which we are asked to say that we are pleased to learn that after negotiations, a satisfactory settlement has been made. Standing in my place here, entertaining the views I have always entertained, with the record I have made for myself, for consistency at least, in a humble sphere, I could not subscribe to the statement that that was a satisfactory settlement, nor can I subscribe to the assertion that the Manitoba school question is buried. Not at all. There is no funeral, and if it would delight hon. gentlemen to attend the funeral of that question, it will have to be a mock funeral, for there will be no corpse. That funeral cannot take place yet. That question is not settled. There has been no reference in the settlement that I can see to the grievances declared to exist by the Privy Council. There has been no reference in it to the reasonable demands of the minority, and therefore it is a very great mistake for hon. gentlemen on either side to say that this question is dead and buried. You might as well say that the constitution of the country is dead and buried. That question to-day, instead of being dead and buried, is in its full force and vigour. That question to-day is as much alive as the British North America Act itself. That question to-day, so far as the rights of the people are affected, is just as much alive as the constitution ittself, and it will last as long if not reasonably disposed of. There is but one way to bury it, so long as the minority are not restored their rights, and that is by burying the guarantees given by the constitution to minorities. There is but one way to bury the guarantees given to minorities, and that is to erase them from the constitutional Act. How can that be done? By the vote of this Parliament? No, thank God. You cannot do it by the vote of this Parliament. It can only be done by the powers that passed that Act. If any portion of the people have reason to think to-day that the fathers of confederation made a mistake when they gave these guarantees in good faith, when they pledged the honour of the country to the minorities in this country—at the demand of the Protestant majority, happily, for the Catholic minority—if they wish to say to-day that the constitution is wrong in that respect, does that give them any right to ignore the constitution? No, it does not; the constitution must be obeyed and ought to be respected while it lasts. If there is any part of the constitution that is inimical to the interests of Canada, then ask for the amendment of the constitution; and if there be good reasons for having it amended, the Imperial Parliament, no doubt, will make the amendment. Otherwise, I am sure it will not. I speak plainly on this subject because I want it clearly understood, from my point of view. There may be a number of gentlemen who differ very widely from me, but if I understand the constitution under which we live, when that little minority was deprived of its rights, when faith was broken with it, when it appealed to Parliament and its attention was called to the constitutional means by which redress should be sought, when it followed, step by step, those constitutional methods which were pointed out, when it went to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to obtain judgment, when that judgment declared that its case came within the operation of the Act of Confederation and pointed out what its grievances were and declared that an appeal lay to the Governor General in Council for a remedy, when that appeal was made, and the remedial order passed, and when that remedial order was not obeyed, then the doors of this Parliament were unlocked to that minority. Then they came to this Parliament, and the Remedial Bill was introduced by a Conservative Government and carried to a second reading successfully by a Conservative Government, with a majority of Conservatives supporting it, which majority was increased by the support of other members of the House, thus affirming the principle of the Bill. From that date, within the limits of that judgment and within the limits of the Re-

medial Order, this Parliament was seized with the legislation on that subject and no power can take it out of this Parliament. I am not going to say that this Parliament can be forced to exercise that power now. The majority of this Parliament may say it is not wise to exercise that power, as a majority may say that the minority must submit to the settlement and must not ask us to exercise that power here at all, the majority of Parliament can do as they please; but the power and, to my mind, the obligation to legislate is here, and the question is not by any means settled. The question is not by any means settled. But I am not going to argue that point. I have heard different speakers who have preceded me say that the question has not been settled and that what has been granted is an instalment. I do not like the line of argument taken by some of those who have spoken on that subject. Because, I want it clearly understood that on that question I am not speaking for party purposes or as an old Conservative, but that I am speaking as a friend of the constitution. I happen to be a Roman Catholic, an adherent of the same faith as the minority in Manitoba. But I tell you solemnly, Mr. Speaker, standing in my place as a member of this House, that were I a Protestant I would take exactly the same ground. I speak as I feel about it and I speak candidly and honestly, I do not attack the Government or any member of the Government for any expression they may have used in or out of Parliament to show the settlement is not final. I do not find fault with that. I find fault with the settlement because I have reason to know it is not satisfactory to the minority. You may talk about carrying by-elections, but outside of the one principally affected, that does not alter my opinion at all. You may tell me that the French representatives in the province of Quebec, who are as much interested in the question, so far as sympathy is concerned, as I am, are satisfied. That does not affect my position. Well, yes, it does affect because it weakens my position; but it does not change my opinion, nor does it weaken the sense of obligation I feel resting upon me as a man elected to this Parliament and sworn to carry out loyally and truly the constitution of this country. I do not think that that comes well from any of our friends because it might indicate a desire to continue an agitation for the sake of the agitation. I want it to be understood that I am not a party to that. But I blame hon. gentlemen on that side of the House, and I stated clearly and distinctly, for having used double arguments for political purposes, to defeat the Government of the day. For the same reason I condemn that policy as unworthy of honest men, I will be no party to attacking the Liberal Government on the same unworthy grounds. I have never in any political fight I have ever fought, struck below the belt. I have never met an opponent whom I was ashamed to meet again. I have never taken any stock in those double-edged weapons; there is no honesty about them, there is no good to come to the country from their use. I recognize every man's right to his convictions, but I expect to fight fairly and to be fought fairly.

I may be a little irregular in the line of my remarks but I have already prepared the House for that. Let me for a moment touch upon the subject of the mission to Rome. I touch upon that reluctantly, for I feel that too much has been said about it already. In my experience, in discussing matters in Parliament, reference is frequently made and properly made to passing incidents of which we have notice from the public press of the country. But the House of Commons has never yet, to my knowledge, settled down to a prolonged debate upon a subject without some substantial information about it. If any hon. member will rise and tell me what the mission is or why the present ablegate has come to this country, I will be prepared to discuss it if necessary. But, not knowing that, and believing that none of my fellow-members know more than I do about it, I do not see that there is room for prolonged discussion. But, as the matter has been referred to, I desire to say a word about it. I listened to the document read by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) signed by forty-five members of the House of Commons, senators, and members of the Government. The right of the hon. Minister of Public Works who, I know, signed that document and of the other Catholics who signed it, to appeal their grievance to the highest authority of their church, I do not call in question. I do not think that it is the business of anybody to interfere with them in the exercise of this right. With the reason which impelled them to make the complaint I have nothing to do. They have made a complaint, the complaint has been heard, evidently, and an inquiry is to be made into it. But I do find fault that hon. members on both sides of the House, irrespective of party, are carrying on a discussion about the substance of that complaint. I do not think it proper or delicate for members, especially from the province of Quebec, pending the inquiry, and pending the result of the visit of the distinguished Papal representative, to carry on a discussion about it. Now, with regard to an ablegate coming from Rome to this country;—well, there is no wonder in that. It does not surprise the Catholic population of the country; it need not surprise our fellow-citizens of Protestant faith. They have sufficient knowledge of the organization of our church and its discipline to understand that that may be necessary and quite proper in the interest of the church itself. I

am quite sure that any ablegate or delegate sent from Rome to Canada will acquit himself in such a manner as not to lower the dignity of the authority that sends him or his own. He comes to Canada as repre sentatives of the Papal authority have gone to the United States and other countries and returned without setting the heather on fire. So that all this tempest in a tea-pot about the ablegate coming here and what he is doing here and what will be the result of his coming here, is mere speculation. And I do not like some of the references made on this subject. For instance, it is said that he is coming here to run this country. Well, that is too old, it is too ignorant a cry to be used in the Parliament of Canada. There is no danger of it, and when I say danger of it, I do not wish to be misunderstood. There could not possibly be any danger. He would be powerless, even if he were so lacking in common sense as to believe that he could revolutionize the constitution of this country, or interfere with the rights of Her Majesty's subjects in Canada. So I think a little too much attention has been paid to that; perhaps I may be reproached with having paid too much attention to it, but I have made my reference as brief as I could. I will simply add to what I have already said upon this school question, that I am precluded from adopting the grounds taken in the complaint made by certain gentlemen in Quebec against the hierarchy, for the reason that I do not want to commit the same error—an error against good taste—that has already been committed in the House. I will go no further than to say that if I wished to discuss that matter, I could make a very strong case. I could quote several gentlemen to show that in appealing to Rome they took a very different course on a not very remote occasion. That does not affect the principle at issue at all. Now, the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) reproached me with being mute on this subject. Well, he and I differ. I have often been silent, I have never been as fond of speaking as my hon. friend. The hon. gentleman paid me a good deal of attention when I was on the other side of the House, though I am not going to make any complaint that he was unfair. But he was very attentive to me as well as to other Ministers with regard to their estimates, and with regard to the management of their departments; and I thought perhaps that he would have allowed the occasion to pass without making any reference to my being dumb. The fact is, we are a good deal in the same position. I can sympathize with him, and I expect him to sympathize with me. I am out, having been in; he is out, not having got in. Now, I want to put myself right, not only myself, but my party, and especially my party. I have been trained in the Conservative party. I was trained under the noblest leader that ever led the Government, and the hon. gentleman sitting opposite who occupies that proud position to-day, I am sure will not consider my remarks as any reflection upon him. I came to this Parliament, Sir, when it was first opened. I was not then allied with the Conservative party. I did not know anything about the Conservative party in Canadian politics. I came here against the combined influence of the Conservative party here and in my own province, and I was under no obligation to them. I allied myself with the Conservative party, not from any personal interests, but on broader grounds. I found at the head of the new Parliament and presiding over this new country, two great men, the late Sir John A. Macdonald, a Protestant, and Sir George Etienne Cartier, a distinguished Roman Catholic French Canadian. These two names will live in the history of Canada, and their memories will ever be cherished by the Canadian people. The policy of the Conservative party enunciated by these two men was a policy broad enough for every man in Canada to support, their platform was broad enough for every Canadian to stand upon. Toleration, peace and harmony, and equal rights for all classes—that was the platform of the Conservative party. It is the platform of the Conservative party to-day, I believe; if I did not, I would not be here. Now, some capital has been made against us on this side, and hon. gentlemen opposite have taunted us as being a party simply in search of votes, and without any sincerity. I resent that. When some gentleman on this side rises and says something differently from what I recognize to be the principles of the Conservative party, it is greeted on the other side with tremendous acclamation as a proof that we are a divided party. There has been no division that I know of in the Conservative party, except the division that occurred on the Manitoba school question. That division was pressed; a certain number of Conservatives could not see their way to support the policy of the Government on that question. I have no means of punishing them; I have no desire to punish them; they were free men to do as they pleased. They attacked the Government, most of them, some of them at all events, on very strong grounds, and pressed the Government as hardly as they could to a defeat—not all perhaps, but at all events on that question many of them certainly preferred to see the Government go down rather than have their policy adopted. That was their business. They are not, however, exponents of what I understand to be the platform of the Conservative party or the policy for which we have fought, and for which I hope to continue to fight. Hon. gentlemen opposite must remember to be careful about applauding them; those hon. gentlemen would not applaud me to-night. They applauded hon.

gentlemen opposite. They were allies of hon. gentlemen opposite during the Manitoba school discussion. An hon. gentleman to-day has boasted that that little band defeated the Remedial Bill. That little band could not have defeated that Bill.

Mr. WALLACE. They could try.

Mr. COSTIGAN. They could try, and I know what they could do. It was because they received efficient help that the Bill could not be carried. I, therefore, say that so far as the Conservative party is concerned, it remains just as it was before. If the Conservative party to-day should say that the constitution of this country must be a dead letter, then I am not a Conservative.

I do not want to go over the whole history of the debate on the school question; I will not be trapped into a discussion of the merits of separate schools, further than to say this, that I have always believed in separate schools, I have always believed in religious teaching in our own schools—I have no right to make a choice for other people's schools. But I lay down as a broad proposition that if you were to poll the votes of the Protestant people of Canada to-day, leaving the Catholics at home, leaving out the question of separate schools that has created a prejudice in many minds, leaving the Pope out of the question, and if you were to ask the Protestant people: Do you want schools in which religious instruction will be given or not.—I honestly believe that four-fifths of the Protestants of Canada would say: Give us religious instruction in our schools, mould the minds of the youth in that way, because from my experience I believe you would thereby bring up Protestant and Catholic children as young Christians; give them religious training when they are young and you will make better Protestant and Catholic citizens than if you send them to godless schools. That doctrine is sound, and it is acceptable to Catholics and Protestants in this country. But a cry is raised against separate schools. Mr. Speaker, that cry has no foundation from beginning to end. An hon. gentleman speaking the other night said that if it were something new to ask Parliament to force separate schools on Manitoba—and I believe this argument will have some influence on the sympathies of some Protestants—he would not support such a measure. I think that is a fair interpretation of his words. This Parliament could not be called on to interfere; it has nothing to do with deciding as to whether a province shall have separate schools or not. All we have to do is to see that the schools which were granted to Manitoba, as they were granted in Quebec to the Protestant minority and in Ontario to the Catholic minority, are maintained and respected according to the guarantee. We are not compelled to argue and prove our case that separate schools are better than common schools; we do not shrink from the argument if necessary, but it is not required. We remember the cry of coercion that went up to the effect that the Dominion was coercing the little province of Manitoba. Did it ever strike hon. gentlemen that the little province of Manitoba has been coercing the Dominion, has been violating the constitution and declaring to the people of Canada that the constitution so far as it regards that province, shall be a dead letter? That is exactly the position; constitution or no constitution, they say, you shall have no separate schools here. They will not say, of course, that we have broken that compact, that they have taken away the separate schools and will not restore them. No, they try to cloud the question, and make it appear that this country was coercing that little province and forcing on it a system of schools to please the Pope and the Roman Catholic hierarchy. When the people of this country understand the true issue, when they understand that the rights guaranteed by the constitution are being withheld, the Canadian people, irrespective of religion or nationality, will say: Keep faith with the compact, respect the constitution and carry it out. I shall be very glad to see the hon. member for Toronto West (Mr. Clarke) take that position. I know what his views are upon this question, but it would be a generous and noble position for the hon. gentleman to take. He does not believe in separate schools, but in a national school system. No one wishes to do violence to his belief, and if this was the first effort made to establish separate schools in Manitoba, I could understand the hon. gentleman saying, No, I do not believe in separate schools, and I consider that under the circumstances they will not work well. But what I would expect the hon. gentleman to say, under present conditions, would be: You have had separate schools established there; I would not have voted to give you separate schools, but I belong to the Protestant majority in this country which boasts of giving fair-play and of its willingness to give freedom to every human being, and we recognize the guarantee given in our name; we will vindicate our honour in Canada and uphold the rights that were guaranteed to you, which must not be sacrificed no matter whether I believe in separate schools or not. I do not expect to live many years to see a change that may take place similar to the change that has occurred during the past quarter of a century or even less; but if I were a young man like many I see on both sides of this House, young men beaming with intelligence, coming fresh from their constituents, some of them just entering the political arena to battle for their country and to contend for right against wrong, I should say that this settlement is an instalment and that justice will be done as surely as the sun will rise in the Heavens

to-morrow. I believe that justice will be done. I have no more to say with respect to this question, except to answer an argument used by the Minister of Public Works which staggers some people who sympathize with the minority in Manitoba. The hon. gentleman took a number of schools in Ontario where Catholic children attend and said: There are so many Catholic children attending the public schools in Ontario, and they do not establish separate schools where they have the power to do so. Do hon. gentlemen not see that after all this is a farce. I do not dispute the accuracy of the hon. gentleman's figures, for I suppose he got them from a return. Let me present to the hon. gentleman my view. If he will look a little more carefully, he will find that in many districts in Ontario the population is divided and Catholics are so situated that they can have a school under the common school system and working under the common school law, but administered so that Catholic teaching can be given as it is in separate schools, and that while it is classified as a common school, yet on account of the distribution of the population there, so far as their religious training is concerned it is to all intents and purposes as good for them as if it were purely a Catholic school attended only by Catholic children. That is one of the conveniences that in Ontario arises out of the distribution of the population, and a broad and liberal administration of the Act. The position of education in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick has been quoted by the friends of this settlement. Those who opposed remedial legislation have quoted Mr. Kenny of Nova Scotia, and they cite the New Brunswick settlement, and they tell us to look at the harmony that exists in these provinces. Well, Sir, there is no parallel in these cases to the Manitoba case. Why is there harmony in New Brunswick? In New Brunswick the minority lost their separate schools just the same as they did in Manitoba, and under about the same circumstances. The Government there swept away the separate schools which the minority thought were guaranteed them by the constitution of the country. The New Brunswick minority appealed to this Parliament, they appealed to the Supreme Court and they finally appealed to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and the verdict there was, that according to law the minority had no case. As loyal citizens of Canada the minority in New Brunswick bowed to that decision. We thought it a severe decision, we thought it deprived us of rights that we believed were guaranteed as they were guaranteed to the older provinces, but nevertheless we bowed to the judgment. We are told now by gentlemen opposite that a happy condition of things exist in that province. Why? It is because in the administration of that law which swept away separate schools, compromises had been made in some of the cities and in most of the rural districts, by which the law is so broadly administered that separate schools are carried on in purely Catholic districts. But is that a constitutional right? We had in New Brunswick an agitation for three years and an attack upon the Government led by the present Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), because these concessions were given outside of the law. That shows you the position we are in. In Nova Scotia, to the credit of the province be it said, that while our constitutional guarantee was swept away, while we had not a vestige of protection under the constitution in Nova Scotia any more than in New Brunswick, yet the law has been administered by the Government of the day in such a way that harmony prevails upon that question, and the Catholics there accept the concessions made to them for the time being. If to-morrow the administration in New Brunswick or Nova Scotia on some wave of prejudice or religious excitement were to close up every Catholic school in these provinces, is there anything in the law there or in the constitution here to prevent them from doing so, or to afford the minority any relief? Not the slightest. Then I say that while we are thankful, and while we cannot help paying a tribute to these men for their liberal treatment of the minority in their provinces, yet we are dependent solely upon their good will for any concessions given. So will Manitoba be dependent. But is it the same case? Manitoba says no. The minority in Manitoba say: We felt afraid to go into confederation without this guarantee. We felt that the majority might swamp us and that we might lose these rights. They have been swamped, and they now say: Give us that which you promised us at the time of confederation; give us that which the highest tribunal in the land declares is ours. Sir, their demand is a reasonable one. I heard a distinguished barrister in the province of Quebec quoting the judgment reciting the grievances that are found to exist, state that it is not absolutely necessary for a restoration of these rights that the law which was repealed by the Act of 1890 should be re-enacted. That is true. It is quite clear that all the grievances could be removed if the existing law of 1890 were supplemented by such legislation as would restore these rights or remove the grievances. The judgment lays down what the grievances are, and in proceeding to show how the rights of the minority might be restored, it points out two ways. One is by re-enacting the old law itself if necessary, and the other by supplementing the Act of 1890 by such legislation as will meet the wants of the case. This does not require them absolutely to re-enact the old law, and on that point there is no argument in saying, that the Catholic

children who are attending the public schools in any part of Canada is an evidence at all affecting this Manitoba case.

Of course, Sir, a great deal can always be said on the subject of clerical influence. Some people have a holy horror of the influence exercised in political matters by members of the clergy, especially clergymen of the church to which I belong. I have run a good many elections, and as a rule in my own constituency I have had a majority of the clergymen politically hostile to me. I have never made any complaint about that, and I do not complain now. I respect these gentlemen. I call on them when I visit my county, and I recognize their perfect right to oppose or support me just according as their conscience may lead them. With regard to the clergy outside of my own county, I have no hesitation in stating that the English-speaking Catholic clergymen of my own province are largely Liberal. Now, I do not see why there should be a great deal said about this matter by hon. gentlemen opposite. In the province of Quebec, I do not know what the grievances are, but I do know this: that in the election that took place on the 23rd of June last—I heard it remarked all over the country—the people were surprised, and said, "This is a snub to the clergy and hierarchy of Quebec; they have been routed; they have been defeated." I never gave the result of the election that interpretation. It appeared to me that so far as the hierarchy and clergy of Quebec were concerned, the electors adhered very strongly to the principles laid down by them prior to the election. They were neither Liberal nor Conservative; they were as neutral in their united action as it was possible for any set of gentlemen to be. Their mandement left every elector in the province of Quebec free to vote for any man he chose. On one question they asked him to see that the candidate he voted for would do justice to the minority of Manitoba. They did not say, vote for a Conservative candidate because he will do justice more surely than a Liberal candidate. I do not pretend to judge of particular grievances which hon. gentlemen opposite may happen to have in individual cases; but it will be hard to convince me that it would have been possible for him to have turned that province, which was generally and largely Conservative, into what it is to-day as the result of the election, a largely Liberal province. Therefore, I am bound to believe that that mandement did neither the hon. gentleman nor his supporters any harm politically, but left the latter as free as air to vote for the candidate they preferred, Liberal or Conservative, having the assurance from the candidates on both sides that the case of the minority of Manitoba would receive their full sympathy and support. I want to endorse the sentiments uttered by some hon. gentlemen here, Protestant gentlemen, who say that there is no reason in the world why any clergymen in this country should not exercise, not only his franchise, but his legitimate influence in any election, or with any elector in the country. I want to endorse that sentiment on this ground, that if there is anybody in this country unqualified to advise their fellow-citizens in such matters, it is not the clergymen of any church, who are a body of educated gentlemen. From their education and from the dignity of the position they hold, it would be monstrous to say that they have not the right to advise an elector how he should vote; it would be presuming too much. You pay a man five dollars, and hire a cart and horse for him to go out and canvass for you. It is the custom of the country, not confined to one political party. Every candidate seeks to influence this voter or that voter, and you find men going throughout the length and breadth of the land canvassing, all exercising some influence, whose standing, whose integrity, whose intelligence, and whose education fits them much less to exercise an influence upon their fellow-citizens than the clergymen of this country, irrespective of creed. Therefore, I say that that is a legitimate exercise of citizenship even for a clergyman. Now, we have often heard that it was only our priests who have done this. I have before me to-night the report of a delegation, composed entirely of clergymen, and clergymen belonging to one church, that called upon the government at Toronto, Rev. Dr. Carman was the gentleman who introduced the delegation and spoke for them. He spoke as strongly about his church as any mandement that I have ever read. What did he say:

> Speaking of the confidence they felt that the government would bring down a measure that would reasonably meet the expectations of the temperance people, and especially of the body he represented, he said that, unless there was a genuine intention on the part of the government to protect the sobriety of the people in the country, the Methodist Church must hurl its phalanxes at the polls against the men in authority.

That is as strong language as can be found in any of the mandements that were issued. I do not wish to be understood as finding fault with that statement. I quote it simply to show that it is a legitimate exercise of a right claimed by all denominations in this country. Why, my revered friend beside me here (Mr. Wallace), who has a very large following, will tell you in this House or on the public platform that if this thing or that thing is done or is not done, according to what he thinks is constitutional and right and just, the whole people he represents will vote solidly one way. I accept the hon. gentleman's statement.

An hon. MEMBER. What is the statement?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman says I am perhaps going further than the fact. I am not going to discuss the point. That is my understanding of it. Now, on that question I have no more to add. I did not know that I would speak at all upon it. To my own mind it was not necessary that I should speak upon it. I required no speech to tell men who knew me where I stood upon the question; but my silence might have been misinterpreted if I had not spoken. I am prepared to vote for any amendment that may be moved to that particular paragraph referring to the school question, that would simply negative that statement congratulating His Excellency upon the settlement of this question. That amendment is not moved. No amendment is to be moved, as I understand. I do not think it very necessary that any should be moved, for the simple reason that the question is not affected at all by this settlement which is announced in the Speech from the Throne. The negotiations between the two governments have ended. If the Manitoba minority accept that settlement, I do not suppose anybody here will rise to exercise the power which I contend still rests here. If the Manitoba minority accept that as a final settlement, I am not going to make any noise or to say that I am more interested than the people who are principally affected.

Now, I cannot sit down without a short reference to the Queen's Jubilee, and it must be short, because I am sure I could not add to the very eloquent expressions that have been given from both sides of the House on that paragraph which refers to Her Majesty's Diamond Jubilee. I will simply say this, that I join in and endorse to the fullest extent, all that has been said by the two leaders in this House and the gentlemen who followed and spoke so eloquently on this paragraph, and while I, in my humble way, look with pride, as a loyal subject of Her Majesty, to the great development that has taken place all over the world, and particularly in that part of the world, which is considerable, that is enclosed within the limits of Her Majesty's Empire, when I consider the expansion of that Empire and extent to which civilization has been promoted within her reign, what can I say but that it is the most wonderful Empire in the world, that it gives evidence of a wonderful amount of intelligence in the people specially of that little island, which, compared with the rest of the Empire, seems to be a speck in the ocean, and that no one can help admiring—one need not be a British subject to admire—the British constitution, the British Empire, and its history and its noble Queen. If we look too at all that had been done in her glorious reign, there is gratification for every subject. There is one little corner within the shadow of the Throne itself, that little green isle, and while I do not hesitate to raise my voice and join my fellow-Canadians in a just tribute of pride to that great and successful sovereign and the Empire over which she has presided so long and with such distinction, still when I think of that little island, I say that if, in that great monument that is to be raised at the celebration of this Jubilee, you could add but one tablet more, and say that freedom had been given that little island which had suffered so long, with what an outburst would voices be raised from thousands of corners all over God's earth to join you still more heartily, but if that little tablet be not there, let no man say that an Irishman will not join in his best wishes for the success of the Empire. And let me say this, that the monuments that will be raised, in every form, to the glory of that great Queen and that great Empire will attract the attention of the civilized world, and I pray that Her Majesty may yet be spared still longer than that sixtieth year, and that before she descends from the Throne, which she has graced so long and so well, she will have the pleasure—for to her I know it will be a pleasure—to sign a bill giving to Old Ireland home rule as we have it in this country.

Reference has been made to the tariff. I would not attack that until we get it down, and I do not know that I will then very strongly, but I join all those gentlemen who have preceded me in saying that I think it would be in the interests of the Government, as I believe it would be in the interests of the people, that no time should be lost in bringing it down.

With regard to the Franchise Act, let me say this. The announcement is not clear to my mind as to all that is intended. The paragraph reads: "That the franchises of the different provinces are to become the Dominion franchise." I can see some difficulty in that. First, as to the principle of this Parliament divesting itself of one of its most important rights, the right to frame and control its own franchise; but even if you adopt the provincial franchise, what franchise would be adopted? The provincial franchise of to-day, which would imply, of course, that any time any province amended its franchise, you would have to come back and amend yours, because I cannot believe it is the intention to adopt the provincial franchise, whatever it may be in the future. It is an objectionable enough proposition to adopt the franchise which we know exists in every province, but if you declare that whatever franchise any province may at any time adopt will be ours, there will be a considerable objection, because you would be committing this Parliament to something they know nothing about.

In conclusion I want to make a very short reference to a matter that may not be very interesting to the House, but inasmuch as some reference has been made to it in the

press, it is just as well that I should state very clearly where I stand. During the last few years I have been placed in a great many different positions. I found myself appointed sometimes to a collectorship, sometimes to something else, recently I have been transplanted into the arena of politics, and so on. I told my provincial constituents when I went to them last, that it would be likely the last time I would appeal to them. I am getting pretty sick of politics. I do not want it to be implied that politics are getting too hot for me or anything like that. I still retain, thank God, the confidence and esteem of my constituency as firmly and as fully now as at any time through the long years I have represented it, and if I do not go back, it will not be because I have shown the white feather, because I do not think there is any gentleman in the county or out of the county who enjoys the confidence I have enjoyed so long and still enjoy in it. This, of course, indicates that I am getting tired of politics and that I do not intend to continue much longer in it. I am sorry to see the Superannuation Act changed, because I would claim the maximum allowance on retiring. I do not want it to be suggested, either, that, in retiring, I am looking for any position. I am on the wrong side of the House for that; gentlemen opposite are under no obligation to me. They would not offer me an office, nor would I think of asking for one. I am not inclined that way. My ambition is reasonably satisfied, and you will see how easily it is satisfied when I tell you that after thirty-six years I am, financially, just about where I started. So I do not owe much to politics, and politics do not owe anything to me, I suppose. During this Parliament I do not know whether I shall be considered an out and out party man, an out and out Conservative or not. I should be sorry that any wrong impression should exist among my old friends. When I look about and see yet a few of the old guard, a few of the men with whom I have fought for a long time, I should be sorry to think that, because I was getting old and because I see that the time is coming when I might retire from politics, I was getting careless. Not at all; I am just as good a Conservative as ever I was. I was always an honest one and a true one, and I am that yet. And a consistent one, and I am that yet. I will fight as a Conservative every day that there is a fair fight to be given. But I will fight with legitimate weapons or not at all. I am speaking now, perhaps for the last time on this subject—it is the last time I shall make any reference to it in Parliament at any rate—and I want to be fairly understood. I do not wish to be considered as offensive when I say that I am just as independent of one party as of the other. The Conservative party never constructed or built me up. I came here having carried my county. I became a Conservative and got my county to endorse the Conservative policy, largely, I think, myself; and I have contributed my humble share to the success of that party. In my own province I have done the little end of the work, perhaps, but that little was important and well done and honestly done. Now I am not going to take the same active part in politics as before. If any proposition ever comes before this House which I have advocated as part of the Conservative platform or policy, I will stand by it; I shall be bound to stand by it for my own self-respect. If I say that I am as independent of one side as of the other, the hon. leader of the Government (Mr. Laurier) will understand that I have no reason to be under obligation to those on his side, as they have fought me always. The hon. gentleman himself came down to my county and fought me pretty hard. I think he will say that I struck back as well as I could, speaking in French when necessary; and, though he is an orator and I speak broken French, I think he will say that I hit back as hard as I could, but never dishonestly. I will pay the hon. gentleman one compliment—I can afford to do so, seeing that I carried the county, I can tell him that he was mistaken in his man, that he was unfortunate in his selection of a candidate. If he had not taken hold of that candidate, that candidate probably would not have saved his deposit. The compliment I pay the hon. gentleman is to say that every vote over 150 or so, nominally, given to the candidate who opposed me—a renegade Conservative—was actually polled for the Prime Minister himself. Any man whom he endorsed would have got the same vote at that time. I have said—there is no necessity for saying it, but it is just as well to be plain about it, it is well that I should not be misunderstood—that I never looked to be shelved by my own friends, and I do not expect to be shelved by the hon. gentlemen whom I have opposed. I do not know of any vacancy I could apply for, and if there were a dozen I would not apply for a position. I am not of the retiring kind in that sense. I intend to finish up this Parliament, to do my duty as a Conservative, and when the Parliament is at a end, unless my people absolutely think my services are required, I do not intend to trouble Parliament any longer. I have always said that if my people wanted my services, while I was living or able to render them service, they could count upon me. This, perhaps, is a little irregular, but, for the reasons I have stated, and in view of the fact, that, in my long connection with this Parliament I have not taxed the patience of the House very frequently, even though I am doing so to-night, I trust I shall stand excused.

I presume that the Address will pass without a vote, but not without protest, particularly with regard to the point which I have raised, the paragraph with reference to the settlement of the school question. If

that Address passes on a division I will be satisfied, having given or tried to give my views in the few remarks I have offered. I will say this before I sit down—that, notwithstanding all the attacks that were made upon the Conservatives that introduced this legislation upon that question and went to the country, there has been no evidence, there can be no evidence produced to show that they did not act strictly in accordance with the pledges made to this Parliament, and endeavour to carry them out to the best of their ability. They failed; some said they pursued a mistaken policy which has been denounced by a prominent member of this House on the ground that looking after minority rights is not a paying business. Well, from a material point of view that may be true, but I do not, of course, share that view. I do not think that a man who represents a constituency and has the honour of a seat in the House of Commons of Canada, should weigh exactly the paying side of a question of right in any stand he takes on a matter of principle. The position the Government took on that question of the Manitoba schools, I felt myself was the right one. Even though we saw defeat staring us in the face, still, believing that we were performing a duty, an obligation imposed upon us by the constitution, we would not have been worthy of our positions if we had not gone straight to defeat, and defended what we deemed to be right. I think yet the day will come when that policy will be vindicated; but to argue that any more would be to repeat what I have already said, and weary the House, which I have no desire to do. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you, and through you the House, for listening to a very uninteresting address from me. I want the House to understand the difficulty in which I found myself when I began to address you; I want the House to understand that it was not so much as to what I would say, but I had to study very carefully what I should not say—not that I wanted to withhold any of my own views, but I wanted to make no unfair charge against any man on either side of the House. I did not wish to break, in this last Parliament which I may attend, the good feeling that has existed between myself and the gentlemen with whom I have worked so long. I wished to retain from the other side of the House that friendly courtesy that I have found in many quarters from gentlemen with whom I could not act, and in that way end a public life, a little stormy at times, in peace and quietness, so that I may take away with me the most pleasant recollections, and leave behind no very bitter ones against me.

Mr. BRITTON. Were it not that another hon. gentleman has copyrighted the phrase that he did not intend to address to the House any remarks on this occasion, I would like to use it myself, because, until a comparatively short time ago, I had no intention of troubling the House with any remarks upon the Address. However, having made up my mind to say a little, I shall endeavour to compass it within a very few minutes, and to give it, at all events, the one merit of brevity, if it has no other. Sir, there can be no doubt as to the loyalty and affection of the Canadian people, without distinction of race, or creed, or sect, or sex, towards Her Majesty the Queen. There is no doubt that the invitation of the home government to our Premier to take part in the Jubilee celebration, is one that, I am sure, we all appreciate, and I am only repeating what has been said by nearly every member who has spoken, in saying that much in reference to it. All would be glad to see the Premier go, and there present the homage and affection of a loyal and united Canadian people to Her Majesty on this Her Diamond Jubilee of a reign of sixty years. That, Sir, it seems to me, will be the very best homage that we can pay, and it will be the very best representation that the Canadian people can make on this momentous and important occasion. I see by the newspapers that there is some talk of sending a Canadian regiment, or a representation of our militia, or a part of either the permanent staff or of the volunteer staff, as guard of honour to the Premier. Well, if, on consideration, it is thought best that such a representation should accompany the Premier, I for one would not in any way oppose it. But I would suggest that before it is done the Government should think twice, and consider the proposition well. We must remember that in a display of that kind there will be representations of all the crack regiments in the British Empire, and perhaps detachments of foreign troops coming from old and warlike nations. While we may send men who are an honour to the service, who are honoured for the services that they have rendered, men who are bedecked with medals, and who wear worthily the gold lace, I am afraid that our own troops would be somewhat eclipsed in the great procession of that day. I fear that, worthy as our men are, and good as the representation would be, there might be some trouble in making a selection, and some heart-burnings might result, and the Government might meet with a little difficulty of that kind. On the whole, I think that the very best representation we can make, will be a representation on the part of our Premier of the feelings that the people of Canada, of all sorts and conditions, entertain for Her Majesty and the Empire, expressed, as it will be, so felicitously, by the Premier. Now, it seems to me that such an expression, based on the unanimous opinion of this country, will afford an excellent answer to such articles as we see from time to time in the American newspapers. Sometimes we see in the American press things

that annoy and irritate us a good deal; for instance, the following article I saw the other day in the New York "Sun":

A certain series of recent events, the last being a strong British anti-American speech delivered in London by a Canadian statesman, Sir Charles Tupper, has called new attention to the British preparation as a basis for hostilities against the United States. A correspondent of the "Sun" who had enumerated the various features of this preparation, is thus controverted by a leading Tory organ of the Dominion, the Toronto "Globe":

Perhaps it is hardly worth while quoting from a paper that knows so little about our Canadian press as to call the Toronto "Globe" a Tory organ, but such is the case in this quotation:

"Sir Charles Tupper's speech cannot be regarded as evidence of Canadian hostility, still less as evidence of British hostility to the United States. The re-arming of the militia is the only measure that can be connected with our relations with our neighbours, and it was certainly due largely to the Venezuelan trouble."

So, when the United States roused itself to protect a sister American republic against oppression and conquest by a grasping transatlantic power, the Canadian militia was armed anew for readiness against Venezuela's friend. Such a sentiment is unnatural to American soil. The idea of the people of Canada maintaining a political relation that could by any circumstances whatsoever, bring them, as the ally of a European power, into conflict with the American republic is the extremity of folly. The "loyalty" that can uphold such servitude to a foreign country is disloyal to the American land of Canada.

While the British flag and British destiny rule Canada, its people will remain in fact and in feeling a people without a country.

When we see such an article as that published we feel that we are citizens of no mean country, that we have in Canada a grand country—a country of great possibilities. But besides Canada and beyond it, we are part of the millions ruled over by our beloved Queen, that we have an interest in, and have our part and lot with the British Empire. That is why I am glad the Speech from the Throne, unanimously as that feeling has been expressed in this Parliament, embodied that sentiment.

As to the tariff, surely the tariff needs revision. If it needed revision in 1878 and 1894, much more does it need revision in 1897. No one can find fault with that part of the Address which refers to the revision of the tariff. I will, however, follow the course adopted by the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat (Mr. Costigan), and will leave the discussion of that topic until the tariff is brought down, because from the beginning to the end we shall have an educational discussion going on in the House from both sides, so that every hon. member will have an opportunity of saying his say in regard to it.

The Franchise Act will be repealed. The Franchise Act will die an unlamented death, unless, perhaps, lamented by the revising officers and printers, to whom it has been a source of no little profit during the years it has remained on the Statute-book, but during the last campaign no one had a single word to say in its favour. Everywhere and whenever it was brought up in discussion on the hustings against the late Government, the supporters of the Government never pretended to justify the Act, but declared they would assist whatever Government came into power in repealing it; and it was promised by the then Opposition that it would be repealed, and on the very first opportunity afforded to the Government to redeem their promise they stated it would be repealed. I, for one, can rather sympathize with what was said by the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Costigan), in regard to the difficulty of giving over our franchise to the provinces. There may be difficulty about that matter. One would like that hon. gentlemen were elected by a franchise applicable to every province, and one that would be entirely within the control of this Parliament. But any law cannot be worse in its working than the Franchise Act under which we have lived for the last ten or twelve years, an Act which allows to remain on the list names of men who have been dead for twenty years, as in some cases within my own knowledge, cannot be any benefit to any party, and the sooner it is repealed the better.

Then as to the other matters mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. It was said in the early part of this debate that the Liberals were never known to fulfil their promises. After the first sentence in the Address, which refers to the Diamond Jubilee, and which of course is a new matter, every sentence in the Speech refers to measures that the present Government when in Opposition had promised, and in bringing them down they are simply doing so in fulfilment of their promises, and as soon as possible the fulfilment will be made complete by the enactment of Parliament. One would be tempted, if time permitted, and if I had a more sympathetic audience than members of this House afford at the close of a debate of this kind, to say something in regard to each of these items as they appear in the Address; but I shall confine in the main my other remarks to one question which has occupied so much of the time of this House during the last few days. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Costigan) only emphasized, as it seems to me, what has been apparent during the whole of this debate, and that is the difference prevailing in the opinions of hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. gentleman stated that he considered he was a good Conservative, while those who have been acting with him in the past are not now Conservatives, and this difference has perceptibly widened since this debate commenced. The hon. gentleman made two points. He said

that the principles of the late Government were fully confirmed by the results of the late elections; the National Policy was sustained; the views of the Government in regard to the Manitoba school question—although I must confess it is rather difficult to see how they were sustained by the result of the elections on 23rd June last—were sustained. If that be so, I can hardly see why the hon gentleman now takes such a gloomy view, because like a good Conservative, as he says he is, one who prefers principles to men, if the principles are sustained it makes no difference who the men are who are the embodiment of those principles. If his principles are established, why does he not cut loose from his old associates, and come over to this side of the House and make one more supporter of the Government, and we will try to make him as comfortable as possible for the rest of the Parliament. That should be the plain duty of an hon. gentleman feeling as he does in regard to this matter. He said the province of Manitoba has been coercing the Dominion instead of the Dominion coercing Manitoba; at all events, that is the way he looked at this question. I can hardly see how there can be any coercion by Manitoba if the province has been acting throughout in a constitutional manner. If I read the decision of the Privy Council aright, the Act which Manitoba passed in 1890 abolishing separate schools has been declared constitutional. If so, Manitoba has been acting in a constitutional manner, whether there has been coercion or not. The Act of 1890 was either constitutional or not. It was constitutional according to the decision of the Privy Council. But suppose there has been some mistake and that Act was not constitutional, then there was only one plain course for the hon. gentleman and the Ministry of which he was a member at that time to adopt, and that was to disallow the Act. As he did not disallow the Act then, he can hardly turn around now and say that the province of Manitoba, by acting in a constitutional manner has in any way coerced or attempted to coerce this Dominion. It was conceded by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Costigan), that there is no obligation on the part of this Parliament to restore the schools as they existed before 1890, and Manitoba being master of the situation, did only what was perfectly right from the first to the last; taking the last as the concessions that were made on the representation of the present Dominion Government. I am not very familiar with the procedure of this House, but it seems to me that this question should be left by this Dominion Parliament just where it is left in the Speech from the Throne. The position of the leader of the Government, it appears to me, is logical and consistent. Accepting the judgment of the Privy Council, admitting that the minority had a grievance, that the minority had the right of appeal, that, in obedience to the judgment of the Privy Council, the Governor in Council required the provincial government to pass a remedial measure which the provincial government refused to do, and by reason of that appeal the Parliament of Canada was fully seized of the question and could, as a matter of jurisdiction, have passed a remedial law which the provincial government would have been bound to obey; admitting all that, and that is going the whole length the hon. gentleman (Mr. Costigan) went, then, according to his argument, and according to the argument of the majority of members in this House, it simply became a question of policy. I am perfectly free to say that the late Government did not wish to force a Remedial Bill on Manitoba. It was only what they believed either to be their duty, or the last resort open to them, that they pressed a remedial measure; but it was not their wish to pass it and that is evidenced by their negotiations and their attempt to achieve a settlement of this dispute between the province and the Dominion. And so they sent up their commissioners in an attempt to get a settlement. We all know what followed and the bitter discussion that there was in the last session of the old Parliament. The present leader of the Opposition tried to pass his remedial legislation, and he was fighting for the constitution, as he said. The old Government insisted upon Parliament passing a remedial measure, and they brought down a Remedial Bill which everybody must admit was a bad one. The present leader of the Government said that that Bill should not pass, and his closing words in moving the six months' hoist were:

> This power of the Dominion Parliament should not be exercised until all the facts bearing on the case have been fully investigated, and all means of conciliation have been exhausted.

Parliament did not agree to the six months' hoist, but Parliament did not pass the Remedial Bill. Then there was an election and the results of the election sustained the position of the then leader of the Opposition, and on the memorable 23rd of June the electors declared that this power of the Dominion Parliament should not be exercised. They said, at least, that, and perhaps they said a great deal more in reference to this question. Then the Liberal Government came into power and then came the negotiations which the hon. the Premier set on foot for the settlement of this question, and the leader of the Opposition in his speech of the other day says—I quote his words from "Hansard":

> Who authorized that settlement?

He further said, that this settlement was unconstitutional. He was very properly answered, that if it was unconstitutional, what was the object of the present leader of the Opposition and his then Government

undertaking negotiations. Surely, if these negotiations had resulted in success, and if there had been any agreement come to between these commissioners and the representatives of the provincial government, the only way in which these negotiations could have been carried out would have been by an Act passed by the Manitoba legislature, and then the Remedial Bill would have been withdrawn. If that had been constitutional for the late Government to do, it was just as constitutional for this Government to do it, and so that argument falls to the ground. The question as it is, has been put by the hon. the Premier, and I do not remember that it has been quoted in the House. I shall read a few lines from it, because, as part of the discussion, it seems to me it ought to be put on record. What I shall read to the House is from a Memoir of the history of this case by the Prime Minister. published in the Montreal "Herald" on the 18th February last. The document is entitled "Memoir on the question of the Manitoba schools, with an explanation of the reasons which have led the Liberal party to adopt the policy of conciliation which has been finally accepted by the government of that province." The following is the quotation :—

In order to properly understand the conduct followed by the present Government in the settlement of this question, it is highly important to thoroughly understand all the constitutional points raised in this discussion. Manitoba is one of the seven provinces which constitute the Dominion of Canada. These provinces have exclusive jurisdiction over certain matters, among which is included that of education. This jurisdiction is subject to certain restrictions in the provinces (in those provinces only) where the right to separate schools existed before confederation.

The agitation caused by that question had lasted for more than six years, and a strong Protestant feeling had been aroused in all the provinces, except Quebec, against the extension of special favours to Catholics. Peace and harmony, which had reigned between Protestants and Catholics heretofore throughout Canada, were seriously affected to the detriment of the Catholics, who are in the minority in all the provinces except one.

The Conservative party had been in power during those six years, and the Government, instead of promptly putting an end to the agitation before popular prejudices had been aroused, allowed the matter to drag from 1890 until the present time. It then became evident that the province of Manitoba had determined to resist federal interference. The manifest interest of the minority from that moment was that the question should be settled on such a basis that the settlement should win the approval and good-will of the Protestant majority, not only in Manitoba, but also of the whole of Canada.

The importance of an amicable arrangement will be better appreciated after the following facts have been duly considered :—

The population of Mantoba, when the last census was taken, was 152,506, of which 20,571 were Roman Catholics, distributed in 90 different municipalities. The total number of Catholic schools in 1890 was only 97, and 28 of these schools were in the city of Winnipeg, at St. Boniface and St. Norbert. In all the other parts of the province there were but 69 schools.

The number of children attending the Catholic schools of the province was 3,316, but the average attendance was only 2,267. It is, therefore, apparent that one-half of the Catholic children of Manitoba were, through force of circumstances, obliged to attend the common schools, or else be deprived of the education given in those schools.

Considering all these circumstances, the Liberal party became convinced that the policy of coercion which had been adopted by the preceding Administration, was not a wise one, and destroyed the peace and harmony which had existed formerly between the different Christian denominations in all the parts of Canada, and, moreover, the Liberals were of opinion that if the population of Manitoba was approached in a spirit of conciliation, that population would grant the wishes of the Catholic minority and would make such concessions as to satisfy its just demand.

The Liberals, consequently, resolved to adopt a policy of conciliation as the basis of their programme when the time came to appeal to the people. And the electorate, by a significant majority, approved its attitude.

The new Liberal Administration, of which Mr. Laurier is the leader, which came into existence at the defeat of the Conservative party, is supported in the House of Commons by 45 Catholics, out of a total of 66 Catholics in the House. Immediately after the formation of the new Cabinet, negotiations were opened with the Government of Manitoba, and concessions were secured which it can be reasonably hoped will satsfy the minority and restore peace in that province.

That is the record, as far as I care to read it. The supplement of that is that the settlement, having been arrived at, has been ratified by the Act which the Manitoba legislature has passed, and that in the Speech closing the legislature, Lieut.-Gov. Patterson made this statement :

The amendments to the Public Schools Act, embodying the settlement arrived at between the Dominion and my advisers, adopted during the session, will, I am convinced, put at rest a prolonged and vexing controversy. It now remains for the law as amended to be so administered that the advantages of the provincial education system may be freely enjoyed by all classes of the community. I feel assured that this will be done, and that the most complete harmony will be re-established between all sections of our population.

That being the end of the matter, let us all hope for such fair-play from Manitoba as will win the confidence of the minority, and, from what the hon. gentleman said in reference to New Brunswick and in reference to the attendance of Roman Catholic children in the public schools of Ontario. we have every confidence that the law will be so administered as to win the confidence of the minority, and that we shall hear no complaint from this time forward in reference to this matter. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) said in his speech yesterday that if this settlement had been made by the Conservatives instead of by

the Liberals, the leader of the Liberals would have carried his torch from one end of the Dominion to the other inciting sectarian strife. All I can say is that the Liberal leader is not the kind of a man nor are the Liberal members the people to carry lighted torches or to enkindle sectarian strife. It is well known that torches were once enkindled, and as a result the Parliament buildings in another city were destroyed; but the party that enkindled those torches was not the party from which these Liberals are descended. I am glad to say that no party at present would desire to do what members of that party did in 1849; but that, on the contrary, all are now more inclined towards a policy of conciliation and peace and good-will which ought to characterize all the members of a community. Nobody now wants to light any torch or carry it from one end of the Dominion to the other, and I hope that the hon. gentleman who spoke in that way will not attempt to light either torches or rushlights, or do anything that will hinder the peace and good-will which we seem to have entered upon. With regard to the mission to Rome which has been so often referred to, I agree entirely with the remarks made by the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Maxwell). It seems to me that we have no business, in the main, with that matter; but I do ask, in all sincerity, to whom should Catholics appeal in matters relating to the conduct of their church authorities except to the highest authority in the church? This case is settled; but the ablegate is here, and he is a man of education, piety and tact. He is here to inquire into the differences between members of the great church he represents, and to right those differences if he can. He has a right, if he thinks proper, not to appeal to this Parliament, for this Parliament is not seized of the matter; but he has a right to go to the provincial government, and influence them in any way he can, by reason or argument, to grant greater concessions if he desires greater concessions, to the Roman Catholic minority in that province. If it would not weary the House, I would like to read again certain parts of the petition to the Pope, to emphasize the fact that this gentleman has been sent out only for the purpose of dealing with differences among members of the same church. In that respect he is only doing what is done every day in Protestant churches. There are, no doubt, a great many members of this House who are adherents of the Methodist Church; and I would like to know what would be said if any one of these gentlemen would say to the Rev. Dr. Sutherland what right have you to promise to hurl the phalanxes of the Methodist Church against the Ontario Government if they do not do what you ask them to do in the matter of temperance legislation? If some member of the Methodist Church were to bring him to book, by laying the matter before the Methodist conference, would anybody say that was unconstitutional or was bringing in some foreign power to whom allegiance was given, instead of to the governing power of the country? No; all would say that he had a perfect right to bring the matter before the church. The ablegate is brought here for a similar purpose, and there is no ground whatever for the statement that his presence here is the result of an appeal to Rome to grant civil rights to citizens of this country. I am sure that that argument will fail when the petition to the Pope is carefully read and the matter is considered in the light of common sense. I am glad the document has been brought into Parliament and has been read in this House. Why was it brought here? hon. gentlemen opposite ask. It ought to have been brought here. If it had not been brought here and read, many men throughout the country would have said that it was something different form what it now appears to be. Men cannot trust to their memory, they cannot trust to the repetition of a discussion that is only oral. But when we have the document itself, when we have the very words of that petition published in the records of Parliament, then it cannot be misconstrued, and the argument cannot be successfully made that the papal appeal is something else than what it really is. I hope that every member of this House will agree that, in this long debate on the Address, we have said all that need be said in this Parliament on the Manitoba school question. If that question is to be agitated any more, as was suggested by the hon. gentlemen who has just spoken, let it be agitated in another place and let us have done with it here. It is dead, so far as this Parliament is concerned, let us bury it, and let its epitaph be "requiescat in pace." I believe that is the sincere desire of the great majority of the members of this House and of the people of this country.

We have had in this discussion reference made to the Government work, and the question of the dismissal of Government employees has been made the most of. I venture to say, without fear of successful contradiction, from facts within my knowledge regarding Government employees in different parts of this Dominion, that the Government have acted with wonderful leniency. From the first to the last, they have acted as men who desire to be fair and to give to those against whom complaints were made the benefit of every doubt. The insinuation has been made, with regard to the change of solicitors in England, that there must be some motive beneath which does not appear on the surface, which prompted that change. I should like to know by what right it can be urged that any man who acts as a solicitor for this Dominion Government stands in any different position from the solicitor

of any individual or corporation. If any private individual thinks proper to change his solicitor for one reason or another, for the purpose of giving a young man a chance, or for any other reason, what objection can there be to his doing so? and should not a like discretion be given to the Government? We know that when the late Government came into power, they changed every legal agent of the Government all over the Dominion. The legal gentlemen who acted for the Government in the matter of claims for compensation for lands damaged by the rising waters of the different canals and claims of other kinds, were changed all over the Dominion, and the men who acted for the Mackenzie Government from 1873 to 1878 have not been called upon to act in the same capacity since. I do not know what the policy of this Government may be, but I suppose that in Canada as in England they will naturally give their patronage, assuming the work can be done just as well, to those they favour rather than to those who have been the agents of the former Government, and I can see nothing wrong in that. A word or two with regard to what was said by the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Quinn) whom I am sorry not to see in his place. For some reason or other he dragged into this discussion the commission that has been at work inquiring into penitentiary matters. Well, as to the personnel of that commission, the present Government appointed Mr. Meredith, who is a Conservative but who once had something to do with a penitentiary and would natually be supposed to know something about the work; they also appointed another gentleman who has had a great deal of experience in prison matters and I suppose it was on that account he was appointed; they subsequently appointed another gentleman, who was of the same faith as the hon. member for Montreal Centre, and these three have been doing the work. The work is completed and we are only waiting for their report which I hope we will soon have. The impression has gone abroad—I do not know whether it is well founded, that a good many things in connection with the penitentiaries have taken place that ought not to have taken place and that some persons who are now, or who have been connected with penitentiary work will be found to have been guilty of very irregular practices. For the purpose apparently of discounting the effect of this report, when it appears, the hon. gentleman thought proper to say that these commissions were nothing more than Liberal emissaries and spies sent out by this Government, and he quotes instances of their conduct or conversation with people at Montreal. I venture to say that when the real facts are known it will be found that a good deal of what the hon. gentleman said was due to his lively imagination and the poetic license to which perhaps he is entitled rather than to the bald and naked facts which actually took place down there. No doubt the hon. gentleman, fearing that the report of this commission would affect some of the friends of the late Government, endeavoured, in advance to decry the character of these commissioners and their conduct and thus depreciate the value of their work.

I shall now close my remarks and am very sorry that in my attempt to be as brief as possible, I have presented my views in such a feeble manner. I am very much obliged to my hon. friends at this late hour for listening to me as patiently as they have done. I can hardly take my seat, however, without referring to the remarks of the hon. gentleman who preceded me (Mr. Costigan). I am sorry that he showed so much disappointment with political life, and I hope that the speech he made will not be his valedictory address. I hope that the plaintive tone in which he made his remarks is not indicative of his early departure from this House. He was listened to with that attention his remarks deserved, and I am sure we will all be glad to hear from him again, and all the more glad if, consistent to principles as he says he is, owing nothing to the Conservative party among whom he now sits but willing to support good measures from whatever side they may come, he will remain and support the good measures that will come from this side before this Parliament closes.

Motion (Mr. Russell) agreed to, on a division.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved:

That the said Address be engrossed, and presented to his Excellency the Governor General by such members of the House as are of the Privy Council.

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

The PRIME MINISTER moved:

That a Special Committee of five members be appointed to prepare and report with all convenient speed, lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees ordered by the House on Thursday, the 25th March last, to be composed of Mr. Laurier, Sir Charles Tupper, Sir Richard Cartwright, Sir Adolphe Caron and Mr. Davies.

Motion agreed to.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

The PRIME MINISTER moved:

That a Select Committee be appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of this House during the present session, with power to report from time to time; to be composed of Messrs. Beausoleil, Bergeron, Charlton, Choquette, Craig, Davin, Earle, Ellis, Haley, La-

Rivière, Monet, Richardson, Scriver, Somerville and Taylor.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved :

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

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved :

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

Motion agreed to.

CONTROVERTED ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received from two of the Judges selected for the trial of election petitions, pursuant to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, a certificate relating to the election for the electoral district of Macdonald, by which the election was declared void.

Mr. SPEAKER also informed the House that in conformity with chapter 9, section 46, of the Revised Statutes, he had issued his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 5th April, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DRAINAGE ACROSS RAILWAY PROPERTY.

Mr. CASEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 14) respecting drainage on and across the property of railway companies. He said : Some of the older members will recollect that I have introduced a Bill under this same title during the two last sessions of Parliament, but this differs materially from the former Bill under the same name. My former Bill proposed to subject Dominion railways to the drainage laws of the different provinces as far as these apply to railway companies. The objection was made, and perhaps fairly, that there should be a uniform law all over the Dominion for the governance of railway companies, and last session the then Government expressed their willingness to allow the passage of a proper Bill applying uniform conditions to all Dominion railways. This Bill is intended to meet that view. It provides in the first place for giving the right to all land holders and municipalities to drain across the property of railway companies subject to the provisions of this Act, to the same extent as they have the right across the property of any other land holder. It goes on to provide machinery for securing this right in a way that shall be fair both to the railway company and to the land owner. There is a system of notices to be given to the manager of a railway company by the person desiring to have drainage works completed, and on the company receiving notice the engineer of the railway company and the engineer of the other party interested shall try to agree about the proposed works. If they cannot do so they may appoint a third engineer as umpire, and if they cannot agree on that, the Minister of Railways and Canals shall have the right to appoint a competent engineer as umpire. These three engineers are to go on the spot where the work is to be done and settle the matter finally and without appeal. The main object of the Act is to avoid the expense and difficulty, and I should say unfairness, of compelling persons to appear before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council at Ottawa, in connection with every small question of drainage. The municipalities and the farmers interested have felt it a serious grievance that they had to come to Ottawa and engage a lawyer to combat the railway lawyers before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. They felt that under the circumstances, they could not expect to get full justice in some cases, and in no case could they get justice without incurring an expense which they could ill afford. This Bill is intended to remove these difficulties.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, NAPANEE.

Mr. WILSON asked :

What is the name of the collector of customs in the town of Napanee ? When was he appointed, and who recommended him to the Controller of Customs for the position ?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). Thomas Edwin Anderson is

the collector of customs at Napanee. He was appointed on the 10th December, 1896.

Mr. WILSON. You did not answer the latter part of the question. Who recommended him for the position ?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I do not know that the hon. gentleman would be entitled to an answer on that point. I have no objection whatever to say, that a great many people spoke in his favour.

Mr. FOSTER. You might answer.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. the Controller of Customs can answer the question or not ; as it is fully understood.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a new objection.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) need not have given any explanation.

Mr. FOSTER. He need not have given any answer at all.

CUSTOMS OFFICER AT STRATHROY.

Mr. CALVERT asked :

1. What is the name of the customs officer in the town of Strathroy, in the county of Middlesex ?
2. What was the amount of customs dues collected for each of the years 1894, 1895 and 1896 ?
3. What was the salary of said officer during each of said years ?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). James Ferguson Taylor is customs officer at the outport of Strathroy. The revenue at the outport for the three years named was as follows :—1893-94, $5,214.33 ; 1894-95, $5,138.48 ; 1895-96, $5,653.83. The salary of the officer for each of said years was $300.

INLAND REVENUE OFFICER AT STRATHROY.

Mr. CALVERT asked :

1. What is the name of the inland revenue officer at the town of Strathroy ?
2. What was the amount of revenue collected for each of the years 1894, 1895 and 1896 ?
3. What was the salary of said officer for each of said years ?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). 1. The name of the inland revenue officer at the town of Strathroy is James F. Taylor. 2. The revenue collected in 1894 was $8,282.43 ; in 1895, $6,954.25 ; and in 1896, $6,560.13. 3. The salary paid in each of the years 1894, 1895 and 1896 was $850.

POSTMASTER OF MARSH HILL, ONT.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. When was the post office at Marsh Hill, Ont., filled by the appointment of George G. King ?
2. What caused the vacancy to which Mr. King was appointed ?
3. When did Mr. King cease to be postmaster at Marsh Hill ?
4. What amount has been paid to Mr. King for services as postmaster of Marsh Hill ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (for the Postmaster General). The post office at Marsh Hill, Ont., was filled by the appointment of George G. King on the 4th of August, 1896. The vacancy was caused by the resignation of John Howsam on the 16th of October, 1895. Mr. King ceased to be postmaster at Marsh Hill on the 8th of December, 1896. There has been nothing paid to Mr. King for services as postmaster at Marsh Hill.

POSTMASTER OF BEAMSVILLE.

Mr. McCLEARY asked :

1. When was W. D. Fairbrother appointed postmaster at Beamsville ?
2. Was he appointed by Order in Council ?
3. Has the said W. D. Fairbrother been dismissed from said position ?
4. If dismissed, what was the cause, and were any charges made against him ?
5. If charges were made against him was an investigation of the truth of such charges made ?
6. Has a successor been appointed to Mr. Fairbrother ? If so, who is he, and what is his age ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (for the Postmaster General). W. D. Fairbrother was appointed postmaster of Beamsville on the 11th of April, 1895. No Order in Council was passed appointing him. The following charges were made against him :—That, from the time he took possession of his office until the 23rd of June last, every possible means was taken to sell and give away Conservative literature through the office, and that he held back literature that was in the interests of the Liberal party ; that, during the last campaign he repeatedly absented himself from the office in order to attend political caucuses in the interests of the Conservative party ; that he endeavoured to utilize the office rather for profit to himself than for the public convenience ; that he would keep a lobby full of people waiting for their mails whilst he parleyed over the sale of papers through the wicket ; that he changed the general delivery from a convenient arrangement of fifty boxes to that of 21, which made the office so crowded as to occasion nearly double the necessary time for the distribution of papers, circulars, &c., the public being thus kept waiting ; that this change in the system of delivery was such as to greatly delay the delivery, involving a handling of from twenty to fifty pieces of mail matter for almost every person calling for mail ; that when asked by the assistant why he so inconvenienced himself and the public in keeping them waiting so long, he replied : "I do not care how long they have to wait, let them purchase boxes. If you make it more convenient for

them than they have it, they would never rent a box." That the postmaster would stand by the half hour reading the contents of ingoing and outgoing postcards passing through the office; that the assistant cautioned him against this practice without avail; that he took an active political part in the last general election, that during the whole of the election day he acted as outside scrutineer and took an active part in bringing voters to the polls instead of attending to the duties of his office; that satisfactory evidence was furnished as to the postmaster having taken such political part which rendered any further investigation unnecessary, and he was accordingly removed from the position and Alex. Allan appointed in his stead.

Mr. McCLEARY. The hon. gentleman has not answered that part of the question about the age of the gentleman appointed.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will furnish that to the hon. gentleman tomorrow, if he wishes.

POST OFFICES IN ANNAPOLIS COUNTY, N.S.

Mr. MILLS asked:

1. Was there ever a post office established in the county of Annapolis called "Young's Cove"?
2. Was James Kearns made postmaster of that office?
3. Is there such a post office now or such a postmaster?
4. If not, why not?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (for the Postmaster General). There has not been a post office established in the county of Annapolis, N.S., under the name of Young's Cove.

Mr. MILLS asked:

1. Was there a post office established in the county of Annapolis, N.S., called "North Perott"?
2. Was Alfred Spurr appointed postmaster of that office?
3. Is there such a post office now or such a postmaster?
4. If not, why not?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (for the Postmaster General). There has not been a post office established in the county of Annapolis, N.S., under the name of North Perott.

Mr. MILLS asked:

1. Was there ever a post office established in the county of Annapolis, N.S., called "Virginia"?
2. Was Ezekiel Banks made postmaster of that office?
3. Is there such a post office now or such a postmaster?
4. If not, why not?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (for the Postmaster General). There has not been a post office established in the county of Annapolis, N.S., under the name of Virginia.

OBSTRUCTIONS—BEAR RIVER.

Mr. MILLS asked:

1. Does the Government realize that the remains of the piers of the old bridge at the mouth of the Bear River, between the counties of Annapolis and Digby, lying north of the new bridge lately constructed by the Nova Scotia Government, are an impediment to navigation, and at certain times of tide, a hidden danger to life and property?
2. Is not the Government of Nova Scotia responsible for the removal of said piers?
3. Is it not the duty of the Federal Government to see that the Government of Nova Scotia does its duty in this regard?
4. Has anything been done by the Government towards obtaining the performance of the obligation of the Nova Scotia Government in this regard?
5. If so, what?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The Government some years ago was advised that the remains of the piers of the old bridge formed an obstruction to navigation. The late Minister of Marine called the attention of the provincial government of Nova Scotia to this alleged obstruction, but that government repudiated any responsibility in the matter. A legal question has arisen as to where the responsibility lies, whether with the provincial government, the municipalities where the alleged obstructions are or the Dominion Government. That question has been lately submitted to the Department of Justice for its opinion. When that is obtained the proper steps will be taken to have these obstructions removed.

ANNAPOLIS, N.S., PIERS.

Mr. MILLS asked:

1. Is the Government aware that the pier at Hampton, in the county of Annapolis, needs repairing and is rapidly going to ruin, and that it is, in its present state, almost useless?
2. Has the Government a report from its engineer on the present condition of this pier?
3. If not, will the Government ask its engineer for such report?
4. Will an appropriation be made in the Estimates this session for the repair of this pier?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). The Government regrets very much to learn from the hon. gentleman that the piers of the county of Annapolis, which he has so long represented, were left by him and the several governments he has for years past supported, in such a lamentable condition of delapidation and ruin. The attention of the Government has been pointedly drawn to the alleged delapidated condition of these piers by Hon. Mr. Longley, and steps have been already taken to have their real condition reported on by the engineer of my department. Proper means

will be taken to put those works in good state of repair.

Mr. MILLS asked:

1. Is the Government aware that the pier at Port Lorne, in the county of Annapolis, needs repairing, and that a comparatively small sum expended now would save said pier from rapid delapidation and ruin?
2. Has the Government a report from its engineer on the present state of this pier?
3. If not, will the Government ask its engineer for such report?
4. Will an appropriation be made in the Estimates this session for repair of this pier?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The same answer applies to that.

Mr. MILLS. I would like to have an answer to paragraph 2 of this question.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Reports have been received and steps have been taken to obtain fuller reports.

INDIAN SUPPLIES.

Mr. DAVIN asked:

What supplies were guaranteed to the Indians of Manitoba and the North-west Territories under treaty stipulations? What provision is the hon. the Minister of the Interior making for the purchase of these supplies? Does the hon. the Minister of the Interior intend to call for tenders for these supplies?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). Treaty No. 3 guaranteed ammunition and twine to the value of $1,500 yearly, and the following supplies to be given once for all. For each family actually cultivating the land (at the date of treaty, 1873) or who shall hereafter commence to cultivate land, 2 hoes, 1 spade, 1 scythe. For every ten families, 1 plough. For every twenty families, 5 harrows. For each band, 1 axe, 1 cross-cut saw, 1 hand saw, 1 pit-saw, necessary files, 1 grindstone, 1 auger, 1 chest of tools. For each band, enough of wheat, barley, potatoes and oats to plant the land actually broken up for cultivation by such band. For each band, 1 yoke of oxen, 1 bull, 4 cows. For each chief and subordinate officer, 1 suit of clothing once in every three years. Treaty No. 4 guaranteed for each chief and headman, not to exceed four in each band, a suit of clothing once in every three years. Powder, shot, ball and twine to the value of $750 each and every year; and the following supplies, once for all. For every family actually cultivating the soil, at the date of treaty, 1874, or who should thereafter settle upon the reserve: 2 hoes, 1 spade, 1 scythe, 1 axe, and enough seed wheat, barley, potatoes and oats to plant such lands as they have broken up. For every ten families, 1 plough, 2 harrows. For each band, 1 yoke of oxen, 1 bull, 4 cows, 1 chest tools, 5 hand-saws, 5 augers, 1 cross-cut saw, 1 pit-saw, necessary files, 1 grindstone. Treaty No. 5 guaranteed ammunition and twine to the value of $500, each and every year. For each chief and subordinate officer, 1 suit of clothing every third year, and the following supplies once for all. For every family cultivating the soil at date of treaty, 1875, or who should thereafter commence to cultivate, 2 hoes, 1 scythe, 1 spade, 1 axe. For every ten families, 1 plough. For every twenty families, 5 harrows. For each band, 1 cross-cut saw, 1 hand-saw, 1 pit-saw, 1 grindstone, 1 auger, necessary files, 1 chest of tools, 1 yoke oxen, 1 bull, 4 cows, and enough of wheat, barley and oats to plant such land as they have broken up. Treaty No. 6 guaranteed ammunition and twine to the value of $1,500 each and every year. For each chief and subordinate officer, 1 suit of clothing every third year, and the following supplies once for all. For every band cultivating the soil at the date of the treaty or which might hereafter commence to cultivate the soil. For each family, 4 hoes, 2 spades, 2 scythes, 1 whetstone, 2 hay-forks, 2 reaping hooks. For every three families, 1 plough and 1 harrow. For each band, 1 hand-saw, 1 pit-saw, 1 grindstone, 1 auger, necessary files, 1 chest of tools, 4 oxen, 1 bull, 6 cows, 1 boar, 2 sows, 1 hand mill, 2 wagons or 2 carts. Treaty No. 7 guaranteed ammunition to the value of $2,000 each and every year. For each chief and councillor, one suit of clothing every third year. There is no statement in this treaty to the effect that certain supplies are to be furnished once for all, but the department takes it that the following supplies which are stipulated for are only to be furnished once for all. For each band, 10 axes, 5 hand-saws, 5 augers, 1 grindstone, necessary files and whetstones, 1 bull. For every family of 5 and under, 2 cows. For every family of more than 5 and less than 10, 3 cows. For every family of over 10, 5 cows. If any band desires to cultivate the soil as well as raise stock each family shall receive one cow less, and in lieu thereof when settled on their reserve and prepared to break the soil, 2 hoes, 1 spade, 1 scythe, 2 hay-forks. For every three families, 1 plough and 1 harrow. For each band enough potatoes, barley and oats and wheat to plant land actually broken up if such seed be suitable for the locality. Tenders for the supplies required are being called for.

SOULANGES CANAL.

Mr. MILLS (for Mr. Maclean) asked:

To whom has the contract for sections 4 to 7 of the Soulanges Canal been awarded? Was he the lowest tenderer? If not, why was the lowest tenderer passed over?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The matter of the contract for these sections of Soulanges Canal has not yet been concluded, and until

it is it will not be possible for me to furnish the information asked for.

Mr. MILLS (for Mr. Maclean) asked:

To whom has the contract for section 12 of the Soulanges Canal been awarded? Was he the lowest tenderer? If not, why was the contract not given to the lowest tenderer?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Contract for section No. 12, Soulanges Canal was awarded to M. J. Hogan, contractor, and the contract has been executed. He was the lowest tenderer.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, MORRISBURG.

Mr. WALLACE (for Mr. Broder) asked:

Has an Order in Council been passd since the 23rd of June, 1896, cancelling the appointment of David Halliday to the position of collector of customs at the port of Morrisburg If so, when?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). No.

WHARF AT IONA, VICTORIA CO., N.S.

Mr. BETHUNE asked:

Is it the intention of the Government to pay the balance due James C. McDonald for repairs made on the public wharf at Iona, Victoria county, N.S., early last summer? If so, when? If not, why not?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). No, an investigation was held, and Mr. McDonald has already received the amount shown on investigation to be due for the repairs referred to.

VICTORIA RAILWAY BRIDGE.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

Has any Order in Council been passed by the Government granting any sum of money to the Grand Trunk Railway Company in aid of extending, repairing or rebuilding the Victoria Railway Bridge at Montreal? If so, what was the amount granted, and will the papers be laid upon the Table of the House in due course?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). It would be premature until negotiations between the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Government respecting the Intercolonial Railway terminal in Montreal are concluded to furnish partial information on this subject. All papers will be laid on the Table of the House in due course.

APPOINTMENT OF MR. F. L. CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. DAVIN asked:

Whether a gentleman named Cartwright has recently been appointed Inspector of the Northwest Mounted Police? If so, whether he is a relation of the Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright, Minister of Trade and Commerce? If so, what relation? If such appointment has been made, what has been, up to the date thereof, the business or profession of the aforesaid Mr. Cartwright?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Mr. Francis Lennox Cartwright was appointed inspector of the North-west Mounted Police, his appointment to date from 15th of February last. He is a son of Sir Richard Cartwright and is twenty-three years of age. He has been hitherto qualifying for a military, or semi-military, profession. He held a commission as Captain in the 14th Battalion of Active Militia. He has taken courses of instruction at the Infantry School, London, and the Cavalry School, Toronto.

CLAIM OF EMMANUEL CHAMPAIN.

Mr. DAVIS asked:

Has Emmanuel Champain, of Batoche, in the district of Saskatchewan, a claim against the Dominion Government for losses caused by the rebellion of 1885? If so, has the claim been paid? If not, why not?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). Emmanuel Champain made a claim for a very large amount, about $16,000, for goods said to have been taken by the soldiers. Defence was that he was a rebel, that if the soldiers took the goods their action was a tort for which the Crown was not responsible. A valuable gray horse was said to have been taken for and used by General Middleton. It was subsequently sold with other military supplies at the close of the rebellion. Messrs. O'Connor & Hogg, solicitors for the Government, advised that payment of $200 be made for the horse, if Champain would accept it in full of his whole claim. A cheque was drawn but Champain refused acceptance. The cheque was subsequently cancelled. No other payment was tendered or made.

INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, WINNIPEG.

Mr. CAMERON asked:

1. Who is the manager or superintendent of the Industrial School, Winnipeg?
2. When was he appointed?
3. What was his former occupation and where did he live at the date of his appointment?
5. What is his salary or allowance?
6. Is the school denominational? If so, to what denomination does it belong?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). 1. The Rev. John H. Fairlee is the Principal of the Industrial School. 2. He was appointed on the 15th September, 1896. 3. He was formerly a master in the Mohawk Institute, Brantford, and at the date of his appointment he resided at Meaford, Ont. 5. His salary is $1,000 a year with free quarters and rations for himself and wife. 6. The school is denominational. The school does not belong to any denomi-

nation, but is conducted by the Department of Indian Affairs as a Church of England school.

REVISING OFFICER, TERREBONNE.

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked:

How much has Bruno Nantel, Revising Officer for the county of Terrebonne, received from the Government, in the form of salary and travelling expenses since the date of his appointment?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The payments made to Mr. Nantel, revising officer for the county of Terrebonne, amount to $3,696.80, the details being as follow :—

Revision of 1886—

Reviser's salary	$512 54	
Travel of reviser and clerk	93 90	
Clerk, T. Grignon	178 00	
" A. Beaudry	226 00	
Correcting lists	3 00	
Posting lists	61 65	
Assessment rolls and lists	197 18	
Stationery and postage	28 35	
		$1,300 62

Revision of 1889—

Allowances to reviser for services and expenses	$712 62	
Reviser's travel	60 50	
Posting lists	26 70	
		799 82

Revision of 1891—

Allowances to reviser for services and expenses	$728 26	
Reviser's travel	68 00	
		796 76

Revision of 1894-95—

Allowances to reviser for services and expenses	$735 60	
Reviser's travel	64 00	
		799 60
		$3,696 80

PREVENTIVE OFFICERS, PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY.

Mr. PETTET asked:

How many collectors of customs, landing waiters and preventive officers have been dismissed in the county of Prince Edward since the present Government attained power? What was the salary of each per annum? What amount of revenue was collected by each officer each year during the last four years?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The outports of Milford, Prinyer, Weller's Bay and Wellington, and the preventive stations of Black River Bridge, Northport, West Point and Consecon, all under the survey of Picton, in Prince Edward County, having been abolished, the services of the officers stationed at such outports and preventive stations were dispensed with. The names of such officers, and the salaries paid them are as follow :—

Mr. SIFTON.

	Salary per Annum.
William H. MacLean, landing waiter, Milford	$250
John Prinyer, preventive officer at Prinyer	200
George J. Chadd, sub-collector, Weller's Bay	400
S. P. Niles, preventive officer, Wellington.	200
John Shannon, preventive officer, Black River Bridge	200
George E. Boulter, acting preventive officer, Newport	100
John V. Cooper, acting preventive officer, West Point	100
G. J. Waddell, acting preventive officer, Consecon	100

The revenue collected at such outports and preventive stations for the last four years, is as follows :—

—	1892-3.	1893-4.	1894-5.	1895-6.
Milford	$ 41 08	$ 10 89	$ 2 54	$ 18 05
Prinyer	Nil.	5 25	115 20	11 50
Weller's Bay	"	Nil.	0 40	9 00
Wellington	126 99	174 42	396 12	513 29
Black Riv. Bdge.	10 00	Nil.	Nil.	Nil.
North Port.	10 50	"	"	"
West Point	37 95	"	2 60	"
Consecon	10 40	7 85	17 83	43 77

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows :—

ABERDEEN.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, an approved Minute of Council, appointing the Honourable Sir Richard Cartwright, K.C.M.G., Minister of Trade and Commerce; the Honourable Louis Henry Davies, Minister of Marine and Fisheries; the Honourable William Stevens Fielding, Minister of Finance, and the Honourable Joseph Israel Tarte, Minister of Public Works, to act with the Speaker of the House of Commons, as Commissioners for the purposes and under the provisions of the 13th Chapter of the Revised Statutes of Canada, intituled: "An Act respecting the House of Commons."

Government House,
Ottawa, 30th March, 1897.

REPORTS.

Annual Report of the Department of Railways and Canals.—(Mr. Blair.)

Annual Report of Indian Affairs.—(Mr. Sifton.)

List of Shareholders of Chartered Banks.—(Mr. Fielding.)

Abstract Statement of the Insurance Companies for the year ending 31st December, 1896.—(Mr. Fielding.)

PUBLIC BUILDINGS ERECTED.

Mr. LISTER moved for :

Order of the House—Return giving (a) the name of every city, town or village in Canada having a population of 12,000 and under in which public buildings have been erected by the Government or in which public buildings are in course of erection ; (b) the population of each of such places according to last census ; (c) the cost of each of such public buildings ; (d) the gross revenue received by the Government from each of such places from (1) post office, (2) customs, (3) inland revenue.

He said : At the request of the Postmaster General, I move to amend that motion by striking out after the word "Canada," the words "having a population of 12,000 and under."

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

ADMINISTRATION OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Order for :

1. Copies of all correspondence and other documents relating to the creation of post office inspectorships at Stratford, Barrie and Kingston, and the appointment of inspectors and other officials connected with such inspectorships.
2. The number of employees connected with each such office and the salaries paid, and all other expenses of each office.—(Mr. Cameron.)

Mr. CAMERON. I desire to give a little fatherly advice to the Postmaster General as to the conduct and management of the great department over which he presides, but as the hon. gentleman is not in his place to-day, that advice would be thrown away. I ask that the motion be allowed to stand until the Postmaster General is in his seat.

Motion allowed to stand.

DISALLOWANCE OF PROVINCIAL ACTS—BRITISH COLUMBIA SOUTHERN RAILWAY.

Mr. McINNES moved an Address setting forth :

1. That an Act passed by the legislature of British Columbia in the 59th year of the reign of Her Majesty Queen Victoria, entitled "British Columbia Southern Railway Aid Amendment Act, 1896," extends the grant formerly made to the British Columbia Southern Railway Company of an enormous amount of public wealth and extraordinary privileges.
2. That in the opinion of this House (a) the grants and privileges so extended are unwarranted and grossly extravagant, they are made without the interests of the public being properly safeguarded, and include rights the alienation of which from the control of the people will retard the development of the country and prevent a general enjoyment of its advantages ; (b) the said Act, if continued in force, would create such a monopoly in land, coal and transportation as would prove dangerous to the development and prosperity of the said province and to the interest of Canada generally.

And praying, therefore, that His Excellency will be pleased to disallow the said Act.

He said : I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that this motion may appear to some hon. gentlemen as a peculiar motion to emanate from this side of the House. It may seem to some hon. gentlemen opposite that this motion is another evidence of what they have been pleased to call during the last few days, "A variance between Liberal principles and Liberal practice." But, as I understand the principles of the Liberal party, there is no conflict between them and this motion. It is true that Liberals, in the past, have had occasion to defend the provinces from an aggressive, arbitrary and unwarranted abuse of federal power by hon. gentlemen opposite, when they were in office. It is true, also, that Liberals generally have declared their opinion that it is unwise, and, in some cases, where the provinces are determined on their line of action, absolutely dangerous to interfere with the provincial legislatures. It may also be true that some prominent members of the Liberal party have declared that in their opinion the power of disallowance should never be exercised by the federal authority. But, notwithstanding all that, I do not think that the Liberal party ever intended to lay down a cast iron rule with respect to this matter of disallowance. It seems to me in the very nature of things that this is one of those questions upon which a hard and fast rule cannot be laid down. Circumstances will always alter cases ; different conditions will require different treatment and, in a case like this, where it is impossible to conceive beforehand the different conditions that will arise round different cases that come before the federal attention, it is absolutely impossible for any hard or fast rule to be laid down ; consequently, I claim that it is the duty of the federal authority whenever a piece of legislation is brought before their attention from the legislature of a province, and is seriously objected to, to scan that legislation and see if it is proper legislation, to inquire into its merits and demerits and disallow or not, according to their judgment. But, so far from there being any inconsistency in asking the Liberal Government to disallow this Act, Mr. Speaker, it is for the very reason that Liberals in the past have defended the rights of provinces, that we in British Columbia call on them to disallow this Act in question and protect the rights of our province. For I can conceive of no reason why the Liberal party or the Liberal Government, having in the past defended the provinces and protected the rights of the people in the provinces when attacked from powers from without, should be less disposed to protect those same rights when they are attacked by enemies from within the province. But fortunately, in this case, there are circumstances which make the exercise of this power of disallowance any-

thing but an arbitrary act. And the first circumstance which bears out that remark is this, that the people of British Columbia want this Act disallowed.

Mr. PRIOR. No.

Mr. McINNES. The hon. the senior member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) says "no." I was quite aware that he would say "no," for, it is said, that he has an egg in the nest which he expects to hatch out after awhile. It is quite true that the government in Victoria will say, "no," for they are also interested. It is quite true that the monopolists and the land grabbers of British Columbia will say "no." It is quite true that all those out there, and all those in other parts of the country who are under the influence of the Canadian Pacific Railway will say "no"; and these will no doubt make a furore over this motion and call out for us to safeguard provincial rights. But, Sir, the great majority of the people in British Columbia, the people who make that province and who are going to be its bone and sinew are almost unanimous in asking for disallowance. The monopolists, the land grabbers, and the chartermongers will cry out "hands off British Columbia," but the people who are interested in the welfare of that province demand that this Act shall be disallowed. They too cry out: "Hands off British Columbia," but direct their cry to those who have improperly trafficked in the province's resources, and I submit, Sir, that there is a great deal more in the cry of the latter class to commend it to this Government than there is in the cry of the monopolistic faction of that province. It may be thought that this House does not represent the feeling of the province of British Columbia as well as does the legislature of that province, and that if the Act be disallowed the British Columbia legislature will re-enact it. Sir, I doubt it very much. It is true that a year ago they passed this Act, but I doubt very much if the members of the legislature in that province would follow the Government in re-enacting it to-day. But, Sir, if there is a doubt that the people of British Columbia are in earnest in asking for the disallowance of this Act, look about you in this Parliament, I think I may be permitted to say, that the hon. members from British Columbia on this side of the House are a unit in demanding disallowance. On the other side of the House it is true that there are the hon. the senior member for Victoria (Mr. Prior), and his colleague (Mr. Earle), one of them interested and the other I do not know whether he is interested or not in the matter; but at all events the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House represent the whole of British Columbia outside of the city of Victoria, and at best those two hon. gentlemen only represent one city. But I am credibly informed that on this matter they do not even represent the feeling of that city, because if the discussion is given to this question which its importance demands, before that discussion is concluded there will be resolutions sent to this Government from mass indignation meetings throughout the province insisting on disallowance of this Act.

There is another circumstance which would rid disallowance in this case of any arbitrary appearance. It is true that the Act is within the jurisdiction of the provincial legislature, but it nevertheless deals with a matter which is of national importance. I shall not dwell now upon the national aspect of the Act, but I will for present purposes lay down the proposition: that if that legislation is of national concern and if it affects the commercial interests of the Dominion at large, then I say we are justified in scrutinizing it. And, if after scrutinizing that legislation we are of opinion that it has been passed recklessly, and hastily, and rashly, without properly safeguarding the rights of the people, then we are justified in exercising the power to annul it which is given us under the constitution.

I am quite aware that there are some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who have a very high regard for the doctrine of non-disallowance of provincial legislation, but I would remind them that the doctrine of non-disallowance is not the only doctrine which is held dear by the Liberal party. It is not the only tenet of the Liberal creed; it is not the only plank in their platform. There are other planks around which we have rallied and for which we have fought that are of a great deal more importance than that comparatively insignificant principle of non-disallowance of provincial legislation. It must not be forgotten that we have fought in the past for equal rights to all. We have fought for the land for the people, we have opposed monopolies, and we have decried systems because they created monopoly. Sir, these latter principles are of the very essence of liberalism, and they must not be set in the background and a rather secondary principle given precedence when we are considering a matter of this kind. Whenever there is an apparent conflict between the principles of the Liberal party, I submit that there is one final test to guide us, and that is, the common good of the country and the greatest good to the greatest number. If the Liberal party act in a way consistent with that final test of liberalism, they need not be afraid of any taunts or sneers as to inconsistency, let them emanate from whatever source they may.

I shall now, Mr. Speaker, briefly review the history of this legislation and subsequently point out the objectionable features of it. In 1888 a charter was applied for to the British Columbia legislature by a number of politicians

and government officials out there, and some other gentlemen of lesser importance. Among the applicants was Colonel Baker, who at that time was a member of the legislature and who has since become Provincial Secretary of the province. The company as incorporated at that time was called the "Crow's Nest and Kootenay Lake Railway Company," and it acquired the right to build a line from the summit of the Crow's Nest Pass to some point in the centre of Kootenay; probably Pilot Bay. They were to build their road within a certain specified time, but before that time expired there was an Act engineered through the legislature called "The Railway Aid Act," passed in 1890, which gave enormous grants to this company as well as to some other company. The promoters found that their time was going by, and in 1890 they asked for an extension of their franchise, and it was accordingly extended. In 1891 they applied again for new rights and larger privileges, and in that amendment of their charter the name was changed from the "Crow's Nest and Kootenay Lake Railway Company" to the "British Columbia Southern Railway Company," the name which it now bears. In 1893, finding they were still unable to dispose of their charter with the enormous privileges which have been granted them, they again applied to the legislature to have all their rights under the charter extended, which was accordingly done. In the same year, by another Act, their privileges were largely extended, and their land grant was enormously increased. In 1894 they again appealed to the legislature to extend their charter, and to show the utter recklessness with which the legislature allowed such legislation to pass, let me tell you, that in that year the legislature of British Columbia gave away eight million acres to this company without knowing that they had done so; and it was not discovered that they had given away this eight million acres in addition to the other large grants, until about six months ago when some o the Ministers of the present Dominion Government were out there.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the hon. gentleman (Mr. McInnes) passes away from that point I would like to ask him: Whether the Act has not been amended so as to correct that mistake?

Mr. McINNES. The Act has been amended in that respect. During the session which is now sitting in Victoria they brought in what they called an "Ambiguity Bill" which revoked that grant, claiming it appeared in the Bill by some clerical error. In 1894 they consolidated all the rights they had, under a new Act. Before I come to that, let me say that in that Act of 1893, by section 23, a peculiar privilege is given to the promoters of that company, and that privilege is: to sell out to any company that they saw fit and which would in any way connect with their line. Now, these parties got the charter away back in 1888. I do not think I reflect on them when I say that as individuals they had no means whatever of constructing this line. Their sole purpose was to acquire this charter, to hawk it about the country, and to make a big thing out of it. They accordingly hawked it about the country, but they failed to dispose of it. They applied to the provincial legislature time and time again for extensions, and, in order to be enabled to dispose of the charter more effectually they had this peculiar privilege put in their Act of 1894. In 1896 they came again before the legislature, and they asked to have the time limit, within which they were to construct this line by sections, extended, and it was accordingly extended; and it is the Act passed in 1896, being chapter 4 of the British Columbia statutes, that we ask the Government now to disallow. The Act was sent to the Department of the Secretary of State here, and it was received by that department on the 4th of June, 1896, and accordingly, under the constitution, it is within the right of His Excellency, up to the 14th of June next, to disallow the Act.

Having given this brief history of the legislation, I wish to point out to you some of its objectionable features—features which I think will make it repugnant to you, and explain why it is obnoxious to the people of British Columbia, and why they are desirous of having the Act disallowed. In the first place, it creates an enormous monopoly in land. Section 1 of chapter 40 of the Act of 1890 grants 20,000 acres of land per mile to this railway company, in alternate sections; and, as the length of that line will in all probability be 325 miles, you will see that the company will receive 6,500,000 acres. That land is situated right in the centre of the Kootenay mining district, a district which is attracting the attention of the world to-day, and which is bound to go ahead. People will flock in there, and without a doubt that land will become immensely valuable. For one corporation to hold within its grasp such an enormous quantity of such very valuable land, is a thing which I think should not be tolerated for a moment. In the district which I have the honour to represent, similar legislation has gone into effect. Half of Vancouver Island is held by the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company, and has been held by it since 1887. Of all parts of British Columbia, that section has progressed the least, and there is no explanation for this except that the company holds the land as a monopoly, and will only alienate it on conditions which are very unfavourable to settlers. Not only is there an enormous land monopoly established, but with the grant of land goes all the base minerals. Now, as you know well, the Kootenay country has received a great amount of fame on account of the gold and

silver which it has produced; yet, if the truth were told, Rossland is really rather a copper camp than a gold camp. The base metals in that district are of enormous value, and there is no doubt that it is rich in all kinds of minerals; so that the mineral grant to this company is necessarily very important. But it has a still more serious feature. In the great majority of cases the gold and silver in that country are not found native, but are mixed with iron, copper and other elements. So that, except in those cases where the gold is free-milling or where the silver is native, the miner will have to approach this company before he can mine gold or silver at all. The case I cited a few minutes ago in my own district is exactly analogous to this. There are very valuable mineral bodies in Vancouver Island within the railway belt, but they cannot be worked and are not worked to-day, although many of them are a great deal richer than those in the Kootenay country—why? Because when a prospector goes out and finds a lead, if it does not contain free-milling gold, he has to deal with this Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company, because that company has a monopoly over the base metals which are alloyed with the gold and silver, and the company exacts terms and conditions which it is beyond the power of the poor prospector to comply with. Not only is this company given the base metals, but the grant of land carries with it the timber, which is of enormous value.

But the mineral of the greatest value which goes with this grant is the coal. The coal basin which has been discovered in the Crow's Nest Pass, or that immediate vicinity, as I think the geological experts will affirm, is unequalled by any other coal basin on this continent. Now, you will readily understand that if the Kootenay country goes ahead, as we all believe it will, there will be enormous reduction works, smelters, and such like works established there. Coal is an absolute necessity to the working of these establishments, and their economical working is an absolute necessity to the working at a profit of many of the mines there; because in the Kootenay district at the present time it is unfortunately the fact that the ore has to run from $20 to $25 a ton to be worked profitably, though under ordinarily favourable circumstances ore that runs from $7 to $8 a ton can be profitably worked. One reason why the gold ore in the Kootenay district has to be so high-grade to be profitable is the high price of coal. It will surprise you to learn that a great deal of the coal and coke used there at present is imported from Wales, being carried around the Horn a distance of 15,000 miles. This coal bed in British Columbia is no more than 200 miles from the locality where there will be the greatest demand for it; and if that coal is to be held by any single corporation, and if, as is the case, it is the only bed of coal there, that company will have a degree of control over the development and the prosperity of that country the danger of which you can readily realize But that you may properly understand the true extent of that coal basin, let me give you some figures in connection with it. Professor Selwyn, in the Summary Report of the Geological Survey for 1891, volume 5, No. 1, page 14A, says that he passed through the Crow's Nest Pass, and examined briefly the coal formations there. He says he found 20 seams exposed, having an average thickness of 132 feet. He says he saw, from a cursory glance at the country, that there must be at least 144 square miles of that coal. He also estimates that with that thickness of 132 feet, each square mile would average a production of 50,000,000 tons of coal. At these figures, therefore, the possible tonnage of that coal basin amounts to 7,200,000,000 tons. Prof. Selwyn tells us, however, that he hurried through the pass and did not examine it carefully, but others have examined it very carefully, whose interest it was to do so, and I shall give you some of their figures. Mr. Fernie, who it appears is engineer for the British Columbia Southern Railway or the Crow's Nest Coal Company, says that the area of coal is thirty-five miles long and ten miles wide. He has been on the ground, and he has examined it carefully, and that is his estimate, and he says, in some directions, the area actually exceeds those limits. At the same figure of thickness of the coal, 132 feet, which Prof. Selwyn gives, and with the area that Mr. Fernie estimates, you would have a tonnage there of coal of 17,500,000,000 tons. But the Canadian Pacific Railway have become interested in this matter, and have, in a recent pamphlet upon the resources of British Columbia, stated that the thickness of that coal runs from 132 to 448 feet. If the Canadian Pacific Railway's statement be correct, and we can only conclude that it is, then with an average thickness of 290 feet (the mean between the Canadian Pacific Railway's figure, and with the area given by Mr. Fernie) you will have a total tonnage of 39,375,000,000 tons. This is part of the subsidy, which is to be given this British Columbia Southern Railway for constructing this line. If you value that at one cent a ton, it amounts to a bonus of $393,750,000, practically as much as the national debt of Canada, and sufficient to build a railway almost round the earth. But if that coal be worth a cent a ton, it will be, with the enormous demand that there must be for it, worth a dollar a ton when worked, to the company, and at that rate, it would give a return of $39,375,000,000. To show you that the company knew what they were about, let me refer to the Act. It was their intention, evidently, from the first, to get a monopoly

of those coal lands, and this is the way they accomplished their object. They had a clause inserted in the Railway Aid Act, chap. 40 of the statutes of 1890 of British Columbia, providing that where the 20,000 acres could not be obtained along the line of their railway, on account of previous alienation or of the twisting route which the railway would have to take, the deficiency would be made up to the company right in the heart of this coal basin. Col. Baker, who was prominently connected with this company, happens to represent the district in which all this coal is situated. He understood the conditions thoroughly, and came before that legislature and got it to supply the deficiency in land along that part of the line which would run through the coal fields, which he knew all about, but which probably, at that time, there was not another man in the legislature knew anything about.

But there is another extraordinary feature in connection with this matter. The company can acquire all that enormous quantity of coal, not for supplying a line through Crow's Nest Pass into the Pilot Bay or the centre of Kootenay, but for merely building a narrow gauge line for a distance of only seventy-five miles. The authority for this statement is section 9, chap. 53, Act of 1894, which says that as soon as the company has completed certain limited sections, they will be entitled to the land grant connected with those sections. You will, see, therefore, that for building that one section, the eastern section, which runs through these coal lands, they will be entitled to that enormous wealth.

Not only is there an enormous monopoly in base minerals and in coal, but this company also have many special privileges. They can run saw-mills, open up mines, run smelters, run tramways, operate petroleum works and do a thousand other things. Therefore, I say that on account of these extraordinary privileges and these enormous grants there is ample justification for this Parliament advising the disallowance of the Act.

But you would naturally ask me, if this property is so valuable, how is it that these men who went round hawking that charter, were unable to dispose of it till last year. Well, there are reasons for that. One is that some of the people who have been connected with this charter, were connected with other schemes and have hawked other property, in connection with which there were transactions which were not creditable to them. There is also another thing to be considered. Hon. gentlemen in this House do not know these gentlemen as well as we in British Columbia know them, or they would know that these gentlemen are not the class of men who would readily gain the confidence of capitalists. There is also another reason why they did not succeed sooner in selling this charter, and that is the dullness which has afflicted the financial world the last few years. That explanation itself is sufficient, but there is still another explanation which will commend itself to hon. gentlemen. These coal mines, while enormously valuable now, were of no more value two or three years ago than if they were at the North Pole. Coal is of no value unless there is a demand for it, just as railways are of no value where there is no trade, but now the people are flocking in to settle the country, it has acquired enormous value. You will understand that the Kootenay country has been going ahead with giant strides, and the value we now attach to these things is enormous compared with the value they had a few years ago. If the charter and all the enormous grants that are given that company were offered for sale in the country to-day, you would find capitalists crawling over one another to acquire them. There is no doubt of that.

But there is another serious aspect in connection with this question which I approach with some little diffidence, but which I hope I do not approach in any spirit of bitterness, and it is this, that the enormous grants and privileges given this company and the dangerous monopoly thereby created, are as nothing compared with the condition imposed upon the people of British Columbia by the sale of all these rights to the Canadian Pacific Railway. These charter-mongers finally succeeded in their efforts and sold their charter to the Canadian Pacific Railway That puts a very serious phase on this question for British Columbia. It would have been bad enough had that monopoly been created and stood by itself. It would have been a danger which would have threatened the progress of that district. But when you remember that the Canadian Pacific Railway is another monopoly, possibly a greater monopoly, and that we have to confront a union of these monopolies against which there can be no competition, you can understand the importance that this question has for us.

Now, the Canadian Pacific Railway, as you know, has had a monopoly in the past of railway transportation in the west. Unfortunately, notwithstanding the enormous grants that they received from the Dominion and provinces, they have not shown the interest in the development of the country, they have not shown good intentions towards the people and, particularly, towards the settlers of that western country, that we had the right to expect. On the contrary, they have pursued a policy which has tended to make farming and settlement in that country unprofitable and undesirable. They have had in force freight rates which have been most excessive, which have taken the last cent from the struggling settlers and farmers and those engaged in every pioneer industry in the west. And this is not talk that cannot be proven. The commercial boards of the west

have often taken this matter up and have often protested against the high and excessive freight rates. And the Government of Manitoba, in 1895, made an elaborate statement and presented it to the commission appointed by the Dominion Government at that time, showing beyond a doubt, that the rates charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway are excessive, and higher than there is any reasonable excuse for. And, Sir, if you think that they do not ask extortionate rates, you have a splendid opportunity, in the circumstances that are now transpiring, to size up their greed. Not only have they now, since they purchased the rights of the British Columbia Southern Railway Company, enormous subsidies in coal and lands towards the construction of the proposed line from Lethbridge to Kootenay, but they are appealing to the Dominion Government for more assistance still. Can you imagine anything that bespeaks more gall, stupendous gall and insatiable greed. There are special reasons why the people of British Columbia are opposed to this road being built under monopoly at all, and by the Canadian Pacific Railway, above all others. The commerce of British Columbia demands that there should be an independent line running from the east into that country. At present the producers and traders are at the mercy of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Let the Canadian Pacific Railway control the railway through this Crow's Nest Pass, and there is no relief that can ever be given to the commerce of British Columbia and the west. But let me say that the people of British Columbia are desirous, not only that a road should be built from Lethbridge to Kootenay, but also that that road should be extended from Kootenay to the coast, and that construction should be begun at both ends simultaneously. There are many reasons that make this work imperative. We all acknowledge that the trade of the Kootenay county, as it now stands, and particularly as it will no doubt be developed in the future, will justify the construction of railways necessary to secure competition in trade. We also admit that the country from the Crow's Nest Pass to Rossland and Pilot Bay is a rich country and amply warrants the building of a railway to open it up. But the fact is not generally known in the east that the district from Rossland to the coast is a richer country in mineral than that to the east. Through the Tulameen and Granite Creek country, Fairview Boundary and Kettle River districts there are claims which, I believe, without reflecting upon the splendid development of the Rossland and Kootenay districts, are really of more value. Now, the people of the coast of British Columbia claim that road should be pushed from the coast into the Kootenay country in order, in the first place, that a valuable country should be opened up, and, in the second place, that they may have the opportunity of sharing in the trade of the Kootenay. Whatever turn this matter may take, I hope that the Government will see to it that the interests of the commerce of the coast are properly safeguarded and that the line will be built from the coast to the Kootenay. Whether the whole line from Lethbridge to the coast is constructed as one line, or whether the situation is past relief, and the Canadian Pacific Railway will build from Lethbridge to Kootenay, we hope that, at all events, construction will be begun either by the Government or under Government control immediately from the coast into Kootenay. There is another reason why the Canadian Pacific Railway, of all companies, should not have the right to built this railway, and this is that they have already the right to go through one of the passes which pierce the Rocky Mountains. As you are well aware, there are but four passes, four possible means of access, by railway to British Columbia from this side. Of these, two, the Pine Pass and the Yellow Head Pass, it may not be known to most people, are already alienated, a charter having been given to a company to construct through them. The Trans-Canadian Company received a charter from this Parliament two years ago to build through both these passes. The Kicking Horse Pass is already monopolized by the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Crow's Nest Pass is the last available route by which railway communication can be carried through from the east to the coast of British Columbia. Now, if any company is to have the exclusive privilege of running through that pass it surely should not be the company that already has means of access to that country. This pass should be held for an independent line, and I hope that the Government will see their way to retain it as a Government pass for the general advantage of the people.

But there are those who contend, notwithstanding that the Canadian Pacific Railway has bought this charter with its grants, and intends to build the line, that this Government can, by some means or other, extract concessions from the Canadian Pacific Railway as to through rates, and that, notwithstanding that the Canadian Pacific Railway may build this line, the concessions that will be obtained from that company will make it advisable to leave the present arrangement alone. To my mind, this is a gross delusion. There is no possible means by which this Government or this Parliament of Canada can enforce concessions from the Canadian Pacific Railway. Under their charter, which you will find in chapter 1 of the Dominion statutes of 1881, by sec. 14 of the appended agreement, they have a right to build in any part of Canada. This right they possess independent of this Parliament and this Government. Now, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have enormous concessions from the British Columbia Gov-

ernment, having purchased the rights of the British Columbia Southern Railway Company. Through this latter company they have a subsidy that will warrant them in building this line a thousand times over. It is true that they are coming to this Government and asking for aid. But, Sir, do you think for one minute they will give up the enormous, the extraordinary privileges which they now enjoy of extorting whatever rates they like from the people in exchange for the mere pittance that they would get from the Government in aid of this road. If this cannot force concessions from them, what means can this Parliament and this Government use to extract these concessions ? I say absolutely none. But there are those who say : We will put conditions upon the Canadian Pacific Railway as to their running rates. Mr. Speaker, you cannot do it. That matter was sealed when you gave them their absolute charter years ago. But some say again : We will appoint commissioners who will have control over the freight rates. Well, Sir, that cannot be done, for reasons previously given. Now, I might at one time have believed that these concessions could have been obtained ; I might have believed that conditions could have been enforced upon the Canadian Pacific Railway which would have produced satisfactory results ; I might have believed at one time that commissioners could have been appointed who would have faithfully performed their duties. But after what we have seen in this country since this question became a matter of controversy, I am precluded from believing that any longer. Sir, we have seen a shifting, and shuffling and somersaulting by leading newspapers and by public men, which, I say, is dishonourable and disheartening. Take the attitude of the "Globe" in this matter. Why, Sir, judging from its past you would have supposed that it would have stood up firmly for the people, in favour of securing to the great masses of the people their rights, that the attitude upon this question of the men who control it, would have had a clear and certain ring of "neverism" about it. What is the fact ? I have no hesitation in saying that from the time, some months ago, when they took up this matter with extraordinary, sudden and intense interest, their attitude has been characterized by cant and deception.

Mr. MILLS. That is nothing to the somersaults that you will see in a few months.

Mr. McINNES. Sir, they have been beating about the bush month after month suggesting what they dare not openly state. They have dealt in a profusion of arguments that has been ingenious at times, but invariably unprincipled. Now, after all these months of pretended discussion, and unfair statement of facts with regard to this matter, they finally pretend to come to a conclusion which is definite in nothing but that the Canadian Pacific Railway, their masters, should build the proposed line. Now, Sir, we have not only seen the attitude similar to this taken by other newspapers from which we expected different treatment, but we have seen public men turning somersaults in the same way. We have seen public men who at one time were prominent in the political life of this country, who owed their positions in this Parliament even, and the confidence which the people had in them, to their strenuous efforts against the Canadian Pacific Railway monopoly. To-day they go about the country trying to pacify public opinion, trying to persuade the people to remain quiet until this new yoke of bondage is fastened securely upon them. I make no mention of names ; names will occur to you without my mentioning them. But when we see men like these, when we see papers like these, advocate the extraction of concessions from the Canadian Pacific Railway, and dwelling upon the probable faithfulness of commissioners, we are entitled to regard all their suggestions with the utmost suspicion. What does it mean, then, if this Act is not disallowed ? It merely means this, that the whole trade and commerce of British Columbia, of that whole western country, is handed over to the Canadian Pacific Railway. There will be no possibility of any relief from it ; it will be impossible to extract concessions from the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that western province, with all its promise of glorious future possibilities, will be handed over to the tender mercies of a corporation that, unfortunately, in the past has been characterized by corruption, extortion, tyranny and greed.

Now, Sir, I come to another reason why this Act should be disallowed. If this Act is not disallowed the Government can never build this road, and can never have a proper control over railway transportation in the west. What I mean by that is this : If this Act is not disallowed, the Canadian Pacific Railway have ample warrant to build that line under the subsidy they now have from the British Columbia legislature and aid from the British Columbia Southern Railway Company, and if they build the line under them, as they undoubtedly will, whether assisted by this Parliament or not, then it passes out of the hands of this Parliament and this Government for ever. Now, I understand that in order to make that argument valid, it is necessary to prove, in the first place, that the road is necessary ; and in the second place, that no other parties than the Government could build the road. As for the necessity of that line, there can be no two opinions. The Canadian Pacific Railway themselves, in their late annual report, have stated most emphatically that the trade of that district amply warrants the building of the line. The trade at the present time is of such importance that it

is keeping up a prosperous American district to the south. It has built up one or two large cities there, and there can be no doubt at all that the road is necessary from the standpoint of trade, and for the purpose of opening up a new and rich country. The second proposition is that no other parties than the Government could build that line. I will not discuss at length at this time the advisability of the Government owning the road, further than to say that I believe that all these great systems of transportation, these great means of public convenience, should be held by the public, and should be controlled by the Government for the benefit of the people at large. Especially that is the case in a new country like British Columiba, a country that gives such brilliant promise; and I hold that if it is at any time right for governments to own railways and operate them in the interests of the people, it is especially desirable in a young country where the right step can so easily be taken at the start.

But there are fortunately several reasons why the Government should build this road. The first one is that it will undoubtedly be a paying investment. Now, I know it is the experience of this country in past years that government railways are not very profitable. Naturally the Intercolonial Railway will loom up before your minds, and you will think of the losses incurred by the country in the working of that railway. But, Sir, there is no comparison at all between the Intercolonial Railway and this proposed line. The Intercolonial Railway was built more or less as a national necessity, it was the creation of political expediency at the time; and since it has been built it has been operated, not so much as a commercial institution on commercial and business lines, as a political machine. But notwithstanding that fact even, there was a year in which the Intercolonial Railway was operated at a profit; and I am given to understand that there are prospects that under the able administration of the present Minister of Railways and Canals, that line will, in future, be a paying rather than a losing concern. But I say there is no comparison at all between that line and this proposed line. The country through which the Intercolonial runs is nothing like as rich, the possibilities of trade are nothing like as good. It must be remembered also, that there is a keener competition with the Intercolonial Railway than there would be to this proposed line. But there is another good reason why the Government should build this line, namely, that it is a matter of national concern. It is not a line that is going to be altogether to the advantage of British Columbia; the advantages which will accrue from the building of that line will necessarily be shared by the whole of Canada. Now, my first ground for saying that, is the industry to which it will give rise, and the character of the country which it will open up. There can be no one so dead in national spirit that he can contemplate the progress which is being made in the development of mineral wealth of British Columbia, without national pride.

We have been told, and I think properly so that in the west lies the hope of Canada. I believe that. In order to give some idea of the progress made out there, I will read a few statistics. In 1887, in fact up to 1892, there was no production of gold in that province from lode mines. In the last year, however, the production of gold from lode mining was $1,244,180. The gold produced in British Columbia at the present time amounts to three-quarters of that produced in the whole of Canada, and the rate at which it is going ahead is something astonishing. The silver production of British Columbia in 1887 was only $17,331; last year it reached the enormous figure of $2,100,689. We produced last year all the silver produced in the Dominion of Canada. The lead produced in connection with silver amounted last year to $721,000; whereas in 1887, 1888 and 1889 we had no lead production at all in that country. The value of copper mined last year amounted to $190,000, whereas up to three years ago, there was not one ounce of copper mined in the whole country. These figures will give hon. members some idea of the progress made; but this progress in the mineral development of the province is but the beginning of what it is going to be. Capital is pouring in there now, because the mining industry has been placed upon what you might call a permanent basis, and is an assured fact. Up to last year the people might have looked upon the mining prospects of the country as altogether speculative and uncertain; at the present time, however, their richness is assured, and with that assurance there is not the slightest doubt that capital will pour in from eastern Canada, the United States and the old country, and the development will be tremendous. With the development of the mines, population will come in, and with increased population the revenue which will accrue to the Government will enormously increase. A few years ago there was no such place as Nelson in the Kootenay country. It was made a port of entry three years ago, and last year the amount of duty collected there amounted to $187,631. In the Kootenay country during last year there were not more than 15,000 people, and they contributed that amount of revenue named. With the enormous increase of population which will necessarily pour in there, the revenue which will accrue to the Dominion will become enormous. Here I might point out a fact, that may seem strange to hon. members, that the amount of revenue con-

tributed by British Columbia to the federal exchequer is larger by half than the total revenue paid into the treasury of the province for provincial purposes. I, therefore, contend that the further revenue from the province, warrants the Government in undertaking this work which will assuredly swell that revenue. There is still another reason, and I press it on the Government, why the Dominion should build this road as a national undertaking, and that is that thereby they would retain the pass. It is the last available pass and the only remaining means of access to British Columbia, and it is the duty of the Dominion Government to retain that last available pass in the interest of that province and in the interest of Canada generally.

But there are those who will contend that the Government has nothing to do with this line, that the line is a local undertaking, that the road if built would be on behalf of and to the advantage of ten thousand or fifteen thousand miners in British Columbia and that therefore British Columbia should build it. I have heard that contention put forward, and I have regretted to hear it. British Columbia is doing more to-day towards railway construction than any other province in the Dominion. It has given enormous assistance to the British Pacific Railway, to the Burrard Inlet and Fraser Valley Railway, to the Columbia and Western, to the Slocan and Kaslo Railway, and Nakusp and Slocan, and other railways I could mention; the people of the province are doing more to-day to aid in railway construction than the people of any province, exclusively by provincial assistance. But even if we were asking that this undertaking be carried out as a provincial matter, if it were admitted to be altogether to the advantage of the province, if there were not a surplus advantage that would accrue to this country, I say we would be amply justified in asking that this be done by the Dominion Government. I base that statement on the fact of the enormous revenue contributed by Britsh Columbia to the Dominion exchequer. This matter has been referred to previously by hon. members who have represented British Columbia in this House; but I have made a statement which is a little more comprehensive than any made previously, and which I believe will place the matter in a clear light before the House. I have made a statement in the first place, as to the amount paid by and received by British Columbia during the last ten years. I am averse to reading figures, but I hope the House will indulge me while I read these statements. I have had returns furnished by the deputies of all the departments, and the figures are undoubtedly correct. They are as follows:—

STATEMENT showing Amount paid into and received from the Dominion Treasury by British Columbia during last ten years.

Year.	Amount paid in.	Amount paid out.	Surplus paid in.
	$	$	$
1887	1,061,771	666,218	395,553
1888	1,064,727	716,807	347,920
1889	1,253,512	738,283	515,229
1890	1,388,214	814,595	573,719
1891	1,770,476	911,804	858,672
1892	1,903,601	1,104,361	799,240
1893	1,771,669	1,096,528	675,141
1894	1,681,387	1,310,181	371,206
1895	1,513,423	1,261,864	251,559
1896	1,841,206	1,188,812	652,394
Total surplus..	.....	.....	5,440,633

In the columns of amounts paid out to British Columbia, I have included not only every item for carrying on all branches of the federal service altogether, with the provincial subsidy and special appropriations, but I have also included a statement of the amount which, as a rule, in these computations, has been omitted, and that is the amount which British Columbia should properly contribute towards the interest on the national debt of this country. That amount runs from $240,000 to $270,000 during these years from 1887 to 1896. In the amount which I claim as having been paid out to British Columbia I have not included the grant of $750,000 which was given to the E. & N. Railway Company as a subsidy for building that line, and for the very good reason which will occur to all British Columbians, that that $750,000 given, it is true, by the Government here, was met by a quid pro quo from the province of British Columbia, which gave 3,500,000 acres of valuable land in the Peace River country to the Dominion Government. Now, this table shows a serious state of facts. It shows that the total amount of surplus which has been paid in by the province of British Columbia and for which it has not received one cent in return amounted, in these ten years, to $5,440,633. I say, Sir, that is a serious matter. British Columbia is a young province; the people of British Columbia have many obstacles to encounter, and it is a grave matter that that enormous amount of money should be drained from that province without giving her the slightest return. We expect different treatment. A province with such promise as British Columbia, should be dealt with in a generous spirit; at least in as fair a spirit as the other provinces of the Dominion are dealt with. Instead of that, we find that during the last ten years, $5,440,000 has been extracted from it without the slightest advantage. But

there is a more serious matter still, and that is, that while we have paid in more than we have gotten back, we have at the same time been actually taxed more, and a great deal more, than the people of any other part of this country. I have prepared a statement which I think will show this conclusively. I have prepared a statement in detail for the year 1896, and then I have prepared a similar statement for the last ten years, but as these statements are somewhat comprehensive and extensive, I will first give the one for the year 1896 in detail, and afterwards a summary for the other years. This statement is calculated upon the estimated population in each given year. The estimate as to population I have received from the Dominion statistician, Mr. Johnson, and I have no doubt it is approximately correct. It is as follows :—

I wish also to submit the following statement to the House :—

STATEMENT showing Federal taxation in British Columbia and in the balance of Canada, with amount of excessive taxation in British Columbia from 1887 to 1896.

YEAR.	Federal Taxation per cap. in B.C.	Federal Taxation p. cap. in bal. of Canada.	Excess p. cap. paid by B.C.	Population of B. C.	Amount of over-taxation paid by B.C.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.		$
1887....	13 98	6 91	7 07	75,950	621,806
1888....	13 09	6 96	6 13	81.339	498,608
1889....	14 39	7 13	7 26	87,110	632,418
1890....	14 88	7 24	7 64	93,294	712,766
1891....	17 72	6 88	10 84	99,914	1,083,067
1892....	17 79	6 41	11 38	107,004	1,217,705
1893....	15 46	6 62	8 84	114,597	1,013,037
1894....	13 70	6 18	7 52	122,729	902,922
1895....	11 56	5 73	5 83	131,438	766,283
1896....	13 08	6 02	7 06	140,765	993,800
			Total amount of over-taxation....		$8,442,412

STATEMENT SHOWING REVENUE CONTRIBUTED BY PROVINCES—FROM CHIEF SOURCES—IN AMOUNTS AND PER CAPITA IN 1896.

Province.	Population.	Customs Revenue.	Per Capita.	Inland Revenue.	Per Capita.	Public Works Revenue.	Per Capita.
		$	$ cts.	$	$ cts.	$	$ cts.
Ontario	2,219,909	7,806,367	3 54	3,553,438	1 60	28,710	0 01
Quebec	1,561,408	7,738,548	4 95	3,088,972	1 97	58,550	0 03
Nova Scotia	455,647	1,442,927	3 16	301,068	0 66	1,026	0 002
New Brunswick	321,279	1,086,804	3 38	287,738	0 89	602	0 001
Manitoba	195,779	615,218	3 14	252,421	1 28	...	...
Prince Edward Island	109,177	127,609	1 16	44,829	0 41	...	...
North-west Territories	121,472	40,828	0 33	189,739	1 34	1,381	0 01
British Columbia	140,765	1,306,738	9 28	295,299	2 09	11,739	0 08

Province.	Postal Revenue.	Per Capita.	Marine and Fisheries Revenue.	Per Capita.	Land Sales, &c., (Interior) Revenue.	Per Capita.	Total Revenue per Capita.
	$	$ cts.	$	$ cts.	$	$ cts.	$ cts.
Ontario	1,997,872	0 90	35,681	0 01	13,892	0 007	6 06
Quebec	836,073	0 53	8,160	0 005	2,983	0 002	7 48
Nova Scotia	297,916	0 65	6,180	0 01	42	0 0001	4 44
New Brunswick	202,224	0 62	10,696	0 03	930	0 003	4 92
Manitoba	190,805	0 96	1,670	0 009	84,434	0 43	5 81
Prince Edward Island	41,961	0 38	2,161	0 02	...	...	1 97
North-west Territories	106,061	0 87	586	0 004	93,207	0 77	3 32
British Columbia	156,882	1 11	26,410	0 18	49,052	0 34	13 08

Revenue per capita contributed by	British Columbia	$	13 08
do do	balance of Canada		6 02
Excess do	British Columbia		7 06
do in amount calculated on estimated	population		993,800 90

When similar statements to these I have given have been made in this House on previous occasions, it has been charged that the high rate of taxation per capita which British Columbia claims to pay is derived from customs duties on goods which are not consumed in British Columbia at all, but in other parts of Canada. That statement has been refuted many times; but I think the figures I have presented to-day will furnish an absolute refutation of it, for this reason, that they show not only that does British Columbia pay more in customs revenue than the other provinces, but that the same high proportion is maintained in every other source of revenue. The inland revenue we paid last year amounted to $2.09 per capita; the balance of Canada paid about $1.40. Of public works revenue we paid 8 cents per capita, whereas the highest paid by any other province, the province of Quebec, was only 3 cents. So with the postal revenue; we paid $1.11 per capita, while the highest paid by any other province, the province of Ontario, was 90 cents. All the other sources of revenue show a similar state of things—that British Columbia contributes per capita a great deal more than any other provinces. It could be shown further if absolute justice were done in this matter, that British Columbia pays even a still larger proportion. In that province we have about 25,000 Indians, forming practically about 20 per cent of the population, who contribute nothing to the revenue; so that these statements should in reality be calculated on figures reduced by the Indian population, namely, 50,000 to 115,000, which would of course greatly increase the proportion.

Now, these statements show that if the railway which is contemplated to be built from Lethbridge to the Kootenay country were pushed through to the coast, the revenue which British Columbia has contributed in the past has been amply sufficient to pay interest and sinking fund on the amount of money that would be necessary to build the road. If it cost $25,000,000—and it would not cost one cent more—the amount of excessive taxation contributed by British Columbia would amply justify that province in asking the Government to build that road as a Dominion or national undertaking.

There are those in the east—I hope there are none in this House—who persist in thinking that British Columbia has been getting a fat thing out of the Dominion treasury. They persist in looking upon the people from British Columbia who make demands for railways and other public works as most importunate persons who are continually nagging for appropriations, and who in the past have been dealt with most liberally; and in support of that they will tell you that the Canadian Pacific Railway was built for British Columbia. Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Pacific Railway was not built for British Columbia. It was built as a national necessity, without which the Dominion would be politically impossible. It would be impossible to have a united country without an inter-oceanic railway. If we were to believe some hon. gentlemen, that railway was built not for the Dominion of Canada alone, but in the interests of a united Empire. In any event I can show you by facts and figures that it has been of enormously greater advantage to Ontario in particular than to the western part of this Dominion. As a matter of fact, the Canadian Pacific Railway was built under an agreement. The province of British Columbia came into the confederation on the distinct understanding that a western railway should be built. It was accordingly built, after a number of delays which I think were inexcusable. But, Sir, it was not built as a special appropriation for British Columbia. It was built as the necessary result of an agreement between the Dominion and British Columbia previous to that province entering the Dominion. That agreement required that the Canadian Pacific Railway should be built within ten years from the date of the entrance of British Columbia into the confederation, which was in 1871, that the construction should be begun within two years and should be started from both ends, but, as a matter of fact, we know that the construction was only begun about ten years later, and then it took a number of years to construct it, much longer than was necessary.

But what I am coming to is this. There seems to be the opinion that the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway has been of immense advantage to British Columbia, and that eastern taxpayers have contributed that benefit. Well, Mr. Speaker, it has not been of that advantage it should have been. In the first place, it was not built speedily enough, and at the time it was completed, the British Columbians had other means of access to the eastern world. They had railway communication over the American lines, and, as a matter of fact, a great number of the merchants and the travelling public in British Columbia actually prefer the American lines to-day to the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Canadian Pacific Railway was not built in a way to conduce to the development and advantage of British Columbia. We all know that the company imported hordes of Chinese labourers to construct that line. That was their first great mistake. These people have remained with us ever since, and have become a curse to the country. They have kept out white settlers from coming in and filling up our lands and engaging in our industries. Not only was the Canadian Pacific Railway indifferent to our prosperity in having the line built by Chinamen, but since the line has been built, it has not been run in the interests of the

country. When British Columbia agreed to enter confederation and demanded, in consideration of doing so, the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, they contemplated a railway which would be run from one end of the country to the other, and be of enormous value to the province. They did not imagine for a moment that the Dominion Parliament would grant enormous subsidies and franchises to a company without retaining over that company some whip by which we could compel them to operate their line to the advantage of the country. The Canadian Pacific Railway has been built by means of enormous subsidies from the country, and yet the company are absolutely independent of Parliament or anybody else as regards their obligations to satisfy the public demands.

But, Sir, I prefer not to discuss this question in a miserable sectional spirit, but to revert again for a moment to the national aspect of the question, for I do not believe there are many in the House or out of it who look upon the proposed road as any other than a great national necessity.

There is another last reason why the Dominion should build this line through the Crow's Nest Pass, and it is this: In the next few months there will be an enormous influx of population into that district. As a matter of fact, the country has not yet been opened up sufficiently to give adequate employment to the people who will pour into it, although in a year or two undoubtedly the mines will have developed to such an extent as to accommodate and occupy a large population, possibly to the extent of half a million of people. But during the coming summer, it is likely there will not be sufficient employment for all the people who will rush in there, and the matter is of national concern in this way. If the Canadian Pacific Railway build this line and repeat their old policy of importing the worst class of labour to build it, the Chinese coolies, the result will be that the white settlers who will pour into that country will have no means of making a living, and they will simply have to leave it again. If the Government would take hold of this enterprise and build it, as it should be built, by white labour, in the course of a year or two, after the road is constructed, the people who are engaged in its construction would become permanent and profitable settlers.

I have endeavoured to advance a few of the reasons why it is desirable to disallow this Act. I do not know if I have convinced hon. gentlemen, but I submit that I have adduced some reasons that should convince this House that there is a calamity impending on that country unless this Act is disallowed. In conclusion I have only this to say: British Columbia is a province of enormous wealth. It has natural resources which are not exceeded, if equalled, by any country of the same extent in the world. But while we have natural resources within that province sufficient to make millions of people happy and prosperous, yet the fact must be apparent that if we are going to allow legislation of this kind to stand it will create monopolies not only on the wealth but in the prime necessities of the settlers, we will be withholding from the people the opportunities of benefiting from the wealth of that country, and will destroy the brilliant future which awaits it, if its natural possibilities are allowed to become developed in a free, natural and liberal manner. The question is, what is this Parliament going to do in the matter? Are you going to strike the shackles off the young western giant or leave it fettered by making a fad of the principle of non-interference? You cannot escape responsibility in this matter. It has been brought before your attention, and it now rests with this Parliament either to make or mar the future of that country. I am a British Columbian, and proud of that province, and I would be among the first to resent and the last to suggest any unwarranted interference with the constitutional rights of that province; but it is because I have unbounded faith in the future of that country, it is because I am a Liberal, that I believe the only course open to me, as a Liberal and as a British Columbian, is the one I have taken. I hope the Government will take the matter in hand and deal with it in a broad spirit, such as will show their faith in the future of that country, such as will make manifest their desire to do what is right, fair and just, and relieve that country of an incubus which threatens its ruin. I hope, therefore, that the Government, as a preliminary to building this line and operating it for the general advantage of the people as a whole, will disallow this Act, and disallow it also as a necessary first step to give back to the people of the province the enormous part of their heritage which has been wrested from them by the gang of plunderers, for we can call them nothing else, who now unfortunately control the destinies of that great province.

Mr. PRIOR. I wish to say a very few words in reply to the motion of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. McInnes). Some of his remarks I perfectly agree with. I am heartily with him as to the necessity that exists for the present Parliament doing justice to British Columbia in giving greater grants for public works and other things. I have brought that matter before this House year in and year out for some time past, but it was very hard indeed to make either side of the House believe that British Columbia was paying so much into the Dominion treasury and getting so little back. However, I am in hopes, now that the former Opposition is on the Government benches, they may look at things in a better light and that we shall find more money

spent in British Columbia than there used to be. But the principal portion of the gentleman's remarks applied to the charter that has been given by the British Columbia legislature to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway Company. I may say at once that I am one of the men to whom that charter was given, and I am not ashamed of it, nor is any man ashamed of it who was named in that charter. There was nothing done by us or by the legislature of British Columbia that was underhand or that we were afraid to have seen in the light of day. The hon. gentleman may call the charter members of the company boodlers and a few other choice names, but still he cannot show that anything out of the ordinary was done in making application for that charter and securing it. When the charter was obtained the land grant that was given was not supposed to be of any particular value; but the Kootenay mines having turned out so well, these coal lands have become more valuable. I do not intend to take up time with an argument on that question. I do not see what this House has to do with it at all. If any discussion is to take place upon the matter it should be in the local legislature of British Columbia and not in the Dominion Parliament. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McInnes) who has just taken his seat, is always trying to make out that the Liberals stand out for provincial rights in other matters. Why, then, should they not do so in this case? That charter was given by the provincial legislature of British Columbia, and they should know what is good for their own province. They were not all Conservatives who gave that charter; there were as many Liberals as Conservatives on the Government benches in the local House when it was given, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. McInnes) knows it. As to the charter being hawked around, as he says, I defy him to show me any company with a project of such magnitude as this one is that has been able to get capital within the last few years to construct even works of imperative importance to the country. Everybody knows that it was impossible to get capital either in England or in New York. We did our best and offered the best terms we could, but there was no party of men who could finance that road either on the English or the New York market, even with the huge land grants which the hon. gentleman talks about; and it is only lately, since the development of the gold and silver mines in British Columbia that the Canadian Pacific Railway has seen fit to take hold of the charter. Now as to what the hon. gentleman has said with regard to these being the only beds of coal in that district, I beg to say that that is not the fact. I refer to the authority of Dr. Dawson that there are other coal beds of equal value in Alberta on this side of the mountains. As to that being the only pass by which access can be had to British Columbia, I would say that the Dominion Government sent an engineer to report on that some years ago. His report will be found in the Railway Department, and it shows that there is room for four lines through the narrowest portion of the Crow's Nest Pass. So there is no monopoly, even if the building of the road goes to the Canadian Pacific Railway or to any other railway. I quite agree that it is highly necessary that we should have an independent road from the coast. I believe that is what the people of British Columbia want and think it desirable that the Dominion Government should assist that road. I do not see that it is necessary for me to say more. There were no statements made by the hon. gentleman that need refuting, in regard to the Crow's Nest Pass. The charter was granted by the British Columbia legislature, and I believe that hon. gentleman's leader has stated that it was not the intention of the Dominion Government to disallow it.

Mr. BOSTOCK. As the member representing that part of the country which is most interested in this question, I should like to add a few words to what has been said by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. McInnes). As the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) has just said, it is owing to the great increase of the output of minerals throughout the Kootenay district that this question of the grant that has been made to the British Columbia Southern Railway, has been brought into such prominence. We have had a large development in the mineral resources of West Kootenay, which has led to the putting up of smelters which are a great addition to the wealth of the country and give a great deal of employment to men in that part of British Columbia, thus tending to bring a large number of people in from different parts of the world. Now it would materially affect the smelting industry in that country to have cheap coal and coke for the purpose of carrying on that industry, and it will be a very grave question indeed for the smelters in Kootenay, if the whole of this coal is to be put into the hands of any company that can make a monopoly of it. At the present time, the smelters in Kootenay are paying as high as $15 a ton for their coal, bringing it sometimes from Wales and sometimes from the coast. The dearness of this fuel brings the cost of smelting very high. It is much in the interest of the Kootenay country generally that they should be able to get their supply of fuel cheaper. If they cannot get their coke in at a lower rate it will mean that the low grade ores with which that country abounds cannot be smelted for a long time to come. Therefore, it is to the interest of the country generally that the smelters should be able to get cheap fuel, and it is very necessary that we should guard very

carefully the interests of our country in this way. I must say that I view with some hesitation the disallowance of any Act passed by our provincial legislature; but I think that this particular Act is one that warrants very careful looking into, and that there are occasions when the Dominion Government should exercise their right of control over what is done by provincial legislatures. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) thinks that the discussion should take place in the British Columbia legislature. I think that we, in this House, are perfectly at liberty to discuss questions of this kind. The provincial legislatures have been too free in the grants that have been made.

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

After Recess.

Mr. BOSTOCK. When the House rose at six o'clock, I was saying that in my opinion the legislature of British Columbia had been rather too free in the way they have dealt with the natural resources of the country, and that they have given away more of those natural resources in subsidizing railways than a large number of people in that province consider justifiable or warranted, under the circumstances. It is only now when we are beginning to ascertain the value of our land and mineral resources that we realize how important it is they should belong to the people, and should have been kept for the benefit of the country, instead of being given away and alienated from the people so that they can derive no benefit from them. The hon. member for Victoria, B.C., (Mr. Prior) referred to the coal deposits in Alberta. What we are particularly dealing with in this case is the coal in the province of British Columbia; it is no answer to this question to say that they have coal in other places; what we want is that the coal of our own country shall be reserved for the use of our own people, and for the use of the smelters which are being put up, and which will be put up in the future. It is well known, and it was stated in the report made by Dr. Selwyn, in 1891, that the coal in this Crow's Nest Pass district and in the Kootenay country is a very good coking coal, and one that will certainly be of great value in the development of the minerals of that country. Therefore we are specially interested in seeing that we keep control of those coal deposits, and that they shall be available for the use and benefit of the people. The development that has been going on in the erection of smelters is shown in the returns that have been lately published in the report of Mr. Carlyle, the provincial Mineralogist. The Miner also states that the ore sent out from the Nelson smelter between the 1st of January and the 20th of March, 1897, was 499¼ tons, and that the Trail smelter turned out 856¼ tons, of the total value of $973,210. Every month we hope to see these returns largely increase, because, as the country develops, it will be easier to bring the ore from the mines, and as the mines are opened up, we shall see larger returns from the smelters, and we hope to see other smelters built up over that country. I do not propose to say much at this time on the question of handing the Crow's Nest Pass Railway over to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I think that my hon. friend from Vancouver has dealt with that matter very fully, and that what he has said fairly represents the views of the people of British Columbia. Those on the mainland, especially, feel the danger of allowing any corporation to get hold of a monopoly that will give them power to dictate to the people the rates which they shall pay for carrying freight. That is a serious matter in a new country, and care should be taken that no such power is given to any corporation. The people of British Columbia are deeply interested in this matter, and they are anxiously watching to see what course the Government will adopt; although they do not desire to interfere in any way, or to increase the difficulties of the Government in dealing with this matter. They realize, however, that it is a very serious question for the country, and they think that if the Government was aware of the feelings of the people throughout the province, and indeed of the whole North-west, their wishes and their interests would be consulted, and the Government would grant no monopoly to any corporation which would give it control of the development of that country. The development of the country depends largely on the course pursued by the Government in this matter. The North-west, and especially Alberta, will be more and more interested every year in the development of the Kootenay country, because at the present time the people in the former districts are drawing their supplies from that part of the country and will do so to an increasing extent especially after this Crow's Nest Pass Railway is built. At the present time, owing to the fact that the railway from Revelstoke only goes down as far as Arrowhead, it is necessary in the case of the supplies to break bulk and transfer the produce from the train to the steamer at Arrowhead; and this increases the cost of carriage into Kootenay and makes it heavier than it otherwise would be. A case was brought before me some time ago in which a mining company in the Rossland camp had ordered some eight carloads of machinery for the purpose of developing their mines, and they found that they could bring it in much cheaper over the line from the south than they could over the Canadian Pacific Railway. This is explained by the fact that if it was brought in over the Canadian Pacific Rail-

way they would have to break bulk at Arrowhead and again at Trail; and consequently the cost of handling heavy machinery being so great it was not possible to bring it in over the Canadian Pacific Railway, and they had to bring it in over the line to the south. Now, the people in British Columbia do not wish to see all the resources of the province used for the purpose of building up towns in the states to the south, and they are exceedingly anxious to see this Crow's Nest Pass Railway built. They feel, also, that it is not merely a provincial matter, it is not a matter that concerns the province of British Columbia alone, but it concerns the whole Dominion. It will indirectly benefit the people of Ontario and Quebec, because I find from inquiries that a great deal more machinery is now being purchased from manufacturers in Ontario and Quebec than has been purchased heretofore. The manufacturers of the east are beginning to realize the importance of mining development in British Columbia, and if proper railway communication is given, they will be better able to supply the machinery that is required, and the wants of the miners in other respects. And consequently the only thing that stands in the way at the present time is really this question of transportation. The building of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway is an important matter to the whole of Canada, and I hope hon. members in this House will not look upon it simply as a matter which concerns the province of British Columbia, but will realize that it affects the interests of the whole of this great Dominion, and that the opening of the Kootenay country, especially East Kootenay, will have a great effect in settling up the lands of the North-west and in carrying out a successful trade policy. There was one point in regard to the resources of that country which I think the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. McInnes) either omitted or only lightly touched upon. There are included in the lands covered by this grant in question very rich and valuable oil deposits, that are found in the rocks there. Dr. Selwyn, in his report of 1891, mentions having travelled through this country and found oil in four or five different places close to the river, and that he was able to obtain a considerable quantity of it in its different degrees of purity, and that he did so with very little trouble; and he suggests in his report that tests be made by sinking wells for the purpose of ascertaining the extent of the deposits in the country. That is another valuable product that we will be giving away under this grant to the British Columbia Southern Railway Company. I do not propose to occupy the attention of the House any longer on this question. I think the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. McInnes) covered the whole subject very well, and I hope that the Government will pay careful attention to this matter, and that this debate will place before the House and the people of the country generally the feelings and wishes of the people of the province in regard to it.

Mr. DAVIN. Before this question is put, I wish, without entering into the merits of the subject from the British Columbia standpoint—which has been so exhaustively and so ably dealt with by the hon. gentlemen who have thus far taken part in the debate—to say that the North-west Territories are deeply interested in having a railway built through Crow's Nest Pass as quickly as possible and on conditions that will secure to the North-west as low freights as possible. I must say that when it was indicated to the public by a great authority that arrangements had been made with a great railway company to build a railway through Crow's Nest Pass, conditions being exacted that would greatly relieve the settlers in the North-west Territories as regards freight rates. I was rejoiced; but if that project has fallen through, then I say the Government itself should turn its attention to the building of the road as a Government work; and if it be a 'sine qua non,' as the mover of this motion has contended, that in order that the Government may be free to build a road through Crow's Nest Pass, or a road that would be controlled by the people of Canada through that pass, that the Act of the provincial legislature should be disallowed, then I say that a cogent and conclusive case has been put before the Government for taking that course. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that within the last few years we have run a little wild in regard to the rights of the provinces. It seems to be considered now by a great many and in high quarters that anything a province does, provided it can be held to be technically within its rights, the Dominion Government, whatever Government may happen to be in power, must allow it to pass, and take no consideration whatever of the general interests of the Dominion that may be involved. But it is a truism that this great ocean-walled Dominion of Canada has interests that must overshadow the interests of every province; and if the interest of any province, or the 'amour propre' of any province clash with the interests of this great Dominion, then they must go by the board, and we must look to what are the interests of the people of Canada at large and feel that the interests of the people of Canada at large and what is best for them must be the guiding stars in any patriotic Dominion Government. I was sorry indeed when I heard it a few days ago indicated that Government would not so much as consider whether they ought or ought not to interfere in this matter. I will not go into the cloud and scandal that have gathered over this Crow's Nest Pass.

Mr. PRIOR. What is that scandal?

Mr. DAVIN. It is a scandal, not connected with Victoria, but connected with Toronto—it is more central than Victoria. The scandal I speak of is one put forward by one of the most influential newspapers in Toronto, which connected the name of a very prominent man and the name of one of our prominent legislators. I am not going into that—I do not want to go into it certainly at this time. The argument that has been put forward so ably by the hon. gentleman who has made this motion seems to me to be the argument that ought to commend itself most strongly to the Dominion Government. I am afraid from the fact that there is no mention of a Crow's Nest Pass Railway in the Speech from the Throne, and also of the way that the Government has indicated its regard for this matter, and also because of the strong indictment—shall I call it so ?—that has been brought against the Government by one of its most distinguished and able supporters, although I believe the youngest member in this House, who in a well elaborated argument made as strong a case as I think could be made for the proposition that he wanted to enforce—I say when an hon. gentleman known to be so strong a party man as the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. McInnes) feels compelled to speak so strongly, it looks as though the Government, at all events, were lying on its oars in regard to the important matter of giving the Dominion the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, which as long as we are without, you are only building up foreign cities, which as long as we are without, you are doing great harm to the commercial as well as the mining interests of the west, which as long as we are without, you are injuring not merely Alberta but the mining districts of Rossland and the Slocan, and you are injuring Assiniboia also. I, therefore, am glad that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McInnes) has brought this matter forward, because if there is any intention whatever on the part of the Government to build the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, the speech of the hon. gentleman may "prick the sides of their intent" and so possibly lead them to act when they otherwise would not. Mr. Speaker, I have only to say in regard to this, that probably it is not too late for the Government to take a step in regard to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway which will redeem them from the charge which I laid at their door earlier in the session, of having met this, their second session, without doing anything whatever for the North-west Territories.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, in the few remarks which I purpose making to-night I shall endeavour to confine myself to the notice of motion before the House. That notice of motion, the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has either not seen or has forgotten, and it may not be inopportune to read just what this notice of motion is. It is for an address :

Setting forth : 1. That an Act passed by the legislature of British Columbia in the 59th year of the reign of Her Majesty Queen Victoria, entitled "British Columbia Southern Railway Aid Amendment Act, 1896," extends the grant formerly made to the British Columbia Southern Railway Company of an enormous amount of public wealth and extraordinary privileges.

2. That in the opinion of this House, (a) The grants and privileges so extended are unwarranted and grossly extravagant, they are made without the interests of the public being properly safeguarded, and include rights the alienation of which from the control of the people will retard the development of the country and prevent a general enjoyment of its advantages ; (b) The said Act, if continued in force, would create such a monopoly in land, coal, and transportation, as would prove dangerous to the development and prosperity of the said province and to the interest of Canada generally.

And praying therefore that His Excellency will be pleased to disallow the said Act.

That, I conceive to be the matter before the House and I shall crave leave to refer very briefly to it. In dealing with this motion I am not unmindful of the fact that by the British North America Act the control of the Crown over the provinces is exercised through the instrumentality of the Dominion Government, and in the exercise of that constitutional supremacy the Governor-General must not ignore, and must have regard to and respect for the rights of the provinces as set out in our federal constitution. I am not unmindful either of the fact that that great charter of our constitution recognizes the right of each province of this Dominion to local self government, and unless these respective provinces contravene their jurisdiction and go beyond their provincial authority, then I contend that this Federal Government ought not and constitutionally cannot interpose and interfere with the acts of the various provinces. I am not unmindful of that, Sir, and unless the respective provinces go outside the bounds of their jurisdiction or assert a principle, or make a claim which might, not which "does" but which might injuriously affect the interests of the Dominion at large, then I say that the jurisdiction of this Government should not be exercised. It is not incumbent upon me to impress upon the House the necessity of keeping these principles constantly in view when discussing such a serious question as the one now before us. The notice of motion in appearance may be quite innocent, but underlying it is a very important principle the invasion of which would be a most dangerous precedent for this House to adopt. In the constituency which I have the honour to represent, I admit that the feeling is very strong indeed in respect to this so-called, rightly or wrongly, monopoly of the British Columbia Southern Railway Company, and equally strong is it in the constituencies contiguous to my own.

At the same time I am pleased to say, that strongly as my constituents feel on this question they are intelligent and liberal-minded, and if I can as their representative justify the course which I shall endeavour to adopt in this instance in not going headlong for a disallowance of this Bill, I know that my constituency will not in any sense feel dissatisfied with the action of this House should they feel disposed not to exercise that prerogative of disallowance which is now solicited by this notice of motion. The constitutional authorities available are full of precedents enunciating the principle of non-interference on the part of the Dominion Government with the action of the local legislatures, when these legislatures are acting within the purview of their powers. I have endeavoured to read the authorities very carefully, and I find there are at least two grounds of objection which may lie against the Acts of a provincial legislature. The first is, where the objection may be because the Act is in excess of the constitutional power of the local legislature, or where it contravenes or is at variance with Acts of the Dominion Parliament. That is the first ground of objection which may lie against a provincial Act. The second ground is, where the provincial Act contains provisions contrary to the sound principles of legislation, and is, therefore, likely to prove injurious to the interests of the Dominion at large, or in short, on the ground of public policy. Now, this Act of the British Columbia legislature must necessarily fall under either of these categories ; either the British Columbia Southern Railway Act is ultra vires of the legislature, at variance with some Act of the Dominion House, or it is against public policy. I rather conceive that the ground of objection to this Bill is that it is against public policy, that it is against the interest, or invades some rights of the Dominion at large. In so far as it may do so, to that extent, of course, it is reprehensible, and may be the subject of disallowance. Then, the question following from that would be, whether the exercise of the prerogative of disallowance is a matter of policy or not. It is needless for me to point out to the House, for it is axiomatic, that no legislature has the right to deprive a person of his property, at least not without adequate compensation ; but it may not be so generally known that, by the theory of the constitution, the legislature has the power to do so ; and it has been very tritely said that, as a consequence, the legislature is the judge of the morality of its own legislation. This motion before us pretends to touch the morality of this piece of legislation on the part of the legislature of British Columbia. That legislature is the judge of the morality of its own piece of legislation ; to that extent, interference with existing rights is a question of policy and not of power ; and it will be for this House to decide whether it is good or bad policy to exercise the prerogative of disallowance in this case. I may go further and say that, in deciding as to the disallowance of an Act, the Government is not confined to considering solely the validity of the Act. The power of disallowance is very general and, in arriving at a conclusion as to its exercise, it is quite admissible to take into consideration other matters than those affecting the validity of the Act in question. For instance, a particular Act within the competency of the province might include portions involving unsound or objectionable principles of legislation. In that case, if the local legislature did not remedy the grievance, then I take it the onus would lie on the Dominion Parliament to remedy it, and that Parliament would have to be responsible to the electorate for its action. Now, all the authorities advocate the most extreme caution in exercising the prerogative of disallowance. On reference to the statistics, it will be seen that the instances in which disallowance was resorted to from confederation up to 1891, the latest year for which I could find the figures, have been very few indeed; and I regret to say—because I think it is a reflection to some extent on our legislature—that, excepting Manitoba, British Columbia has had the largest number. Of some 800 Acts of the legislature of British Columbia, from 1871 to 1891, twenty were disallowed. In Manitoba, twenty-four were disallowed ; whereas in New Brunswick only one out of about 2,000 Acts were disallowed ; and in Ontario and Nova Scotia only comparatively few. However, twenty out of 800 is a very small ratio, indeed, which goes to show the extreme care and caution with which the prerogative of disallowance has always been exercised.

Now, the aspect of this case which, to my mind, is the most serious, is this. We are asked to disallow an Act of the legislature of British Columbia, and the remarks which have been made by the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Davin) would incline me to believe that he took the view, although he did not state it explicitly, that the local legislatures are somewhat inferior in their functions and powers, and that this House, having superior scope, ought to have no hesitation in recommending the reversal of any legislation passed by a local legislature. The hon. gentleman, who, I believe, is a member of the legal profession, has not apparently looked up his material—at any rate, not his law : and he does not appear to be familiar with the recent cases affecting this matter. In the case of the Attorney General of Canada against the Attorney General of Ontario, in 1892, reported in volume 3, Ontario Appeal Reports, 1896, the analogy existing between the federal and provincial executives is laid down. This is a synopsis of the case as decided : that the whole mass of executive authority is divided into two parts—that portion of

which is capable of being exercised with relation to the government of the Dominion being placed in the hands of the Governor General, and that portion which is capable of being exercised with relation to the government of the province being vested in the Lieutenant-Governor; and the executive authority which goes to the latter is of the same nature, of the same origin, of the same even higher antiquity, because it was practically continued from the old provinces. Therefore, the provincial executive authority has not any subordinate or inferior nature or quality. Of just the same nature as that possessed by the Queen's direct representative acting in her name in Canada is the executive authority possessed by the Lieutenant-Governor as the Queen's representative for the province. Therefore there is some perplexity in a case of this kind. This House is asked to deal with a piece of legislation passed by a body equal in standing and prestige to the executive of the Dominion Parliament to which we come for its disallowance, and having even greater antiquity; and it does not do for us lightly to say that inasmuch as the particular piece of legislation in question is provincial legislation, therefore it must be inferior and open to suspicion.

As a member of the legal profession, and pretending to understand somewhat cases which are applicable to questions of this kind, I must say that I have great diffidence in asking this House to vote in favour of the disallowance of this Act, particularly if I desire this House to proceed on constitutional grounds. However, as representing my constituency, in the first instance and, of course, the province and Dominion at large generally, I cannot ignore the overtures that are being made from time to time against this piece of legislation on the part of the people of the province of British Columbia. On all sides there are evidences of dissatisfaction, which I cannot ignore; and, although I cannot go so far as to say that this House cannot ignore them, at the same time, they are evidences which I think justify me in making use of them on this occasion, and then leaving the House, after hearing the facts as supplementary to those already given by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. McInnes) and the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Bostock), to decide whether it shall vote in favour of disallowance of this Act or not. Now, we have the "Province," a paper of a great deal of influence in British Columbia, in its last number, stating this:

> If the Dominion Government will exercise its prerogative and veto the British Columbia Southern Railway charter, it will make more friends in this province and do more for the cause of Liberalism than it possibly wots of.

That is really the gist of the feeling throughout the province of British Columbia. The Kamloops "Sentinel," another influential and ably edited paper, has a three column editorial urging the Government to disallow this charter. Very long resolutions are set out in that paper, very ably drawn, which express, no doubt, the opinion of the majority of the electorate in the vicinity of Kamloops. On every hand, we find these murmurings against this piece of legislation. The Victoria "Daily Times," one of the leading papers of that city, also holds very strong views on this matter. In the last number which has reached us, I find the following:—

> The disallowance of the British Columbia Southern Railway Company's charter, the remedy proposed by Mr. McInnis, would simplify the situation; and if that remedy can be justified on grounds of public policy, British Columbia will be in a position to act generously with the Crow's Nest Railway, having its terminus at the Pacific Coast.

I just refer to those to show the feeling that exists in the province of British Columbia with regard to this matter. Of course, as I said at the outset, the only ground that can be raised against this piece of legislation in my opinion is that it may be contrary to public policy.

I shall give a resume of the legislative steps leading up to this last act, and in doing so I shall be as brief as possible in order not to weary the House. It will be then for the House to decide, having regard to the constitutional aspect of the question and with the facts before it—facts which are not and cannot be contradicted—whether it is advisable to exercise the prerogative of disallowance or not. My hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. McInnes) went rather briefly over the ground of the different acts passed since 1888. I am sorry he did not go more fully into this aspect of the case and have obviated the necessity of my doing so, but I shall endeavour not to take up too much time in supplementing what my hon. friend has said on this point.

The first Act passed by the British Columbia legislature with regard to this franchise was in 1888, when the Crow's Nest and Kootenay Lake Railway Company was incorporated. The gauge of their railway was not to be less than 3 feet and the capital was to be $4,000,000; $100,000 of stock to be subscribed, of which 10 per cent was to be paid before the directors could be chosen. The company was authorized to pay in stock the contractors and engineers and other persons who might be engaged in promoting the undertaking. You notice now the terms running all through this legislation, terms which were persistently ignored, and it is nothing but fair—notwithstanding the opinion I hold on the constitutional aspect of the question—to point out the extent of the terms imposed by the legislature in passing these respective pieces of legislation. I would like very much if hon. gentlemen would listen closely and observe the extraordinary course of ac-

tion of that local legislature in British Columbia :

The company shall commence construction on or before two years, that is, by the 28th of April, 1890, and complete and equip before five years from the passage of this Act, that is, April 28, 1893.

Land granted, 90 feet right of way and also for terminal purposes, sidings, stations, &c.

The Act of 1888 was rather innocent and harmless in appearance, but you will see how it has been developed. In 1890, by Chap. 63 of the British Columbia Statutes. the time was extended for the commencement of this undertaking to three years from 26th of April, 1890, which brought it to April, 1893, and for the completion and equipment five years was allowed, which would be April, 1895.

In 1890, by Chap. 40, the company were granted 20,000 acres per mile, to be paid on the completion of each twenty mile section, provided the gauge was 4 feet 8½ inches, but if less than that, the grant was to be 10,000 acres per mile, and the company was to be allowed a royalty of 5 per cent on the value of all gold and silver, over and above working expenses, mined on the company's land grants.

It will be seen how the thing was developing. In 1891, by Chap. 56 of British Columbia Statutes, the name, Crow's Nest and Kootenay Lake Railway, was changed into the British Columbia and Southern Railway, and the new company was given the same power to construct a line from the Crow's Nest to Lake Kootenay. Some hon. members perhaps do not know that the Crow's Nest Pass is not altogether in the province of British Columbia, but quite a portion of it is in the Territories. This British Columbia Southern Railway's franchise began on the very summit of one of the peaks in the Crow's Nest Pass, on the boundary between British Columbia and the North-west Territories, or, in other words as far east as it could possibly go. Thus in 1891 the same power was given to this British Columbia Southern road to construct through the Crow's Nest Pass to Kootenay Lake, and in addition from Lower Kootenay River to the Columbia River, Fort Sheppard, with a branch line to Nelson via Salmon River, and also to construct a railway from Columbia River, near Fort Sheppard, to Hope, which is a town on the confines of my constituency in New Westminster district, thence to New Westminster, and Burrard Inlet, also a branch line from Elk River to Tobacco Plain near the 49th parallel.

In 1891, when the name was changed, the charter at that time, which began so obsecure in 1888, swept the whole gamut, as it were, from the summit of the Crow's Nest Pass Mountain, on the boundaries of the North-west Territories, down to the Gulf of Georgia on the extreme western boundary of the constituency of New Westminster.

In 1891, the 5 per cent in gold and silver ores was struck out.

In 1893, the British Columbia Southern Railway Company was permitted, as an alternative route to the line from Cranbrook to the Lower Kootenay River, authorized by former legislation, to construct from Cranbrook to Pilot Bay, on Kootenay Lake, or to the Lardo River by way of St. Mary's River.

These names may mean little or nothing to hon. gentlemen, but if any one will take the map of the Kootenay district and trace out these different places, Lardo, Tobacco Plains, Kootenay Lake and Crow's Nest Pass, he will find that this charter will cover a vast extent of valuable mineral and agricultural portions of British Columbia. Now, this Act of 1893 repeals section 4 of the Act of 1890, which reads :

"That this company shall commence the construction of the work on or before three years, and shall complete and equip the same on or before five years from passing of this Act ; time being declared material and of the essence of the contract under which this Act is passed," and enacts in lieu thereof that the company shall construct and equip the eastern section of the railway on or before 31st December, 1896, the central section by 31st December, 1897, and the western section by 31st December, 1898.

The 31st of December has come and gone and nothing has been done by this company. The 31st of December, 1897, is approaching, and doubtless it will pass without anything being done and probably the same may be said for the 31st of December, 1898. The schedule of the Act defines what portions of the railway are contained in each section. They are :

A.—The eastern section is to commence "at the junction of Summit Creek with Michel Creek, thence by way of Michel Creek, Elk River and the Upper Kootenay River to the 49th parallel and the Tobacco Plains.

B.—The central section is to commence "at a point on the Elk River near the junction of the Elk River with the Kootenay River, thence in a northerly direction to a point at or near Cranbrook, thence by the Moyee Pass to the Lower Kootenay River, or by the alternative route from Cranbrook by way of St. Mary's River to Pilot Bay on Kootenay Lake or to Lardo River."

C.—The western section shall consist of "that portion of the railway commencing from the western terminus of the central section to the coast by the most convenient route, to a favourable place for crossing the Fraser River to the city of New Westminster, thence to a suitable terminus on Burrard Inlet, and shall include the branch line to Nelson via Salmon River."

This 1893 Act also grants the company many additional powers, the most important of which are operating lumber mills, working mines of all kinds, erecting and running smelters, operating tramways, electric plants, petroleum works, etc. In 1893, by chapter 36, further provisions were made for a land subsidy in aid of the British Columbia Southern Railway, namely, 20,000 acres for each mile of railway to be constructed in

the Eastern and Central sections, that is to say, from Crow's Nest Pass to Pilot Bay, Kootenay Lake, or to the Lardo River. This land to be taken in East and West Kootenay. It will be observed that the Act in effect doubles the land grant if gauge of railway is less than 4 feet 8½ inches, as the Act of 1890, chap. 34, gave the company 10,000 acres for any gauge less than 4 feet 8½ inches. The Act which is most attacked and which was the most important in this matter is the Act of 1894. The title of this Act is "The British Columbia Southern Railway Aid Act, 1894," from 1888 to 1894 they were getting concessions and extensions of time ad lib. In 1894 the capacious maw of these people had not been satisfied, and in 1894 they had this Act passed which enacts :

That the grant in favour of the British Columbia Southern Railway authorized by the Railway Aid Act, 1890, as amended by an Act to make further provision for a land subsidy for and in aid of the British Columbia Southern Railway Company, is hereby extended and applied to the several sections of said railway, as described in subsections A, B and C of section 8 of the British Columbia Southern Railway Act, 1894.

This application of the land grant to subsection C, grants 20,000 acres to the company from Pilot Bay or the Lardo River to Burrard Inlet, and in addition 20,000 acres for a branch line to Nelson via Salmon River. That made 9,000 miles at 20,000 acres per mile, a total of something like 18,000,000 acres. It is true as the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) reminded the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. McInnes), this was amended subsequently, but that does not alter the fact that the legislature, in passing such an Act was culpably, if not criminally negligent What was their answer to the discovery of the fact that this land grant extended from the Crow's Nest Pass to the Coast ? It was that they did not intend that it should have such a scope, that it was a clerical error. It was not discovered until the press and the adherents of this Administration had pointed out to the amazed public of British Columbia the tremendous concessions granted—not in the dark, I admit, for these things were done with usual notice to the public ; but in some inexplicable way nobody had commented on the concessions made until last year. Then the Government came up and said in the blandest way : We have no intention whatever of acting upon our powers under this Act. We are too moral, politically, for that. This is a clerical error and we will amend it. But not until they were coerced into it under threat of public opprobrium, did they amend the Act which, I am sorry to say, together with other legislative vagaries, is making the legislature of British Columbia the laughing stock of the Dominion of Canada to-day. That was in 1894. Though they have rectified that clerical error, still the concessions made to that company are very great indeed, and it will be for this House to decide whether they are so monopolistic as to justify this Government in supporting a policy of disallowance. Now, in 1894, by the chapter 53, these Acts and amendments were consolidated, and all former Acts referring to the company were repealed except those granting lands, and section 25 of 51 Victoria, chapter 44, which deals with belts of timber from the Dominion Government. In this consolidated Act the capital of the company is fixed at $4,000,000, with power to increase. Of this capital an unlimited part, paid up, can be issued to "persons who have been and are engaged in promoting the undertaking." It is made a matter of comment that a member of the local legislature is interested in the promotion of this charter, and the fact is used against that gentleman that under this clause this paid up stock can be given to persons engaged in promoting the undertaking. The people of British Columbia fear, inasmuch as members of the Government of British Columbia are interested in this company's concessions, that unless this Government steps in and protects what they conceive to be public interest, their rights will not be conserved. The Act further goes on :

A.—The eastern section is to be completed by 31st December, 1896.

B.—The central section is to be completed by 31st December, 1897.

C.—The western section is to be completed by 31st December, 1898.

But the failure to complete any more of the said sections within the time limited for the completion of the same respectively, shall not prejudice the rights, powers or privileges of the company in respect of such part or parts (if any) of the section or sections as to which such failure shall be made as shall at the expiration of such limited time be made and completed. Unrestricted power is given the company to lease or sell out to any railway company whose line connects with the railway of the company.

I direct special attention to this :

Unrestricted power is given the company to lease, or sell out, to any railway company whose line connects with the railway of the company.

I am not specifying any particular company which will be given this privilege, but it is quite obvious to the House to which company the allusion is made :

This consolidated Act does not require any portion of the $4,000,000 capital to be subscribed and paid up, other than that each of the directors shall hold ten shares of $100 each, on which all calls due are paid.

In 1896 comes the Act which is referred to in the Notice of Motion. You will see that from 1888 to 1894 these amendments and additions were being made without interruption. In 1893, Chap. 55 recites :

That the British Columbia Southern Railway Company has petitioned for an extension of time, and section 1 enacts that the company shall con-

struct and equip the eastern section by 31st December, 1898, the central section by 31st December, 1899, and the western section by 31st December, 1900.

It will be observed that the company is not required to commence construction of the different sections at fixed dates or to expend a certain sum annually. The Act only deals with the dates for completion of the different sections.

1896. Chap. 4.—Confirms the right of the company to 20,000 acres per mile for a 3-foot narrow-gauge railway from Crow's Nest Pass to Burrard Inlet, if constructed and equipped within the extended times granted for the several sections by Chap. 53, 1896, but free miners' rights are reserved to search for minerals and acquire claims in the company's land grant in accordance with the mining laws of the province.

Now, Sir, those are the facts. Those are the pieces of legislation against which the people of British Columbia are to-day crying out. That Act of 1896 extending the time for doing these certain works under this piece of legislation, is the Act which it is asked to have disallowed. As I said before, having regard to the constitutional aspect of it—and personally I cannot ignore that—it is for this House to consider whether these facts as stated by my hon. friend from Vancouver and as recapitulated by myself, are sufficient to justify this Government in exercising the prerogative of veto. I have no doubt that the Government will carefully consider the matter, and will pursue a policy which would have been characteristic of them had they been in power in the past, and which will still characterize them now that they are in power. Whether this Act is disallowed or not, the country will doubtless consider that the Government will have done the best they could in the premises; and I have no doubt that in whatever action they take they will refrain from invading any principle of the constitution.

Mr. SPROULE. Public attention has lately been directed very keenly to this British Columbia Southern Railway charter, and the scheme or schemes connected with it for building up that section of the country; and I would not consider myself as faithful to my duty as a public man, or as a member of this House, were I not to say something on the question now that it has come before the House. If we believe but a fraction of what we have seen in the press lately, we must come to the conclusion that manipulations are going on in connection with this scheme that will not be for the benefit of either British Columbia and the North-west Territories, or of Canada as a whole. Now, while saying that, I am well aware that, according to our understanding of the constitutional right of the Dominion Government to veto provincial charters, we could hardly expect the Dominion Government to veto this charter. We have had some sharp controversies as to the power of provincial governments in chartering railway companies within their own domain, these questions having engaged the attention of Parliament a few years ago, and engaged it very strongly. Feeling became so strong in the province of Manitoba that it was stated the province was almost on the verge of rebellion when the Dominion Government disallowed their charter. For the Dominion Government to do the same in British Columbia would certainly be objectionable in the same way. But I do not apprehend that it is essentially necessary for the Dominion Government to disallow that charter in order to secure the rights of the people of that country; because, while that charter was given by the British Columbia legislature it could only give the right to build railways within its own domain, and that railway could not connect with any other railway outside its domain, nor could it traverse any portion of the North-west Territories without coming to this House for authority to do so; and, therefore, when they do come, as I understand they are about to do, the Government have it in their power to make such restrictions as will compel them to do what is right, or else refuse to grant them the powers which they ask in the charter before this House. Now, this motion advises the disallowance of a charter of the British Columbia Southern Railway. I say if we believe a fraction of what we have heard lately, we would feel that the Dominion Government were justified in disallowing that charter if it was constitutional to do so. Is it a fact that one of the great daily papers of Toronto, the organ of one of the great parties in this country, is hypnotized, as has been alleged by some of its prominent stockholders being so directly interested in this British Columbia Southern Railway Company and another railway company, that they are endeavouring, through their paper, to control the policy of the Government with reference to that great question? Now that has been affirmed, and I have seen nothing in that great organ of the Reform party to disabuse the public mind of the impression that there is something concealed, something that we don't understand, something that the public ought to know and the Parliament of Canada ought to know before they can deal intelligently with this question. The history of this railway is sufficient to make us suspicious about it. It was stated by one of the members from that province that various charters had been granted from time to time for commencing and completing the railway. But as the company were then unable to raise capital abroad, that was given as a reason why there was nothing wrong in this charter being renewed from time to time. In answer to that it was stated that it was only within the last few months that the interest in that country has become so great, and the mining

development is so rapid that the attention of the capitalists of the world has been directed to it, and now they are willing to invest their money in an enterprise which they would not have been willing to do a few years ago. Now it is an easy matter to raise the money. Well, I believe that is a fact, and as an evidence, I need only read a small portion of the last report of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Speaking of their intention to build a road in that country, they say :

> Your directors are strongly of the opinion that any delay in securing your interests in that direction will be extremely dangerous—that unless your company occupies the ground, others will, the demand for shipping and travelling facilities being most urgent. The directors feel that they cannot too strongly urge the immediate construction of a line from Lethbridge to a connection with your Columbia and Kootenay Railway at Nelson, a distance of 325 miles, and anticipating your approval, they have already taken steps towards commencement of the work on the opening of spring.

It is quite evident they have gone carefully over the ground before coming to this conclusion, because if they did not do so, some other railway would occupy it. While they appear to be so anxious to occupy the ground and appear to be prepared to make a large expenditure for the purpose of reaching that section of country, at the same time they are applying to the Government and the country for a very large subsidy, I am told, for the purpose of assisting in building that railway. It is for this House to consider whether that subsidy when proposed is excessive, as the hon. gentleman states it would be in his resolution, which sets out :

> The grants and privileges so extended are unwarranted and grossly extravagant.

If we can believe what we have heard, we must come to the conclusion that they are grossly extravagant. It continues :

> They are made without the interests of the public being properly safeguarded, and include rights the alienation of which from the control of the people will retard the development of the country and prevent a general enjoyment of its advantages ; (b) The said Act, if continued in force, would create such a monopoly in land, coal, and transportation, as would prove dangerous to the development and prosperity of the said province and to the interests of Canada generally.

If we believe what we hear, we must come to the conclusion that the true policy for the Government to pursue is to examine all phases of the question before deciding whether they will ask Parliament and the country to grant subsidies of large sums of money or extensive areas of land. We have had an experience with respect to monopolies in the great west to cause us to be extremely careful either in regard to extending monopolies or giving control of large areas of land. If it be the fact that this is the only pass through the mountains by which a railway can be successfully run, it is all the more important on that account that we should be very careful whether we extend that monopoly or not. It is a fact that if the railway is built by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and they exercise the same influence over the traffic of British Columbia as they have done over the traffic of the country through which the road is at present operated, it will be found to be in British Columbia, as it was in Manitoba, a burning monopoly, which the people will be very glad to get rid of before very long. The Government are therefore amply justified in moving very carefully and slowly before they give that company the power which will enable them to extend their monopoly, which is already stated to be very injurious to the country. Is it in the interest of the country that what has so often been declared to be an injurious monopoly should be extended ? That is a question for the Government and the House to consider. Is it in the interest of the country that it should be extended ; is it in the interest of the country that the people should be burdened with debt to supplement what is claimed to be a very extravagant offer made by British Columbia for the building of the road ? Since the mining development in British Columbia has become so extensive and so interesting, a keen demand for coal for mining purposes has arisen, and if the large and extensive deposits of coal have become more interesting and valuable, and what might not have represented to capitalists much value a few years ago may represent an immense value to-day, the Government should scrutinize the matter before we take a step in the dark which may lead to binding up the resources of the country, retarding development and thus doing injustice to the people of that country. An hon. gentleman who spoke against the motion asked, Has the Government constitutional power to disallow that Act ? Having regard to the principles which the Government have always followed in regard to the disallowance of provincial charters, I do not think they have power to disallow that Act. But if they have not the power to disallow it, they have the power in their own hands of preventing the amalgamation of the company with any other company that would give them a monopoly over the trade of the country for all time, because while the British Columbia Southern Railway Company has power to amalgamate with another company, no power to amalgamate with it is possessed by any other company, and before Parliament pass an Act permitting the amalgamation, the Government would be amply justified in exercising caution in that regard and going very slowly. The hon. gentleman said there are more coal beds than one. There may be ; but this coal bed referred to may be very much enhanced in value on account of its loca-

tion. The reports in regard to this extensive coal area are almost fabulous. If one-fourth of the area reported really exists, the coal beds should pay for the building of the road ten times over, without calling for any assistance from the country. Then, the grant of 20,000 acres of land per mile is a very important consideration. We know what has been the effect of such grants in the North-west. We know that although much has been done for the country in the direction of development, very large tracts of lands are held by railway companies and other corporations, and this fact has largely tended to deter new comers from settling there. Although that country consists of alluvial soil and fertile plains, and you would naturally imagine it would be an El Dorado for farmers, they are not settling there in as large numbers as might be expected. When a stranger visiting the country sees the land for a distance of 20 miles from the railroad still unsettled, he naturally commences to reason with himself as to the cause. When he finds a settler is compelled to go back beyond the railway belt in order to obtain free land, he begins to think there is something radically wrong as he has to go so far back to get a free homestead. It is claimed by some people that the Government would be justified in buying up all the land now vacant and throwing it open for free homesteads, and that this must be done before we will be able to settle up the country. If that is our experience in the North-west, we must be very careful before we allow any company to get control of a grant of 20,000 acres of land per mile for building the railway. It is true that the Dominion does not give the land. British Columbia gives the land, and if it desires to make that grant to a railway company for such purposes the province can do so. But the Dominion Government can exercise such control over that railway corporation as will in a large measure safeguard the rights of the people beyond the extent to which they may be affected by that charter. The hon. member stated that there are four other passes through which a railway can be built. It may be so. But when two railways are constructed through that country they will prove ample for the trade for some time to come, and that fact would be sufficient to deter capitalists embarking their capital in the construction of other roads through that expensive country for railway building. It is not an argument that because there are other passes available, this Parliament should allow this road to go through the Crow's Nest Pass and not raise its voice against it. Under these considerations the Government should look into this question carefully, and not allow the country's interests to be bartered away for the advantage of people who are ready to do whatever will bring money into their own pockets. The very fact, as appears from the public press, that some members of this honourable House and the Senate are directly interested, and that some members who control public organs have either muzzled or hypnotized those organs, so that they have not come out boldly on this subject, leads me to express the opinion that the Government should be very careful before they hand over this undertaking to a corporation and extend a monopoly already declared to work injuriously, and which if extended will be injurious to the extent of the power placed in its hands.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, as the constitutional phase of this question concerns principally the members from the province of British Columbia, I did not wish to speak until they had delivered their views on the subject. But I may say that this matter eminently affects the interests of the constituency that I represent, and it is my duty, representing the interests of my constituents, to express my views on this motion. I can assure the House that however strong the language that has been used by hon. gentlemen speaking on this motion, that language does not express to the full the sentiments of the people I represent. These hon. gentlemen have not in any way exaggerated the strength of the feeling in the western country against this British Columbia Southern Railway. Speaking as to the constitutional side of the question, I shall be brief. I entirely appreciate the fact that the leaders of the Liberal party have always taken ground in favour of what we call provincial rights, and I wish to say that I am a supporter of provincial rights. I believe that to be one of the strong points in the policy of the Liberal party, and I believe that it is one of the guarantees of confederation. Inasmuch as the party on this side of the House is in favour of provincial rights, and in so far as I am in favour of provincial rights, I am bound to understand that the Liberal party is against provincial wrongs, and this is a provincial wrong. There have been agitations hitherto in regard to the disallowance of railway charters. The Government of Canada has in times past disallowed certain railway Acts, but that disallowance was for the prevention of the building of railways, whereas this disallowance, if the Bill is disallowed, would be calculated to promote the building of railways as has been very well shown by hon. gentlemen who represent the province concerned. Those who ask for the disallowance of this Act do not so ask because they are against railway development, but on the contrary, because they are in favour of railway development. It would appear, then, that it is a necessity for the development of railways in that territory that this charter should be disallowed. There is a geographical feature of the case which has not been touched upon by gentlemen who have spoken, and to which I

desire to refer. A certain section of this proposed Crow's Nest Pass Railway will develop not only the coal area that has been spoken of, and the petroleum area that has been spoken of, but will also develop a gold-bearing area which has not been referred to and which it is absolutely certain is at least equal, if it is not superior, to Rossland and Cariboo. I refer to the East Kootenay or Fort Steele gold-bearing region. That district is at present practically unworked, and it must necessarily remain unworked, if it is not reached by a railway. It is to develop the gold mines of that district that this railway is absolutely necessary. Let me emphasize the statement of the hon. member for Westminster (Mr. Morrison) that a certain grant of land goes with the construction of a certain portion of this railway and that a certain section of that road can be built from the Crow's Nest Pass to the boundary line which would develop the coal and petroleum areas and the gold-bearing area as well, and which would carry the whole traffic from those regions across the line into the United States. That can be done and for all we know will be done under this charter of the British Columbia Southern Railway Company. Hon. gentlemen in this House who may be inclined to look upon this as a question affecting British Columbia alone, ought to take note of that fact. As in the case of Rossland and as in the case of Slocan, our trade from this district is liable to be carried across the line, and the wealth of our mines may possibly be diverted so as to build up the commercial interests of United States cities, and to afford a market to farmers. The prospective position in this case is exactly the same as the actual condition of things existing in Rossland and the Slocan. I care not how thoroughly any hon. member of this House may consider this to be a provincial question, I ask him to consider whether it is not in the interests of his locality that the trade of this richest portion of the Dominion of Canada, and probably the richest mining region in the world, should be done in his country. It is a long way from Ottawa to Slocan, a long way from Ottawa to Rossland, and a long way from here to Fort Steele. These are merely geographical expressions to a large number of members in this House; but let me put the case before hon. gentlemen in this way: The debt of the Dominion of Canada runs into the hundreds of millions, and the taxation is a considerable number of dollars per capita on the people. The gentlemen who perpetually turn that side of the question outwards seem to think that there is no remedy. They seem inclined to sit down and cry about the existing state of affairs. They blame somebody or something for the cause of this, but they do not propose any remedy. Now, what is the remedy? If you and I to-day are paying more taxes than we ought to pay, the easiest and the only remedy is to get somebody to develop the undeveloped wealth in this country, so as to increase the number of our tax-paying population and so help us to pay the taxes. In this way benefit will come to every citizen of Canada by the development of the mining region of British Columbia. It will increase the number of taxpayers, and so will lighten the burden on those who are now paying the taxes.

The hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. McInnes) read a large number of figures setting forth the revenue that was derived directly from the province of British Columbia, chiefly from customs duties. Although he made out a most excellent case from the figures he read, those figures were entirely misleading, if he will pardon my saying so, as to the facts of the case. They did not represent by any means the actual amount of customs duties collected by the Dominion of Canada on behalf of the people of British Columbia, because the duties upon the trade of British Columbia with eastern Canada are paid in eastern Canada to a very great extent, and are credited to the cities of eastern Canada. You can put the case in either the one way or the other. You can say if you like that the eastern cities of Canada do not do business with British Columbia, and that, therefore, they do not collect the duties that properly arise out of that trade. In that case I say that above everything it is necessary that provision should be made so that those cities may be able to do the trade. Surely none of our eastern cities or our eastern manufacturers or commercial houses are doing so much business that it would not be good for them to do more. Surely the same trade that builds up the city of Spokane in a few years and makes it to-day one of the most prosperous, if not the most prosperous city in the United States, would be good if distributed amongst the cities of eastern Canada. I do not say this because British Columbia needs my championship. She has able champions here. I speak on behalf of the west at large, which, because of the small amount of duties collected at its customs ports, is held to be a burden upon the Dominion. If the customs duties from the whole of that western country do not pay its expenses, I have only to point out that it is not the amount collected at the customs ports of the west that has to be considered; it is not the amount which they import direct or the amount which the eastern houses import direct and send to them; but it is also the amount manufactured or produced in the east and sent to the people of the west. In all these ways the wealth of the country is increased, so that the development of any part of the west, the turning to account of something that has hitherto been of no account, is of direct as well as indirect financial value to every man in the whole Dominion, whether he lives at one end of it or the other. It is

of value to him in lightening his burden of taxation. It is of value to him in the widening of his business.

As to the right of the Government of the Dominion to step in and disallow this provincial legislation, I agree with the last speaker that if the tenth part of what has been stated here to-night is true, the Government would not be justified in doing anything else than procuring some change in the present arrangements. A great many hard words have been used against the British Columbia legislature for its action in this matter. I do not altogether agree with those hard sayings. The British Columbia legislature was in a certain position and acted under a certain condition. That condition I hope and believe was changed on the 23rd of June last—this chartering of railways, and this granting of land and bonuses of one kind and another, when there did not appear to be any possibility of inaugurating any other system for the development of the country by means of railways. The British Columbia Government, we may suppose, was earnestly desirous of developing the country, and the only way of doing so which appeared possible up to that time was to grant its lands, its minerals, its anything and everything, to any company or body of men who wished to develop the country. It is my hope, at any rate, that there was a change in the conditions on the 23rd of June last, and that a new idea took precedence in this Dominion on that date. I hope that the idea that it was necessary to grant away every right and privilege that belonged to the people in order to get railway communication died on that day, and that the new idea became paramount that the people of this country were entitled to all the benefits and resources of the country—that no longer were the people to work for the railroads, but that the time had come when the railroads had to work for the people. The British Columbia legislature, having passed this monopoly legislation under what appeared to be an irremediable and irrevocable system of monopoly, may now, and in all probability will, be willing to reconsider their legislation, and to meet the Dominion Government half-way, at any rate on new lines, in conformity with the new idea which I hope took precedence on the 23rd of June last.

I said in the beginning that I was in favour of provincial rights. I have supported the Liberal policy of provincial rights against the policy of provincial wrongs. So, while I hold that the Dominion Parliament has the power of disallowance, and the right if need be to exercise that power, still in this case I am in favour of applying the idea of the hon. leader of the Government in favour of the sunny ways of conciliation rather than coercion. This is another case in which I believe negotiations might well be entered into between the Dominion Government and the provincial Government for the advancement of the common good. I think it is well that the case should be presented here as strongly as it has been to-day, with the view of showing to the country and to the Government of the Dominion how strongly the people of the west feel on this matter. Not that there shall be any wrenching of the constitution, not that there shall be any violence done to the feelings of any province, but that the Government, appreciating the gravity of the situation, and the necessity of action in the case, shall forthwith take such action as shall lead to the conservation of the rights, not of British Columbia, not of Alberta, but of the whole Dominion of Canada. Mr. Speaker, if we had Johannesburg situated within a few hundred miles of Ottawa, how fortunate we should be. What would we not give to have such valuable mines at our doors; and is it not a fact—it is a fact, an established fact—that in the Kootenay country we have mines far richer and more extensive than those of Johannesburg. Then, are we to stand still while our good friends—our commercial rivals, and, I am sorry to say, not our commercial friends in any way—in the United States are reaping the benefits of the natural resources of our own country. It is a position that appears to me intolerable; and certainly we who live in the west cannot understand that such a position can continue or have the support of any Government in this country.

Mr. MAXWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of supporting the motion that has been moved by my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. McInnes). I think it necessary that each member from that province should express himself with regard to this motion, and lest it might be suspected that I was not in sympathy with it, I feel obliged to say a few words in indorsement on what has already been so well said by my hon. friends who have spoken. It is particularly pleasing to us who come from that far off province to see how deeply interested the members of this House are in a question particularly affecting that province, and I am sure that we are indebted to those hon. members who have supported us in this matter. It is very noteworthy that the only voice which has been heard in this House against this motion is that of a gentleman who is deeply interested in its passing, and I think it would have been better for him, it would have shown a finer taste, and considerable common sense, if he had held his tongue, instead of rising to support what we all regard as a thing which is detrimental to the well being of our province. It may be asked, why have we come here at all? I believe, in common with other speakers, in provincial rights, and I am willing on all occasions, in which the province expresses its will in a fair and just manner, to abide by the decision of the

province, but this is the position in which we are at present in British Columbia. We have had a considerable fight out there for a just and fair representation. At present the people of that province are not represented at all in a fair or just way. We have constituencies so cut up, that places with 200 electors send a member to the provincial Parliament, while constituencies made up of 18,000 send only three members, so that at the present time, in order to suit the purposes of a sort of a family who have been governing that province for a number of years, the province has been put up in just such a way as will suit their interests when questions such as this comes before the local House. Now, it is because the voice of the people has not been expressed, it is because the people have not had a fair chance of expressing themselves with regard to this question, that we have felt compelled to bring this matter before the Government here and to ask them to disallow an Act which is detrimental to the future prosperity of British Columbia. An hon. member suggested a policy of conciliation. Now, if there were the slightest hope or prospect of anything being done by conciliation, I would at once say: go on with that policy; but I tell you, Sir, that the present Government in British Columbia is too far steeped in this particular policy to do anything that will interfere with the material interests of its friends at present. They know that their end is very near, and I believe they will stick to this legislation for the purpose of benefiting those who have stood at their backs so loyally in the days of their prosperity. I am glad that this question has been brought up, and I tell the Government frankly that it is the desire of all their friends in British Columbia that they should disallow this legislation. But if the Government feel that because of the policy which has been more or less accepted and acted upon during the past, it would be unwise on their part to interfere in provincial matters, I hope that they will at least give us their sympathy, and assure us that if it had not been for this policy they would have supported our demand on this question. If there is no hope that we can do anything at present, I hope that, if not here, at least in the Railway Committee or in some other way, we will yet have the opportunity afforded us of doing something to obstruct this policy which will be ruinous to all that we hold so dear, so far as our province is concerned. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the interest taken in this matter, and I hope that, while we have made this a sort of British Columbia day, from the picture which has been presented to you by my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. McInnes), you will realize there is something at stake, that a grievous wrong has been committed, that something has been done that should not have been done, and that we, as representatives of the people, ought in some way to bring the matter before you, and if the Government is not able to do what we desire, we will not exactly blame them for it, but at the same time it will be a comfort for us, who are fighting the battle of the people out there, to know that we have the sympathy of the House and especially the sympathy of the Government, and that they will do all that in them lies to preserve the interests of the people of that enterprising and prosperous province.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I do not seek to minimize in the slightest degree the great importance of the question which the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. McInnes) brought before this House so ably this afternoon. I had the pleasure of hearing the first half of his address, but, to my great regret, was called away during the latter portion. The hon. gentleman asked the House to adopt a resolution calling upon the Government to disallow the British Columbian and Southern Railway Act of 1896, on the ground that the legislation was of a very improvident character. While we have had a great many discussions in this House as to the circumstances under which the central Government can be justified in disallowing an Act of a provincial legislature, there are certain rules which, I think, are tolerably well understood by hon. gentlemen on both sides with reference to the exercise of such a power. We all agree that where there is a clear invasion of Dominion jurisdiction by a provincial legislature, a fair case is made out for disallowance by the Dominion Government. And it has been asserted, and I think it is pretty well established and is now received as the better authority, that in all cases, even when the subject matter is within the jurisdiction of the provincial legislature, if there is a clear interference with Dominion interests or if the vital interests of Canada as a whole, clearly and imperatively call for interference, that interference ought to take place. But it is perfectly clear that the Act of the local legislature of British Columbia was within their powers. Nobody doubts that. In order that we might be justified in interfering at all with a legislation of that kind, we must be satisfied that there is a great and manifest necessity pressing upon this Dominion Government to interfere and disallow the Bill. Well, I am not going to say whether that state of facts exists or not. I listened with very great pleasure to the constitutional definitions of my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) and the limits he placed upon the exercise of this power by the general government, and, to a very large extent, I agree with what he says. I was pleased to see that he devoted himself, to some extent, from his standpoint, to show that this legislation does come within the class that the

Dominion Government is justified in interfering with. But we must draw a clear distinction in this matter. Mere improvident legislation, I care not how improvident it may be, when it is clearly within the scope of the powers of the local legislature, does not call for nor justify interference on the part of the Dominion Government, unless vital interests of the Dominion are at stake which we are imperatively called upon to protect. It can be shown in this case that the legislature acted clearly within their power. No one denies that. The granting of 10,000 acres or 20,000 acres of land per mile to promote railway extension is purely a provincial matter over which they have exclusive jurisdiction, and, before we can exercise the prerogative of disallowance, we must be clear beyond the shadow of a doubt that there are vital Dominion interests of a paramount character at stake, that justify this interference.

I am sure that the Government will take the facts that have been laid before the House so ably to-night into their sympathetic consideration, and will look at them from all sides. I may say that there has not been a whisper to the Government in favour of disallowance until my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. McInnes) made his speech to-day. There has not been a petition from any public body or from a single individual in British Columbia asking the Government to exercise its power of disallowance. Hon. gentlemen will see, under these circumstances, that the matter calls for very grave and careful consideration before the Government can assume to interfere. Hon. gentlemen know that, the history of the past with reference to disallowance by the Dominion Government by provincial legislation has not been such as to induce us to go one inch further than we have gone. The party I have the honour to belong to have made themselves hitherto the champions of provincial rights in this respect. We may be trusted not to go back on our record in this regard. This subject having been brought to the attention of the Government for the first time to-day, I will ask that it be allowed to rest until the Government have an opportunity to consider their attitude. As to the very important question of a railway through the Crow's Nest Pass, I will not say a word further than this, that it will not be very long before the policy of the Government on this matter will be announced, and it would be exceedingly imprudent for me to anticipate the announcement of that policy. Expressing my thanks to the hon. gentleman who made the motion and his hon. confreres who supported him so ably, I would venture to say, and I think I am expressing the general opinion of the House, that this debate should be adjourned so that hon. members may have the opportunity of reading the statements made in the "Hansard," and when it comes before the House we will be in a better position to deal with it than we are at present. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all calls for tenders and specifications for the same and detailed answers thereto made since the last session of Parliament in respect of the printing of Government notes, stamps, &c., of all correspondence in connection therewith had with the Government or any member thereof and with the Minister of Finance or the officers of his department, copies of all reports made thereon to the Minister of Finance and to Council, together with all minutes of Council passed in relation thereto, and a copy of the contract entered into between the Government and the successful tenderer.—(Mr. Foster.)

Return giving the names of all commissioners appointed by the Government or any of the Ministers to hear charges and make investigations into the conduct of civil servants and employees of the Government or any of the departments since July, 1896, together with the rate of pay and allowances of each and the length of time each has been employed, and the full amount paid; also copies of all reports made by them to the Government, or any member thereof, and copies of the authorization and instructions under which they acted.—(Mr. Foster.)

Return giving the names of all postmasters and other persons in the employ of the Government in the counties of King's and York, New Brunswick, who have been dismissed since July, 1896, and all correspondence in connection therewith. —(Mr. Foster.)

Return showing how many convicts were liberated from the different penitentiaries in Canada since the month of July, 1896; giving their names, why they were convicted, and showing why they were liberated, and the names of those who obtained their pardon for them; also the names of those whose sentences were commuted. —(Mr. Bergeron.)

Copies of all correspondence relating to the retirement of Messrs. Bompas, Bischoff & Co., and the appointment of Mr. Charles Russell as solicitor for the Dominion Government in London.—(Mr. Foster.)

Copies of all memorials, statements and other documents from the Government of the province of Manitoba in relation to an unsettled claim resulting from that province being charged with the cost of the erection of public buildings; with copies of all correspondence in connection therewith.—(Mr. LaRivière.)

Copies of all correspondence, papers, petitions, &c., in connection with the dismissal of Angus McPhee as postmaster at Hopefield, in the province of Prince Edward Island.—(Mr. Martin.)

ADJOURNMENT—FRANCHISE BILL.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies) moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman who leads the House to-night what position the Government have arrived at in reference to the suggestion that I made as to the desira-

bility of postponing the consideration of the Franchise Act. It is very important that the House should have a general idea of what is coming before it, and what measures are to be pressed. I took the opportunity on a former occasion of drawing the attention of the hon. the First Minister and his colleagues to the fact that no member of this House pretends that there is any immediate pressing necessity for a Franchise Act, and that no person doubts that the measure is one of very great importance and one to which it is not undesirable that a great deal of attention should be given. I hope, Sir, that the suggestion that I ventured to make, that the consideration of so contentious a measure as that undoubtedly must be, if submitted to the House at this time should be deferred to a more convenient season. If there had been any necessity for pressing this measure, if we were on the eve of a general election or anything of that kind, I could quite understand that hon. gentlemen opposite would naturally wish to put a law upon the Statute-book in conformity with the strong opinions and feelings which they on various occasions expressed in relation to the matter. But this is not the case. Moreover, a question waits solution at the hands of the Government which is of most vital importance to the whole people. This is demanded in the interests of a suffering country. We have now reached that season of the year when it is most necessary to the commercial classes of this country that they should have a basis of certainty for their transactions. They must make purchases for the season and they are losing most valuable time and being greatly embarrassed. It is consequently of the first necessity to the country that the Government should at least take the House and the country into their confidence as to what is going to be the fiscal policy of this country. I cannot understand how it is possible those gentlemen knowing and appreciating as I am sure the hon. members of the Government must appreciate, and as, I am certain, every member of this House on either side, and every intelligent man in the country appreciates the vital importance to Canada as having as early as possible an uncertainty which has been so prejudicial, and so damaging, which has so greatly injured the condition of the country from end to end, removed, should still prolong that uncertainty. And I must again ask my hon. friend opposite whether the Government will not take into consideration the suggestions I have ventured to throw out, with the desire to facilitate in every possible way from this side of the House of dealing with the questions of vital importance to the country and to postpone the consideration of questions that will not for a moment compare in pressing importance, until a future period. I should be very glad if my hon. friend was able to give any assurance that these suggestions, thrown out in the best possible faith, with the desire of assisting the Government and facilitating the consideration of measures that are absolutely indispensable in the public interest, will receive such favourable consideration as will enable us to deal with this great question upon which the interests of the country depend in so intense a degree.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I sympathize fully with the desire the hon. gentleman expresses that at the very earliest possible, reasonable time the policy of the Government with respect to the tariff should be announced. I had the pleasure of hearing the hon. gentleman's appeal to the Prime Minister, made the other day, pretty much in the line of the remarks which the hon. gentleman has made to-night. For myself I fail to see the signs of suffering which, in his mind, exists throughout the country because the tariff has not already been brought down. The hon. gentleman, I think, will do the Government the justice of saying that it would have been quite impossible for them to bring down the tariff already, even had they desired to do so. They did not lose a single moment of time in proceeding with the Government business; but the Opposition, in the exercise of their perfect rights—I do not question it at all—chose to debate the reply to the Address from Friday, when it was introduced, until late Friday night, when the House adjourned. The hon. gentleman knows that whatever disposition the Government might have had, and however ready they may have been to introduce and push forward any one of their measures, it was utterly impossible up to the present moment, absolutely and constitutionally impossible, that they could have taken the first step in that direction. Now, I may relieve the hon. gentleman's mind by telling him that which he knows—no man knows better, from the vast experience he has had in these matters—that in introducing a policy of this kind the Government, unless they have entirely lost their heads, and I do not think they have, desire to proceed with reasonable prudence and caution. They desire to consult from time to time, on some matters, with their leading friends. They are doing so, and it is their intention as soon as they can get it ready, which will be, I hope, at an early day, to lay that policy before the country. That may take some days yet, the hon. gentleman knows necessarily must take some days. But in the meantime, public business can be proceeded with, and one of the first measures which the Government thought it necessary to lay before the House and the country, was the proposition which they have advocated continually and consistently for so many years in Opposition, to abolish the late Franchise Act and introduce the one of which the hon. the Solicitor

General moved the first reading the other day. In the opinion of this House, Sir, it is highly important that that measure should be pressed to a speedy conclusion. I myself did indulge the hope, and I think that I have had the best grounds for indulging the hope, that upon this matter, whatever might have been the differences between the two parties in times gone by, these differences had all been healed. I recollect not very long ago that the gentlemen who then occupied these benches announced their conversion to the policy we had advocated; and when they themselves declared that there was an immediate necessity for the repeal of the old Franchise Act and going back to the provincial system, I thought from that time forth this question had ceased to be a contentious one. Well, Sir, it appears not; but however that may be, I understand that it is the Prime Minister's intention to press forward that Bill as speedily as the constitutional rules and usages of the House, and paying the greatest respect to the desire of the hon. gentleman from time to time for delay, if he wishes it, will permit. Therefore, I believe the second reading of the Bill will be moved to-morrow, and I suppose the next stage will be taken when the hon. gentleman has had the proper time for which he may ask, that of going into committee. But I regret to say that I am not able to give him any assurance that the Prime Minister has changed his mind from that which he declared the other day. At any rate, the leader is not here to-night, but I know I am expressing what his views were a few hours ago.

Mr. SPEAKER. Before putting that motion, I would like to remind the leaders on both sides of the House that when a motion is made to adjourn for the purpose of closing the business of the House, it is certainly not regular to make remarks as extended as those which have been made to-night by both hon. gentlemen. Questions and replies about the business of the House are of course in order; but I ask hon. members to endeavour to avoid discussing questions of policy, if possible, on a motion to adjourn the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 6th April, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE RATE OF INTEREST.

Mr. QUINN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 15) further to amend the Act respecting Interest.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Explain, please.

Mr. QUINN. This Bill provides that, whatever rate of interest is agreed upon, no greater rate than 6 per cent per annum shall be recoverable. In the Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter 127, the Act respecting Interest, it is provided that any rate of interest may be exacted. We have had cases throughout the country, particularly in the city of Montreal, in which a rate of interest equal almost to 3,000 per cent per annum has been collected. There was one notable case in Montreal within the last few days, in which a man obtained a loan of $150, and was sued for, and was compelled to pay, in interest, the sum of $5,000 for the loan of $150. This Bill is to prevent the infliction of such a rate of interest upon persons needing money, and, at the same time, to protect persons lending money by providing that they shall be allowed interest at the regular legal rate of 6 per cent per annum. It would compel persons who wished to exact an exorbitant rate of interest to take it in the form of a discount, and deduct it from the face value of the note that was given. For example, if a lender wished to charge 75 per cent per annum for four months on a loan of $100, he would be obliged to deduct from the face value of the note $25, and give the borrower only $75; but if he allowed the term to expire, and was obliged to sue for the money, he could only collect the $100 with 6 per cent interest added. I think this is a very wise and necessary measure, and ought to be enacted.

The PRIME MINISTER. Will my hon. friend permit me to ask him a question? Do I understand that under his Bill such a contract cannot be enforced except at the legal rate of interest, 6 per cent?

Mr. QUINN. That is the intention. At present, any rate of interest stipulated in the Act can be collected. The intention is to limit the collection to 6 per cent per annum, no matter what rate may be stipulated for.

Mr. McMULLEN. This appears to be rather a singular Bill. If we are going to have a usury law, and it is intended to apply to the whole Dominion, it is well that we

should fully understand it. I have no objection myself to limiting the rate of interest. I quite admit that a great many people are subjected to great loss by notes being drawn at very heavy rates of interest. I notice that in the city of Montreal recently there was a case of from 2½ to 5 per cent per month being charged on a note which had been in existence for some time, and the judge felt himself compelled to give judgment for the entire amount, including the exorbitant rate of interest. I think it is well that there should be some law to reach cases of that kind; but whether it is wise or not to adopt a general usury law in Canada is another question. We know that there are usury laws in almost every state of the United States, but in every state they are over-ridden and evaded. In the state of New York there is a usury law, but it is not obeyed. It is found that these laws, in place of being of advantage to the borrowing public are, in many cases, a decided curse and nuisance. In Canada our people have a great deal, in my opinion, to be thankful for. Money, on good security, can be obtained as cheaply here as in any other colony of the British Empire, and it is questionable whether it is wise or prudent to disturb that condition of things. I do not for a moment challenge the sincerity of the hon. gentleman, and his desire to accomplish something in the right direction; but this is a very large question. The banking institutions of the country, as well as the money-lenders and money borrowers are interested in the question; and, in view of past experience in this country as well as in the United States, I question if it is wise at this time to disturb present arrangements by a measure of this kind. I presume that if the Bill goes to a second reading, we shall then have full explanations of it and a more extended debate upon its provisions.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock) moved that the House resolve itself into committee to-morrow to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide, with respect to the Bill now before the House intituled "An Act to provide for the abolition of the Civil Service Superannuation Act and for the retirement of members of the Civil Service:"—

(1.) That from the salary of every person to whom the said Act applies there shall be made a deduction of 5 per cent, which deduction shall form part of a "retirement fund," bearing interest, compounded half-yearly at 5 per cent per annum;

(2.) That in the case of every person now in the Civil Service whose salary has been subject, for less than ten years, to the deductions provided for by the Civil Service Superannuation Act, and of any person whose salary has been subject to such reduction for over ten years, but who elects to accept the provisions of this Act instead of those of the Civil Service Superannuation Act, there shall be placed to his credit in such retirement fund a sum equal to the amount of the deductions so made from his salary, with interest, compounded half-yearly at 5 per cent per annum;

(3.) That upon the retirement, dismissal or death of any person to whom this Act applies the amount to his credit in the retirement fund shall be paid to him or to his heirs.

Motion agreed to.

CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION ACT.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock) moved second reading of Bill (No. 9) to provide for the abolition of the Civil Service Superannuation Act, and for the retirement of members of the Civil Service.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. This Bill is not printed in French.

Mr. SPEAKER. That being the case, I am afraid, if the objection be persisted in, that I must rule the motion out of order.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I hope my hon. friend will not persist in his objection. Of course he is technically correct, and if he persists, it will be impossible to go on with the consideration of the Bill, and practically that will interrupt the business of the day. In former years, it was not considered any derogation or giving up of any right, which we have in this House, to have the Bills printed in the two languages, when, in order to expedite business, bills have been proceeded with which were printed in the one language only.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If this were the measure which the country is longing to see placed before it, if the proposal were to deal with the Budget, no technicalities could possibly be allowed to intervene, and we would be only too happy to meet my hon. friend opposite in any way we possibly could. But with regard to the measure which the hon. gentleman says is not going into operation for three or four years at least, I cannot understand why the salutary rule which has been adopted in this House should be waived.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. By way of explanation, I would say that I have not raised the point with a view of prolonging the business of the House, but simply because this Bill and the Bill relating to the franchise are two very important measures, which it would be unfair to ask us to discuss, without having them printed in both languages. Of course I can readily understand that, with regard to ordinary private Bills, we might allow the rule to be overlooked, but when two of the most important Bills that may be brought before this House, with the exception of the Supply Bill, are proposed for discussion, it is but fair that we should

have them in both languages in order to be enabled to study them more thoroughly.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not catch the title of the Bill of which the hon. gentleman moved the second reading. I thought it was the Franchise Bill and not the Superannuation Bill, but I may say with reference to the latter measure, that the extreme activity of the Government in relation to the matter of superannuation has disposed of any immediate necessity for that measure.

The PRIME MINISTER. I suppose the hon. gentleman wants to encourage further that activity of the Government and therefore does not want the Superannuation Act amended at all. The Opposition are quite within their rights, and if they choose to obstruct the business of the Government they can do so.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

The PRIME MINISTER. They are commencing very early. I may say that there has never been a session since confederation when business was so promptly brought before the House as this session. There has never been a session yet when, in the second week of the session, the Government was ready to proceed with the business for which Parliament was called and the measures announced in the Speech from the Throne ready for discussion. It is probable that, in the course of a few hours, perhaps a few minutes, this very Bill will be distributed in French. At all events, it is not now distributed, and if hon. gentlemen opposite choose to obstruct the business of the House they will take the consequence.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I did not rise as a member of the Opposition at all. I simply rose to oppose going on with this Bill, until it was printed in both languages, as a member standing on his rights and prerogatives.

Mr. FOSTER. I think I may be allowed to say a word in reply to the assertion just made by the hon. Premier. I refer to his statement that there never was a session in which Government work was so advanced as it is this session. He has evidently not looked carefully into the records. I happened to-day, for the purpose of comparison, to be looking over the two years 1894 and the present year, and it so happens that in 1894 the Estimates were on the Table of Parliament one day and the Budget Speech was ready three days after the Address was disposed of, and would have been delivered but for an objection from the then Opposition. In spite of that objection, however, it was delivered, and the tariff was brought down eight days after the Address was adopted.

The PRIME MINISTER. With regard to the Estimates, I have to say this that but for the illness of my hon. colleague the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden) the Estimates would have been laid on the Table to-day. I expected my hon. colleague to be here, but unfortunately, when he reached Boston, he was unable to proceed further. The Estimates will be down either this evening or to-morrow.

Mr. McMULLEN. While on this subject, I may give the dates on which the several Budget speeches were made from 1879 to the present, and the dates when Parliament met :

Year.	——	Date.	——	Date.
1879....	Meeting of Parliament.....	Feb. 13..	Budget Speech.....	Mar. 14
1879....	do do	do 13..	Tariff Resolution.....	do 18
1880....	do do	do 12..	Budget Speech.....	do 9
1880-81..	do do	Dec. 9..	do	Feb. 18
1882....	do do	Feb. 9..	do	do 24
1883....	do do	do 8..	do	Mar. 20
1884....	do do	Jan. 17..	do	Feb. 29
1885....	do do	do 29..	do	Mar. 3
1886....	do do	Feb. 25..	do	do 30
1887....	do do	April 13..	do and Tariff Resolution.....	May 12
1888....	do do	Feb. 23..	do	April 27
1889....	do do	Jan. 31..	do	Mar. 5
1890....	do do	do 16..	do and Tariff Resolution.....	Mar. 27
1891....	do do	April 29..	do	June 23
1892....	do do	Feb. 25..	do	Mar. 22
1893....	do do	Jan. 23..	do	Feb. 14
1894....	do do	Mar. 15..	do and Tariff Resolution.....	Mar. 27
1895....	do do	April 18..	do do do	May 3
1896....	do do	Jan. 2..	do	Jan. 31

Mr. FOSTER. Would my hon. friend keep that under his hand, and after the Budget speech of this year is finished, he can complete the comparison.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have no doubt that all the hon. gentlemen who have spoken intend to confine themselves strictly to the point of order, and for that reason I did not interrupt them. If the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) persists in his point, we cannot go on.

ADJOURNMENT.—PUBLIC BILLS, ETC.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). In that case I beg to move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would draw the Prime Minister's attention to the fact that it is quite unnecessary to adjourn the House for the want of public business. We have before us a large number of public Bills and orders, one of very pressing importance known as the Alien Labour Bill. It has been printed in both English and French. Last session, when this Bill was up, the hon. the Prime Minister asked me not to press the business further, but to leave it over, and I should be offered every opportunity of introducing it and should have his assistance in having it enacted into a law at the present session. I am prepared now to proceed with this measure. I think the House and the country demand the immediate passing of this Bill. I notice by the press that a friend of the Government has been put up to move a Bill similar to the one that stands in my name. That Bill is not yet printed in French. I have a copy of both Bills in English, and I notice that the Bill for my hon. friend from South Essex (Mr. Cowan) is word for word the same as the Bill I presented for several years, up to the eighth clause. Clauses 8, 9, 10 and 11 are additions, but there is a provision that these sections shall come into force only on the proclamation of the Governor General. I am quite willing that these four clauses be added——

Mr. SPEAKER. I must ask the hon. member not to go into details of any Bill or measure on this motion to adjourn the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am arguing that we should not adjourn but should proceed to take up this Bill which is on the Order paper and which is printed in both languages.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) has stated, and stated truly, that he has several times already presented the Bill to which he refers. It is within the memory of gentlemen who were in the last Parliament and the Parliament before that, that he brought this measure before the House almost every year. If my hon. friend had shown then, when he was on this side, the same diligence that he has shown to-day, his Bill would already have been made into law. But when his friends were in office he was not at all willing to press the Bill and he allowed it, again and again, on the suggestion of the Government not to press it forward. I told my hon. friend last session that this session I would help him with his Bill. I am ready to do so. But there are three or four Bills of the same nature before the House at this moment, and I suggest that it would be inadvisable to take up any of them at this moment. I suggest to my hon. friend, as I believe he has this subject at heart, that it would be conducive for the best interest of the cause he supports that all these Bills should be in possession of the House before one is taken up. I suppose my hon. friend will agree with me that the time is not opportune at present for pressing his Bill. There is also another consideration. This is a Government day, and we had intended to press the business of the Government, but we are prevented from doing so by a mere technical objection. My hon. friend can hardly find fault with the Government if there is reciprocity in this matter and if the Government does not see its way to help him along since we are met on the other side with so scant courtesy as we find.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid that my hon. friend has been so short a time on that side of the House that he has hardly discovered yet that he is not still the leader of the Opposition. I think in the recollection of members of this House this is the first occasion on which the leader of the House has ever moved an adjournment of the House at this period in the session, and under the circumstances in which he has done it to-day. I do not believe in the records of Parliament you can find a single case in which such a step has been taken. Now, I think the House is entitled to know from the leader of the House his reasons for adjourning. If he says that a technical objection has been interposed, that is not strictly correct. It is one of the most fundamental and well-established rules of this House that an important Bill shall not be proceeded with unless it is printed in English and in French. I do not know that it is the position to-day, but on many occasions I have seen hon. gentlemen, very able and influential members of the House, who could not understand a word of the discussion in English. Therefore, I say that in case of an important measure—and this is a most important measure, affecting, as it does, the vital interests of a large body of the people of this country—I am sure the House would be disposed to consider it on its merits, and in the most candid and dispassionate way. I think hon. members of this House should have that important Bill before them in a condition in which they

can more readily understand its purport than many of them can do if it is confined simply to the English language, because in such a case they are not in a position to give it that full and complete discussion and examination that is absolutely essential. I think that before asking this House to adjourn, as there is a large amount of private business on the paper which it is most important should be removed out of the way as early as possible, the hon. gentleman ought to take the House into his confidence and tell us why it is that for the first time in the history of this Parliament, the leader of the House, the First Minister, moves that the House adjourn immediately upon its meeting, and without assigning any reason whatever.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman has not done justice to my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) in relation to this Bill. He ought to remember that at the last session of this House, when my hon. friend moved this Bill, I joined with the leader of the House in asking him to allow it to remain over, and I did so for the purpose of enabling my hon. friend opposite to exercise those sunny influences, of which he is known to be a great master, with the Government of the United States, in the hope that no such Bill as this would become necessary, and in the hope that the hon. gentleman might have an opportunity of seeing what diplomatic intercourse would affect the Government of the United States before we resorted to such an extreme measure, on which we were so unwilling to adopt, but one which my hon. friend opposite and myself are equally pledged under the present conditions of things to pass. The hon. gentleman will remember that I joined with him in asking my hon. friend who moved the Bill not to press his measure until every opportunity had been given to the Government of the day to exhaust diplomatic intercourse for the purpose of avoiding the necessity of bringing such a Bill forward. I think my hon. friend is hardly right in taunting my hon. friend who is moving this Bill with not having been as desirous in pressing his measure at a previous session, when it is remembered that at the last session of this House that hon. gentleman refrained, at our joint request, from pressing his measure. I trust the hon. leader of the House will withdraw his motion for adjournment, and allow the business of this House, a great deal of which is before us, to be proceeded with.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). It is just as well that we should thoroughly understand the position in which we are, and how utterly futile is the technical objection which the hon. gentleman has taken. It is just as well that we should understand that this is a deliberate attempt on the part of at least one hon. gentleman opposite, and I think concurred in at least by the leader of the Opposition——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—to prevent——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. What is the point of order?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has accused a member on this side of the House, who has an equal right to his opinion with himself, with a deliberate attempt at obstruction because in order to——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. Allow me to finish my statement—because an hon. gentleman has attempted to act in his own right, and under a well-understood rule of the House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman, as usual, has jumped before he came to the wall. I never made any charge of obstruction, or referred to obstruction at all. The hon. gentleman stopped me when I was at the beginning of my sentence, stopped me when I was at the beginning of a sentence of which he could not know the purport or the meaning, stopped me before he had heard one-half of the sentence uttered, and imputed to me that which I have no doubt he would have said had he stood in my place. I do not intend to charge what he says I did, I do not intend to charge an hon. gentleman with obstruction. I charged him with deliberately attempting to prevent the Government to-day from proceeding with the business which they have in hand. Now, that is not obstruction. It is just as well that the country should understand why the Government are not proceeding with their Bill. The hon. gentleman, the leader of the Opposition, attempted to insinuate that it was desirable in the case of important Bills of this kind that they should be printed in both languages in order that the House should fully understand them. Why, Sir, the Government were not asking the House to go into committee on these Bills; the Government were simply asking the House to discuss the principle of each of these Bills, the Superannuation Bill and the Franchise Bill; and after the House had discussed the principle of these Bills, then, in the ordinary way, a motion would have been made at a future day that the House go into committee, so that the details of the Bill might be thoroughly understood and discussed. No advantage was sought to be taken of the House or of hon. members. They might have had a week or ten days, or whatever reasonable time they asked, before discussing the Bills in both languages, and to look at the details, and to compare the clauses if they desired. Surely the motion which my hon. friend the Postmaster General made was simply

for the second reading of the Bill, and a motion which every hon. gentleman knows is one which invites the House to assent to the principle of the Bill only, leaving the details over. But, curiously enough, while a Bill affecting our internal arrangements must, according to the hon. gentleman's argument, be printed in both English and French before it can be considered at all, the hon. gentleman gravely asks us to pass this by and not to do any Government business, and to proceed to the discussion of a private Bill affecting international relations between this country and the United States, while similar Bills of a cognate character are before the House, and not printed in the French language at all. How is it possible for his friends to understand the character of these two Bills, or of their relative importance, if they have not seen them in French? Why, take the hon. gentleman's own argument, and it is conclusive. The Government should not proceed with their Bills because they are not printed in both English and French; but here is a class of Bills which are printed, one of them at least, in only one language, and the Opposition asks us to proceed with these and leave the Government Bills alone.

Mr. McDOUGALL. What about the Bill for the Better Observance of the Lord's Day?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not heard anybody except the junior member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) pressing very much for that; I do not know that he has been interested in it heretofore. He has voted against it, and I suppose it is from a desire of voting against that Bill that he wishes it to be brought up. But I simply rise for the purpose of putting this matter straight, as I understand it, and answering the argument which the hon. gentleman attempted to make, and which seems to me excessively foolish.

Mr. IVES. Before the hon. gentleman sits down will he allow me to ask: Whom does he consider responsible for the dilatoriness of printing, the Government or the Opposition?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot answer the hon. gentleman's question. I suppose the officers whom the hon. gentleman appointed when he was in office for translating the Bills from English into French, are mainly responsible for the delay.

Mr. IVES. They are all superannuated.

Mr. DAVIN. I have a two-fold suggestion to make to the Prime Minister. Sir, the hon. Prime Minister—I do not know whether it is parliamentary or not to say it—in a fit of irritation decided to move the adjournment of the House. There is no sound reason for that except it be that the rule that Bills, before the second reading is taken, shall be printed in both English and French is an unreasonable rule, and not only that, but that it is useless, and that the printing of Bills in French at all is unnecessary. If that be the case, then we must go further. We should ask for a revision of the rules and excise that rule which provides that a Bill is to be printed in French as well as in English. Now, this is the first suggestion. If, however, the Prime Minister holds that it is important that that rule should remain, I respectfully suggest to him that he should withdraw his motion. There is but one alternative. He must choose one horn of the dilemma or the other. Either he must hold that the rule that Bills be printed in French is useless, or else—and this is a horn I should be sorry to see him impaled upon, because the character of our Prime Minister is part of the heritage of Canada which she cannot forego and would desire to be proud of—he must admit that his motion to adjourn the House is made merely in a fit of irritation. So that I suggest to my hon. friend either that the rule be expunged or else that he withdraw his motion.

Mr. FOSTER. I must rise to enter a most earnest plea on behalf of the progress of the business of the House and the country. Here are nearly 200 members who have been brought here, I must say, at a very late and inconvenient season of the year, in total opposition to the very strong strictures, and I had supposed, the strongly held principles of the hon. the Premier and his colleagues, that the House should be called together not later than January, so that it could get at the business and get through the business in good time. But, called together at so late a season of the year, we find hon. members very anxious to get through with the business of the session so that they may get home to their business. What is the position of the Premier? A most lamentable position for a Premier to be in, a most sorry position for a Premier to be in, a position that is not creditable to the dignity of this House, and one which my hon. friend had much better have avoided. Have we rules for the governance of this House or have we not? Are these rules necessary for the proper transaction of business or not? Are they the result of years and years of assent and consent by all parties as being necessary for the proper and orderly conduct of business? Who is responsible that these rules shall be carried out? You, Mr. Speaker, in the Chair, are responsible, but if any other person has a responsibility, it is the leader of the House, for the Government itself is responsible for the good conduct of the House under the Speaker, and ought always to be on the side of order and rule. One of these rules is No. 93, which is as follows:—

All Bills shall be printed before the second reading in the French and English languages. That is as plain and well understood a rule as any to which this House is subject. That is a rule that has been repeatedly invoked in this House. When I was a member of the Government it was invoked time and time again, and the members of the Government at that time, when it was pressed that that rule should be waived, and was not agreed to, accepted and bowed to the rule as Governments always should. What is the position of the hon. the Premier? He who is responsible for the law and order of the House and for its good conduct is the man who wants to play, not my Lord Pax, as the hon. member for Guysborough said the other day, but my lord High-master. If the rule goes against what he desires to have carried out, he wants the rule broken. He appears to believe that it should be broken, and when my hon. friend, standing on his rights, refuses to have it broken, then the hon. the Premier gets angry, and, in effect, declares that we shall not do any business if we do not break the rules and if we refuse to carry out what he desires. I put it to the House that this is not a proper position for the Premier to occupy. We want to do business. Her Majesty's Opposition is here to see that business is done; we want to proceed now with the business of the day. Looking at the eager faces behind me, it cannot be said that there is one which is not instinct with activity, and anxious to do business as soon as possible. I plead with my hon. friend not to get into a pet, just because he cannot have his will as regards the House, and because when he seeks to act contrary to the rules of the House, because an hon. member refuses to agree with him, he forthwith declares that he will not allow the rest of the business to be proceeded with. There is ample business on the Order paper. I do not quite see that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies), while he may have been ingenious, made a very clear explanation as to why the Bill was not printed in French. He jumped at a conclusion, he went over the whole stile before he came to it, suggesting that the fault rested with an officer of the House, and that the officer was probably guilty because he was appointed by my hon. friend's Government.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). A very good reason for thinking so.

Mr. FOSTER. So the hon. gentleman jumped the stile before he came to it. I believe Mr. Coursolle is responsible for the translation of the French.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Do you know that?

Mr. FOSTER. And I believe he is an old employee, one who was appointed by Hon. Alexander Mackenzie. My hon. friend jumped the whole hedge before he came in sight of it, and with all that abandon and reckless disregard of the truth that generally characterises him he made that statement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman should scarcely use that expression "disregard of the truth."

Mr. FOSTER. I was picturing an hon. gentleman who is taking a leap in the air.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You had better take it back, and act honourably.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman should withdraw his statement.

Mr. FOSTER. I will take it back, of course. It was not a statement made the hon. gentleman in disregard of the truth, but it was the result of an unusually vivid imagination. According to the argument used by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, we should not proceed with the regular order of business because, forsooth, several Bills appear on the Order paper relating to the same subject under the names of different members, each one of whom is an independent member of this House and has a right to propose his Bill and see to have it carried through; and because one member had his Bill in a position, under the rules, by which it was ready to be taken up and other members had not their Bills so ready, and so had not been printed in French, that my hon. friend is asked to forego the advantage which he properly possesses to bring up his Bill at this time. This is not fair; it is not fair to the Opposition, or to any independent member of the House, and it is not a just position for the Government to take. My hon. friend has a right to have his Bill occupy this position on the Order paper, and he has it under the rules of the House, and this motion should not be allowed to interfere with my hon. friend securing advantage from the place which his motion holds on the Order paper to-day. It does not follow that because the hon. gentleman takes up his Bill to-day, it has to be disposed of at this sitting of the House. It does not follow that if the Government wishes all the Bills of this nature to be taken up together, after my hon. friend has made his explanation, the Premier may not, as leader of the House, propose that all these Bills be referred to a special committee, or adopt some other plan to carry out his views. Besides there is other important business that may be taken up. There was a speech made yesterday of unusual length, and with unusual fervour—I was going to say of unusual ability, and perhaps that statement would not be out of the way—and that mo-

tion is ready for debate to-day. It would come on after public Bills and Orders. That could be properly taken up, and no doubt the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. McInnes) would be very glad to make progress in the discussion towards attaining the end he has in view. Then there are questions to be put by members, and notices of motion sufficient to occupy several days. What reason has been given, what reason is there why the House should not go on with business? Has it never occurred in the history of this House that when Government business has been exhausted, the House has proceeded to consider public Bills and Orders and notices of motions. I have seen that occur over and over again. Why should it not? Private members have rights. The Government often take away private members' day on account of urgency of business; but if the Government has no business ready, what can be more fair than that private members should have a chance of occupying the unexpired portion of the day? I hope my hon. friend will not persist in his present opposition. If he expects thus to throw the onus of opposing public business on the Opposition, he will fail to realize the intelligence of the House and the country.

Mr. CASEY. The leader of the Opposition is labouring under a slight misapprehension in one or two directions. In the first place, he tells us that the leader of the House does not seem to realize yet that he is Premier. We have all of us held the opinion that the hon. gentleman has realized the fact and acted in a very Premier-like manner during the whole of last session and during the expired portion of this session. It has often occurred to me, on the other hand, that the leader of the Opposition has not realized that he is no longer Premier. Of course he was Premier for a very short time, only thirteen weeks; but the habit, which is so congenial to his disposition, seems to have impressed that brief span of power on his mind to an undue extent. He still appears to think that he is an oracle on questions of procedure, and that hon. members should be guided by what he says as to what should be done in the House. I now come to the second point on which he is perhaps under a misapprehension. He may not be the actual leader of the Opposition even. The hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) seems to dispute that place with him. When the first dictator rises and lays down the law, the second dictator never seems to feel content that the matter has been properly placed before the House, and he has to re-explain what his leader explained. I do not know that he always makes the matter clearer, but he has the satisfaction of occupying a little of the time of the House.

Mr. LANDERKIN. They are both there to stay, anyway.

Mr. CASEY. Then the question may arise whether the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) is not the leader of the Opposition on this occasion, for the whole of this debate has arisen from an attempt to prove that some unfairness has been done to my hon. friend the whip of the Conservative party (Mr. Taylor). He is apparently in a vast hurry to get on with his Bill this time, but the older members of the House recollect how session after session, that Bill used to be on the paper and how it used to be called out day after day until it sounded like an echo "Bill respecting Alien Labour (Mr. Taylor)," and echo answered "stand," and that echo came from the voice of my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor). He is now in a great stew to get it on this very day, for it is a point worth mentioning for the outside public, to whom this debate has been addressed by members opposite, that the hon. gentleman has only to wait until to-morrow evening, when public Bills will be the first order. The chief trouble seems to have been well illustrated by a recent cartoon in a Toronto paper, picturing one man at the top of a ladder and another at the bottom, and certain names are used which it may perhaps be parliamentary to quote as coming from a newspaper. Little boy Taylor at the foot of the ladder is crying and saying "Boo, hoo, Cowan is carrying my flag;" and Miss Canada says to little boy Taylor: "It is all your own fault, Georgie, if you had not been so ready to drop that flag before, you might have been carrying it still." I am sure my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) feels his false position in having dropped that flag so often, that he is not thought worthy to carry it any longer. The situation of the constituency of my hon. friend from South Essex (Mr. Cowan) is quite sufficient reason for his taking up the Bill with energy and pushing it. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) wished to insinuate that that Bill of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) was ready and printed before the other. He must know that both Bills had to be ready before they were introduced and that the Bill of the member for Essex (Mr. Cowan) was introduced before the other Bill. Why it was not printed sooner is a question that cannot be decided by any one who does not know the mysteries of the printing office. One Bill might have been in printed form already, and the other may have been manuscript, and so on. But, Sir, hon. gentlemen have overlooked another reason which may exist for the adjournment of the House on this occasion. It may not have occurred to the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) that the present Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) would be very glad of a little extra time to consider the tariff which he will have to so shortly present to this House. No doubt Ministers are very hard worked in attending to that, and I should not wonder at all

if they would be glad to have the afternoon and evening to utilize in this way. I am sure that the present Finance Minister does not want to have so many clerical errors in his tariff as there were in the tariffs brought down by the ex-Finance Minister. The present Finance Minister does not want to bring his tariff down in a hurry and have to spend three or four months correcting it when it is brought down. I hope the House will adjourn immediately.

Mr. TAYLOR. Just one word or two in reply——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) has already spoken.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to reply to a personal remark of the Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) desires to make a personal explanation he can do so.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is all. The Prime Minister made a statement that when I sat on this side of the House I had not shown the same anxiety to press this Bill as I do now. I wish to state that while I sat on that side of the House I was just as anxious about the Bill as I am now, and I took every opportunity to press it. If the Prime Minister and those associated with him, and sitting close to him, will read the "Hansard" and see the remarks they made at the time ridiculing the idea of my presenting such a Bill, I am sure he will withdraw the statement. I wish to make another explanation in reply to my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Casey). He said that in previous sessions when that Bill was called I said "stand." He cannot find on the record where I ever requested that Bill to stand.

Mr. CASEY. It is not put on the record when a member calls "stand."

Mr. TAYLOR. Then you think yourself safe.

Motion to adjourn agreed to, on a division, and House adjourned at 4.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 7th April, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. CASEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 16) to amend the Railway Act. He said: This Bill is one I have been requested to introduce by the Canadian Wheelmen's Association, through Mr. E. B. Ryckman, of Toronto, Chairman of the Rights and Privileges Committee of that body. The Bill is briefly to the effect that bicycles belonging to passengers travelling by rail should be carried free as personal baggage. I may be pardoned for saying a few words more in introducing this measure than is usual on the first reading of a Bill, because the subject is probably as new to many members of this House as it was to me when my attention was first called to it by this organization. In the first place, I may say that the wheelmen of Canada have become a very large and important body of men, numbering certainly over 100,000. Those who have joined the Wheelmen's Association number over ten thousand, I understand from the officers of that body, and I am quite sure that not one in ten of those who own wheels especially in the country, belong to that association. Until within a year or so, bicycles used to be carried free by railway companies as personal baggage, and in former days they weighed twice as much as they do now. But when their weight became reduced from something like 50 to 25 pounds, the railways began to charge extra for carrying them. This is a grievance which is particularly felt in suburban neighbourhoods where a man may run out on his wheel for a ride into the country and be caught in a storm and take the train back. He may only have to pay 15 or 20 cents for his own ticket, while the lowest charge for carrying the bicycle is 25 cents, so that in many cases he pays more for the bicycle than for himself.

Two or three gentlemen to whom I have mentioned the subject said it would be just as reasonable to make a railway company carry a man's horse and buggy home, if he chooses to put them in a baggage car. My reply to that is that when a horse and buggy can be shown which will only weigh 25 pounds, and will behave themselves in a baggage car as a bicycle generally does, there may be a parallel between the two cases, but not until then. I have mentioned the minimum charge imposed by railways for carrying bicycles. I understand that for long distances the charge is on the basis of 6 per cent of a first-class fare, so that when a first-class fare is $30, the charge for carrying a bicycle is $1.80. On the other hand, when a bicycle is put in a box or crate, the railways carry it free like any other personal baggage. The objection made by the railway companies to the handling of bicycles free is their liability to claims for damages. Well, the Wheelmen's Association have suggested a plan which seems perfectly feasible, by which, at very slight cost, baggage cars might be prepared for safely carrying bicycles in the space not usually occupied by other baggage, namely, by putting hooks into the ceiling or wall from which the wheels might be hung. At a later stage, I propose to lay

the ideas of the wheelmen on this part of the subject before the House, and I only make these rather full preliminary remarks, in the hope that between now and the second reading of the Bill the members of this House may give their earnest attention to the question. I believe that the wheelmen's organization throughout this country intend to bring this question specially before the members of this House who have wheelmen amongst their constituents, and I think that will include nearly all of us. I hope hon. gentlemen will give this question their attention and be prepared to discuss it on its second reading. The principle on which the Bill is based is that the bicycle is the wheelman's baggage. I hope that the House will entertain the Bill favourably.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CHATEAUGUAY AND NORTHERN RAILWAY—BRIDGE OVER RIVIERE DES PRAIRIES.

Mr. GAUTHIER asked:

Whether it is the intention of the Government to give aid towards the construction of the railway of the Chateauguay and Northern Railway Company, which is intended to connect together Montreal, L'Assomption and Joliette?

Is it also the intention of the Government to help the said company to construct a bridge over Rivière des Prairies, between Bout de L'Isle and Charlemagne?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I may say to the hon. member, as to both the enterprises referred to in his question, that the Government is not yet in a position to announce its intention with respect to these, as the whole subject of giving aid to railways and other undertakings of this character is under consideration.

POSTMASTER AT ANNAPOLIS, N.S.

Mr. MILLS asked:

1. When was H. A. West appointed postmaster of the town of Annapolis Royal, Nova Scotia?
2. Has the said H. A. West been dismissed from the said position? If so, when?
3. Was any complaint preferred against the said H. A. West of malfeasance in office or offensive partisanship? If so, by whom?
4. If any complaint was made, was the said H. A. West apprised of such complaint, and was any investigation held? If so, by whom?
5. If said H. A. West has been dismissed and no complaint made, why has he been dismissed?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). After the defeat of the late Government but whilst they were still in office, it was represented to the then Postmaster General, the Hon. Mr. Taillon, that Mr. A. H. Corbitt, the then postmaster at Annapolis, was prepared to resign his office on condition that Mr. H. A. West was appointed in his stead, such representation being contained in a certain telegram dated the 27th June, 1896, sent by John B. Mills, M.P., to Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper then Solicitor General, in the following words:—

Annapolis, N.S., 27th June, 1896.

Annapolis postmaster, Corbitt, will resign, if Harry A. West can be appointed in his stead. Do this if possible. Important. They won't disturb West. I have resignation for Ottawa.

(Sgd.) JOHN B. MILLS.

Such representation was then communicated to the late Postmaster General by a letter dated 29th June, 1896, from the said Sir C. H. Tupper by letter in the following words:—

June 29th, 1896.

My dear Mr. Taillon,—Pray initial inclosed papers, and ask Colonel White to put them through. Corbitt resigns, and Mills of Annapolis recommends Harry A. West as successor.

Yours sincerely,

(Sgd.) CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

To Hon. L. A. Taillon, Postmaster General.

Thereupon the Hon. Mr. Taillon did on the 29th of June, 1896, six days after the defeat of his Government appoint Mr. West to said office. That it having been brought to the knowledge of the present Government that Mr. Corbitt's resignation was not unconditional, but was only given in consideration of the office being given to Mr. West, and it appearing that such action came within the spirit of section 137 of the Criminal Code, which declares that every one is guilty of an indictable offence who sells or agrees to sell his resignation of any office or any consent to an appointment or resignation or agrees to receive any reward from the sale thereof, the Government deemed it their duty to vacate an appointment made to fill the vacancy thus improperly brought about, the making of which vacancy under such circumstances, appears to come within the class of evils sought to be remedied by the Criminal Code. Hence Mr. West's appointment was cancelled.

CROW'S NEST PASS RAILWAY.

Mr. MACLEAN asked:

Has the Canadian Pacific Railway yet begun the construction of their line through the Crow's Nest Pass?

Does the Government intend to allow that company to begin the work of construction without first completing the negotiations now going on for the modification in the clauses of the company's charter in the matter of the construction of branch lines, and the regulation of the rates and tolls charged by the said company?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). As to the first clause of the question I may say that the Government is without information as to whether the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has yet begun the construction of a railway through the Crow's Nest Pass, except that it was understood that some grading had been done a couple of years ago in or ad-

jacent to the Pass. As to the second clause of the question, I am afraid I shall be obliged to ask the hon. gentleman to modify or amend the question so as not to contain a statement which I should have to either accept or challenge in answering. If the hon. gentleman will put the question again without the objectionable clause, I shall be pleased to answer it.

Mr. SPEAKER. In looking at this question I held that it contained a statement of fact, and I referred to the hon. member who had given notice of it. He assured me that the statement of fact was based upon an answer to a question given on the 29th March in the House, and for that reason, I did not ask him to modify the question. The point now arises whether the Minister and the hon. member agree that that is a statement based upon the answer referred to. If it was not strictly so, it would not do to put the question in this shape, because questions of fact must be either in explanation of the question or entirely indisputable. I think, if there is any doubt about it whatever the hon. gentleman had better modify his question.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the hon. member (Mr. Maclean) must have misunderstood the tenor of any reply he received from me, because there certainly was none by me implying that negotiations were going on for the modification of the company's charter in regard to the construction of branch lines. I think my answer will not be found, on further examination, to contain any such imputation. It certainly was not so intended.

Mr. MACLEAN. I tried to frame this question in the light of an answer already received from the Minister. I understood that answer to be to the effect that the Government was negotiating with the Canadian Pacific Railway for the modification of this clause. I believe the country so understood it, as it has been commented on in the press——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Maclean) has the question there. Will he be good enough to read it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think it will be found——

Mr. MACLEAN. I believe I have the floor, Mr. Speaker——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS—that the hon. member was answered——

Mr. MACLEAN. I believe you asked me to read the question, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MACLEAN. No; Mr. Speaker had asked me to read the answer.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member is going to read the answer.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Very well; that is what I was going to do.

Mr. MACLEAN. On March the 29th, I put the following question to the Government:—

Whether it is the intention of the Government to enter into negotiations with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the abrogation or modification of the following article in the contract and agreement made between Her Majesty and Mr. George Stephen and others, as set out in chapter 1, 44 Victoria:—

"14. The company shall have the right from time to time to lay out, construct, equip, maintain and work branch lines of railway from any point or points along their main line of railway to any points within the territory of the Dominion: Provided always that before commencing any branch they shall first deposit a map and plan of such branch in the Department of Railways, and the Government shall grant to the company the lands required for the road-bed of such branches, and for the stations, station grounds, buildings, workshops, yards and other appurtenances requisite for the efficient construction and working of such branches, in so far as such lands are vested in the Government."

2. Whether it is the intention of the Government to enter into negotiations with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the modification or abrogation of the following clause of chapter 1, 44 Victoria:—

"20. The limit to the reduction of tolls by the Parliament of Canada, provided for by the 11th subsection of the 17th section of the Consolidated Railway Act of 1879 respecting tolls is hereby extended so that such reduction may be to such an extent that such tolls when reduced shall not produce less than ten per cent per annum profit on the capital actually expended in the construction of the railway, instead of not less than fifteen per cent per annum profit as provided by said section, and so also that such reduction shall not be made unless the net income of the company ascertained as described in such subsection shall have exceeded ten per cent per annum as provided by the said subsection; and the exercise by the Governor in Council of the power of reducing the tolls of the company, as provided by the 10th subsection of said section 17, is hereby limited to the same extent with relation to the profit of the company, and to its net revenue, as that to which the power of Parliament to reduce tolls is limited by said subsection 11 as hereby amended."

Then my question was:

3. What steps, if any, have been taken by the Government to ascertain the capital actually expended in the construction of the said Canadian Pacific Railway as referred to in the above quoted clause?

The Minister's answer was:

I may say for the information of the hon. gentleman, that the subject is under consideration, but no conclusion has yet been arrived at; I refer to the two first questions. As to the third question, we have no intention at present of making the inquiry to which the hon. gentleman refers.

These first two questions deal with the extension clause, and the other with the re-

gulation of tolls; and I understood the Minister to say that negotiations were in progress for the modification of these two clauses; and on that answer I based my third question.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I am sorry the hon. member should have so completely misapprehended the meaning of my reply. He asked whether it was the intention of the Government to enter into negotiations with the Canadian Pacific Railway for such a purpose, and he received a reply to the effect that the subject as to entering into negotiations was under consideration, but no conclusion had been arrived at. That is very far from implying that negotiations had been entered into; and therefore I find it quite impossible to answer the hon. gentleman's question in the form in which he has put it. I will have no objection to answering it, of course, if he will put it in such a way that I can do so without making admissions or implications which cannot properly be made.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it would be better, under the circumstances, for the hon. gentleman to reconstruct his question after the Minister's explanation of his former answer. There is evidently a misapprehension.

Mr. MACLEAN. I can move it now, Mr. Speaker.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Order.

Mr. MACLEAN. With the consent of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman can move it now——

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

Mr. SPEAKER. But I think it would be better to reconstruct it.

Mr. MACLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I can put it this way——

The PRIME MINISTER. Order.

Mr. MACLEAN. The Speaker says I am in order, I am abiding by what the Speaker has already decided.

Mr. SPEAKER. The first part of the hon. gentleman's question has been answered. The second part, after the explanation he has received, can be modified.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In any case, I would ask the hon. member to allow his question, even if he were to modify it, to stand until to-morrow.

Mr. MACLEAN. All right; I consent to that.

GEORGE BROWN, MAIL CARRIER.

Mr. MILLS asked:

Is the Government aware that George Brown, the mail carrier from Clementsport to Clementsvale, in the county of Annapolis, carried the mail over three months, once per week, from Clementsvale to "Virginia" post office?

2. Has the said George Brown received pay for such services?

3. If not, why not?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The Government is not aware that George Brown, the mail carrier from Clementsport to Clementsvale, in the county of Annapolis, carried the mail over three months once per week, from Clementsvale to "Virginia" post office. Inquiry will be made into the matter.

POSTMASTER AT BEAUHARNOIS.

Mr. BERGERON asked:

When was Octave Laurin appointed postmaster at Beauharnois? By whom was he recommended for the position?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Mr. Octave Laurin was appointed postmaster at Beauharnois on the 16th of January, 1897, upon the recommendation of the Hon. Mr. Tarte.

Mr. BERGERON asked:

When was Alexis Doutre appointed postmaster of the town of Beauharnois, P.Q.?

2. Has the said Alexis Doutre been dismissed from the said position? If so, when?

3. Was any complaint preferred against the said Alexis Doutre of malfeasance in office or offensive partisanship? If so, by whom?

4. If any complaint was made, was the said Alexis Doutre apprised of such complaint, and was any investigation held? If so, by whom?

5. If said Alexis Doutre has been dismissed and no complaint made, why has he been dismissed?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Alexander Doutre was appointed postmaster at Beauharnois on the 8th of June, and whilst such postmaster to the personal knowledge of the Hon. J. Israel Tarte, took a most active and violent part in the last election, using the post office building as a most active committee room. Under such circumstances, it was deemed advisable to free him from the trammels of office, which was accordingly done.

IMMIGRATION AGENTS.

Mr. SPROULE asked:

1. How many officers in the public service have been superannuated from the 13th July, 1896, up to the 5th of April, 1897? What are their names? What is the age of each? How long in the service, and what is the amount additional charge on the superannuation fund?

2. Has Mr. Jno. Dyke, Dominion Government agent at Liverpool, England, been superannuat-

ed? If so, who was appointed as his successor, and what is his salary?

3. Have the services of Thomas Grahame, Canadian agent at Glasgow, Scotland, been dispensed with? If so, who is his successor, and what is his salary?

4. Have the services of John W. Dunn, Canadian agent at Bristol, England, been dispensed with? If so, has a successor been appointed, and what is his salary?

5. What agents, residents of Canada, have been appointed to or engaged for work as emigration agents in Great Britain or Ireland, since the present Minister of the Interior took office to date? In what field of labour have they respectively been assigned? What salaries are they to receive?

The MINISTER OF INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). 1. One, in so far as Department of Interior is concerned, Henry Hall Smith, late Commissioner of Dominion Lands, Winnipeg. Age, 50 years. Service, 13 years. $1,590 per annum. 2. Mr. John Dyke, Dominion Government agent at Liverpool, England, has not been superannuated. 3. Mr. Thomas Grahame, Canadian agent at Glasgow, Scotland, services have not been dispensed with. 4. As to Mr. John W. Dunn, there was no such agent at Bristol, England. Mr. John W. Down, late agent at Bristol, England, services have been dispensed with from 28th February, 1897. No successor appointed. 5. Alfred F. Jury, England, $150 a month; W. L. Griffith, Wales, $100 a month; H. M. Murray, Scotland, $2,000 a year; Thomas Duncan, Scotland, $100 a month; Charles R. Devlin, Ireland, $2,000 a year; Edward O'Kelly, Ireland, $150 a month; John Webster, Ireland, $75 a month; Thomas Roberts, return-man to North Wales, has had his expenses paid.

INDIAN AGENT CROWE.

Mr. McNEILL asked:

1. What are the irregularities in connection with the duties of his office of which Mr. Crowe, late Indian agent on the Saugeen Reserve, has been adjudged guilty, and which in the opinion of the Government rendered him unfit for the position he held?

2. Was Mr. Inspector Macrea instructed to inquire into charges of this nature, or were his instructions to inquire into political charges preferred against Mr. Crowe?

3. Has Mr. Crowe been asked if he has a defence to these charges?

The MINISTER OF INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The file containing the official report of Mr. Inspector Macrae has been temporarily mislaid in the moving of the department by the officials of the department. The information will be furnished as soon as the file is found.

MR. JOHN McIVER, INDIAN AGENT.

Mr. McNEILL asked:

1. Have representations been made by supporters of the Government to the Minister, or to the late acting Minister, that Mr. John McIver is unfitted for the position of Indian agent at Cape Croker, to which he has been appointed?

2. Has Mr. McIver furnished to the Minister the necessary financial securities?

3. If so, when were the securities furnished, and who are the sureties?

4. Have the Indians of the Cape Croker Reserve received their March quarterly payments for 1897? If so, when? If not, why not?

The MINISTER OF INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). 1. No representations have been made by supporters of the Government that Mr. John McIver is unfitted for the position of Indian agent at Cape Croker. 2 and 3. The necessary financial securities have not yet been furnished. Sureties have, however, been named by Mr. McIver, and accepted by the department, and bonds have been transmitted for execution. 4. The Indians of Cape Croker have not yet received their March quarterly payments for 1897. It is not usual to pay the March quarterly interest money until after the 1st April. Last year, however, by special request the money was sent on the 31st March. This year it will be paid before the 15th instant.

Mr. McNEILL. I desire to call your attention to the fact that part of the question has not been answered. I asked what were the names of the sureties.

The MINISTER OF INTERIOR. I did not notice that that part of the question was omitted in the answer. I will furnish the answer to-morrow.

NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN THE DOMINION GOVERNMENT AND THE GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the notices of motion are proceeded with, I desire, Mr. Speaker, to call the attention of the House to a matter of some importance, and in order to do so, I shall put myself in order by moving the adjournment of the House. The question to which I wish to call the attention of the Prime Minister is this. A few days ago I asked the Prime Minister across the floor of the House whether he would answer off-hand or not if there was any truth in the rumour current in the papers that an Order in Council had been passed agreeing to pay the Grand Trunk Railway a sum of money, which rumour placed at some $300,000. My hon. friend was not able to say whether an Order had passed Council or was not willing to answer the question off-hand, as he had a perfect right not to do. I then put the question on the Order paper, and on 5th April I asked as follows:—

Has any Order in Council been passed by the Government granting any sum of money to the Grand Trunk Railway Company in aid of extending, repairing or rebuilding the Victoria Railway Bridge at Montreal? If so, what was the amount

granted, and will the papers be laid upon the Table of the House in due course?

The Minister of Railways and Canals answered that question as follows :—

It would be premature until negotiations between the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Government respecting the Intercolonial Railway terminal in Montreal are concluded to furnish partial information on this subject. All papers will be laid on the Table of the House in due course.

That would have been quite a fair answer to have been given presuming the information which was denied to the House offhand and by the Minister of Railways, had been as zealously guarded elsewhere as it has been by the Minister of Railways from the knowledge of the House. But taking up yesterday's papers, I find an announcement largely in detail has been made in another quarter, and that the president of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, at a meeting of shareholders of that great carrying concern. had congratulated the shareholders of the railway and the public interested in that railway upon certain action which he says has been definitely taken by the Government of Canada. The paper goes on to say—this is from the "Star's" special correspondent in London :

In moving the adoption of the very favourable report, the essentials of which have already been transmitted to the "Star" in my special cables, the president touched upon the chief topics of importance in connection with the great railway system. A most interesting announcement was that touching upon the new arrangement between the Canadian Government and the Grand Trunk respecting the Victoria Bridge, which crosses the St. Lawrence at Montreal. The new plans were only given in outline, Sir Charles Rivers Wilson stating he would withhold the details until the announcement had been made in the Canadian Parliament. Connected with the announcement of the bridge agreement, was given a statement regarding the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal.

The Grand Trunk, said Sir Charles, had agreed with the Ottawa authorities that the Government having extended the Intercolonial Railway to St. Hyacinthe, the Grand Trunk would grant the Government road running powers into Montreal over the Victoria Bridge on terms which, he believed, would enable the bridge to be double-tracked and practically reconstructed without a cent's cost to the company. The announcement of these favourable terms was greeted with applause long and loud. When it had subsided, Sir Charles proceeded, stating that in addition to what he had announced, he hoped the Dominion and Quebec governments would each contribute 15 per cent to the actual cost of renewing the bridge.

It does seem to me that the House of Parliament assembled as it is here has a perfect right to the first information with respect to these important matters. This is not the first announcement that Sir Charles Rivers Wilson has made. I remember seeing in the papers not a long while ago a statement made by that gentleman after he had visited this country and seen the Ministers—a statement made, I think, to his company or on behalf of his company—that he had interviews with the Dominion Ministers and he was pretty certain from the tone of the conversation with them, the Dominion Government would be prepared to take off the coal duty, and he went on to talk of the great assistance that would be given to his extended system of railway if free coal should be given. We will let that pass. This is, however, a matter that is definite, one which involves financial considerations apparently of very great importance. The statement is made that the Intercolonial Railway has actually made its arrangements to extend the road to St. Hyacinthe, and having extended it to St. Hyacinthe, it has made arrangements with the Grand Trunk Railway Company for running powers, and in connection with that there is an arrangement by which the bridge over the St. Lawrence will be materially altered and enlarged and double-tracked, and that the arrangement is so favourable and the money consideration is so large that all this immense work has been done without it costing a single cent to the exchequer of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. I am not going to press this matter in a party spirit or in a heated spirit. I simply say that the Government when it had come to these conclusions, ought to have laid these papers on the Table of the House at the opening of the session, that it ought to have given Parliament the first information with respect to these matters, and it comes to us rather as a shock that the president of a great railway company should have prior information and should make that information public to his constituency before the Government condescends to give Parliament the information to which it is certainly entitled. A large financial consideration outside of other points arises on this proposed arrangement if the hon. gentleman had led an important railway at some previous time, it may be through great stress of circumstances, to believe that an arrangement would be made and that coal would be made free and that certain arrangements would be entered into ; or if a result has been arrived at recently, or if negotiations even very lately have taken place, that information should have been given to the House, which has been sitting since 25th of March. And yet it has been impossible for the House to get any information either from the Premier or the Minister of Railways, or to induce them to adopt the better course of laying the papers on the Table of the House. I desired to call attention to this matter—and I place myself in order by now moving the adjournment of the House—and to call the attention of the House to a state of things which I do not think is consistent with the dignity of Parliament or is altogether in line with the position occupied by hon. members of

this House which is sitting here as the High Court of Parliament, the Government being after all simply an executive or administrative committee of this Parliament.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). As I understand the complaint made by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), it is that an arrangement has been completed between the Government and the Grand Trunk Railway Company, under which the Government is to take over certain interests and rights from the Grand Trunk, and that this arrangement, having been concluded, is withheld from Parliament, but that the president of the Grand Trunk has felt himself justified in making the matter public; and the hon. gentleman concluded that there is some reflection cast on the dignity of Parliament because the Government has withheld this information and allowed it to become public through another channel. Mr. Speaker, I would not complain of the fact that the hon. gentleman has called attention to this fact if he had conclusive evidence. if he had evidence which really ought to be sufficient to satisfy himself that arrangements had been definitely and finally concluded between the Grand Trunk Company and the Government, and that having been concluded, those arrangements were withheld by the Government from the knowledge of the House. But, I think the hon. member (Mr. Foster) ought to have believed from the statements which have already been made to the House in answer to his inquiries, that the arrangements were not and have not been concluded. It is a matter entirely within the discretion of the president of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, as to, at what stage he may feel warranted in telling his shareholders about these negotiations, and as to whether he may state or not, that such an undertaking will be carried out or that these arrangements will be concluded. That is entirely in his discretion; but, Sir. because the president of the Grand Trunk Railway Company feels warranted in assuming that these negotiations will finally reach a satisfactory result, or because he has deemed it well to make that statement, it does not at all follow that there has been such an arrangement concluded as will warrant the Government in advising the House to that effect. I want to repeat what I said the other day: that the matter is still under negotiation between the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Government. It may be that these arrangements will come to nothing; it may be that while we are finally settling the conditions they will not be agreed upon, and in that case all that has been done will avail nothing. That is the position in which this matter stands now, and I do not feel that the Government would be warranted in making any partial statement as to what terms have been partially agreed upon, until they all have been agreed upon and until we are in a position to inform this House that a satisfactory arrangement has been concluded—not that it is under discussion, not that one instalment of it, or one feature, or some features of it have been agreed upon, but that all have been agreed upon. I want to inform the House now that such is not the case. The House may rest assured, and it is a material fact, that nothing will be done which will not be wholly and absolutely subject to the sanction of this Parliament. We will not hamper Parliament by any act that we will do or any course which we will take. We will leave Parliament entirely free.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We are very much obliged to you for that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) says: we are very much obliged to you, implying that we could not do otherwise even if we wished to. Well, we do not pretend to bind Parliament. It is known to the other parties to the negotiations, as the agreement may be reached at each step, and at the various stages of it, that what we agree upon is all subject to and must be submitted to Parliament. When we have reached such a stage as that we can say that this whole matter has been agreed upon between us we propose to lay that before Parliament and to ask the assent of Parliament, and until then we do not think we ought be expected to make any partial announcement. the effect of which might be to defeat entirely the negotiations which are pending. Notwithstanding the fact that the president of the Grand Trunk Railway Company may have felt warranted in assuming in advance that arrangements would be satisfactorily agreed upon, feeling compelled perhaps to make this announcement because his shareholders were having their annual meeting, and in order to make as favourable a showing as possible, he probably desired not to delay giving them this information. But Parliament is in an entirely different position. We are not now concluding our session; many weeks must elapse before it is over and we expect to be able to reach a satisfactory understanding with the Grand Trunk Railway Company in all its details before this session of Parliament is concluded, and at the earliest possible moment we will acquaint the House with the details of that arrangement.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The House will hardly be disposed to accept the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) as meeting the very grave point raised by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), in reference to this House being dependent upon the press, and upon outside statements of irresponsible persons, for information as to the policy of

this Government in regard to a very great and important transaction. I have no remark at all to make upon the question, as to whether it is wise or unwise for the Government of Canada to conclude the proposed arrangements for extending the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal; but I do say: that until arrangements are concluded, and until negotiations are brought to such a point that this House when in session can be informed of what is being done, the Government have no right to give to private individuals, or to the representatives of companies, or to the press of this country, statements that are calculated to have a most serious effect, and before the Government is in a position to state to this House what they propose to do.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What do you allude to now, Sir Charles?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. To the statement that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) alluded to as having been made by the Government. I say that the statement made by the president of the Grand Trunk Railway Company in London, is a statement in respect to which probably hundreds of thousands of pounds have changed hands in regard to the stocks of that company. Now, Sir, I want to know what would be the position of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair), suppose these negotiations are not brought to a conclusion, and if at the next meeting of the shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway Company the president is obliged to inform some 25,000 shareholders in England, that the statement he made that he had entered into an arrangement with the Government of Canada under which these great advantages were to be obtained by that company which would be of enormous value, and which would raise the stock and lead to large operations in it had fallen through; I ask what would be the position of the hon. gentleman and of the Government if such a condition of things should arise? The president of the Grand Trunk Railway Company leaves no doubt upon the minds of the shareholders that these negotiations have been completed, and he says he is not in a position to give the shareholders the details until he has the authority of the Government of Canada. It appears, however, that he is in a position to hold out to the shareholders, that he has made a deal with the Government of Canada enormously advantageous to that company. Statements of that kind cannot be made without involving the credit and reputation of the Government of Canada to a large extent; and for this reason: the parties who acting in good faith upon the declaration of the president of the Grand Trunk Railway Company will be in a position to throw back upon this Government a great deal of obloquy provided these arrangements are found not to have been carried to completion. The Minister of Railways, instead of confirming the statement of the president of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, intimates that he is in a position still on the part of the Government to recede from any promises or pledges that have been made. Well, Sir, these pledges either exist or they do not. If the Government is in a position to recede, then the statement made by the president of the Grand Trunk Railway Company is most unwarranted; and if the Government be not in a position to recede, then this House is entitled to at least as early information as the stockholders of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, as to what this Government propose to do in regard to this important matter involving a great expenditure of public money.

Now, Sir, this does not stand by itself. It is not an exception, but it has become the rule for this Government to give to private individuals, and to private corporations, information which they refuse to this House. What is the position of the hon. Minister of Finance on this question? Why, Sir, I brought before the House on an important occasion the different statements of different members of the Government in regard to the policy of the Government on a most important matter, that is, the coal interests of Canada. The Prime Minister had given a pledge to the people of this country in the most emphatic terms that the duty would be taken off coal. My hon. friend beside me (Mr. Foster) has referred to the fact that the president of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, at its last half-yearly meeting, stated to its shareholders that after his interview with this Government, he was in a position to assure them that the duty would be taken off coal. Now, I want to know if a question as to the policy of this Government in regard to a great public interest should be answered here, or have we to learn it either from the press on the other side of the Atlantic or from the press in various parts of this Dominion? I say it is treating Parliament with contempt; it is violating the fundamental principles of the constitution; it is doing that which the Minister of Finance declared it would be infamous for any Government to do—to make a statement touching the tariff of the country to private individuals, instead of on the floor of this House, where it would be known equally to all interested persons. What has happened? While we have been unable, by questions put in a constitutional manner on the floor of this House, to get the slightest information as to how these irreconcilable statements were to be reconciled—as to whether the policy of the First Minister or the policy of other members of the Cabinet was to prevail in regard to the duty on coal—the Finance Minister, sitting down, not with the representatives of the coal interests of Canada, but with a single section of it, imparted infor-

mation to them in advance of information he would give to this House or even to the other coal interests of the country. Was that right? It was a matter of tariff; it was a matter on which the enormous amount of stocks held by persons connected with the coal interests of this country would be instantly affected. I ask the Minister of Finance—for I can hardly believe that he has fully estimated the importance of this matter—how he can justify himself to the other coal interests of this country for having sat down and listened to the statement of one single coal company, and having given them information as to what the policy of this Government was to be in regard to coal? If he wanted to act in accordance with the constitution and in accordance with the best interests of the people of this country, if he wanted to maintain the character of the Government of which he is a member, for dealing fairly and justly with all men, without respect to persons, he would have made the statement here, where no person could take special advantage of it, and where the information would be given at the same moment to all interests in the country. I happen to hold under my hand the evidence that this information was given in advance to one company, and that other coal companies, whose representatives were within reach of the hon. gentleman's summons in the city of Montreal, were not afforded the same opportunity. This is what Mr. Budden says on this point:

To the Editor of the "Gazette":

Sir,—In your issue of Saturday, you refer to the coal duties, and say that the representatives of the coal-mining interests waited on Hon. Mr. Fielding, Minister of Finance, at the Windsor Hotel, on Friday last.

We beg to inform you that the delegation that interviewed the hon. gentleman on that occasion, was composed solely of gentlemen representing Cape Breton mines, which are controlled by non-residents of Canada, and that the mainland mines of Cumberland and Pictou were not represented at that meeting.

The representatives of these companies were in Montreal—the Hon. Mr. Drummond representing the coal mines of Cumberland, and Mr. Budden representing the Intercolonial Coal Mining Company of Pictou.

Although advised that such a meeting was in contemplation, and that they would be notified of the hour, no such notification was given them.

Now, Sir, here is the representative of one of these companies saying that this information—information of the most valuable character, information that would enable persons to operate on the stock exchange, if they relied on the accuracy of the information—is given to the portion of the coal mining interests and not to another. But I deny the right of the hon. gentleman to meet even the whole of the coal mining interests, and give them information as to what he proposed to do with regard to the tariff. I say that the place to give that information was on the floor of this House, and there was abundant opportunity for him to do so, because the hon. gentleman's opinions were invited, and he evaded giving any reply, but treated the subject with the utmost levity. Sir, it is not a subject for levity. It is a subject that touches the honour of the Government of Canada, and that which touches the honour of the Government of Canada touches the honour of Canada itself. I am sorry to say, Sir, that that is not the worst of it. I believe that the meeting held between the hon. Minister of Finance and the Dominion Coal Company at the Windsor Hotel, and the outcome of that meeting, which is reported in the "Globe" newspaper, was the result of a deliberate attempt to take an unfair and dishonourable advantage of the position that the hon. gentleman occupied, in the interests of a party, and not in the interests of the country. The hon. gentleman is reported by the "Globe" newspaper of 13th March to have said:

If, however, your view is correct, and it turns out that the United States duty is raised to a high figure, then we shall claim and exercise the right to revise our views respecting the Canadian duty, and we shall feel bound to impose a duty not only on bituminous coal, but also on anthracite coal, which at present comes into our market from the United States free of duty.

The United States duty had already been raised to 75 cents a ton by the Dingley Bill, which has passed the House of Representatives; and here is a positive, solemn and emphatic declaration of the Government of Canada, by the mouth of its Finance Minister as to what the Government of Canada would feel bound to do in a certain event, which event everybody had reason to believe had already occurred. I want to know, had the hon. Finance Minister the authority of the Council of Canada when he declared what the Government, in a certain contingency, that there was no reason to doubt had already occurred, would feel bound to do? Had the hon. gentleman the consent of his colleagues to declare to anybody that a duty would be imposed upon anthracite coal, which is now free under the tariff? I say, if the hon. gentleman was in a position to make that statement, the place to make it was not in a private parlour in the Windsor Hotel, but on the floor of this House, where all men interested in the great coal mining industry of this country, in which millions of capital are invested, would have been upon an even footing, and one would have had just as much information as the other. I may be told that this was given to the press. Why is it that when they submit a tariff in this House, the Government take possession of the telegraph lines and will not allow any message to be sent by any person, member of Parliament or not, from the moment the tariff resolutions are on the Table until they are passed? The reason is because a single

hour's advanced information would enable individuals to make large fortunes. That is the principle that lies at the foundation of that sound policy, and imposes upon the Ministers, and, above all, upon the Minister of Finance, the solemn obligation not to give a particle of information as to what this Government will feel bound to do unless on the floor of Parliament, and in such a way that the whole country may obtain the information at the same time.

But this is not all. What is the history of this transaction? It is this, that an hon. Minister, engaged with his colleagues in settling the tariff of the country, suddenly called upon his successor, the leader of the Government of Nova Scotia, to close up, in inconvenient haste, the business of the legislature of that province and dissolve the local House for an immediate appeal to the people. What more? After the people of this country had waited long and weary months for the hour to come when this ruinous uncertainty under which we are labouring as to the financial policy of the country should be set at rest, and rejoiced to know that the Government had called Parliament to meet on the 11th of March, what did the people find? They found that simultaneously with this party movement in Nova Scotia, simultaneously with this dissolution of the Nova Scotia Legislative Assembly, this Parliament was prorogued for a longer period and not allowed to come together until the 25th of March. Has there ever been any explanation or any reason given on the floor of this House, or anywhere else, by the Government for that extraordinary movement? Sir, the reason is plain. If Parliament had met on the 11th of March, it would have been next to impossible, with all the finesse, all the adroitness of hon. gentlemen opposite, to postpone the hour when the people of this country were to know their fate with regard to their fiscal policy. But by that postponement to the 25th March, it would be possible, by such devices as we now have to meet with from day to day, to have the elections of Nova Scotia before bringing down the tariff policy.

And that is not all. Why, the hon. gentleman's successor brings forward, as his tariff policy, a duty on coal. It is a spectacle unprecedented in this country, of finding the leader of a local legislature suddenly dissolving the local House long before its term expired by efflux of time, because its term does not expire until the spring of 1898, and doing this as the evident result of a combination with the Dominion Government. The two acts are practically simultaneous—the one, the dissolution of the Assembly of Nova Scotia; the other, the extension of time for calling the Dominion Parliament together for the despatch of business from the 11th to the 25th of March. And then we have the leader of the Nova Scotia Government coming out and declaring that he makes this untimely appeal to the province in order to settle the question of the duty on coal. If this were not a matter of such serious moment, it would be properly characterized as a farce, and if the hon. gentleman wants to know what the opinion of his own friends is, let him read one of his most steadfast supporters in this country, the daily "Witness," of Montreal, and in that paper he will find the Finance Minister taken to task in terms not usually applied to members of a Liberal Government by that paper, and ridicule cast on this attempt of the Government of Nova Scotia to make an appeal to the country on any such question.

What else have we as the result of this private arrangement made between the Minister of Finance and the coal companies of Montreal? It is well known that for eighteen years, aye, more, for twenty-five years, one of the questions in controversy between the Liberal party and the Conservative party of this country has been the policy of the duty on coal. Every person knows that the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) could find no language strong enough to denounce the imposition of a duty on coal, and some of the members of this House may not know that there was no man more hostile to that duty than the present Minister of Finance. Let me read from a special despatch to the Halifax "Chronicle," the organ of the hon. gentleman in the province of Nova Scotia, a report of what the hon. gentleman said at Sydney, in the county of Cape Breton:

> Mr. Fielding then took up the failure of the National Policy and the dismal efforts of the Government to keep the people at home. Referring to the coal trade, he said the Liberal party would not preach one doctrine in Cape Breton and another in the rest of the Dominion. If the coal business could not be carried on without protection, then it was better not to carry it on at all. The coal business was not a pauper business.

Those were the sentiments of the hon. gentleman before he found himself seated in a parlour of the Windsor Hotel at Montreal with the members of a private company engaged in the coal trade, and there settled the fiscal policy of this country on this important question. The hon. gentleman has had the satisfaction of finding that this conspiracy—for I can call it nothing else—entered into, in defiance of every principle that has hitherto been held to govern the conduct of the Governments of Canada in the past—a conspiracy that is in antagonism with every principle of right and justice and fair-play—has had its effect. The hon. gentleman has reaped, to a certain extent, the fruit of his policy. He makes this declaration which is subsequently published, and then, Sir, the coal owners are placed in this position: You must support Mr. Murray in the local elections of Nova Scotia and the Liberal party in that province or have the protection you now enjoy on coal taken from you.

That is the position. And, Sir, if the hon. gentleman thinks that I am straining that point, if he thinks I am going too far, let him read in his own organ, the Halifax "Chronicle," an account of the Pictou nomination, when Mr. McDonald, one of the Liberal candidates in that province, declared on the hustings that they had secured the support of the coal interest. Look at the great heading, which says "McDonald throws a bombshell into the Tory Camp." What was the bombshell? It was a bomb manufactured in the Windsor Hotel by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), and for the purpose of doing to the Conservatives what Orsini intended to do to the Emperor of the French. If the hon. gentleman wishes to be handed down to posterity as a manufacturer of bombshells, I think he has taken the right way to secure that end. But he has taken it at too great sacrifice of his own character and the character of his colleagues.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They may laugh, Sir, but I tell them there is not an intelligent, there is not an honourable, there is not an honest or high-minded elector in this Dominion that will sanction the carrying out of a scheme such as we see here attempted. The "Chronicle" says:

> On the coal question, he took the stand that the Government of Canada should not allow the United States to stamp out the coal industry of Nova Scotia, and, in reply to the charge that Premier Murray was not sincere in his manifesto on the coal question, he read an important letter from Henry A. Budden, vice-president of the Intercolonial Coal Company, Montreal,——

The same gentleman who complained over his own signature of the treatment he had received at the hands of the Minister of Finance, that after being notified that he would be called upon to attend, he was left in the dark while this information as to the policy of the Government was given to other parties.

> —to Charles Fergie, manager of the company's collieries at Westville, urging him, in view of the firm and important stand taken by Premier Murray,——

On a question which, the Montreal "Witness" tells him, he had nothing to do with—

> —to frustrate the return of the Murray Government to power, and adding that the miners should now see that their and the owners' interests are already safeguarded by Mr. Murray's manifesto. This letter sounded the death-knell of the Tory candidates, and Mr. McDonald said that, for the first time for twenty-four years, Pictou would go solid for the Liberals.

Hon. gentlemen opposite, no doubt, accept that as a very considerable compensation. But I say that if this bombshell manufactured by the Minister of Finance and thrown in a crisis of this kind, and under the circumstances, accomplished its intended work—and I do not believe it will, because the people of this country are too intelligent not to spurn with indignation an attempt thus to hoodwink and mislead them—the advantage would be short-lived. Why, the hon. Minister of Finance knows that his policy with reference to coal is diametrically opposed to that propounded by the rest of his party. Every man in connection with the coal mining industry and every citizen knows that all the protection that has been given to this coal mining industry, all the prosperity it has enjoyed for the last eighteen years, greatly to the advantage of the whole country, has been secured through the determined, unflinching battle fought by the Conservatives in Canada for the protection to coal; and they all know that the battle has been won in spite of all the opposition and the hostility that the Liberals could show. The leader of this Government on the floor of this House, declared that a coal duty, even for revenue, was an indefensible duty. The hon. gentleman went further, and, in the most solemn manner that a great party leader could do it, declared to the electors, and to the great manufacturing industries in Montreal especially, that he had decided that raw material should be made free, and that coal and iron were those raw materials. No one would rejoice more than I if, at the eleventh hour, the hon. gentleman should be converted from the error of his ways, because I believe it would be a very serious mistake for the hon. gentleman to carry out the opinions he then expressed. But, considering that the protection to the coal interests has been given in spite of the hostility of the Liberals, I regard this as a most unfair attempt on the part of the Government to subordinate the very highest function that the Government in Canada possesses, that of dealing, honestly, fairly and justly with all classes of the people, irrespective of individuals, to party interests. These hon. gentlemen were bound not to give to any single individual or any number of individuals the policy of this Government which had been demanded from them on the floor of this House, in advance of its being given on the floor of this House. Therefore, I am bound to say, when I put together the fact of the private meeting in the Windsor Hotel parlour in Montreal where this policy is propounded, the fact of the sudden dissolution, at the instance of the hon. gentleman, of the legislature of Nova Scotia long before its time, the farcical appeal made by Mr. Murray, the Premier of Nova Scotia, to stand solidly at his back to promote the coal industries of the country, and the further fact of the postponement of the meeting of this Parliament, and the refusal of this Government to give even at this late hour a declaration of what their policy is on this subject so that the whole country may know it—when I put these facts together I cannot but see that they indicate

one of the basest political conspiracies ever attempted by any Government or any party in Canada. If hon. gentlemen think they can win with loaded dice and marked cards, I tell them that theirs will be a short-lived game. They are face to face with the great, intelligent, independent electorate of this country, an electorate that will not, for party purposes, long suffer the great fundamental principle of government to be trampled under foot for the purpose of carrying out these miserable party objects. For they are miserable. It is of very little consequence to the people of Canada whether Liberals or Conservatives are in power. What is of vital importance to every man, whether Liberal or Conservative, throughout the country, is that the Government of the country shall be so administered that every man shall feel that the fundamental principles of good government will not be ignored for miserable party purposes. I do not believe now that coal is to be protected; I believe that when these elections are over in Nova Scotia, and there is no further party purpose to be subserved, the pledge which the First Minister gave to the manufacturers and to the great railway interests of this country, that coal would be made free, will be fulfilled. But, Sir, I say it is unfair to all parties, it is unfair to the people of this country, it is unfair and unjust to this House in the last degree, that we should not be able to get a plain authentic statement; and that the policy of this Government should be to prevent the tariff being laid upon the Table of this House, or the Budget speech being made, until the local elections in Nova Scotia are over, and that the party interests for which they have made such tremendous sacrifices shall, as they hope, be subserved. I do not believe their object will be accomplished. I believe that the country is too intelligent: but I say that if they were to succeed by such means, their victory would be so discreditable as to make it a very dangerous one for themselves.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Mr. Speaker, busily engaged as I have been on the somewhat ardous duties of my office, I must confess that I have not had as much time as I could desire to devote myself to a study of the provincial politics of Nova Scotia during recent weeks, and I am not as well informed as I should like to be, I have not hitherto been as well informed as I should like to be of the political situation in that province. I confess that after having so many years of my life taken an active part in provincial affairs, I should like to be able to be down there now and raising my voice in support of the Liberal friends with whom I have worked for so many years. But my duty requires me to be here, and whether my hon. friend is willing to believe it or not, I must honestly say that I have not been giving as much attention to the election in Nova Scotia as it might reasonably have been expected I should give. Let me say that I have heard the hon. gentleman's speech to-day with a considerable degree of pleasure, because the violence of that speech and the manner of the hon. gentleman show me that which I did not so well know before, that the news has come to him and to his friends that once more the dying if not dead cause of Toryism and Tupperism in Nova Scotia will meet with a disastrous defeat. I venture to say that if the hon. gentleman had any hope of carrying the provincial elections in Nova Scotia, he would not have made this very ill-tempered speech to-day. The hon. gentleman has announced that the Conservative party are going to attack the Liberals at the provincial election; he has sent his missionaries throughout the length and breadth of the provinces, he has sent a distinguished member of his own family down to Nova Scotia to take part in the campaign; and he seems to have so little confidence in the prospects of the election, that he is prepared to-day to confess, as he virtually does before the world, that when the polls close on the 20th day of April—if that is the day when the elections are to be held—once more the Liberals will succeed, and once more my hon. friend will discover that in the province which it was his pride to claim that he ruled, his name is no longer one to conjure with, and his party no longer has any considerable number of supporters. This debate began with a reference to the Grand Trunk Railway. I suppose it was well understood that that was merely a gentle opening of the debate, and that the main purpose was to allow my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition to indulge in this explosion on the coal question. We are not deeply interested in Nova Scotia, not locally interested, in the question of the Grand Trunk Railway, and I do not suppose anybody imagines that this coal discussion has been raised to-day merely to ascertain if a certain arrangement has been made with the Grand Trunk Railway. Now, here is the whole story in a nutshell. Negotiations have been conducted with the Grand Trunk Railway. Now, here is the Railway Company. These negotiations have not yet been completed, and the hon. the Minister of Railways has said that he is not in a position to lay the matter before the House. If the president of the Grand Trunk Railway Company makes a speech in London which is designed to influence—though I do not suppose the hon. gentleman meant to suggest that, or which did influence the stock market, that is a question between Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson and his stockholders and the London market, and they can settle it among themselves. This Government is not concerned in anything that Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson may say; it is concerned in submitting to Parliament at the right time,

after matters have been fully discussed and have been brought to a conclusion—this Government is then concerned in submitting those matters to the High Court of Parliament; but until they have been so concluded, it would be preposterous to bring them down and lay them on the table. That is the whole story of the Grand Trunk Railway. Now, with relation to the interview which it was my privilege to hold in Montreal a few weeks ago.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Before the hon. gentleman leaves the Grand Trunk Railway—as he is, of course, well posted with regard to the matter, and the House as well as the country is anxious to know the facts—will the hon. gentleman tell us whether any Order in Council resultant from the negotiations with the Grand Trunk Railway has taken place in regard to it?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I hope my hon. friend knows me well enough to know that I will not tell him, because I think it would be exceedingly improper. Orders in Council, Mr. Speaker, are frequently passed and wait for a long time before being submitted to Parliament, because the public interest so requires. Coming back now to the question of this coal interview, the leader of the Opposition began with a somewhat remarkable statement that I had given to a private corporation information which should only have been given upon the floor of Parliament, information which, he said, we had refused to give on the floor of Parliament.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman emphasizes it by saying "hear hear." Well, now, whatever may be the merits of that information, whether good or bad, I could not well have refused to give it to Parliament at a time when Parliament was not in session. When the interview which I had the honour of holding in Montreal took place, it was a considerable number of days before Parliament opened; and, therefore, when the hon. gentleman says that I gave them information which I had refused to bring down to Parliament, he has forgotten the important fact that Parliament was not in session. Now, Sir, as to whether there were reasons why that information should not have been given, I grant you that might be a fair matter of debate; but before the hon. gentlemen are in a position to determine that question, they must be as fully informed as I was of all the facts which led me to make that statement. It is one of the disadvantages to which public men in official positions must submit, that at times they have to make statements without fully disclosing all the facts upon which they base them; and I venture to think that if it were in the interests of the country that I should lay before Parliament now all the facts that led to my making that statement, there are very few members of this House who would not say that I was fully justified in taking an exceptional course in relation to it.

Mr. FOSTER. A little retaliation, was it?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was very little retaliation, I think; nothing of retaliation in it. I think the whole tone of the remarks was not of a retaliatory character; but I am willing that the hon. gentleman shall differ with me on that point. What I wish to say is that the Government had good reason for making that statement. I hope the hon. gentleman is not serious when he asks me to state whether I have the authority of my colleagues for making the statement I did. I had hoped I had been long enough in public life to be known as one with a little knowledge of public affairs and of the constitutional principles of government, and I cannot imagine the hon. gentleman to be serious when he wants to know whether I spoke in the name of the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. How about Mr. Dobell?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman will find, when Mr. Dobell is here, that he is generally able to take care of himself. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman seems now to be very much concerned as to whether that statement is to be adhered to. I am going to take him into my confidence and tell him that the statement that I made at Montreal is the statement of the Government to-day, as it will be when the Budget speech is made. If there is good or bad in it, you have it now before you, and hon. gentlemen are free to make whatever use of it they can. But did I give it to a private corporation or not? What does the hon. gentleman mean when he says that I gave the information to private parties? How was this information given? To a delegation representing the coal interests; and he said, quoting the letter of a gentleman in support, that it was a delegation representing the mines of Cape Breton owned by outsiders. Who were these outsiders? The hon. gentleman is himself one of them, for he is a director of the General Mining Association.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Let me say that on the day that I accepted the position of a member of the Government, I resigned any connection with the General Mining Association.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The point is not important; but if it is important, I understand when the hon. gentleman at a by-election went to the county of Cape Breton—after he had induced, by a pleasant arrangement, an excellent gentleman to accept a position in the Senate and allow the hon. gentleman to run for his seat—he pretended before the electors that he was a director of the General Mining Association,

and that he was so at that time. The hon. gentleman now tells me it is not so; I am bound to accept his statement, and I do not attach much importance to the point.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My statement was that when I became leader of the Government I resigned my position.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That was not the main point. The main point was that a deputation representing several coal companies, I am not sure that I can now tell the House how many there were, waited upon me. But what has the number got to do with it? The hon. gentleman talks of giving away private information, he uses words that were used a few days ago in regard to giving private information with respect to the tariff, an act which I said would be one of a shameful character. Sir, it would be a shameful act to give away any information in regard to the tariff to any private individual for his advantage.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman say whether there was more than one company represented?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Budden denies that distinctly in the letter I have read.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Budden could only say that he was not there.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He says that other companies were not notified to be there.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He says that the companies intended to be present, but were not notified. I cannot help that; I did not notify them. Gentlemen came to me and talked with me on the question.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. One company.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was represented that other companies would come; I cannot tell how many companies were present. But I may say that the hon. gentleman's own company, the General Mining Association, was represented at that deputation. I do not, however, attach much importance to this matter. The point of importance is, in the first place, that there should be good and sufficient reason for my action, and I shall be in a position at a future day to offer full explanations and vindicate myself before Parliament and the country. In the second place, the important point is whether information was given privately; but instead of such being the case, it was given to the public and to the world at large, and within half an hour of the interview information was given to the reporters of the press and was sent on the wings of electricity over the continent to all parties interested. If, therefore, the hon. gentleman wishes it to be understood that any information was given to any company or to any person connected with any company under conditions which permitted them to take any advantage in the matter, there is not a shadow of foundation for such statement. I want to say a word in regard to the hon. gentleman's championship of the coal interest. The hon. gentleman has told us that for a long time there has been a great fight waging between the two parties in Nova Scotia on the coal question, and he has quoted some observations of my own; but he has not quoted any observations made by me that are inconsistent with the view I now hold. He has shown that I went into Cape Breton, and in the presence of the coal miners, and that at a time when I was asking votes for my friends, I told them they had no right to demand exceptional treatment for the coal interests, but that they must stand or fall with other interests. I am afraid that would not be the method pursued by the hon. gentleman, that he would be prepared to say to the coal miners that he thought a certain policy would suit them, but when he went off in another direction he would not be prepared to hold up the flag in the same way. But what is the history of this question? It is time the hon. gentleman ceased to masquerade as the defender of the coal interests of Nova Scotia. Let the hon. gentleman go back in his memory a few years. Let him not go back to the beginning of the National Policy, not to 1878, but to 1870, when there was a National Policy question in this House. The hon. gentleman was a member of the House at that time, but not a member of the Cabinet, if my memory serves me correctly. He came before this House, and declared almost as strongly as he has spoken to-day, that in the interests of the Dominion of Canada, it was necessary to have a great National Policy, which would include duties on coal, flour and various other products. He persuaded the House to agree with him. This National Policy was carried out in 1870. In 1871 something happened and something had happened in the meantime. The leader of the Opposition to-day had passed from the ranks of a private member to the position of a Minister of the Crown, and if he was the protector of the coal interests in 1870, surely he would be more powerful in defending those interests in 1871, when he had taken his place in the Cabinet. Well, Sir, the Government brought in a tariff at that time which included a duty on coal. The hon. gentleman stood up for that tariff at first, but after a while he discovered something which led him to understand that if he were to continue a fight for coal he might lose his office. He saw it was imperilled, that his friends in Ontario and in some other provinces did not want a coal duty. And then, what? Did he stand by his colours and fight the battle, determinedly and unflinchingly, of the coal industry? No; but

when he saw that a firm position on that great question—because he himself had declared the coal question to be a great question, and one involving great principles—might lead to a loss of position and defeat of his government, the hon. gentleman sacrificed the coal industry and took the duty off coal. There were some protests made on the Conservative side of the House of that day, for some hon. gentlemen were not so heartless as was the hon. gentleman himself. He was the father of this infant, the National Policy, but when the critical time came he was willing to let it be kicked out of doors. There was, however, an hon. member, I think from Ontario, who moved to restore the coal duty and the duties on flour and other articles which made up the National Policy. The vote was taken in this House, and the name of the hon. leader of the Opposition is recorded as voting against the coal duty and as having kicked the National Policy out of doors.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will find in "Hansard" a full and complete refutation of the statement he has made, which will fairly silence any such arguments, which indeed he is only repeating.

An hon. MEMBER. There was no "Hansard" at that time.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will not rest on the point that there was no "Hansard" at that time; there were, no doubt, newspaper reports. In those reports we will find some of the hon. gentleman's finely spun arguments, such as he delivers when he seeks to make black appear white: but he will find in "Hansard" and in the Journals of the House the vote he gave when he took the duty off coal and strangled his baby, the National Policy. No amount of explanation will ever wipe out that record, and it must not be expected that the people interested in Nova Scotia coal mines are going to forget it.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman strangled a babe eight years before it was born.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have already shown the hon. gentleman that there was an older National Policy than that of 1878, that the National Policy was born in 1870 and not in 1878.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will find he is altogether mistaken. The proposition to levy a duty was brought down by the Government, and the Government was defeated on the occasion, and the duty was not imposed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is quite right in a certain sense. The Government brought down the proposal, they were defeated on it, but they did not resign. The hon. gentleman must know that if the National Policy involved the great principles which he has always contended it embodied, if it were essential to the good government and welfare of Canada that duties should be imposed on those articles in question, then there was a great issue at stake, and he who tells us now that he fought a determined and unflinching battle for those principles, in dealing with that great question—I do not say that this applies in all minor questions, but it applies to a question of such vital importance to the Dominion and above all of such vital importance to the province of Nova Scotia—he should have gone down with the wreck rather than have submitted. The hon. gentleman brought down the tariff, and found difficulty in carrying it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I was not in the Government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman will find that in 1870, when they put on the coal duties he was not in the Government, and perhaps should not claim much credit, but in 1871, when they took the coal duty off, he was in the Government. It is, I say, too late for the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) to masquerade before the people of this country as the great champion of the coal industry.

There was one point in the coal question wherein I differed from some of my friends in Nova Scotia. I took the view, which the hon. gentleman himself once entertained, and I hope even yet entertains, that the best thing that could happen for the coal trade of Nova Scotia would be that we should have free trade in coal with the United States. I believe it would be the true policy, to let New England buy her coal from Nova Scotia and to let the province of Ontario buy her coal from across the line. I believe, that if that were done by both countries it would be the true policy, and the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) once talked in that way. He went down to the end of the pier at Sydney Harbour, and he pictured to the people the great future they would have when his party brought about a reciprocity treaty with the United States, which he pledged he would get within two years if the electorate adopted the National Policy. He pictured the great future before that harbour and that town from the development of the coal trade—not the coal trade of the upper provinces, but the coal trade of New England. By and by, when the elections were coming on again, the hon. gentleman went back on his declaration in favour of reciprocity, and he sent his agents up and down through the Dominion, into every coal mining electoral district, to tell the people, that if the Liberal policy of reciprocity in coal were carried out, the mines would be closed up. He was then going back upon the declarations of a lifetime: but that was not all. At the time I made that speech in the town of Sydney, from which he quotes, I was face to

face with an audience of coal miners, and I told them that free trade in coal between Canada and the United States was the best thing that could happen them, but many of them would not believe me. I did not blame them for that. The managers of the coal mines came up and joined the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) and said they could not stand that sort of policy, and they joined him in declaring that this Grit policy of free trade in coal was going to shut up the mines. Well, Sir, who will believe it? At that very time, when the Government of which the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) was a member sent their Ministers and their speakers throughout the coal districts to say that the Liberals were going to shut up the coal mines by advocating reciprocity with the States; there was on the files of the Committee of Ways and Means at Washington a letter of Sir John Macdonald, offering reciprocity in coal. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) talks of having one policy in one place and another policy in another place, but what are we to think of that? Picture, if you can, the scene, when my Liberal friends and I were going up and down through the coal mining districts telling the people frankly that it was our policy to have reciprocity in coal, and my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) and all his associates following us around and declaring that that policy would shut up the mines, when, at that very moment, his Government had a proposition before the Government at Washington offering reciprocity in coal.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE. Does my hon. friend deny it?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do. The hon. gentleman has asked me if I deny it, and I tell him that there is not the slightest foundation for the statement that the Washington authorities had a proposition of the Government before them; unless the proposition of a single member of the Government given to an individual, binds the Government? I say this emphatically: That the letter which Sir John Macdonald gave to Mr. Ritchie, without any communication whatever with his colleagues, did not bind the Government in any shape or form and never had been authorized or assented to in any way whatever.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In a famous transaction a few years ago, a phrase was used, "the inferior members of the Government." The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) would have us believe, if he could, that he was an inferior member of the Government and did not know what was going on. I refuse to believe that an hon. gentleman occupying the high position that he did as a Minister of the Crown, did not know what Sir John Macdonald was doing.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) allow me to correct him again. I was not in the Government then.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Well, considering the manner in which my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) has been slipping in and out of the Government for years one may well be pardoned for not knowing whether or not he was in the Government at a certain period. However, we are not likely to make any further mistake in that direction, for we know that he is out of the Government now, and with a fair prospect of staying out. But the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) knows, and the House knows, and every one who knows anything of constitutional government knows, that when the Prime Minister of a Government writes a letter on a public question in the name of his Government——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, and more especially when he writes that letter to a public man in another country.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, to a private individual. The letter was to Mr. S. J. Ritchie, a private individual.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) is not going to escape on any such plea as that. Sir John Macdonald wrote the letter to Mr. S. J. Ritchie, of Akron, Ohio, and he told Mr. Ritchie to take that letter to Washington. He authorized him to show it to the Committee on Ways and Means, as the basis of their action, and he only exacted one condition: Don't say anything about it just now. The Nova Scotia elections were coming on, the Dominion elections were coming on, lots of elections were coming on, and the coal miners' votes were required. Don't say anything about it now, because, if you do, we won't be able to go down to the county of Cape Breton, and tell the coal miners that the Grit policy of reciprocity is going to shut up their mines. I say that, in the whole history of the coal trade; in the whole history of tariff questions in this country, there never was a more scandalous exhibition of duplicity and double-dealing, than when the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) and his colleagues went throughout the length and breadth of the coal districts in Nova Scotia, declaring that the Liberal policy of reciprocity would shut up the mines, while at that very time, they themselves had made a proposition to Washington to have reciprocity in coal.

I do not wish to labour this discussion, Mr. Speaker, and I think I have said all that is necessary, barring a single word on another matter. I do not deem it necessary to say anything about the provincial elections in Nova Scotia. I am not indifferent to them; I am naturally desirous that my friends

down there shall win, but I say, Sir, that, in my connection with this coal question, in the interview that I had in Montreal—and I state this now with the expectation that those who know me will believe me—I had no communication whatever with the Government of Nova Scotia on the subject. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) speaks of doing these things with a party purpose in view. That, I take it, is an illustration of the homely adage in reference to measuring other people's corn with your own half bushel. Hon. gentlemen opposite know that they never made a move in these great questions in which they did not endeavour to turn it to some mean party advantage, and, therefore, they naturally suppose—and knowing them I forgive them for it—that we would do the same. Well, Sir, we are naturally human; we are far from perfect, but I hope we are not going to follow in their footsteps, and I hope we are not going to turn anything to the lowest and meanest party advantage. If it were necessary to say anything to help my friends in Nova Scotia, I would be willing to do so in a manly fashion, but the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) has shown me to-day that there is no necessity for anything of that sort, because he has thrown out the flag of distress, and he has declared that the provincial elections in Nova Scotia, soon to be held, will be one more of the many triumphs of the Liberal party.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). From what has transpired in the House this afternoon, in our endeavours to get information from the Government, it is quite clear that the Ministers intend to be very reticent. The efforts of my hon. friend the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) have only resulted in eliciting the bald information that the Government are negotiating with the Grand Trunk Railway Company. With regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway, all the information I can get is that the Government are considering whether they will negotiate or not; and on other questions we have seen the same thing. The other night we tried to learn from the Government what their intentions were in connection with the mission to Rome. The Minister of Public Works, in the celebrated document which he read to the House, said:

> Your Holiness has already been made aware of the conduct and attitude of certain prelates and of certain members of the secular clergy, who, during the elections in this country in the month of June last, intervened in a violent manner.

We asked the Minister of Public Works at that time if he would put us in possession of that information. He declined. From what has occurred here this afternoon, it is quite evident that we must take the same means to get that information that we have had to take to get the information with regard to the Grand Trunk Railway. We had to go to the Grand Trunk meeting to find out what was the intention of the Government with regard to that railway. It is quite evident that we shall have to go to the ablegate himself to get this information, unless hon. gentlemen opposite bring it down. I think they are showing bad policy in not taking this House more fully into their confidence. They ought to give the information in regard to the Grand Trunk Railway which has been properly asked for; they ought to give me the information in regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway which I have repeatedly tried to get; and the Minister of Public Works ought to give us this information in regard to the ablegate. All I can say is that the newspaper men—and I hope they are enterprising—will have to send and ask the ablegate to give that information which the Government have declined to give to the House.

Mr. McMULLEN. Hon. gentlemen opposite should not forget that they have a record in this House. The hon. ex-Finance Minister commenced this discussion by drawing attention to a quotation from the "Star," and finding very serious fault with the Minister of Railways for not at once giving information regarding the proposed arrangement between the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Government. Allow me to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to an instance in which a quotation was read to this House from the same paper from which he has quoted to-day. He was then the leader of the House, and occupied the position of Finance Minister. It occurred on March 21st, 1893:

> Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the House.
>
> Mr. LAURIER. I call the attention of the hon. gentleman to a statement made in the Montreal "Star" of yesterday. An interview is reported with Sir Charles Tupper, in which he said that the treaty was essentially a Government treaty, which they were obliged to carry through the House, or resign. Has the hon. gentleman taken notice of this paragraph, and has he information to give the House?
>
> Mr. FOSTER. I have not taken notice with regard to that paragraph, and do not propose to criticise it.
>
> Mr. LAURIER. Nor to give information?
>
> Mr. FOSTER. At the present time, not.

This was in connection with the French treaty, a matter of vital importance to this country. It is well known that the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) negotiated that treaty, and questions were asked across the House as to what the Government intended to do with regard to it, and from day to day they declined to give the information; but in the Montreal "Star," the very paper from which the hon. ex-Finance Minister quoted to-day, the leader of the Opposition declared that the treaty was complete, and that the Government would have to ratify it or resign; and the ex-Finance Minister refused to give the House the information. Yet he gets up

to-day and finds fault with the hon. Minister of Railways because he does not give information on a question on which the Minister of Railways declares that the negotiations are not yet complete.

Mr. IVES. Mr. Speaker, before you put the motion, I would like to ask the members of the Government present if any Order in Council has been passed by the Government with respect to the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to St. Hyacinthe or to Montreal, or with respect to the arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway Company to which the president of the company referred at the meeting in London the other day; and if so, whether that Order in Council will be brought down and submitted to the inspector of the members of this House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I am sorry that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways is not in his place. My impression is that the Order in Council will form part of the record, which is not yet complete; but I would rather not give a definite answer to the hon. gentleman's question, but would ask him to repeat it when the hon. Minister of Railways is present.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I would like to see the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) in his place before I proceed; but perhaps the hon. Minister of Finance can explain the matter I complain of. The hon. gentleman has stated that owing to engagements in his department, extending over a number of weeks, he has been unable to give that attention to the election in Nova Scotia which he would like to have given. I have reason to believe that if he has not been able to give the attention he would like to have given, he has been able to delegate that duty to another member of the Cabinet. A few days ago I had information from the county of Cape Breton that an officer of the Fisheries Department was distributing fish bounties in that county last week, and was at the same time canvassing the people to whom he was distributing the bounties on behalf of the Liberal candidates. I want to know if this gentleman was doing so under authority or instructions from the Government?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will please recollect that the debate should be reasonably confined to the points raised by the hon. member who moved the adjournment of the House. A general discussion of the policy of the Government on motions of this kind is not in order.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I am sorry that I cannot get this information at the present time, because it is important. However, I wish to say a word or two on the coal duties. Representing as I do a constituency where there are ten thousand people largely dependent on the development of the coal mines, it is natural that I should on their behalf feel anxious to know what the policy of the Government is with regard to that particular industry. We have had from the hon. Minister of Finance what his own organ at Halifax, the "Chronicle," characterizes as a distinct statement that not only will the duty on coal be maintained, but a duty will likely be placed on anthracite. We have had declarations year after year, extending over sixteeen or eighteen years, made by hon. gentlemen who today occupy the Treasury benches, and by men who support them, that such a policy was legalized robbery. I take for granted that the influence of these hon. gentlemen will not allow the duty on coal to continue. It is therefore of importance not only to the capitalists who have their money invested in that industry to the extent of from $12,000,000 to $15,000,000, but to the people whose livelihood depends upon the prosecution of that industry that the intention of the Government with respect to this question should be made known at an early day.

There are a number of young people who, if they are unable to get employment in the mines, which they have been in the habit of getting in the past, will have to seek employment elsewhere, and the season now is getting so advanced that these people have to come to a decision one way or the other. A week or even a day is of great importance to them now. If the duty be reduced or repealed, the coal industry will suffer, and that will mean that these people will have to leave the country. It will mean that not one-half of the people will be employed in that industry who have been given employment in it during the past few years. It is, therefore, of the greatest importance that they should know, at the earliest possible date, what the Government definitely intends to do in that matter. These people must seek employment elsewhere if they cannot get it in the coal mines. They cannot continue idle any longer. I do not remember a year, during the last fifteen years or more, when there was idleness prevailing in the coal mines for the length of time it has prevailed during the present season. It will be very disappointing, if, after that industry has arrived at its present stage of development, owing to the policy of protection, these people's plans should have to be changed and all their hopes frustrated by any interference with the duty, because any such interference will compel them to leave the country or engage in some other industry or employment. I do not wish to detain the House, but am so anxious on this question that I would urge upon the Minister of Finance the importance of bringing down this tariff at the earliest possible date. We were promised by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies), a few days before the House met, that within a week the Government would be prepared to bring

down their tariff, and he further gave the assurance that the Government were going to adhere to the principles they had advanced in this House, year after year, while in Opposition. These statements have caused a great deal of anxiety among our people, and it is on their behalf that I take the liberty of addressing the House on this question.

Motion (Mr. Foster) to adjourn, negatived.

THE BUTTER TRADE.

Mr. REID moved:

That the production of cheese in Canada has reached a very high and most satisfactory point, and any expenditure for the further development of this product alone, might be detrimental to the best interests of our dairy industry as a whole.

That Great Britain imports immense quantities of fine butter from foreign countries of which Canada as one of her most important colonies, at present furnishes a very small portion.

That proper cold storage facilities are now promised by our Government.

That the governments of other countries have expended large sums of money in fostering their butter industry by means of bonuses, &c., with the result that their butter industry has prospered and assumed large proportions as is shown by the official returns of butter imported by Great Britain.

That Canada is specially adapted for and has so many natural advantages for the production of finest butter.

That whereas a large export butter trade would benefit not only the farmers as a whole, but the millions of money it would yearly bring into the country would do incalculable good to the whole community.

That in view of the foregoing facts our Government should take immediate steps to do something more to assist in the development of our butter trade, and this House is of the opinion that the Government should place in the Estimates for the present session an amount to be paid to the farmers direct by way of a bonus of one cent per pound on a specified quantity of our finest creamery butter to be exported to Great Britain while fresh and in condition to secure a reputation for itself and establish a lasting demand, and that this bonus be continued for three consecutive years. This bonus to be increased at the discretion of the Government on butter made during the winter months. All such butter to be subject to a rigid Government inspection.

That this bonus be paid only to those farmers who will furnish for export regular supplies.

He said: Before asking the House to vote on this motion, I wish to offer a few remarks in explanation of it. In the first place, I wish to refer to the growth of our cheese industry in Canada during the past few years. A few years ago Canada supplied but a very small quantity of cheese to Great Britain. At that time the farmers in the older provinces depended entirely on the raising of grain, hay and horses, but as our great North-west developed, Manitoba and the Territories were able to raise these products so much cheaper that they came into direct competition with those of the older provinces, which were compelled, therefore, to look to some new field. The Government in power at that time saw that England was purchasing very large quantities of cheese, and spent a great deal of money in developing this industry in Canada, with the result, we are proud to say, that our cheese industry has been growing from year to year until now Canada is able to supply Great Britain with 60 per cent of the quantity of cheese they now import. We are all glad to see this great growth of the cheese industry, but in our efforts to advance this industry, the great industry of butter has been lost sight of. England to-day imports 340,000,000 lbs. of butter, of which Canada only supplies the very small quantity of 9,000,000 lbs. The colonies of Australia, a few years ago, also saw that they had something to do for their farmers, who, at that time, only supplied a very small quantity of butter, and granted them a bonus direct, with the result that in a few years Australia increased her product very rapidly and is to-day supplying some 30,000,000 lbs. to Great Britain per annum. Our little province of Quebec, a few years ago, saw that it too should do something for the farmers, and adopted the plan of giving them a small bonus, with the result that in 1890 they had 111 creameries in operation, turning out 2,779,000 lbs. of butter, and some four years later they had 256 creameries in operation producing 7,704,000 lbs. of butter.

With reference to England's supply of butter, I wish to point out that the United States supplies her with 15,000,000 lbs., or very nearly twice as much as Canada. From Denmark she gets nearly 137,000,000 lbs.; from Holland, 26,000,000 lbs.; from France, 52,000,000 lbs.; from Germany, 12,000,000; from Sweden, 36,000,000 lbs.; from the Australian Colonies, 25,000,000; and from other countries, 25,000,000 lbs., making a total of 340,000,000 lbs., of which Canada only supplies 9,000,000 lbs. This goes to show that there is a chance for Canada to supply a much larger quantity than we do at present, and anything that can be done by this Government for the purpose of developing that trade, should be done. The first thing to be done in order to develop this industry is to induce the farmers to take an interest in it, and nothing will encourage them more than a little assistance from the Government. I believe if a small bonus were paid, they would at once take hold of this industry. The owners of creameries must also take an interest in it and should add creameries to their cheese factories, and it is necessary that they should be encouraged by the farmers supplying them with milk. Now if the factories were made so that they could manufacture both butter and cheese, during the winter months the farmers could make butter and thus we would be able to help the farmers during the

whole year. I believe, now that the Government are, as I understand, trying to encourage the manufacture of cheese in the North-west Territories. When they get this industry further developed there, the result will be it will interfere with the cheese industry in the older provinces, for the large amount that will be shipped from there will have the effect of reducing the price here. But in these older provinces they are better able to compete in the way of making butter than they are in the North-west Territories, for the reason that in these older provinces the cattle are stabled during the winter and well fed, and so they are milked during the whole year, while, in the North-west Territories they are allowed to run on the range and are not milked during the winter. In order to make this a success it should be understood that the butter is shipped each and every week direct through to England, so that it will be fresh when it arrives on the market, and thus the reputation of our Canadian butter will always be first-class. The Government have adopted a system of cold storage, a system which, I believe, was arranged and almost completed by their predecessors. As I understand it, this Government is simply carrying out what was arranged by the late Government. I am glad of this, as I believe it will be a great help to our Canadian farmers. Now, our Government are spending large sums of money, or at least intend to do so, on the extension of the Intercolonial Railway, the Crow's Nest Pass Railway and the canals. They will have no trouble to raise millions of dollars to carry on these works. So, when I ask them to put a small amount, say ten or twenty or thirty thousand dollars in the Estimates for this industry, I think there should be no trouble in finding the small amount, as a start, to encourage our farmers. I ask this on behalf of the farmers of this Dominion. I believe that the members on the Government side of the House have, for years, been promising to do something for the farmers. There is no way by which they can do it better than to pay them a direct bonus and so encourage them to go into this industry and take a great interest in it. Therefore, I move this resolution.

Mr. FISHER. Before the motion is gone on with, I would like to say a few words in reply to the hon. member for South Grenville (Mr. Reid). I can agree very heartily with some of the propositions in this motion, certainly in the first, the second, and the third. That other governments have been successful in stimulating the export of butter to Great Britain by means of bonuses, I am not quite so sure as the hon. gentleman seems to be. That Canada is specially adapted for the production of the finest butter, I most certainly concur in, and emphatically declare; and that a large export butter trade would benefit the farmers and other people of this country is also a self-evident fact. Having thus cleared the ground as to the things to which we can agree, I must venture to take a little exception to the manner in which the hon. gentleman proposes to stimulate our butter trade. He wishes to stimulate by bonus butter making and the export of butter from this country, and quotes in support of this the experience of Australian colonies and of our own province of Quebec, and then goes on to point to the increase of butter-making and the export of butter to England from Denmark, France, Holland, and other countries. I wish to point out, in the first place, that one Australian colony, Victoria, for six years, did give a bonus for the export of butter. During that period the butter exports from Victoria very considerably increased, as I find from the figures under my hand. But immediately upon the cessation of the bounties, the export of butter from the colony to Great Britain dropped enormously, showing that the stimulus was not sufficient to encourage and to create a proper and legitimate trade. There is no doubt from the experience of that Australian colony that the stimulus given was of a hot-bed nature, and that the trade cannot stand without it, although it had had for six years a large bonus given for the export. This does not encourage me to adopt that plan; on the contrary I look upon it as a warning against following it. The hon. gentleman has alluded to the experience of the province of Quebec. I know something about the experience in that province, probably more than the hon. gentleman does. I would point out, first of all, that a bonus was given by the province of Quebec, but none was given by the great province of Ontario from which the hon. gentleman comes; but notwithstanding the fact that Quebec gave this bonus and Ontario did not give one, the increase of butter exported from Ontario has been far larger than the increase of butter exported from Quebec; in other words, the butter-makers of Ontario, without the stimulus of a bonus, have been able to improve their trade, to increase their exports and to establish their business on a firmer basis without a bonus, than the farmers and butter-makers of Quebec have been able to do by means of the stimulus of a bonus. But I must point out to the hon. gentleman, that this is done, nothwithstanding the fact which I have stated on many occasions in both Quebec and Ontario, that the province of Quebec is probably better adapted for the manufacture of fine butter. The trade in that province has increased wonderfully during the last few years; still Ontario has increased its butter output and export without the bonus in a larger ratio than the province of Quebec. I want to point

out further to the hon. gentleman, that a bonus was given in the province of Quebec to stimulate winter butter-making, and that winter butter-making, as a consequence of that bonus, was somewhat stimulated; but the province of Ontario did not give a bonus for winter butter-making, and yet winter butter-making has increased in Ontario in as great a ratio as in Quebec, if not greater. Then, Sir, from these facts I deduce the conclusion that it is not necessary to give a bonus to increase the trade in butter or to establish on a firm basis our export trade in the first quality of butter. Now, I will say another word about this bonus given in Quebec, as the hon. gentleman wishes that a bonus should be given to the farmers. The bonus that was arranged for by the government of Quebec was ostensibly to be in favour of the farmers, it was to be given to encourage the production of milk and butter in the winter, but afterwards it was for the production of fine butter for export purposes. But what are the facts? To my certain knowledge the last year of that bonus not one dollar was paid to a farmer in the province of Quebec; every dollar of that bonus was given to the butter buyers in the city of Montreal. The farmers did not reap the benefit of the bonus, but the buyers did. Now, Sir, I do not believe that that is the way to encourage our farmers to increase their production of butter, or to place their business on a firmer basis. In reply to that, it may be said that in consequence of the bonus these buyers gave higher prices to the farmers for their butter. Now, I happen to know a good deal about the way in which these buyers have bought butter in the province of Quebec; I know as a matter of fact, that the buyers of these firms who got the bonus, gave exactly the same price for the butter which they bought, that the buyers of other firms in Montreal gave who did not get any of the bonus. That is conclusive proof that in giving these bonuses we are running great risk that the farmers themselves, those for whose welfare the hon. gentleman is solicitous, those whom he represents to a certain extent in this House, coming as he does from a county in which butter-making is an important industry—I say these things show that the farmers themselves are not the ones who are likely to be benefited by a bonus. Now, Sir, there are other matters which the hon. gentleman has alluded to, and which I will deal with briefly. The hon. gentleman asks in his motion that we should give a bouns for the export of butter. I have in my hand a report of a meeting of the butter trade of Montreal, which report is taken from the Montreal "Gazette." That meeting was a large one, and representative of the trade, and they find that the plan of fostering the butter industry by granting a bonus, has been detrimental to that industry. I find it stated that:

> Outside of one instance, there had not been a pound of butter manufactured in this province as a result of the bonus. It appeared that the persons here who manufactured butter from cream and milk sent from Ontario, got quite a goodly proportion of the bonus, and by this means they had built quite a little business at, as he claimed, the expense of the legislature.

Mr. Brice, who is one of the leading butter buyers in the city of Montreal, and who is very high up in the business, states distinctly here that the bonus had not fostered the butter industry, but on the contrary had been detrimental to it. This is the tone of the whole meeting. It wound up by Mr. Hodgson, a well known butter and cheese buyer in Montreal, moving:

> That a committee be appointed to draft a resolution strongly advising the discontinuance of the system of granting bonuses to creameries, and also the advisability of applying whatever money has been voted for that purpose to the increasing and improving of refrigeration accommodation both by water and land.

Then Mr. Ayer moved in amendment:

> That this association, having heard that the province of Quebec proposes this discontinuing the bonus to creameries, heartily concurs in the same, and recommends that any further grants be given towards the increasing of refrigeration accommodation.

We find therefore that the experience of the province of Quebec, instead of supporting the hon. gentleman's motion, rather condemns it, because the gentlemen who reap the benefit of that bonus in the province of Quebec, declare that it is time to put an end to it. I may say further that even supposing that in the early stages of the butter industry in this country it was advisable to stimulate it by giving a bonus, that stage has long since passed away. To-day the butter industry in Canada is on a firm basis. True, it has not attained such grand proportions as the cheese industry; but at the same time our butter industry in this country to-day is growing rapidly, our exports in butter have increased enormously during the last two or three years. During the season just passed we exported more than double the amount we did the year before; the year before that we exported more than double what we did the preceding year: in other words, our butter exports have been increasing by over double for the last three years; and I venture to say from the knowledge that I have of the business, and from considerable inquiry made throughout the country during the last few months, that there is a fair prospect that, without giving any bonus but by the natural increase of the trade, and by the growing efforts of the men engaged in this business, the butter export of Canada during the coming season will again double the quantity exported last year. The hon.

gentleman spoke about encouraging winter butter-making. Let me tell him, if he does not already know it, that during the winter just passed we have been exporting every week a large quantity of butter to England, a thing which has never before been known in the history of our butter export trade. This export trade has usually ceased along with the closing of navigation in the St. Lawrence; but every week during the past winter there have been quantities of butter shipped from the maritime ports and from Portland. That will go on until the spring trade opens, and for the first time in the history of the butter trade of this country, Canada will export butter every week in the year. The hon. gentleman has alluded to the cold storage arrangements which, he says, are accomplished. I am happy to be able to take this first opportunity of informing the House, as I have informed the country on various occasions, that the arrangements for a cold storage system by which our butter and other perishable food products can be carried to the English market by a continuous chain of cold storage, are perfect and complete. By that means, according to the information which I have received from those who are most largely interested in the butter trade and those who are concerned in its manufacture, an enormous increase to the butter trade, which a few months ago I foreshadowed, is almost sure to come about. The only difficulty we have experienced in the past in England is that our butter has arrived there in a different condition from that in which it was produced in the factory. Now that has been changed, and we have arranged that our butter shall be shipped here in as fine condition as when it issues from the creamery, and I have no fear of the result; but, on the contrary, I feel perfectly satisfied that the dairymen of Canada will be able to take the same position with our butter that is taken by them with our cheese, and that in the near future we shall be able to say in regard to Canadian butter, as we are able to do in regard to Canadian cheese, that it stands at the head of the market. Under the circumstances, I hope my hon. friend will not press his motion. He made it, no doubt, in the interests of his constituents and in what he believes to be the interest of the trade; but from my knowledge of the trade—and I can say without boasting that, owing to information obtained from the position I occupy, and from my large connection with the trade, that I possess a little more information than does the hon. gentleman—I can assure him that this proposed arrangement is not necessary in the interest of the butter trade, while, at the same time, it might become an enormous charge on the revenue of the country, which I do not think it is necessary for us to ask, although, if necessary, I would not hesitate in the interest of the trade and of our dairymen to ask for anything that might be necessary to stimulate their trade. I have taken that position in regard to cold storage. I asked last year to be given a comparatively free hand to make arrangements to secure the object which the hon. member has in view. The House gave me a free hand, and I have accomplished that object at a reasonable expense to the country, and at such a reasonable expense that I am satisfied that the House will be ready to endorse propositions which I am going to bring before it this session; but, having undertaken that step, I do not think it is at all necessary in the interest of the butter trade that this increased expenditure proposed should be incurred, and, at the same time, that it will be better in the interest of the whole community if we rest satisfied with what we have done.

Mr. DAVIN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

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

After Recess.

SAFETY OF RAILWAY EMPLOYEES AND PASSENGERS.

Mr. CASEY moved second reading of Bill (No. 2) further to secure the safety of railway employees and passengers. He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to move the second reading of this Bill I shall have to repeat some matter that will be familiar to those members of the House who sat here in previous sessions, but I think the importance of the subject justifies me in doing so for the sake of those hon. members who are new to the question. In the first place, I may say that I was first induced, a couple of years ago, to introduce a Bill on this subject by my own observations, and by information gathered from railway employees in my own neighbourhood. Since that time, the question has been taken up by the railroad organizations of Canada generally, and the Bill, in the shape in which I now introduce it, has been compiled from a former Bill by the executive committee of the joint board of government of the railway organizations—I forget the exact name of the organization, but it is the one with which all the subordinate orders of locomotive engineers, trainmen and so forth, are affiliated, and it represents the whole body of railway employees in Canada. The Bill which I introduced last year had been compiled after consultation with the officials of that board, but they held an inquest on this Bill during the last few weeks, and sent me a copy exactly as they wished it to be presented to the House, and the Bill as introduced is exactly as they want it. Some provisions in my Bill, as drafted, have been omitted, which, perhaps, I would prefer to have re-

tained, but I think it is preferable to present the Bill in the form in which the railway men desire it, and if amendments are considered desirable they can be introduced at the committee stage.

It is perhaps necessary to point out that Parliament has a right to regulate the dealings between railway companies and their employees. There is not a railway in Canada which has not received public aid in some shape or other; there is not a railway company which does not possess a valuable franchise given to them free of cost by the people. These reasons alone would justify the Government and Parliament of Canada in passing laws as to how these companies should deal with their employees. But, beyond that fact, there is the point that the occupation of a railway man is one of special risk and one requiring special qualifications. The safety of the employee's life and limb does not depend upon his own carefulness or sobriety to the same extent to which it does in many other occupations, for it depends very largely on the condition of the roadbed, of the engines and cars with which he has to deal, and therefore he is, to some extent, at the mercy of the companies that are responsible for the condition of the roadbed and rolling stock. Under all these circumstances it has been admitted by the House on a previous occasion when this Bill passed the second reading, that we had the right to interfere, and to provide how railway companies shall deal with those who work for them.

The number of those interested is worthy of the consideration of this House. I am not in a position to state exactly how many railway men are in Canada, for we have no late statistics directly on the point, that I am aware of. But we may guess the number with some degree of accuracy from the consideration of the extent of railways in operation, and the number of engines and cars which the men have to handle. For instance, during the last year, according to the report which was laid before the House a few days ago, there are 16,270 miles of railway in Canada. The different companies own 2,044 engines; of passenger cars, including mail and baggage cars, there were 3,744. The other cars numbered 57,000 odd. These figures show the enormous number of cars to be handled, besides the unrecorded thousands of cars which are not Canadian but are handled in transit by Canadian trainmen. To estimate from these figures the number of trainmen employed, we can figure that each engine requires two men, which would give at least 4,100 who are employed as engineers and firemen. If we assume that the average passenger train comprises five cars, we know that each train employs three men in addition to those on the engine, and this would make over 2,000 trainmen on passenger trains, besides those on the engines. This is the very lowest calculation, and I am sure that I have put that figure too low by assuming rather a larger number of passenger cars for each train than would be justified by the average. Supposing that there were 18 to 20 cars in an average freight train, the 57,000 other cars would make about 3,000 trains employing five men each, which would give 15,000 employees at this work. The total, therefore, of this grand army of trainmen would be somewhere between 20,000 and 25,000, and in addition to this you have the men employed in or about the railway yards and workshops. From these figures we can make a pretty fair guess at the number of men actually employed on Canadian railways during the last year. Of course, I might have taken the figures from the census, but railway work has grown since that time, and the number of employees has largely increased.

Then, as another means of estimating the number and importance of these men, we find that the working expenses of the railways last year amounted to over $35,000,000, the greater part of which doubtless went in wages to the employees. This class of men run special risks, and they require special qualifications. When you remember how far the life and limb of the trainman himself and the life and limb of all who travel by trains are at the risk of his good conduct, you will recognize that the men who operate our railways must be specially sober and intelligent and painstaking. Strong physique is required, good judgment, and above all, honesty and sobriety. When you consider that the class of men to which I have referred are as numerous as they are, and when you consider what attainments they must possess, I think you will agree with me that a great deal of consideration ought to be paid by this House to their claims. The Bill which I am introducing, is in all its particulars supported by that class unitedly from one end of Canada to the other. They are taking means, they inform me, to ask every member of this House to support this Bill, and they will give their reasons for asking for that support. I hope that when hon. gentlemen receive these petitions they will not drop them into the waste paper baskets as such things are sometimes dropped, but that they will give them their very serious attention.

Now, Sir, as to the Bill itself. In the first place, it contains provisions for the greater safety of the employees; and in the second place, it contains provisions which are intended to secure jointly the safety of passengers and trainmen; and in the third place, it contains provisions intended to secure greater general safety of transportation for freight and passengers on railways. The provisions intended for the benefit of the trainmen are few. They call for the putting on of outside ladders on

opposite sides of the ends of each car, so arranged as to be convenient for the trainmen to climb up by means of them, and for arched iron rails on top of each car to assist the man who has climbed up the ladder in getting on to the running board. The Bill also provides that all box freight cars built for use on Canadian railways shall be of uniform standard height, and of capacity not to exceed sixty thousand pounds, and of a pattern to be approved by the Minister of Railways and Canals. The subsequent clauses provide penalties for infraction of these provisions, and make it the duty of the Minister of Railways and Canals to proceed against any company violating the Act, by failing to put these attachments on the rolling stock.

Then, Sir, there is a provision intended for the safety of all concerned, namely, that all cars fitted with air-brakes shall, within two years from the passing of this Act be provided with an automatic device in the hose coupling of such air-brakes, or in the train pipes, so arranged that, after the cars are coupled, the connection between such brakes and the air-pump on the locomotive cannot be broken, or the couplings deranged, accidentally or otherwise, without the knowledge of the engineer. To some this may not appear to be an important provision, but its importance is brought home specially to those who live in my part of the world by an awful accident that occurred at St. Thomas fifteen or sixteen years ago, just for the want of such an appliance as this. An excursion train coming north from Port Stanley tried to slack up at the usual point after entering the city of St. Thomas. The engineer applied the brakes, but the brakes which he had supposed to be in perfect order, did not work. The train could not be stopped, and it rushed along to the crossing of another railway, struck a train of coal oil cars, cut it in two, set fire to the coal oil, which burned for some time, and then exploded, and the result was an awful conflagration of cars and human beings, which produced a very dreadful impression upon the minds of the people, and is not forgotten to this day. Since that time many similar accidents have occurred, one, I believe, within the last week or two, which I have heard of but have not been able to trace in the papers. Any railway man will, of course, see at once the tremendous importance of the engineer knowing whether the air-brakes are in a condition to work or not. This section has been objected to on previous occasions because it was thought to be introduced for the purpose of booming some particular device or contrivance for this purpose. As more than one device is known by which this desired end can be accomplished, and the compulsory direction to put an arrangement of this sort on cars does not involve the using of any particular patent. It only provides that some arrangement of that kind must be put on these cars within two years after the passage of this Bill.

Coming to the provisions which refer generally to transportation, I will quote the last clauses of the Bill:

8. (1) Every railway company shall at all times employ a sufficient number of telegraph operators, train men, section men and other employees and workmen to safely carry on its business, and to keep its bridges, track, roadway, rolling stock and plant in good condition.

2. (2) If it fails to do so, it shall be held responsible for all injury to life, persons or property in connection with its operations.

This I consider one of the most important clauses of the Bill. It protects the general public against the undue economy sometimes exercised by railway managers in letting the road run down until it has become in an unsafe condition. Almost every one of us must have travelled at some time in his life over a railway which had a pretty decent alignment, on which the grades were not steep, but yet on which the cars bumped around and the rails rattled in a manner which proved that that part of the road was not properly looked after. There was not a sufficient force of section men, and something slightly wrong with a spike, or a tie, or a rail, was allowed to get worse, until the road was really in a condition not fit to be travelled on. This Act provides that if a road is allowed to run down in that fashion, the owners shall be responsible for any damage that may happen.

I have left, however, perhaps the most important part of this Bill, as regards railway men, to the end. It provides that when a railway employee is injured, or killed, or disabled for life by an accident which happens to him in the discharge of his duty, and which is not caused by his contributory negligence, he or his heirs shall be entitled to a fixed compensation from the railway company. The Bill fixes the compensation in the case of a man who is laid up from work because of injury, at 60 per cent of the current rate of wages for his class of workmen, but not more than one year. It fixes the amount to be paid for total disablement at $3,000, and the amount to be paid to his legal representatives in the case of his death at the same figure. I do not care to stand on these particular figures of percentage or amounts, but I want to establish by the Bill that there shall be some fixed amount payable to a man who is disabled or laid up on account of accident, or to the representatives of a man who is killed. In the case of manufacturers using dangerous machinery, legislation has always interfered to protect the employee. In the case of railways, I think there is much more reason why legislation should interfere. There is this particular reason in the case of railways, that although, as the law now stands, an employee may be entitled to damages for injury sus-

tained, he can only get those damages by means of tedious lawsuits which may be carried from court to court, until the employee is worn out by the litigation, while the railway company does not mind the cost of repeated appeals, since it may save litigation in other similar cases. I want to illustrate that point by reading a brief account of a case which actually occurred in Montreal some years ago, and which I quoted last year:

One Mr. Flynn, an employee of the Canadian Pacific Railway, was killed in the yard at Hochelaga by an accident caused by the negligence of a fellow-employee. His widow sued for damages, and, after going through a lot of preliminaries, she got the case to trial, and obtained a verdict of, I think, $5,000 from the jury. Then the company took the case up to the Court of Review for interpretation of judgment, as I believe the phrase is in the province of Quebec. The judgment having been confirmed in favour of the widow, they went further, to the Court of Appeal, and asked for a new trial. The Court of Appeal refused a new trial. The company went from there to the Supreme Court at Ottawa, and that court granted a new trial. So, after the fourth step, the extremely expensive one of an appeal to the Supreme Court, the widow was obliged to go again before the jury and prove her case from the beginning. A new trial was held. The jury gave a verdict for rather larger damages than the first time. In the meantime, in some of these proceedings—I do not know at what stage—it was decided that the company was liable when an employee was killed in the manner in question, and so this issue was really already decided; but the company went on fighting, in the hope of tiring out the poor widow. They went back to the Court of Review, and the decision was again favourable to the widow. They went to the Court of Appeal again, but that court decided against the company. They went to the Supreme Court again, and this time the Supreme Court did not grant a new trial. Then they took the case across the sea to the Privy Council, and the Privy Council finally confirmed the judgment of the first court, and the widow got her damages, and the railway company had to pay the costs.

There was a very elaborate series of twelve or thirteen steps before the poor widow of Mr. Flynn got the damages from the railway company to which the court in the first instance decided that she was entitled. If it had not been for the generous assistance of the fellow-employees of Mr. Flynn, and the kindness of Mr. T. Cassie Hatton, a lawyer in Montreal, who assisted in carrying on the case, this poor woman could not have got what she was entitled to in equity, and, as it finally appeared, in law also.

I do not say that the railway companies invariably pursue heartless conduct of this kind. I do not say that even in this case the solicitor of the railway company was inspired by heartless feelings, or by a desire to defraud the poor woman; but you know that it is a principle of all corporations—in fact, they feel it to be their duty—to fight to the last any claim for damages, no matter how well founded it may seem in the first instance. Railway companies do constantly fight all such claims whenever there is the ghost of a chance of tiring out the litigants by repeated appeals. It is to save the railway men from such a necessity, and to give them, or their legal representatives in case of death, a fixed rate of compensation for injuries that I have introduced this clause of the Bill.

I further provide that the employee shall not be able to surrender these rights to fixed compensation, by any bargain he may make with the railway company; for, if he were allowed to so contract himself out of the obligations, it would always be made a condition of employing a man that he should surrender them by his contract, and the Bill would have no effect. The Bill provides sufficient safeguards in the way of medical certificates, &c., in all cases in which these damages are claimed.

Now, I shall not detain the House any longer on the details of the Bill. When I brought it up last year, it was allowed to pass the second reading, but the Government of that day insisted upon sending it to the Railway Committee. I hope and expect that the Government of to-day will take a more reasonable view. It is quite impossible that a Bill of this kind should be fairly discussed in a large committee, like the Railway Committee, consisting of over a hundred and fifty members, most of whom would necessarily be ignorant of the technicalities in a Bill of this kind, and also unable to hear and study all the evidence adduced. I propose to ask the Government and the House, if this Bill passes the second reading, to allow it to be referred to a special committee of nine members, to which also, no doubt, a subsequent Bill that will be moved in this House will be referred. I shall ask that this committee hear both sides, the railway workmen and the railway employers, and decide what particulars should be in this Bill and what left out. I take the ground that those who accept places on the committee are favourable to the principle of the Bill, and will merely use their judgment in the maturing of the Bill, to the best advantage, after the principle is accepted.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. CASEY moved:

That Bill (No. 2) be referred to a special committee of nine members, composed of Messrs. Maclean, McGregor, Ingram, Choquette, Stubbs, Belcourt, Powell, Ellis and the mover, with power to send for persons, papers and records, and report from time to time by Bill or otherwise.

Mr. TISDALE. I do not propose to take up the time of the House in discussing the principle of the Bill, but I see no good cause for referring it to a special committee. The argument of the hon. gentleman was rather against that reference, when he said that

many members of the Railway Committee would be ignorant of the technical matters involved. I do not think there are many technical matters in the Bill. The main principles are two. One is whether we shall adopt the principle—a very large and serious one, in the circumstances in which our railways now stand—of forcing them to adopt appliances of this sort. The second is whether we shall depart from our usual course by taking this matter out of the hands of a large committee, especially appointed and qualified, and refer it to a special committee. The hon. gentleman asks that it be referred to a special committee favourable to the Bill, but I submit that what we require is discussion before a body that is neither favourable nor unfavourable until they have examined into the matter. The hon. gentleman selects a committee favourable to the Bill. I do not think that is the sort of tribunal it has been the practice of this House to choose. I hope the Government will not establish the principle of taking an important matter like this out of the hands of the Railway Committe specially appointed to deal with such matters and which, I am sure, will impartially inquire into it, and put it in the hands of a special committee. The Government, of course, have discretion in the matter, and they must assume the responsibility. Then, as regards the question of saving time, my experience is that, in matters of principle such as this, the report of the committee, whether the Railway Committee or a sub-committee, is sure to be fully discussed by the House. It is only when questions are technical or local, when they deal with matters peculiarly of a family or personal nature, that they are referred to special committees. But when great principles are involved, the Railway Committee is the proper body to which to refer them.

Mr. CASEY. The principle of the Bill is not referred to the committee. That principle has been endorsed by the House in giving the Bill a second reading. What the committee has to do is to consider the details of the Bill, and to decide how best to carry out the intention of the House, and it has invariably been the practice of Parliament, when a Bill is referred to a special committee to refer it only to a committee which is in favour of the principle adopted by the House. The decision of the committee is subject to revision by the whole House. It is useless to bring a Bill of this kind before the Railway Committee because only a few of the members stay there to hear the arguments, and the great mass only come in to vote. That is not the way to perfect a Bill or to construct one Bill out of the two or three that may be referred to the committee.

Mr. MACLEAN. I have had a good deal of experience before the Railway Committee in connection with a Bill of a similar nature which I introduced in preceding sessions and with which I made very little headway. I am glad to join the hon. gentleman in asking for a special committee to consider his Bill. Such a committee would bring out the facts to the House, and the House, having accepted the principle, we will speedily come to a conclusion. That committee will have nothing else in charge but this special legislation. It will be able to tell the railway employees, who are very anxious for this Bill but who cannot afford to lose any time, on what day they will be heard here, and will be ready on that day to hear them and also the railway companies. And the Bill in my name also, no doubt, will be referred to this committee and considered at the same time. I am very much in favour of a special committee having charge of this matter, and I think that this House should do something to remove a great abuse and protect the lives of railway employees and the public.

Mr. IVES. This is purely a business question, and my experience in the Railway Committee is that it is par excellence the business committee of the House, and one would suppose that a committee of business men of the House, composed of 160 odd members, who are in the habit of dealing with these questions from session to session —many of them old members who have been on railway committees for the last eight or ten years—would be a more suitable committee to refer this question to than any possible small special committee. I have heard the names of those proposed for the special committee, and although they are all estimable men, and men of good judgment no doubt, still none of them, so far as I know, are railway men, none of them have any special technical knowledge to fit them for dealing with this particular case. There are in the Railway Committee several hon. members on both sides of the House who have a very intimate knowledge of railway subjects, and it does seem to me that there would be nothing whatever gained by referring this important measure to a special committee composed of a small number of members as proposed. The matter must come back to the House. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) knows very well that though his Bill has had a pro forma reading, it is not fully born yet; it will have to stand the ordeal of a great deal of criticism in the House, and probably, of a division, before it becomes law. The hon. gentleman had better go to the Railway Committee; it would be better in his own interest, because if he succeeds in getting through the Railway Committee, he will have a better chance of getting the Bill through the House. The Railway Committee may appoint a special committee and refer the Bill to it, if they think it best. Now, this question is not a new one; it is one that has been before Parliament for a number of sessions, and it is met with the very vigor-

ous opposition of all the railway companies, and will, no doubt, again. Why? You may say, for the selfish reason that it involves the railway companies in a very large expenditure. The Government itself is interested in two ways. Of course it is interested in the safety of citizens who are railway employees, and it is also interested as the owner and operator of the Intercolonial and other railways which would have to submit to the provisions of this Bill just the same as other railway companies will I may be mistaken, but I think that this Bill, innocent though it may appear, will involve the expenditure of a great deal of money, of an enormous amount of money, and it is quite certain that the matter must be considered by the House more fully than it has been to-night, it must be considered by a much larger number of members than this small select committee to which it is proposed to refer it. There is another matter to which I would call the attention of the hon. the leader of the House and the Minister of Railways, and that is that this motion proposes to give the committee power to send for persons and papers. That is a very wide power and one that may involve a large expenditure. It may mean an investigation reaching over the whole Dominion. This is a question for the Railway Committee, and I certainly think that the hon. Minister of Railways and the leader of the House will be taking a serious responsibility if they allow this question to be referred to a select committee as proposed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think there is a great deal of force in what has been said by my hon. friend from Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives). The Railway Committee as constituted last session, and as, no doubt, it will be arranged this session, is a very strong committee, and will be able to examine this question more fully than it will otherwise be examined. Moreover, when they have examined it and come to a conclusion upon it, the decision at which they arrive will much more likely be accepted by this House than a report of a special committee. In the interests of the measure itself, I think it will be better to have the report of the Railway Committee. The object of my hon. friend (Mr. Casey) is not to get the report of the committee, but to get the Bill carried in the House; and unless he is able to carry a large portion of the Railway Committee, which, I think, consists of something like 169 members, there is no prospect of a report even in favour of the Bill receiving the approval of the House. But if it is decided to refer to a special committee I would suggest the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals should be a member of that special committee, so that the Government may have an opportunity of hearing any testimony that may be introduced upon the subject. There is no question that this is a very important measure. Anything that can be done to protect the lives of railways employees deserves the most careful and kindly attention of this House. There is no body of employees in the public service or in the service of private companies that deserve more the careful attention and consideration of this House in regard to do everything that will protect life and limb than the railway employees, and I am quite sure that, the feeling of hon. members on both sides of the House will be in favour of doing everything that possibly can be done, with any justice or propriety or advantage, to secure that important object. Therefore, I trust that my hon. friend will consent to refer this Bill to the Railway Committee, or, if this is not done, that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals will be appointed a member of the special committee to which the Bill is referred.

Mr. INGRAM. As I have been named as a member of that special committee, I desire to say a word. I differ from some of my hon. friends as to referring this Bill to the Railway Committee. I believe it to be in the interests of railway companies as well as of railway employees that this Bill should be referred to a special committee. It is not correct to say that the members of this proposed select committee have no practical or technical knowledge of the subject dealt with in this measure. I pretend to have both practical and technical knowledge of this matter as complete as that possessed by any other member of this House. My practical knowledge of legislation of this kind leads me to the conclusion that there is a very great misunderstanding between the railway employees and the railway managers as to what is to the best interest of the employees and management of the railways of this country. So far as I know, the management of the different railways are doing their best to introduce the latest improvements on their railways because it is less expense to operate the roads when they have the latest equipments. Now if the representatives of the employees and the representatives of the officials managing the roads assemble together and discuss this question, I am satisfied that the railway employees will be less eager in their demands upon the railway companies. For that reason, it is in the interest of the railway companies as well as of the railway employees, that they should assemble and that a special committee should be appointed to hear the grievances or complaints of all parties concerned. Now, if I may be permitted to refer to a similar Bill introduced by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) last year, I desire to say that I took exception to certain sections of that Bill. I was told then that the committee which prepared the Bill understood what they required, and for that reason, I should not differ from them. But what is the fact?

The sections that I objected to last year have been left out of this Bill entirely, and what I stated then has proven to be strictly correct, that they were not in the interests of the railway employees or of the railway company.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman should avoid discussing the merits of the Bill.

Mr. INGRAM. I was going to refer to another section, but in obedience to the Speaker, I will pass it over until the Bill comes before the special committee, if it ever does. As to the matter of cost which has been referred to, I may state that so far as railway managements are concerned, I think they would not object to coming here to give their evidence before this special committee. I do not think that would be a reasonable objection to the appointment of a committee. Now, it has been said that the railway companies are put to large expense. This Bill, if it passed, might involve them in large expense. I think the employees in this country are not fully posted as to the extent of the improvements which the railway companies are putting on their railways. Last year the Canadian Pacific Railway put $300,000 in their estimates for the purpose of equipping their cars and engines; and this year they are also going to expend a considerable sum in the same way. The Grand Trunk Railway is doing the same; and the Canada Southern Division of the Michigan Central have scarcely a train passing over their road that is not controlled by these latest improvements.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to say one or two words in support of the reference to a special committee, and also in support of the suggestion that the Minister of Railways should be on that committee. Those who think as my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) seems to think, that all we should desire, those of us who are interested in legislation of this kind, so much desiderated and so necessary—that all we should desire is to have it go before the Railway Committee, probably have not watched as closely as those of us who are interested in this legislation, what the fate of such measures is when they go before the Railway Committee. Let me point out what happened in 1890. I introduced a Bill in this House with provisions somewhat similar to these, and with other provisions of importance, and specially relating to the North-west Territories. That Bill passed its second reading here, but when it went up to the Senate it was emasculated there. In 1891 I had the Bill again put on the paper, and Sir John Thompson agreed that it should be put on the Government Orders. It passed the second reading, and I naturally thought, after Sir John Thompson had agreed that it should be put on the Government Orders, that the moment it passed the second reading the Bill was safe. But when it went up to the Railway Committee, why, you could not get a red herring into that committee room. The Railway Committee room was crowded with members on both sides, and although that Bill had passed its second reading in this House and had received the imprimateur of the Government, when I divided the committee upon it, I only got four members to vote with me. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we cannot trust to the Railway Committee in legislation of this sort.

Mr. IVES. How are you going to escape them when you come back to the House?

Mr. DAVIN. I will tell you, Mr. Speaker. If they vote in the House they vote in the public eye, they vote in the eye of the newspapers. What they do here is known; but what they do up in the Railway Committee is not known, is not reported, and the yeas and nays are not taken. Now, I believe, as my hon. friend has just suggested, that the railway magnates of this country are greatly mistaken in supposing that the reforms we seek to carry out in the interest of the employees, in the interest of the life and limb of those men on whose alertness the lives and limbs of tens of thousands of people every day depend—I say the railway magnates are mistaken in supposing that the reforms we seek to accomplish are not also in their own interests, and in the interest of their shareholders. Now, with regard to one of the main provisions in the Bill of my hon. friend—I believe the great railway company that runs through the North-west Territories probably felt that its interests at the time I brought forward those measures of which I speak, were opposed by my Bill. But what have they done, Sir? Year after year they are gradually bringing in the couplers that I sought to compel them to bring in; and that shows that they think it is to their interest, whenever they make new cars, to carry out such provisions. I think it would be very important, and add to the weight of that committee, and add to the confidence of this House in the committee, to have the hon. Minister of Railways upon it, and I therefore move that his name be added.

Mr. CASEY. In speaking to the last amendment, I beg to say that I should be only too happy to have the Minister of Railways act as a member of the committee. I had asked him whether he thought he would have time to do so, and he was very doubtful on that point. If he can reconsider that point and act as a member of the committee, I should be very happy indeed to have him upon it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think if the Bill goes to a select committee it would be well to have the late chairman of the Railway Committee act upon it, I mean the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Tisdale). He

has had a great deal of experience in railway legislation.

Mr. TISDALE. I decline, Mr. Speaker.

Amendment (Mr. Davin) agreed to.

Motion, as amended, agreed to, and Bill referred to a special committee.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. MACLEAN, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 3) to amend the Railway Act, said: This Bill is exactly on the same lines as the preceding Bill, although of somewhat narrower scope. I do not intend to take up the time of the House in urging anything in its favour, having spoken on the subject several times heretofore. I will simply content myself by moving the second reading.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and referred to Special Committee on Bill No. 2.

IMPORTATION AND EMPLOYMENT OF ALIENS.

Mr. COWAN moved second reading of Bill (No. 5) to restrict the importation and employment of aliens. He said: Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable timidity that I rise to move the Bill which I am going to ask the House to adopt. I quite readily understand that it is entirely contrary to the trend of modern legislation and to the ideas of the Canadian people to place any restriction upon labourers from any country entering the Dominion of Canada. At the same time, I feel, coming as I do from a border constituency, immediately facing upon the great republic to the south of us, that I would be derelict in my duty and to the labourers and artisans, not only of that constituency but to the labourers and artisans of every constituency in the Dominion of Canada if, under all the circumstances, the state of affairs, and in view of the legislation that exists in the United States of America to-day, we did not put forward an honest effort to protect Canadian artisans in the labour market at home. I do not propose to go into particulars and enter into the details of this Bill at this juncture. Bills of a similar character have been before this House on previous occasions, but I am going to content myself with reviewing, during the short time that I propose to occupy the attention of the House, some of the legislation of the American republic respecting the employment of aliens in that country, and which operates exceedingly harshly against the labourers and artisans of this country. I believe, Sir, that somewhere about 1875 or 1876 they passed a law which, if it had been put in force, would have had the effect of restricting, to a certain extent, Canadian labourers and artisans obtaining employment in that country. The lines were gradually drawn tighter until, in 1885, and by subsequent amendment in 1886, a law was passed which prohibited labourers and artisans from any country, entering into a contract outside of the United States to perform labour in the United States. But those restrictions were not put into force as against the Dominion of Canada, as they were intended by the leaders of that time to apply to the importation of Chinese and Italians. That legislation was passed, not on the ground of protecting the labouring men of the great republic, but on the ground that it would restrict the importation of objectionable labourers that would lower the moral, social and physical status of the citizens of the country, and the institutions of the land of the free and the home of the brave would thereby be endangered. That policy was continued, and somewhere about 1887 or 1888 those laws were enforced against the Dominion of Canada, until to-day all along the frontier which divides this country from the United States, Canadian labourers and artisans, whether going to visit that country or secure employment, are turned back into the Dominion, and are refused entry into that country. There have been previous discussions in this House on the subject, and a good deal has been said and articles read and documents quoted to show the treatment meted out in certain instances to our citizens. A short time ago, I picked up the Windsor "Record," and I found the following article:

> Another outrage was committed on a young Canadian this morning by Detroit customs officials.
>
> W. J. Sutherland, a young man of about twenty years, from Wallacetown, Elgin county, came through on the Michigan Central Railway this morning, to visit his uncle, Mr. F. Offer, at Detroit.
>
> He was met on the other side by one of the immigration agents of the United States, and asked to explain himself. The young man said he was going to visit his uncle. This did not satisfy the officers, and they proceeded to overhaul his baggage and open his letters found in his valise. Among them was one received some time ago from a firm in Detroit to whom Mr. Sutherland had applied for a situation. The letter was a refusal. The officers then assumed that he was again looking for a situation, and, after the usual compliments to Canada and Canadians, the young man was fired back over the river.

After reading that article, and being desirous of securing information on the subject and the true circumstances of the case, I sought out the young man and took from him a declaration, which I will read to the House. It is as follows:—

> Dominion of Canada,
> County of Essex.
> To Wit:
>
> In the matter of W. J. Sutherland and his return to Canada under order from American customs.
>
> I, William J. Sutherland, of the hamlet of Wallacetown, in the county of Elgin, do solemnly

declare that, on the eleventh day of January, A.D. 1897, I was on a M. C. R. train, travelling on a ticket purchased at Dutton Station, where I took the train for Detroit. My baggage was examined, and the officer asked me my age, where my home was, and how much money I had. I gave him the information, and had about $8.50. He then asked me what I was going to Detroit for. I replied : to visit my uncle in Detroit, and gave him his address. I had some private letters in my valise. He opened them, and one was an answer to an application I had made for a situation several months before, stating they had no opening. And I was ordered back to Canada, and they refused to permit me to enter the United States. I had no contract with any person to enter into or engage in any employment in the U. S., but was on my way to a friend's. I after crossed on another ferry and went to my friend's, and am to-day on my return to my home in Canada.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of "The Canada Evidence Act, 1893."

W. J. SUTHERLAND.

Declared before me at the city of Windsor, in the county of Essex, this 19th day of January, A.D. 1897.

M. K. COWAN,
A Commissioner.

The young man made that declaration before me and I signed it as a commissioner for the county of Essex. I have read it in order to show that not only the existing law in the United States is stretched to its utmost limit, but even a man's finances are inquired into for the purpose of endeavouring to find an excuse under the Pauper Immigration Act to refuse respectable citizens from Canada entrance in the republic. I have just one more case to cite. I have here a letter written on December 19, 1896, to Mr. A. McNee, editor of the Windsor "Record," as follows :—

Windsor, December 19, 1896.

Sir,—The following are the facts relative to the action of the customs official and immigration inspector, in refusing me the right of admittance into the city of Detroit on the evening of December 15th (Monday), from off the ferry boat plying between this city and that of Detroit :—

I left my home (Toronto, Canada) at 10.10 p.m., December 5th, and came over the Grand Trunk Railway, through the tunnel, arriving in Windsor at 9 a.m., the next day. As I have friends on both sides of the line, I concluded, at their invitation, to stay a short time. I had intended going on to Cleveland, and possibly on to Chicago. I endeavoured to secure employment on both sides of the line, but failing, was on my way to Cleveland, when stopped, baggage examined, and held myself, put through a series of questions as to my intentions and destination. To their query as to whether I was seeking employment or not, I replied : I have friends in Detroit with whom I purposed staying for a time, intending to go on my way as soon as I should get a remittance I had written for. A customs officer named Flummerfelt asked me what money I had. I told him, about five dollars ($5), but I expected to get more from Chicago in a day or two. He seemed to regard my statement as untrue, and said so, and did not hesitate to state on every possible occasion that I had prevaricated throughout.

I took exception to these remarks, and he would then take advantage of occasions afforded to emphasize the fact that I was an alien—perhaps, more properly speaking, a Canadian—and he an officer of the American Republic. In brief, I was parolled, after being debarred, and remained so for over forty-eight hours, my baggage held, and thus putting me to an unnecessary expense. On the morning of the 16th, I went to the county clerk's office and made application for papers declaring my intention to become a citizen. I was asked if I resided in Detroit for any length of time. I told him, only a week this time, but on a former occasion I had worked in Detroit for nine months, then left for Rochester, N.Y., and being explicit, did not understand that it must be six consecutive months before making application. The clerk (Mr. Oldfield) then stated that I would require no witness, and accordingly administered the oath, which I accepted in good faith. On presenting these papers to Flummerfelt, who said that they were of no use, and he alleges misrepresentation, seized and held said papers. And the clerk refused to refund the 50 cents I had paid for them. This same officer, in his zeal, did his best to have me punished for perjury, and had it not been for chief inspector, Mr. McLogan, I might, and most probably would, have had to stand trial on this charge. I then left Detroit with my baggage and crossed the river to this city. In the evening, acting as an escort to a lady friend, I again crossed the river, and was called in and held at the customs, while this friend had to proceed alone and attend to her business, while I awaited her there. This constitutes my grievance.

Respectfully,
D. LEWELLYN IRVINE.

I read these letters, Mr. Speaker, simply for the purpose of putting on record the actual facts as they exist upon the frontier, and as seen every day by myself and my hon. friend from North Essex (Mr. McGregor), and I feel there is no chance, that there is no hope of securing a removal of the restrictions that at present exist against Canadian citizens entering the United States. I sincerely trust that in the discussion of this question, I may be able to deal with it with that dignity which becomes a member of this House. I have no desire to say anything harsh against any Government which sees fit to enact legislation of such a character ; but at the same time, as a Canadian citizen, I must say that while that might possibly be proper treatment to deal out to the citizens of a country whom they fear might lower the moral, social and physical status of the people of the United States, I object, Sir, that the labourers and artisans of the Dominion of Canada should be treated in such a way.

This is not a party question, Mr. Speaker. This is not a question in which any of the principles of any of the great political parties of the Dominion of Canada are involved. This is not a case into which one single party principle enters, but, Sir, as an humble member of this House, I say that in my judgment it is a question in

which the self-respect and the national honour of every Canadian is at stake. I believe that our Canadian labourers and Canadian artisans stand unsurpassed to-day in the world. In their veins mingle the best strains of the best blood of the flower nations of the earth. They have all the power of application, all the thrift, frugality, independence and industry of the Anglo-Saxon blood, mingled with the sweet, the genial, the poetic and contented nature of the people of proud imperious France. Sir, the Canadian labourer and the Canadian artisan need not, neither does he ask, for protection in the open field of competition, but if any country is going to protect her citizens, and to debar the Canadian labourer and the Canadian artisan from enjoying the fruits of honest toil, then I say that the Canadian artisan and the Canadian labourer should be protected in the labour markets of home against the labourers and artisans of that country, unfettered, unhampered by restrictive laws of foreign countries. The Canadian labourer and the Canadian artisan would scorn the folding around him of the solicitous wings of legislative enactments to protect him or his in the workshops of this continent against the scions of any flag that floats over it. Too honest, too proud, too manly, to seek for more than an open field, he was never known to run to cover, or to ask for legislative aid to protect him in the unrestricted fields of competition. He never asked any Government to protect him by legislative enactment which declared that his neighbour from a foreign nation had to renounce the flag of his country and to sever the ties of his home that he loved, before he could secure the vantage-ground in life's broad field of action that pledges the inevitable to final victory. I admire the spirit of the man who says: Try me, let my honest merits be my own certificate, let the results of my honest toil be their own recommendation or carry with them their own condemnation. Sir, I have no admiration for the man who asks for an unfair advantage, or who seeks to be placed in a position better than the man against whom he is pitted. I admire the spirit and the flag of a country which says: Let your honest merits be your safeguard, we will never be the first to cast a stone at the goddess of liberty and freedom. I have no admiration for the institutions of a country that demand as a certificate to the securing of a situation, the expatriation of the applicant, and I have little confidence in the fealty of the citizenship so obtained. At the same time, the toiling masses of Canada are entitled to our first consideration, and if by force of the narrow-mindedness of the politicians of other countries, the Canadian labourers and the Canadian artisans are debarred from competing in the labour markets of the world, and are debarred from exercising their honest vocation wherever honest toil can earn an honest dollar; then I feel that we as members of this House would be derelict in our duty to our constituents and derelict in our duty as Canadian citizens if we did not put forth an honest effort to protect the Canadian labourer and the Canadian artisan in the labour markets at home against the labourers and artisans of any country which places upon its statute-books a law restricting the citizens of this commonwealth from enjoying the fruits of labour wherever they may chance to roam. I object to the labourers of any country enjoying the labour markets of Canada when that country is not ready to extend equal privileges to our own people. It was incidentally remarked in the speech on the Address delivered by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. MacPherson) that legislation of a retaliatory character was unwise, injudicious and retroactive. I agree with that sentiment. I am not so narrow-minded as to endeavour to take up the time of this House in enacting legislation of a retaliatory character pure and simple. I am quite free to admit that the idea of retaliatory legislation for retaliation's sake is repugnant to the generous principles that pervade the breast of every true Canadian. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, if our carrying out of the first law of nature, namely, self-defence, should have the effect of protecting Canadian labourers in the labour markets of Canada, and barring out labourers from the foreign field where the greatest restriction against Canada exists, then I am willing to go as far as this Bill goes, or farther, if need be, even if the carrying out of that principle should smack, and smack hard, of retaliation. I object to a Canadian citizen having his letters ransacked at an American port, and himself being barred from that country, unless a citizen from that country meets with a similar fate at a Canadian port. I am an advocate of the freedom of the subject, with all its most valued privileges; but, Mr. Speaker, it is the principle I object to, that an embargo should be fixed against a Canadian labourer while that Canadian labourer is not protected at home against the artisans and labouring men of the country which imposes that embargo. I have that confidence in the Canadian labourer to believe that in the unrestricted field of competition he asks for no protection; and if in the fight he gets a bloody nose, he is not coward enough to ask the man who inflicts the blows to wash the bloody handkerchief. Coming as I do from a frontier city in a border county, representing, as I do, a constituency whose shores are washed by the international waters that divide both countries, I know whereof I speak when I say that constituents of mine have had indignities heaped upon them, their private correspondence searched, their breeches pockets gone through, as in the case of young

Sutherland, to see what money they possessed, as if they were moral lepers or Chinese highbinders. I say that the initiation, the inauguration, the enforcement and the perpetuation of that policy is an insult to the citizens of the country initiating and enforcing it. It is a foul stain on the legislative enactments of the 19th century, and its retention on the Statute-book is a disgrace to any country over whose domain the flag of freedom floats. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I am willing to go on record as being in favour of the principle that the labourer from no country shall slide down the cellar door of Canada unscratched, if they are going to drive tacks in theirs. I believe they should find it mighty slippery work climbing up our apple tree if they are going to make a greasy pole of theirs. Occupying as we do the northern half of this great continent, with a climate unsurpassed, with fertile fields teeming with a power to produce, abounding in mineral wealth beyond compare, and with a population intelligent, industrious, enterprising and frugal, there is no portion of the American continent to which the words of Ralph Waldo Emerson more fittingly apply than to the Dominion of Canada when he said that "America was another name for opportunity." Our future is bright; our prospects as boundless and as limitless as the horizon of human hope. With possibilities such as these, let it be understood once and for all that we will not swerve from the strict line when duty calls, that no bribe, or no threat, or no coercion can or will swerve or sway the citizens of this Dominion from their allegiance to the British Crown, whose flag is the emblem of freedom and under whose protecting folds security is ours. Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it is very refreshing to me to hear a speech like the one we have just been favoured with, coming from gentlemen now sitting on that side of the House. I had the pleasure of introducing a Bill in this direction in 1890, and the Bill introduced by my hon. friend to-day is word for word for eight clauses a copy of the Bill I then introduced. A few years ago I introduced a Bill into this House to prohibit the importation of oleomargarine into this country. I fought for that Bill session after session, and had the satisfaction of educating public opinion, not only on the side of the House on which I then sat, but on the Opposition side; and during the last election, when my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. Bain) came into my constituency, he said that Mr. Taylor deserved no credit for having introduced that Bill, but that Mr. Paterson, the present Minister of Customs, was the gentleman to whom all the credit was due for having introduced the legislation which finally prohibited the importation of oleomargarine into this country. I am satisfied that my hon. friend will now take some credit for this Bill. The only fault that may be found with me is that I introduced this Bill several years before its time; but I have this proud satisfaction of knowing that I have not only educated the members of this House but the people in the country, so that to-day I may challenge any member of this House to get up and say that he will vote against this Bill. It was not so when I first introduced it. I hold in my hand evidence that when I was fighting for the Bill in the House I met with some strong rebuffs from gentlemen on that side of the House; but I finally succeeded in getting the Bill referred to a special committee composed of some seven or nine members representing the different provinces of the Dominion. That committee called witnesses from one end of the Dominion to the other, and after having fully investigated the matter, it made this report:

> Your committee find, on examination, that this Bill is similar in all respects to a Bill passed by the Congress of the United States in 1885 and amended by that body in 1886.
>
> Your committee have had before them witnesses from different points along the frontier, and find from their evidence (copy of which is annexed hereto) that the American Alien Labour Law has been enforced in such a way as to compel many of our people to relinquish their employment in the United States, or to remove with their families, and reside there permanently, while citizens of the United States are permitted to work in Canada every day, and to return to their homes on the American side of the frontier at night, without interference from the Canadian authorities.
>
> Your committee recommend that the attention of the authorities in Washington be directed to the oppressive application to Canadians of the American Alien Labour Law, and to allow such representation being made, and to afford time for its due consideration, recommend that further consideration of this Bill be postponed until next session; and if some suitable measure for granting relief to Canadians from the grievance complained of be not passed in the interval by the American authorities, then your committee recommend that a Bill dealing with this question be introduced next session and taken into consideration.
>
> All of which is respectfully submitted.
>
> GEO. TAYLOR,
> Chairman.

After this report was printed and distributed throughout the country, petitions came in from different organizations throughout the country, year after year, asking for the passage of this Bill. I introduced it the following session, and then was met by the First Minister stating that there was to be a conference at Washington when this matter would be discussed. The charge has been made that I did not endeavour to fight this Bill through as vigorously as I might have done. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have, as best I could, endeavoured to have it passed every session, and all the time, although I failed to succeed, public opinion was being educated up to the proper point by my agi-

tation on this question. I have here a copy of the Bill of my hon. friend who has just spoken ; I have also a copy of a Bill which appears next on the paper, and which is in my name, and if hon. gentlemen will examine these Bills, they will find that the hon. gentleman's Bill is a verbatim copy of the one which stands in my name, and that the only changes are the addition on his Bill of three or four other clauses, and the provision that these clauses of his Bill from 8 to 12 shall only come in force on proclamation of the Governor General. I do not think that either the House or the country is willing to wait for a proclamation to issue, but wish this Bill to become law at once if the House approves of it. Then I would go further than the hon. gentleman's Bill goes. I wish to add another clause providing that the public contracts of this country shall be given to Canadians only. I do not think it is fair or right that Americans should come over here and compete for public contracts offered by the Government of this country. The hon. First Minister mentioned to me, just before dinner, that all the Bills dealing with this alien labour question would be referred to a special committee. If I am on that committee, I will insist on having a clause inserted into this Bill that all public contracts given by the Government must be given to residents of Canada.

In order to disprove the charge made by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) that I did not press my Bill through as vigorously as I might have done, let me inform the House what I did when I introduced, in three different sessions, my Bill into this House, and I think this will show that if the Bill did not become law the fault was not mine but will show that the country was not then prepared for a measure of this nature. In 1890 I brought in a Bill to counteract the effect of the American Alien Labour law, but the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. McGregor) who sits at the right of the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan) did not give me the support I expected from an hon. gentleman living in a border constituency, every time I introduced this Bill. That hon. gentleman found no grievance existing in his part of the country, but I did in my constituency, and, labouring under a sense of that grievance, I introduced this measure. I was charged with having issued a proclamation. Well, Mr. Speaker, I did issue a proclamation, and it had this effect, so far as my constituency is concerned, that the Alien Labour law has not been enforced along its border since 1890. We have had since then practically free trade along the border of my constituency but, nevertheless, I introduced my Bill in the interests of the labouring classes of the Dominion, and the evidence brought before the committee which had charge of the Bill proved conclusively, that down in Nova Scotia and thence to the Pacific Ocean, our labourers were being driven back from the United States. I could read by the hour clippings from newspapers to show how cruelly our people were dealt with by the American authorities when they migrated into that country. I shall not, however, occupy the time of the House in doing so, but shall just refer for a moment or two, to some of the utterances of hon. gentlemen opposite on this subject, in order to refresh their memory. I am sorry the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) is not in his place, because it would be interesting to him to recall what he said in 1890, when I introduced my Bill. He then said :

> I am sure that we all desire to promote friendly relations with the United States ; but that is not to be done by passing a Bill of this kind, but is to be accomplished by friendly negotiations. I think it would promote good feeling on both sides of the line, if a large majority of this House refused to give this Bill a second reading.

That is what the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries said in 1890. Will he rise in his place to-day and refuse to give this Bill a second reading. I do not think there is an hon. gentleman on either side who will do so, because the public opinion of the country has come to the conclusion that although, a few years ago, I was in advance of the times, to-day my views ought to prevail. Later on, I asked the House to print 500 extra copies of the Bill for distribution. In the discussion on my motion to that effect, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) said :

> This Bill met with very general disappointment when it was first introduced. It contains, to my mind, very objectionable principles and very objectionable legislation, which I cannot approve of in any sense or way. * * * The present Bill will meet with greater disapproval outside of the House than it has met with in the House, and, in view of what is transpiring in the House of Representatives at Washington, I know of nothing which could be more injurious to Canadians than the publication of this Bill in the country, or the leading of the workingmen of the country to believe that we are going to adopt such a measure. I, for one, will not give my support to this proposal.

And I could not get the House to go to the expense of printing 500 copies of this Bill to distribute among the workingmen of this country. Now, let me read to the House what the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) then said on that question. I am quoting from the Official Debates of March 19, 1890. The question was put whether the Bill should be read the second time, and no one objecting, the Speaker declared it carried. Then Sir Richard Cartwright interfered and the report reads as follows :—

> Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Did I understand you to say "carried," Mr. Speaker? By no manner of means.
>
> Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, unless a division is called for.
>
> Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, I call for a division on that Bill.
>
> Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was declared carried.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a Bill which was most strongly objected to, and which ought not to be passed without division in this House. It is taking quite an unfair and unusual advantage. I had thought that the thing had been withdrawn by mutual consent.

Further on in the debate the hon. gentleman said:

What I objected to mainly was what I supposed to be an attempt to rush this through, without regard being had to its great gravity and importance. I cannot at all assent to the principle of the Bill, because it commits us, as far as it goes, to a direct policy of hostility and retaliation towards the United States.

There was another gentleman who spoke on this subject and who has been since transplanted from this Chamber to the Senate The Hon. Mr. Mills said:

I do not wish my name to appear on the committee,——

I was asking for the appointment of the committee to whom this Bill should be referred:

—as I am opposed to the reference. I hold that it is a matter for executive action, and that the Government should assume the responsibility of dealing with an international matter; and, further, that the committee will not have before it the necessary information to enable it to act properly. I, therefore, decline to serve on the committee.

So you will see the hon. gentleman says that this was a matter the Government should take charge of. Hon. Peter Mitchell, leader of the third party, was also named on the committee. He said:

The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has taken the words I was about to utter, out of my mouth. I decline to serve on the committee for the same reasons which have been so clearly stated by my hon. friend.

And my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey), who charged me yesterday with having been insincere in pressing this Bill upon the attention of the House and the country said:

Under all these circumstances, I am satisfied that the Government should take the Bill into their own hands and mould it so as to suit themselves, or substitute another Bill for it, or otherwise choke it off right here. Of these three alternatives, I think the proper one should be that they should substitute a Bill of their own.

And he went on and moved a motion that practically killed the Bill. I think there have been a great many conversions since then. The Prime Minister of that time, the late Sir John Macdonald strongly advocated the reference of the Bill to a committee to make full inquiry and report to this House. In 1891 (I quote from page 200 of the "Hansard" of that year):

The Order being read for the second reading of Bill (No. 6) to prohibit the importation and immigration of foreigners and aliens under contract or agreement to perform labour in Canada.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before proceeding with that Bill, I would like to inquire what correspondence has taken place between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States in reference to this subject. We had a special committee, who reported, after taking evidence, last year, that a Bill should be introduced at the next session dealing with this question.

And I spoke further on the subject:

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In reference to the report of the committee adopted last session, some representations have been made at Washington—I think, through the Department of Agriculture. I am not prepared to say, of course, that the amelioration which has taken place, and to which the hon. gentleman has referred, has been the result of that correspondence; it may have been rather with a view to the better administration of the Act itself relating to the importation of alien labour into the United States. I think that, under the circumstances, it would be unwise to proceed with the Bill, at any rate at present, especially in view of the circumstances which the hon. gentleman himself has mentioned, that negotiations covering practically all the questions between this country and the neighbouring country are fairly on the way to discussion next autumn. For that reason, I think it would be very desirable that the hon. gentleman should not press the passage of this Bill, at any rate for the present time. I am hardly in a position to assure the hon. gentleman that it will be one of the subjects of discussion at Washington, because that could only be done with the concurrence of the Washington authorities. Of course, it is in their power to say that any particular subject shall not be one of the subjects of discussion at the conference which is expected to take place. But I can say, and I feel bound to say, out of deference to the report which was adopted last session, that the subject it dealt with will be certainly presented for the consideration of the authorities at Washington, with a view either to the amendment of the Act itself, or, at any rate, a more reasonable execution of the Act than that which was brought to the notice of the committee last year.

Mr. TAYLOR. After the remarks of the Minister of Justice, I beg to move that the order for the second reading of Bill (No. 6) to prohibit the importation and immigration of foreigners and aliens under contract or agreement to perform labour in Canada, be discharged.

Motion agreed to, and Bill withdrawn.

Then, in the next session, that of 1892, I introduced the Bill again.

Mr. COWAN. And you agreed to the six months' hoist, as you will see on page 2458 of the "Hansard."

Mr. TAYLOR. We will see what it says.

Mr. COWAN. Sir John Thompson moved the six months' hoist and you agreed to it. You will see it first mentioned at page 295.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will find first at page 295 what my hon. friend's friends said on that occasion.

Mr. COWAN. Speak for yourself.

Mr. TAYLOR. I speak for myself on this Bill. I fought for this Bill as consistently as any person could have fought, from the time I introduced it until this session, and many hon. members in this House will cor-

roborate what I say, and moreover the record will prove it. The hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Fraser), whom I am sorry not to see in his place, said on page 297 of "Hansard:"

Mr. Speaker, I wish to enter my protest against this Bill, in the first place on general principles, and secondly, because of special cases that I know of myself.

And he went on and made a long speech, in the course of which he said:

Although, even then, it would strike at our industries in New Glasgow, and I would still be opposed to the measure. I do not believe that this Parliament should follow the wrong methods of any country. I do not believe that we, with our broad views, should pass any Bill because another country is shortsighted enough to enact in the interests of factions within the country itself, upon which the party in power depends for its political existence. Therefore, I am opposed, with all my heart, to the passage of this Bill.

And the hon. gentleman who now presides as Speaker of this House (Mr. Edgar) said —page 306:

I think this Bill is a very extraordinary one. For instance, in the sixth paragraph, to which no reference has yet been made, I find that it is proposed to make the collector of customs at every port in Canada a judge, and a juror, and a policeman. The Bill says:—

And I ask my hon. friend who has introduced this Bill to take up clause 6 and read it line for line with the clause that Mr. Speaker quoted then as being the sixth clause of my Bill and see if it is not the same:

—"The collector of customs of any port in Canada, in case he shall be satisfied that an immigrant has been allowed to land in Canada contrary to the provisions of this Act, shall cause such immigrant, within the period of one year after landing or entry, to be taken into custody and returned to the country from whence he came, at the expense of the owner of the vessel."

The idea of coolly proposing in this Parliament legislation of that character I cannot understand. To place it into the power of any collector of customs at any port in Canada, upon being satisfied of certain conditions, to arrest an individual and place him in custody and expel him from Canada—why, Sir, I think the hon. gentleman cannot have been serious in asking the House to pass a clause of that kind.

And yet that is the very clause my hon. friend (Mr. Cowan) is asking the House to pass to-day. Why? Because it is a copy of the clause in the American statute, which I copied, simply substituting the collector of customs for the official who in the United States has charge of operating the Bill against Canadians. Now, my hon. friend spoke about the six months' hoist. The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) spoke on that occasion, he took my side of the question, and he said this:

I think the time will eventually come when the motion for the six months' hoist for a Bill of this kind will not prevail in this House.

When some person suggested the six months' hoist, the hon. member for Sherbrooke prophesied that the time would come when such a motion would not prevail, and to-night he can see his prophecy fulfilled. The time has come when you cannot get an hon. gentleman to rise in this House to move the six months' hoist, nor to make, as was made then, an objection to going to the expense of printing 500 copies of the Bill for distribution to enlighten the people of this country as to its sion opened. I thought the rules of the Government to promote this Bill. I may say that some person has charged me with not having attended to my duty in failing to introduce this Bill at the opening of the session. I was here the day before the session opened. I thought the rules of the House were that no Bill could be introduced until the session opened, and I properly lodged my notice, but I was informed that my hon. friend from Essex had taken the ground from under my feet, and had sent his notice down here two weeks before the House opened.

Mr. COWAN. No, you have taken the ground out yourself.

Mr. TAYLOR. How?

Mr. COWAN. When you voted against that Bill in 1892.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman makes a statement that is not true. I never voted against the Bill. I fought for the Bill. I fight for the Bill to-day; I don't care whether you call it the Taylor Bill or the Cowan Bill. I think I am the father of the thought anyway. I want to see the labouring men of Canada protected, and I am glad to see that my hon. friend has become a protectionist, as this Bill is aimed at protecting the labour interests of this country. I do not care who gets the credit for the Bill. I presume the Government will take it under their wing, as the Prime Minister promised me last year that next session I would have ample opportunity of pressing my Bill to a conclusion. As long as the Government take charge of it, as I presume they will do, I do not care whose Bill is adopted. I presume both Bills will be referred to a committee where they can be whipped into shape. They cannot take any bad out of one that is not in the other, because one is a copy of the other, so far as that goes. But there are three or four clauses of new matter which, perhaps, are owing to amendments made by the United States. I have already suggested one amendment that I think should be made in the Bill when it comes before the committee and that is dealing with contractors from the United States for public works in Canada. As I said before, I do not care who gets credit for the Bill; all I want is that the workingmen of this country should be protected against competition from the

United States, unless the United States allow our people to go over there and have a fair show in the labour markets of that country. I have here a great many documents that I could read, like those that my hon. friend has read, showing the indignities that have been placed upon our Canadians when crossing the line; but the "Hansard" is full of quotations of that character that I have read year after year in the course of educating the people of this country up to the necessity of a Bill of this kind. I am glad the agitation has had effect, and now hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House are willing to stand up and fight for the Bill. I hope the Bill will be put into proper shape and become the law of the land, and not be left to a proclamation of the Governor General to bring it into force, but that it shall take effect the next day after it receives the assent of the Governor General at the close of this session.

Mr. CRAIG. I think every one who has been some time in this House will admit that we owe a debt of gratitude, so far as this Bill is concerned, to the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor). I think also that we ought to be able to say with the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Cowan) that this is not a party measure, although I must confess that it looks a little as if our friends on the other side were trying to make it one, or to claim credit for this Bill. Of course, I suppose everything is fair in politics. Now with reference to the fact that in time past some have opposed this Bill, I may say that I myself have felt heretofore a strong repugnance to a measure of this kind, and in fact I may say that I feel so still. I look on legislation of this kind as very objectionable indeed, and as legislation which should not be passed by the House of Commons except the case is very extreme. Sir, this Bill will not be passed, this Bill is not brought forward, I am sure, in any spirit of retaliation against the United States. Our motto on this occasion is not defiance, but defence. We are compelled to introduce a measure of this kind, we are compelled by the course of the Government of the United States to pass a law which shall protect the workingmen of Canada, inasmuch as they are excluded from the United States. Now, Sir, I need not say any more about retaliation, nor about the desire we have in this country to hold the most friendly relations with the United States. I am satisfied that the course of the late Government and the course of the present Government are evidence enough on that point. Sir, I think the United States are especially blameable in not listening to the Government now in power. This Government have always been particularly friendly to the United States, their policy up to the present time has always been in the direction of friendly relations with the United States; and I may say that I did hope last year when the Premier stated that an opportunity would be taken to go to the United States to get them to modify their course in this matter—I did hope that his efforts would be successful. I suppose we may take it for granted that the present Government have made efforts to that end, I suppose we may take it for granted that they have endeavoured to induce the United States to modify their conduct, and I suppose we may take it for granted that in that effort they have failed, inasmuch as they have allowed a supporter and perhaps encouraged him, to introduce this legislation. Now I notice one thing about this Bill, that is objectionable, and that is, that while it aims at the United States it applies to all other countries in the same way as it does to that country. I think if we aim this Bill at the United States, it should apply to that country and no other. But as I read it, I find it applies equally to France, to Great Britain, I suppose, and to Germany, and to all other countries in the world. I think this Bill should be made to apply to that country alone which applies a similar measure to us. Now, while supporting the principle of this Bill, there are some things in it which I think should be modified. I am strongly of the opinion that this ought to be a Government measure. I agree with the remarks made some years ago by the Hon. David Mills, as quoted by the hon. member for South Leeds, that in an international matter of this kind, a matter of such great importance, this Bill should be a Government Bill. I think the Government should take charge of this Bill and be responsible for all its provisions, and I hope this will be done yet, because there can be no doubt that the Bill may be advantageously amended. Besides if it came from the Government it would have more effect and weight with the United States than when introduced by a private member of this House. I would only repeat, that while I support this Bill, I do so with reluctance, but I am compelled to do so in defence of the workingmen of this country, and I must say that the workingmen where I live are almost without exception in favour of the Bill, in fact I have found no exception. While it must be admitted that such legislation is objectionable, I think the time has come when we cannot furtfier delay legislation; we have already shown our desire to be friendly and have done everything possible to induce the United States to modify its conduct, and the time for peace has now ended and the time for action has come. I have much pleasure in supporting this Bill.

Mr. BENNETT. I think, Mr. Speaker, the passage of the Bill now before the House will be disappointing in the extreme to the mass of labourers and artisans in the Do-

minion of Canada, for if I am correct in my opinion of the Bill, it will resolve itself into this, that if it does no harm, it will not do much good, and vice versa. Divested of a great deal of the verbiage which surrounds the first clause, it reads to this effect:

> After the passing of this Act it shall be unlawful for any person to prepay the transportation, or in any way assist or encourage the importation or immigration of any alien or foreigners into Canada, under contract or agreement made previous to the importation or immigration of such alien or foreigner, to perform labour or service of any kind in Canada.

Under that clause it seems to me, to place the matter in a nutshell by way of example, that it will be quite competent for a man wishing to employ say 20 carpenters in Windsor to cause an advertisement to be placed in a Detroit newspaper, and 20 carpenters might come over from Detroit and seek employment on the Canadian side, because there is no contract made on the American side and no encouragement or assistance rendered to those men to come over there. I quite agree with the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig) that throughout the country there will be some disappointment at the Government not having taken up this measure. I know that in my constituency during the late contest the announcement made there by Ministers of the Crown that the Government would cause to be placed on the Statute-book an alien labour law did not convey to listeners an idea that the Bill was to be a Bill of this limited and very trivial nature. If an alien labour law is to be passed in this country, let the law be a sweeping one, made to meet the case completely. On the north shore of the Georgian Bay year in and year out for the past ten or fifteen years we have seen Americans coming from the other side and being employed in lumber camps and also Americans employed in mills owned by Americans on the Canadian side, these men finding employment to the detriment of Canadians who are looking for employment. I shall certainly support the Bill going through committee, but I hope and trust that when it comes back it will be quite different from the Bill drafted by its original sponsor, the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) and that it will be a Bill to prevent the entry of this country of Americans or foreigners from any other country and to compel them, if they wish to come here to have employment to become citizens of the country by taking the oath of allegiance pure and simple. The Bill as at present drawn, if it does no good will certainly do no harm, but by its reference to a committee I hope it will come back strengthened and fortified so as to meet the demands of the Canadian working-classes. Let us pass a Bill to prevent Americans coming in and working here, and taking wages and wealth out of the country, but if they desire to come let them at the same time become Canadians not only in the matter of employment but become Canadians in every sense of the word by taking the oath of allegiance and remaining here permanently.

Mr. SPROULE. I think this House will willingly award its meed of credit to the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), who has so industriously followed up this subject from the time he introduced a Bill of this kind up to the present time, and I do not think any hon. member can properly refuse to give him credit no matter how disagreeable it may be to do so, because to my personal knowledge he has always endeavoured to the best of his ability to get some such Bill crystallized into law and be made effective. We are entitled I think to contragulate the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan) for one thing at least, and that is that his action has dispelled the illusion in the minds of members of the House that he is a free trader, for he has become an ardent protectionist, because if there ever was any Bill introduced in this House for several years past that bore on its face the principle of protection, it is the present Bill. I congratulate the hon. member on his conversion to protectionist principles, for I always understood he was a free trader before he entered this House. I am willing to give him assistance to pass this Bill, because it is a good one, and I have always favoured a measure of this character whether introduced from the Government or the Opposition side of the House. I believe it is a step in the right direction, and is justified by the fact that Canadian labourers, not only men but also women, seeking employment, should be protected by such a law as is proposed being placed on the Statute-book. I have noticed from time to time that Mr. DeBarry, in Buffalo, has sent back not only men in search of employment, but also women, and in many instances Canadians visiting their friends. When a great country like the United States goes to that extreme it is right that we should in self defence introduce such a measure as the present Bill, and pass it. I need not say anything in regard to what has occurred from year to year on the north shore of Georgian Bay, because there the Americans come in by hundreds, they bring in their own supplies, they bring over contract labour and they supplant Canadians employed in that district. But when this portion of the work is finished, and the raw material, the sawlogs, are sent over to American mills, Canadians are met by American agents at the frontier and are sent back by virtue of the legislation which they have adopted in the United States. It is time we made some effort to protect Canadians. I believe this Bill to be a good enough one, and if

it does not go far enough, it will be the duty of the committee to amend it to cover the whole ground, but so far as it goes, I am heartily in accord with the views sought to be carried out by the hon. mover, and I am willing to give all the assistance in my power to enable him to crystallize it into law.

Mr. CLARKE. I am in favour of this Bill, although I regret very much the necessity of introducing and passing it. It cannot possibly be said, however, that the responsibility for enacting such legislation rests with the authorities of this country or this Parliament. The hon. gentleman who has introduced the Bill and moved its second reading has briefly reviewed the character of the legislation which has taken place on the other side with respect to the prohibition of workmen entering that country, and as each succeeding measure is introduced into the United States Congress, its provisions are found to be more drastic than those of the one preceding it. The object and effect of such legislation can only be to cramp, confine and prohibit Canadian workingmen from finding employment on the other side of the line. It seems to me that legislation of this kind will deface our Statute-books, but at the same time I believe that if this Parliament desires to retain the respect of the great body of toilers in this country, it is its duty to act. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has said that this Bill if it does not do much good will not do much harm. I believe that if it does not render measure for measure in accordance with the legislation which has been passed by the Congress of the United States, it will be very little good, and I think the most valuable parts of the Bill are contained in the last three clauses. I regret very much to see that these clauses are not to come into effect, until a day to be named by the proclamation of the Governor General. If the time be ripe for the passage of legislation of this kind, I know of no good reason, in view of the determined action of the authorities on the other side of the line, why Parliament should not pass these three clauses as well as the other eight, and have them come into operation as soon as they have received the assent of His Excellency the Governor General. In view of the pledge given by the hon. the Premier at the last session of this Parliament, and in view of the subsequent action taken by the United States authorities, it is the bounden duty of this Parliament to express its opinion with no uncertain sound as to that legislation, and to enact for Canadian workmen the fullest measure of justice and protection that this Parliament can possibly give them. Organized labour in Canada has had its attention drawn to the condition of things that exists in the United States, and it has given its opinion regarding it. I notice, in the report in the proceedings of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada held at Quebec in September last, that the matter was under consideration there. It was brought up, I believe, through the presentation by the secretary, Mr. Dower, of a letter which he had received from the president of the American Confederation of Labour, Mr. Samuel Gompers, in reply to a communication which Mr. Dower had sent him respecting this matter. On pages 15 and 16 of the report of the proceedings of that Congress, Mr. Gomper's letter appears, and he says :

> I have the honour to acknowledge your valued favour of the 24th instant, contents of which have been carefully considered and noted. Of course, I can see the apparent justice of the complaint you made against the operations of the Alien Contract Law of the United States and its application to our fellow-workers, and particularly our fellow-unionists, of Canada. Beyond doubt, there are some cases of hardship and injustice resulting from the application of that law, but I think you will agree with me, when I say that the wage-workers of the United States were compelled to adopt some method by which their interests could be protected, not so much against our fellow-workers of Canada, but of those who come to the United States under the contract, either written or implied. * * *
>
> I recognize the difficulty confronting us to-day, and the justice of the complaint of members of local unions attached to their international unions if their cards should not secure them the rights of work and membership everywhere. I believe with you, that men finding employment in our respective countries should make their abode therein. You say that your Congress is to convene at Quebec on September 15th, when the subject matter will be discussed. I do hope that grave consideration will be given the matter, and that no ill-advised action will be taken.

This communication of the president of the American Federation of Labour was referred to a special committee, and I see on pages 29 and 30 the report of the special committee which was adopted by that Congress :

> That the executive of the congress be, and they are hereby, instructed to consider the subject referred to in the said letters, along such lines as may be deemed best to secure the end in view.
>
> It is also recommended that the congress hereby records itself in favour of the adoption of federal legislation prohibiting, under heavy penalties, the importation from any country of persons under contract or agreemnt to perform labour in Canada.

That is an expression of opinion by the representatives of organized labour in this country at the Congress held at Quebec in September last.

In view, Mr. Speaker, of the repeated insults that are being given Canadian workmen when they attempt to cross the border to seek employment, I think we would be derelict in our duty as a Parliament, if we did not adopt legislation treating American workmen who come to this country, just exactly as Canadian workmen are treated who go to the United States. There seems

to be a consensus of opinion in favour of the passage of legislation of this kind ; and whilst we must all regret it, it is a gratifying thing that we are seized with the importance of the subject, and that we desire to give fair-play to our own people, in our own country. It seems to me, too, that there need be no further time lost in passing this legislation, for I have carefully read as many of the speeches as I could lay my hand on, of the gentleman who occupies the distinguished position of President of the United States, and I have yet to see in one of these speeches the slightest sentiment, given utterance to by that distinguished gentleman, of a desire to promote friendly relations with this country, or to alleviate in any way the harsh lines which have been drawn by American legislators against Canada. For these reasons, and for other reasons, which might be advanced if I trespassed on the time of the House, I strongly support the passage of this Bill, because I believe that under it a great deal more employment will be found for our labourers and artisans than can be found at present. I believe that hundreds, if not thousands, of citizens, who owe their allegiance to the United States now find employment in Canada for the whole, or for the greater part of each year ; and under the operation of a proper Alien Labour Law these people would be compelled to assume the responsibilities of British subjects in Canada, or return to their own country, and their places would be taken by many Canadians and British subjects who are now out of employment.

The most regrettable feature of legislation of this kind to me is, that it is an indication that there is something wrong in the social and economic conditions of the people of both countries. It seems to me that with such great possibilities and resources as exist on both sides of the line, and especially on this side of the line, it should not be necessary, in order to find employment for all who are willing and able to work, that legislation of such a reactionary character should be enacted by both countries. But for the reasons I have briefly stated, I cordially approve of the propositions in the Bill, and I hope that when it goes to the special committee, the last clause will be eliminated and the Act come fully into force as soon as it has passed the House and received the assent of the Governor General.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Mr. Speaker, every time this Bill has been before Parliament it has not only received my very cordial suppport, but I have said a few words in its favour. I have never gone quite so far as some have in my approval of the Bill itself, and I regret exceedingly the circumstances under which this Parliament finds it necessary to take any action on the subject. During the last session when the Bill was under discussion, I had the honour of suggesting to the First Minister, that in any negotiations which might take place between this Government and the Government at Washington, it might be well that care should be taken to find out whether something could not be done to lessen the grievances which existed on account of the action of certain United States authorities with regard to the enforcement of this Act. I dare say that if you were to meet that distinguished gentleman (the President of the United States) who has just been referred to by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke), and were you to say to him, that the legislation of the United States was discriminating against Canada in the so-called Alien Labour Law, you would be told : that that was not the case ; that you might search from the beginning to the end of that law, and that you would not find one single letter which discriminated against this country. And, when he told you that, he would be telling you what was strictly within the letter of the law. But unfortunately its operations extend to Canada, and although it does not discriminate against this country any more than it discriminates against any other country, yet, owing to the geographical position of the two countries and the exchange of labour that is going on between them, the operation of the Act against Canada is not only unfriendly, but is in every respect such as should be avoided as between two neighbouring nations.

Now, I do not know whether this Parliament has any power to enact an Alien Labour law discriminating in its operations against any one particular nation which by a similar law does not discriminate in name against us. I merely throw out that suggestion to those who are thoughtful, and will give it that attention which I think it deserves. I heartily approve of the suggestion that the Bill should be sent to a special committee, whatever may be my doubts as to the ultimate ability of this Parliament or the desire of the greater Parliament which still has jurisdiction over our deliberations, to put any such measure into operation. I thoroughly approve also of the provision in the Bill which postpones its operation for the purpose of ascertaining whether the Bill, if it becomes the law of this country, can ever be put into force. I certainly agree with what has been said, that this Government should act with all due haste. It is true, previous Governments have had this measure before them session after session. It is true, my hon. friend the member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has shown commendable diligence in bringing it up session after session. It is equally true that governments preceding this Government have requested that the measure stand. This Government requested that a similar measure which was brought in last session by

the same hon. member should stand. They have delayed it once, and they were justified, in my opinion, in delaying it then. They are not justified, in my opinion, delaying it six or seven years more, simply because their predecessors did. Whatever may be the report of the special committee to whom the Bill is to be referred, I desire to put it to the workingmen of this country, on whose behalf so much has been said, that the time has arrived when they must know whether this Parliament intends to enact such legislation, if it is within their power so to do. I do not think that fact has ever been fully ascertained as yet. The Bill itself has my full sympathy, though it is an unfortunate measure, and the occasion should never have arisen to make it necessary. But the necessities of the case have forced this Parliament to do something, and, without asking any questions formally in that direction, I should hope that whatever negotiations may have taken place between the Government of this country and the Washington Government, some request has been made that the operation of the law should in some way be made less rigorous so far as Canada is concerned. Several years ago I had some communication with the then First Minister on this subject, and I know that some communication did take place with the Washington authorities, but nothing came of it. The simple question which I wish to press upon the House and the country is that the time has come when, if we can enact legislation on this subject, we ought to do so.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I entirely approve of the principle of this Bill, and I agree with my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) who indicates that when it goes to a special committee, it will require a very thorough overhauling. The hon. gentleman who has moved the second reading of the Bill (Mr. Cowan) in a speech full of eloquence, described it as retaliatory. I think my hon. friend is mistaken as to the legislation in the United States. For instance, I find that the 9th clause, which is one of those which my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) regarded as doubtful of being brought into operation by the 12th section, says :

> No person shall employ an alien coming into the Dominion of Canada in violation of this Act : Provided that the provisions of this Act shall not apply to the employmentof sailors, deck-hands or other employees on vessels, or to railway train hands, such as conductors, brakemen, firemen and engineers, whose duties require their passing over the Canadian boundary to reach the termini of their runs.

I think my hon. friend who moved the second reading of the Bill is under the impression that in the legislation of the United States there is a similar clause, but he is entirely mistaken. At the present time railway men living in Moosejaw, and going down to the line, are prevented from carrying out their runs ; and I think my hon. friend has hastily taken the Act as it was introduced into the American Congress on January 28, and has failed to look at the Act as it passed the American Senate on December 18, 1896. The Act as introduced had a clause precisely like section 9 of this Act ; but you will find that the Senate excised that clause, and at the present time deck-hands, sailors, deck-hands and employees on railways are not allowed to do what this Bill would allow sailors, deck-hands and railway men coming from the United States to do. If I remember rightly, the hon. Premier himself said last session that if this question were to be dealt with, it would be dealt with by the Government, and the measure would be entirely retaliatory. Certainly, if we are to deal with the question at all, the measure dealing with it must be retaliatory to the fullest extent. My hon. friend who has just spoken (Mr. Wood, Brockville)) has pointed out a difficulty from an imperial standpoint ; but I apprehend—and at present without further inquiry I think I am right—that we can frame a clause that will enable us to deal out precisely the same kind of generosity to the sailors, the deck-hands and the railway men of the United States that the Senate of the United States has dealt out to these classes of Canadians. My hon. friend who has charge of this Bill I rather think made a mistake in not being generous to my hon. friend the member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor). Nobody can doubt for one moment that my hon. friend from Leeds brought this question before Parliament when prominent and influential men on both sides were not ready to receive it in any friendly spirit. In doing that he did the pioneer work of this question, and I think it was a mistake on the part of my hon. friend from Essex (Mr. Cowan) not to be ready to give him the credit of a Bill which, with the exception of the vicious clause to which I have just referred to and three other clauses, he has taken holus bolus from my hon. friend. In fact, although he is not in the Government he has been, to some extent, contaminated by the great men he follows. These great men have inscribed on their banners at present, "We glory in purloined policies." There is not a shred of their policy at present that they have not, in the most calm and unabashed manner stolen, and the only description that I can think of which will apply to the pirate king who leads these thirteen bandits is that which Lord Byron applies to another celebrated gentleman.

> Now, Lambro was the mildest-mannered man that ever scuttled a ship or cut a throat.

I believe we have in this House, at this moment, at once, in his own person, the most audacious rifler of the policies of his opponents, and, at the same time, one of the most courteous and accomplished men I have even seen, and that goes a long way ; but I wish to point out to the Prime

Minister why the Government must really take this Bill up. Here I have a picture by that great genius who daily puts before the people of Canada his graphic cartoons of the great policies that are being pursued by the leading men of the Liberal party. Here he has depicted a bicycle race. Let me say, at the outset, as one who has felt it a great honour to have been for the past ten years a member of this House, and whose sense of the obligation has been enhanced by the fact that a distinguished member of this House all that time has been my hon. friend the member for Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). Now, I complain of Mr. Bengough placing a statesman of the dignity and gravity of the hon. member for Oxford in the attitude in which he is placed here. Why, we have him and the First Minister on a bicycle built for two. I object to that, in the first place, because it is not suited to the gravity and dignity of the great statesmen who are represented, but I object to it still more for this reason, that from all I can hear, the two great statesmen are very inaccurately represented as riding in harmony on a bicycle built for two. And what have we described here? Here we have the description; promises kept; the pacemakers breaking the record. Here is the hon. member for Quebec East, the First Minister, occupying the first seat on the bicycle built for two, marked "promises fulfilled," and behind him is the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the inscription "pledges kept." What are the pledges? They are the Alien Labour Act, in the first place, and how have the Government kept this pledge? By having the Bill introduced by a very recent, but a very clever and able member, as we must admit, my hon. friend from Essex (Mr. Cowan), one of the most promising members of the Liberal party, one of the most promising of the young buds that have come in, the brightest jewel, I believe, in the new crown of the Prime Minister, but after all but a recent importation; and if the Government want to claim the honour of fulfilling any pledge with regard to alien labour, they must bring in the Alien Labour Act themselves. Then there is the Act to abolish the superannuation system and the Act to abolish the franchise law. Farmers of Canada, these are the promises kept by this Government, who made the welkin ring for seventeen years with their denunciations of a policy that was bleeding you white, to use the elegant language of my hon. friend (Mr. Lister) who is sitting behind the Prime Minister and looking as handsome as usual. These are the promises they have kept to the farmers who have been bled by the tariff, with which now, it seems, these hon. gentlemen have fallen in love. Here are little fringe questions, little, petty questions comparatively, which are put forward by this great artist, who has attempted to represent the Government as fulfilling their promises. He depicts them as breaking the record, and the way they break the record with regard to the alien labour law, which is the principal measure by the way, is to put it into the charge of one of the recent members of this House. And here it is a Bill that is, of course, entirely ineffective, because, as I have pointed out, the Bill as it passes the House was deprived of the clause which is represented by the ninth section of this Act. But I may say in regard to my hon. friend the member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) who was accused, I think, rather mistakenly and hastily by my hon. friend from Essex (Mr. Cowan) of having voted against his own measure in 1892, that, if the hon. gentleman will look at the "Hansard" he will see the exact state of affairs, he will see that my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) did not vote against his own measure:

ALIEN LABOUR IMPORTATION.

On the Order to resume the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Taylor, that the Bill (No. 4) to prohibt the importation and migration of foreigners and aliens under contract or agreement to perform labour in Canada, be read a second time: and the motion of Sir John Thompson in amendment thereto, "that the said Bill be read a second time this day six months."

Amendment agreed to.

Of course my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) did not vote, and the statement that he did vote against his own measure is calculated to mislead the public. I do not believe that my hon. friend from South Essex (Mr. Cowan) would persevere in that. Sir, I merely rose to point out the necessity that exists for the Government to take this matter into their own hands. Moreover, I think, that, as they are taking up a policy, that was the policy of one of the leading members of the Conservative party, they should take it up in an open and above board manner. I confess that this seems to me a very ineffective and very unwise way of carrying out the policy of stealing the Acts and Bills and catch-words of the Conservative party. I think the best way is to do it in the most open way possible. The best way is that taken by my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) whom I greatly admire. I think he is frankness itself. I think that while these hon. gentlemen proclaim, as they do in the most open manner, that they are honourable gentlemen—Brutus is an honourable man, and his colleagues honourable men. Brutus, you will remember, Mr. Speaker, after killing Cæsar, went to Athens to study philosophy; he was a man after the heart of a Prime Minister—they should keep the bold road followed by the Minister of Public Works, the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) and proclaim to the world: We are all honourable men, thoroughly honourable men, and think that

is a righteous thing to plunder, provided it is a civil servant that you plunder and a venial sin, if it be not a cardinal virtue, to lie, provided the person you lie to, is a Catholic bishop.

Mr. McGREGOR. It was not my intention to take part in this debate, having spoken some years ago on the same subject, but that my hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) said that I asked him to withdraw his Bill. Now, Sir, the case stood somewhat in this way: My hon. friend from South Leeds was pressing this Bill. I said that the law on the American side had not been used to any great extent against the people in Canada. Where I live, we are not more than 2,000 feet from the American shore. On the American side is the city of Detroit with a population of 300,000 while we have a population of 12,000. Labour is free between these two cities and has been for many years. We have some 500 or 600 crossing from our side to the American side, and they have from 300 to 400 crossing from the American to the Canadian side, and there has been no difficulty. Now we are placed in a different position to-day from what we were in then. To-day we have to face a Bill known as the Corliss Bill.

Mr. DAVIN. No, no; it is the same Bill as this.

Mr. McGREGOR. Take your time. Let me finish. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that the Bill was passed by the two Houses of Congress—that is the Corliss Bill and the Lodge Bill engrafted together—almost entirely cutting off the labouring portion of the people of Canada from working in the United States. We found that this would be very oppressive; but, fortunately, President Cleveland disallowed this Bill. That being the case we must wait for a short time to see what the new Administration in the United States will do. Now we hope that the Government of Canada will have sufficient influence to negotiate with the Government of the United States so that we may have reciprocal trade between the two countries in labour at least. If not, we must place on the Statute-book a law similar to the law placed on the Statute-book in the United States; and, if between one session of Parliament and the next it should be found necessary to bring that law into operation, we want the Governor General in Council to bring it into force at once. We say, therefore, it is well to have the last clause so as to hold the Bill until we are satisfied that the Americans have passed a Bill that affects us so materially as we believe that measure would do. Sir, we want to be neighbourly with our American cousins; we want reciprocity with them on every point on which it is possible to have it; we want to have commercial relations with them if such be possible. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) has said that we were entirely opposed to his Bill. We were not opposed to the Bill, but he was pressing the Bill at a time when it was not in the best interests of the people of Canada that it should be enacted—the time was inopportune. We feel that the time has come now when, if the American people place on their Statute-book a Bill such as the Corliss and Lodge Bill, people of this country will have to adopt a reciprocal measure. If they determine that the people of this country shall not get employment on the other side of the line—and you must remember that we have 4,000 miles of border fronting on the United States, and the people are constantly crossing—we must keep our own labour market for our own people and keep the Americans out. That being the case, I hope this Bill will pass so that the Government can make use of it if it should be required at any time. Sir, I was amazed and somewhat amused to hear it said that one hon. gentleman had taken the Bill of another. Why, Sir, the hon. member for Leeds took, word for word, the American Bill of 1891, with necessary verbal changes, and my hon. colleague (Mr. Cowan) who spoke so nicely on the subject, copied exactly the same Bill, but added four clauses. So he could not come very far from using the same Bill as the hon. member for South Leeds. We hope that before we meet again our Government will be able to bring in a reciprocal arrangement for trade and allow us to do away with such petty laws as between two such great countries as Canada and the United States. For I agree with many gentlemen who have spoken that it is beneath the dignity of Canada and the United States that such laws should be enacted; and I hope that the day will soon come when all such laws will be wiped out and reciprocal trade established between the two countries.

Mr. GANONG. I am in somewhat the same position as the hon. gentleman (Mr. McGregor) who has just taken his seat. I represent a county bordering along the United States for 60 or 70 miles. Not only that, but owing to the conditions there, our population is centred near the American border, so that among our towns along the American border, among the fishing stations along the coast and the country adjacent, the inhabitants come more directly in contact with the United States. We have a population of about 20,000 souls. During the investigation of this matter some years since, referred to by the hon. member for Leeds, voluminous correspondence and evidence was recorded, I believe, in our section, at the instance of the late member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor). And while I did not agree with all the statements that were filed at that time, perhaps, as to the expediency of enforcing a similar law to that of the United States, in so far as it affects our

interests pecuniarily, I do not purpose discussing that question here. That question I consider, may be a debatable one, but I do not purpose following it further. I take entirely separate grounds from any pecuniary advantage to our country. Whatever may have been the intent of the original labour law in the United States, there can be no question that after its passage it was enforced especially against Canada, and more particularly is this true of other similar Acts that have since been passed. This had the tendency, undoubtedly, to obstruct our Canadian workmen going into the markets of the United States. But I do not consider that the alien labour question of to-day stands alone. In this, perhaps, I take a different view from the members of this House, but I cannot dissociate it from many other questions that have come up, and more particularly from the trade question. Any intelligent man who has travelled in the United States or who has read carefully the records of that country to learn the opinions of individuals, must know that there has been a feeling in the United States that we were not in a very good condition in this country, and that all they had to do was to exert a little pressure and Canada would drop in as a part of the Union. And why not this impression ? The older citizens of the United States obtained this impression through their education. Some hon. gentlemen here to-night may remember their old school text-books ; I do very well. There was Morse's geography, which was used throughout the country, and how was Canada represented ? Simply by a picture of a beaver-dam, and some remarks were made in connection therewith that would indicate that we were nothing but a barren waste to the north of them. Since that time the education given in the schools of the United States has not tended to give the people of that country a very intelligent idea of their northern neighbours. Their school books are prepared almost wholly for the purpose of describing the United States, and pay very little attention to other countries. Then, Sir, the history of our own country from 1873 to 1878 has not tended very much to give them a favourable opinion of this country. Since that time they have been told, and have had reason to suppose, that this country is not as rich as we had an idea ourselves it was. I believe there is scarcely an hon. gentleman occupying a seat on the Government benches who has not some time within the past twenty-two years decried this country in one way or another. Their statements have gone broadcast, not only over our own country, but through every state in the union ; and considering the few opportunities they have had of knowing us, what else could we expect than that they should misjudge us ? I consider, as I have already said, that the Alien Labour Law does not stand by itself, but is one of a series showing the results of statements made by some of our own public men giving them the idea that with a little more pressure they might drive us into the union. Now, Mr. Speaker, with your permission I will read one of those romances, one for which I believe the Minister of Trade and Commerce is responsible, as I believe it was given at a banquet to his leader down in Montreal. In view of this, how can we expect much more from our neighbours than we are asked for ourselves ?

> A Canada impoverished, depopulated, debauched, over-taxed, over-burdened, and under-peopled; a Canada in which, I say it with extreme regret, three impqrtant provinces were reduced to a state of almost absolute stagnation, and the two greatest provinces of all, as we know to our sorrow, increasing at a rate far below that common to the most thickly-populated European countries; a Canada in which we find to-day that of all the adult male population of our country, who ought to be with us here, aiding and helping us to build up a country inferior to none on this continent, one man in three are to-day exiled from their native land.

Such, Mr. Speaker, are the statements that have gone broadcast. I do not purpose wearying some of these hon. gentlemen, or worrying them, perhaps, by reading similar statements. They know full well how many such have been made, and for what purpose. I anticipate that they are having just trouble enough about this time as to the future ; because, if we can judge from the twenty-two years of chronic political dyspepsia they have had, and the numerous nostrums they have had recourse to, we can safely conclude that they are already shaking in their boots in view of the dose they are going to get pretty soon from our great eastern tariff doctor. Sir, I am satisfied that after all the crow that has been eaten during the past twenty-two years, this will be the biggest dish for some of them they have ever sat down to. Now, this Corliss Bill has been mentioned, and I would like to refer to it for a moment or two. Let me remind the House that the Corliss Bill was not intended for the border towns. We have an idea that this friction and this agitation only exists along the border, but the Corliss Bill was not intended for the border towns. Let me read to the House a statement made by Mr. Corliss himself in regard to this matter. In answer to an inquiry, he states :

> In the first place, I introduced a Bill providing that no alien retaining his home in a foreign country, should come into the United States and egage in the mechanical trades or usual labour in competition with American labour, with no intent to make this country his home or permanent abiding place. This would, of course, affect Windsor and other points just across the border to some extent, but not as much as it would under the way Senator Lodge amended the measure. My Bill was aimed principally at 50,000 or 100,000 men who came into this country in the spring, and, after working all summer, carry their money home in the autumn. Mr. Lodge in-

sisted upon putting in the words "regularly and habitually," which caused the Bill to directly apply to Windsor people, and made a law which no one could enforce against aliens who come to this country for a season and then go home, because they may only come once.

I never meant to make this direct attack upon people who live in Canada adjacent to the American border, and I tried to devise an exception for them, but found it could not be fairly done. I have since considered the advisability of excepting all Canadians who now live within two miles of the American line, and if I find such a provision will be legal and constitutional, I will make an amendment to my own Bill in Congress to that effect. You will remember that President Cleveland, in his veto, referred to no portion of my part of the Bill, except the words "regularly and habitually," and he very justly asked what they meant. In reintroducing my measure this time, I left out those words, and I shall fight all attempts of the Senate reinserting them. I have nothing against the people who live across our northern borders. I have no desire, for instance, to interfere with a man whose farm may lie partly in this country and partly out of it; but I do believe we should give our labourers as much protection as we give our producers.

Such was the provisions of the Corliss Bill. It must be borne in mind that this Bill was not passed by a moribund Congress, but by a Congress fresh from the people, and by an overwhelming majority; so that if there is any possibility of ascertaining the sentiments of the American people upon an Alien Labour Law, that Bill expresses those sentiments. Now, Mr. Speaker, we know that some members of the Government have been down to Washington for the purpose of interviewing members of Congress with regard to this matter, and of ascertaining the feeling of the Government and Congress upon it. It is true that they were preceded by a great forerunner from the wilderness of Canadian pine; but notwithstanding all this, they have come back with results not very encouraging to us. Now, Sir, without underrating the ability of the Government, I cannot think they were wise in choosing their deputation to Washington. They might expect to be confronted with some of their own statements made here at home derogatory to their own country. These statements were of a character to induce the American press and members of Congress to believe that Canada was getting nearer and nearer to the parting of the ways. The purpose of the Corliss Bill, without any doubt, are antagonistic to Canada. Now, Mr. Speaker, I shall support the present Bill, but not because I have any desire to create a cause of friction with or annoyance to our neighbours to the south of us, who themselves have been so unneighbourly. I will not support it either as a retaliatory measure, because I believe that this country cannot be coerced by the adverse legislation of any foreign state. But standing on our rights and the dignity of our position as one of the arbiters of this North American continent we should take this means of resenting legislation which is evidently directed against us. In so far as reciprocity is concerned, I am in favour of it; but when it comes to a reciprocity that involves that the American eagle shall perch on the North Pole, I decidedly object to it in this year of grace 1897.

Mr. INGRAM. As one of those who has supported this proposed legislation every year it has been submitted to this House, I wish to say a few words in regard to it. I think we should approach this question from a non-party standpoint. It seems to me that as two political parties we have ample to divide us and to discuss without discussing a question of this character, from a party standpoint. I do not, therefore, intend to approach it in that spirit, but I hope to straighten out a few of the assertions unjustly made for what I believe to be party purposes. The hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has certainly introduced this Bill session after session. He has not been successful, it is true; but he has been charged by the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan) with having voted against this Bill in 1892. I ask any hon. gentleman whether, taking into consideration the spirit in which this Bill was received in that year, when he found the Prime Minister of that time moving the six months' hoist, backed up by the then leader of the Opposition, as well as that prominent member, the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), is it to be wondered at that the hon. gentleman, finding so many opposed to the Bill, did not divide the House upon it? These are the facts. I therefore say it is unfair to accuse the hon. gentleman of having voted against his Bill. The hon. member for North Essex I remember at the time, was heartily opposed to the Bill, and he has given a very forced explanation of the reason why he changed his opinion. He says that circumstances have changed. Certainly they have changed sufficiently to justify the hon. gentleman in changing his opinion. But there is one thing I cannot understand, and it seems to be very inconsistent. The mover of the Bill we are discussing represents South Essex. In South Essex there are very few manufacturing industries, very little labour is employed, but North Essex, which is represented by the hon. member for Windsor, employs a large amount of labour, and it is chiefly Windsor and Walkerville that this Bill, if it becomes law, will benefit. How the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. McGregor) should ask, request or even suggest that the operation of this Bill should be postponed to a late period, I cannot understand. Instead of taking that step, we should do something of this kind. Section 12 says:

> Sections eight to twelve of this Act, both inclusive, shall not have force or effect until a day to be named by the Governor General by his proclamation.

instead of suggesting that section, I would suggest something of this kind: That a clause be attached to the Bill which would state in effect that whenever the United States feel like withdrawing their legislation, or withdrawing it so far as regards Canadians, then the Parliament of Canada will withdraw this legislation, or drop it from the Statute-book. We should have immediate legislation, instead of postponement, because several Canadians have been subjected to very grave annoyance in crossing the line. It has been said that the Bill would not be effectual. It may be that it would not be so effectual as it should be. But I see on the Order paper that the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan) will introduce a Bill to amend the immigration laws of Canada, and I presume when he introduces the Bill it will be found that he will suggest something in the direction of the laws of the United States. Mr. DeBarry, of Buffalo, and some others who have enforced the law there, have taken advantage of the immigration law of the United States for the purpose of keeping Canadians out of their country, the Act relied upon being the Pauper Immigration Act. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) mentioned section 9 in particular, and he found fault with it because railway men at Moosejaw had not been allowed to go into a contiguous state of the United States. It may be that that state has some state law against railway employees entering it when employed in a foreign country. But if we pass such a law and apply it to Maine, Michigan and New York, and to railwaymen, we will be doing very great injustice, and it is quite proper that this particular section should be embodied in the Bill, because, taking the constituency of the hon. member for North Essex there are three lines running there, the Canadian Pacific, the Grand Trunk and the Michigan Central passing from Windsor to Detroit, and the railway men complete their runs at the latter city. At Welland we have different railways passing into Buffalo, where Canadian men complete their runs, and no opposition has been offered to the men entering the United States there. But there is one thing that should not be tolerated in this country, and that is this: We have a railway in this country which employs a large number of railway men. These men in certain lines of service are compelled to wear uniforms, and orders have been given these men that they must wear cloth sold in the United States, they are not permitted to wear cloth made in Canada. Those men have told me they can buy superior cloth in Canada and get a suit of clothes made for less money; yet the company insist that the men should buy their clothing on the other side of the line, even though they are obliged to pay increased prices. That is unjust, and if the company persists in that course, the Government should take some action to stop them. I should have liked to hear from the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), as Sarnia and Point Edward are two very important points, and I should have been glad to have had the opinion of that hon. gentleman as to the necessity of passing a law of this kind in the interest of the railway men whom he represents very largely there.

Mr. WALLACE. I think this is a very opportune time for the introduction of the Bill now before the House. I am sorry that the hon. the Premier has not yet declared his opinion in respect to it. I remember very well, that during the last session of Parliament the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) expressed full sympathy with the Bill, and from the tone of his remarks then we might fairly have expected that the Government would have introduced a measure at this session of Parliament. The hon. the Premier went so far as to state then, that if, after looking over the correspondence that had taken place between the late Government of Canada and the United States there seemed to be no way of settling the question satisfactorily to Canadians, then this was a measure that should receive the endorsation of this House, as well as his own sympathy and support. We might fairly have expected that the Government should have assumed the control of this Bill, and given us a measure commensurate with that which the United States have enacted. This Alien Labour Law has been enforced against Canadians for a number of years. The hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) took the matter up several years ago and persistently brought it to the attention of this House. I remember that Sir John Thompson thought, that because of the international character of this Bill, and in view of our relationship with Great Britain, it should not become law. The present Prime Minister of Canada agreed with Sir John Thompson in that, so that at that time the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) had neither of the leaders of the parties in sympathy with him. But, circumstances have changed, and the United States Government from year to year, either by new legislation or by a harsh and strained interpretation of the Act, have made this law exceedingly obnoxious to Canadians along the border, and to those citizens of Canada who choose for any purpose to visit the United States. I have in my hand a letter written a short time ago, detailing the treatment of two young men who were going to Buffalo for the purpose of attending an entertainment. They say:

In crossing the Suspension Bridge on the Grand Trunk Railway train, and near the American side, we were approached by a customs-house inspector, who asked if we had any baggage, and we replied that we had none. He then informed us that we would have to go with him to the

United States Immigration Office and be inspected by Mr. O'Brien, of that office. We naturally objected to such proceedings, but were compelled to go. Upon entering the office, we were questioned by Immigration Inspector O'Brien as follows :—Q. Where are you from? A. St. Catharines. Q. Are you Canadians? A. Yes. Q. What are you doing on this side? A. Going to Buffalo on a pleasure trip. He said he did not believe this, and that we looked like a couple of young fellows looking for work, &c.

That is the kind of treatment accorded to citizens of Canada who may choose to cross the border. More serious than that is the fact, that those living on the Canadian side are precluded from working on the American side, under a harsh interpretation of the law, if the law itself does not practically sanction such a course. I believe that this Bill now before us should be amended in several particulars. In the first place, you cannot enact this Bill at all against Great Britain, and by the reading of the Bill as at present, I assume that it is general in its character.

Mr. POWELL. It does not apply to British subjects.

Mr. WALLACE. Then, the next feature in it is this. It was stated by the member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) that it would not prevent men coming from the United States on American vessels to lumber in the Canadian woods during winter. My own opinion is that the first clause will, but if not, special attention should be paid to that clause, and it should not be permitted that men holding timber limits in Canada can bring across large crews of men in the fall to work in Canadian woods during winter, thus depriving Canadians of work to which they are entitled. These men should not be permitted to work here in the winter and then to return to their own country in the spring. The United States do not permit Canadians to do that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Oh, yes. I do not think they go so far as to exclude Canadians from that work. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) will find that a very large number of Canadians go every winter to the State of Maine and work in the lumber camps there.

Mr. INGRAM. And there was a great outcry made about it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have never known a case where they were stopped. I think we had better proceed cautiously on that point.

Mr. WALLACE. There are restrictions under which they may go, and stringent conditions under which they must return to Canada at a fixed period. At any rate, the effect of the United States law has been, that in the border towns of Windsor and Walkerville on the Canadian side, they are preventing the citizens from going to Detroit to their daily labour, to return in the evening.

Mr. McGREGOR. That is a mistake. They go backwards and forwards three times a day. They come over and get their dinner.

Mr. WALLACE. Where ?

Mr. McGREGOR. In Detroit and Walkerville. Five or six hundred each day. They come from Detroit to Walkerville and Windsor, and they go from Windsor and Walkerville and Sandwich to Detroit.

Mr. WALLACE. And no interference with them.

Mr. McGREGOR. About five or six hundred go from Canada to the United States daily to work, and about three or four hundred come from the United States to Canada to work.

Mr. WALLACE. On the Niagara frontier it is quite different, and the law is being put stringently in force. We are informed that the same interpretation of the law would be enforced on the Detroit River. Now, Sir, there is another very important matter closely connected with this question, and it is this. Under the American law, Canadian contractors cannot go to the States and obtain contracts from the American Government. The very opposite is the case in Canada. American contractors come over here, and if they are the lowest tenderers they obtain Canadian contracts, just as we saw the other day when an American company came over and got the Government lithographing contract.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They are committing the further crime of spending $60,000 to erect a building here.

Mr. WALLACE. They are committing the public crime of depriving many Canadian workmen of employment by doing a large portion of the work in the United States.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Oh, no.

Mr. WALLACE. Oh, yes, but I will not discuss that further now, because it will come before the House in connection with a motion for the papers and then we will have a complete discussion on it. I say that under our law, American contractors can come to Canada and compete with Canadians for Government contracts, while a similar privilege is not permitted our contractors by the law of the United States. On the other side of the line the contract must be obtained and carried out by American citizens, and I believe that we in self-protection must enact a similar law here. Why should we permit Americans to come over here and obtain contracts, competing against our Canadian contrac-

tors, when reciprocity in this is not permitted by the United States. If we are going to have an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth, let us carry it through all these ramifications of business, and enact that, as one of the clauses of the Alien Labour Bill. A case came under our notice in the papers yesterday. In the city of Toronto, where there are unfortunately many mechanics out of employment, a store has been rebuilding, and we are told that a Buffalo architect has come over and brought his Buffalo workmen with him to carry out the alterations. Such a thing would not be permitted in the United States under the Alien Labour Law, and it should not be permitted here. If we are not to have reciprocity in labour, we should prevent American workingmen from having privileges in Canada which they deny to our workingmen in the United States. With regard to postponing the operation of this Act until it is proclaimed by the Governor in Council, I do not think that should be done. I think the time has arrived when we should put this law into force. They have had it in force in the United States for many years, and we are only enacting the same law which they are enforcing strictly and rigidly.

Mr. COWAN. Pardon me a moment. The first seven clauses of the Bill are the American law as it is on the statute-books of the United States. The remaining clauses are the objectionable clauses of the Lodge Bill or the Corliss amendment, which passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, but were vetoed by the President. These were put in so that, if they should be re-enacted in the United States, we would be able to bring them into force in Canada immediately without waiting for a session of Parliament. But the other portion of the Bill will go into force word for word with the American law.

Mr. WALLACE. A law similar to the 9th clause of this Bill was, I understand, enacted by an overwhelming majority of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

Mr. COWAN. In the Senate it only carried by three, with some twenty-seven members absent; but it was re-enacted by a very large majority over the President's veto in the House of Representatives.

Mr. WALLACE. And I have no doubt that the new President will not take the same view of it that President Cleveland did.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). We do not know that. We hope he will.

Mr. WALLACE. The hopes of hon. gentlemen opposite in that respect have been disappointed. All the hopes they entertained of securing some reciprocal legislation have been disappointed, and I do not suppose they have any stronger hopes in regard to this legislation. While we are enacting a law to-day, we should put all necessary provisions on the Statute-book. We have refrained all these years from doing so, and the Premier expressed his hope that after the Government had gone over the correspondence, they might find some means by which the necessity might not arise for the enactment of this legislation. I presume that the Government have looked into the question and have gone over the whole of the correspondence. I presume also that members and friends of the Government by their visits to Washington, have brought this very important and live question before the attention of the American authorities; and if they have done so, I presume that they are prepared to state to-day either that the negotiations have proved abortive or that the Americans have come to terms in some way. We have not heard that they are prepared to come to any terms in regard to this matter, and we are forced to the conclusion that the Government of the United States are not going to relax either the interpretation or the carrying out of the law, or the law itself. Therefore, it becomes the duty of us Canadians to consider our own case, to legislate in our own interests, and to protect the interests of our Canadian workingmen, railway employees, mechanics, labourers and all classes of the community affected by this legislation, amended and perfected as we hope to have it in committee, so that we shall have an efficient law for the protection of Canadian workmen of whatever description they may be.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I have not thought it advisable to take any part in this debate before this moment, because there cannot be any doubt as to the position of the Government upon this Bill. In fact, I do not know that it is at all advisable to prolong the debate any longer; because, so far as I can interpret the sentiment of the House, there is a unanimous feeling at this moment, whatever may have been the opinions held by members in the past, that the persistence of the American Congress in keeping upon the Statute-book these very obnoxious clauses, leaves no alternative to the Canadian people but to apply the same law themselves. For my part, I can only repeat what I stated during last session, that I have come to that conclusion with very great reluctance. I am in no sympathy whatever with the principle of this legislation, and it is with extreme regret that I have come to the conclusion that we should follow so unfortunate an example. But the course adopted by our neighbours seems to me to leave no option to us but to apply to them the same measure of justice, or of

injustice, as they applied to us. I would not care, however, to go one single step further than is absolutely necessary in order to maintain not only our dignity, but the possibility—I look to that more than to anything else—of having this obnoxious law removed at some time or other. I stated my conviction during last session, and it is my conviction to-day, that in framing such legislation, we should simply adopt the American law, such as it is, word for word. My hon. friend the mover of this Bill has embodied in it the text of a Bill which, luckily for us, did not become law. It is true the Corliss Bill was passed by Congress, and, being vetoed by the President, it failed to get the requisite majority in the Senate, perhaps only for want of time, although it got more than the requisite majority in the House of Representatives. Therefore, the Corliss Bill is not the law of the United States to-day; and that being the case, for my part, I do not think it would be advisable to make it the law of Canada. I would strictly limit the law that is to be enacted by this Parliament to a copy, word for word, of the American law as it exists to-day. I offer this suggestion to the House. With regard to the proper course to be taken on this Bill, I have conferred with my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor), who, it is only his due to say, has taken a deep interest in this matter for many years; and he has agreed with the mover of this Bill that it would be proper to have it referred to a select committee. With regard to the powers of the select committee, I have consulted both friends and opponents of the Government from all parts of the country, and I think that it would be conducive to good results if this committee were clothed with the power to hold an investigation. The effects of this law have been confined to certain portions of the country. It has been limited chiefly to the town of Niagara and Windsor and the Thousand Islands. In so far as my information goes, this law has not been applied in Maine or Vermont or other parts of the Eastern States. Therefore, I think the committee should be empowered to hold an investigation and ascertain what are the effects of this law, in so far as they can apply to one section of Canada or another, and I propose that, when read the second time, the Bill should be referred to a committee which has been agreed on between the two sides of the House.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Will the Bill of the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) be referred to the same committee?

The PRIME MINISTER. Certainly.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

The PRIME MINISTER moved:

That Bill (No. 5) to restrict the importation and employment of aliens, be referred to a Special Committee to be composed of Hon. Messrs. Davies, Sifton, Wood, Langelier, and Messrs. Casgrain, Taylor and Cowan, with power to send for persons, papers and records, and to examine witnesses under oath, and to report from time to time.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the hon. First Minister if it is intended that this should become law during this session. To report from time to time means that the Bill may be delayed for a very considerable period and possibly not become law this session.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman, being an old parliamentarian, knows that when a Bill is referred to a committee it is in the hands of the committee and not of the Government, but I may say that the Government has no intention in referring the Bill to a committee, to have it killed by the committee.

Mr. TAYLOR moved second reading of Bill (No. 6) to prohibit the Importation and Immigration of Foreigners and Aliens under contract or agreement to perform labour in Canada.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have no desire to open up the discussion again on this Bill, as the two measures are very nearly the same. I said nothing on the former occasion, and desire simply to reiterate what has been said by many members of this House. I regret that we are pledged to enact legislation of this character. Representing an industrial county, where there is a great deal of labour employed, I may say that in that section of the country in which I reside, the sentiment in favour of this legislation is very strong indeed, and I have no hesitation whatever in supporting the very strongest measure that I believe the First Minister will be willing to give his approval to. I think that the legislation we should enact along this line should be, word for word, letter for letter, the American legislation. This, at any rate, is the character of the legislation called for by the section of the country I come from, and I trust this Bill will become law this session.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

The PRIME MINISTER moved:

That Bill No. 6 be referred to the committee on Bill No. 5.

Motion agreed to.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 8th April, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier), from the special committee appointed to prepare and report lists of members who compose the Select Standing Committees ordered by the House on the 25th March last, presented the following report :—

No. 1.—ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Messieurs

Angers,
Belcourt,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Blair,
Borden (Halifax),
Britton,
Bruneau,
Cameron,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Casgrain,
Choquette,
Davies,
Davin,
Fitzpatrick,
Flint,
Fortin,
Fraser (Guysborough),
Geoffrion,
Haggart,
Ives,
Langelier,
LaRivière,
Laurier,
Lavergne,
Lister,
Lount,
McAlister,
McCarthy,
McCleary,
McInerney,
McIsaac,
Madore,
Mills,
Monet,
Monk,
Mulock,
Pouliot,
Powell,
Quinn,
Russell,
Tisdale,
Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Wood (Brockville).

No. 2.—ON EXPIRING LAWS.

Messieurs

Bazinet,
Beausoleil,
Bell (Addington),
Bennett,
Bourbonnais,
Carroll,
Chauvin,
Copp,
Cowan,
Desmarais,
Dugas,
Earle,
Ethier,
Ferguson,
Fitzpatrick,
Fortin,
Hale,
Harwood,
Hurley,
Legris,
Logan,
Meigs,
Roche,
Rogers,
Seagram,
Somerville,
Tyrwhitt.

And that the quorum of said committee do consist of seven members.

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

Messieurs

Angers,
Beattie,
Beausoleil,
Beith,
Belcourt,
Bell (Pictou),
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Bernier,
Bethune,
Blair,
Blanchard,
Borden (Halifax),
Borden (King's),
Bostock,
Bourassa,
Britton,
Broder,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Bruneau,
Burnett,
Calvert,
Cameron,
Campbell,
Cargill,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Carroll,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),
Casey,
Casgrain,
Champagne,
Charlton,
Chauvin,
Choquette,
Christie,
Clancy,
Clarke,
Cochrane,
Corby,
Costigan,
Cowan,
Craig,
Davies,
Davin,
Davis,
Dechene,
Desmarais,
Dobell,
Domville,
Dugas,
Dupont,
Dyment,
Edwards,
Ellis,
Erb,
Featherston,
Fielding,
Fiset,
Fitzpatrick,
Flint,
Fortin,
Fraser (Guysborough),
Fraser (Lambton),
Frost,
Ganong,
Geoffrion,
Gibson,
Gillies,
Godbout,
Guay,
Guillet,
Guité,
Haggart,
Hale,
Haley,
Harwood,
Henderson,
Heyd,
Hodgins,
Hughes,
Hurley,
Ives,
Kaulbach,
Kendry,
Klock,
Kloepfer,
Landerkin,
Langelier,
LaRivière,
Laurier,
Lavergne,
Lemieux,
Lewis,
Lister,
Livingston,
Logan,
Lount,
Macdonell (Selkirk),
Mackie,
MacLaren,
Maclean,
MacPherson,
McAlister,
McCarthy,
McCleary,
McCormick,
McDougall,
McGregor,
McHugh,
McInerney,
McInnes,
McIsaac,
McLennan (Glengarry),
McLennan (Inverness),
McMillan,
McMullen,
Madore,
Martin,
Maxwell,
Migneault,
Mills,
Monet,
Monk,
Montague,
Morrison,
Mulock,
Oliver,
Osler,
Parmalee,
Penny,
Pope,
Pouliot,
Poupore,
Powell,
Préfontaine,
Prior,
Proulx,
Quinn,
Ratz,
Reid,
Richardson,
Robertson,
Robinson,
Rogers,
Rosamond,
Russell,
Savard,
Scriver,
Sifton,
Snetsinger,
Sproule,
Stenson,
Sutherland,
Talbot,
Tarte,
Tisdale,
Tucker,
Tupper (Sir Charles),
Turcot,
Tyrwhitt,
Wallace,
Wilson,
Wood (Brockville),

Hutchison.
Ingram,
Wood (Hamilton).

And that the quorum of said committee do consist of thirty-one members.

No. 4.—ON MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS.

Messieurs

Bain,
Beattie,
Beith,
Belcourt,
Bell (Addington),
Bell (Pictou),
Bennett,
Bethune,
Boisvert,
Bourbonnais,
Broder,
Brodeur,
Burnett,
Calvert,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Carroll,
Carscallen,
Casey,
Choquette,
Cochrane,
Corby,
Cowan,
Craig,
Davin,
Desmarais,
Dupont,
Dyment,
Earle,
Edwards,
Ellis,
Ethier,
Fitzpatrick,
Fraser (Guysborough),
Fraser (Lambton),
Gilmour,
Graham,
Guillet,
Hodgins,
Joly de Lotbinière (Sir Henri),
Kaulbach,
LaRivière,
Lavergne,
Legris,
Lemieux,
Livingston,
Logan,
Macdonald (Huron),
MacLaren,
Maclean,
MacPherson,
McAlister,
McDougall,
McHugh,
Martin,
Meigs,
Migneault,
Monet,
Moore,
Morin,
Morrison,
Mulock,
Paterson,
Penny,
Pouliot,
Prior,
Proulx,
Roddick,
Rosamond,
Russell,
Savard,
Scriver,
Stenson,
Tucker,
Yeo.

And that the quorum of said committee do consist of eleven members.

No. 5.—ON STANDING ORDERS.

Messieurs

Bain,
Bazinet,
Boisvert,
Bourbonnais,
Broder,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Cargill,
Copp,
Davis,
Douglas,
Dupré,
Earle,
Erb,
Ferguson,
Fiset,
Fitzpatrick,
Flint,
Hodgins,
Hughes,
Hurley,
Ingram,
Joly de Lotbinière (Sir Henri),
Kaulbach,
Landerkin,
Lang,
Mackie,
McGugan,
McInerney,
McInnes,
McMillan,
McNeill,
Maxwell,
Mills,
Monk,
Moore,
Morin,
Pettet,
Ratz,
Rinfret,
Roche,
Scriver,
Semple,
Stubbs,
Tolmie,
Wilson,
Wood (Brockville),
Wood (Hamilton).

And that the quorum of said committee do consist of seven members.

No. 6.—ON PRINTING.

Messieurs

Bergeron,
Bourassa,
Charlton,
Dupont,
Ellis,
Foster,
Gibson,
Hughes,
Landerkin,
LaRivière,
Macdonald (Huron),
Maclean,
McMullen,
Montague,
Oliver,
Parmalee,
Préfontaine,
Richardson,
Somerville,
Sutherland,
Taylor,
Tisdale.

No. 7.—ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Messieurs

Blair,
Borden (Halifax),
Borden (King's),
Cameron,
Campbell,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),
Casgrain,
Champagne,
Clancy,
Clarke,
Cochrane,
Costigan,
Cowan,
Craig,
Davies,
Dobell,
Domville,
Fielding,
Fitzpatrick,
Flint,
Foster,
Fraser (Guysborough),
Fraser (Lambton),
Frost,
Ganong,
Geoffrion,
Gibson,
Gilmour,
Haggart,
Hughes,
Landerkin,
Langelier,
Lister,
Lount,
Macdonald (Huron),
Macdonell (Selkirk),
McCarthy,
McCleary,
McGregor,
McInerney,
McIsaac,
McLennan (Glengarry),
McMullen,
Madore,
Mills,
Montague,
Morrison,
Mulock,
Oliver,
Paterson,
Powell,
Quinn,
Rinfret,
Rosamond,
Sifton,
Somerville,
Sproule,
Sutherland,
Tarte,
Taylor,
Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Wallace,
Wilson,
Wood (Brockville),
Wood (Hamilton).

And that the quorum of said committee do consist of nine members.

No. 8.—ON BANKING AND COMMERCE.

Messieurs

Angers,
Bain,
Beattie,
Beausoleil,
Beith,
Bell (Pictou),
Bernier,
Blair,
Blanchard,
Borden (King's),
Bostock,
Bourassa,
Britton,
Brown,
Bruneau,
Calvert,
Hutchison,
Ingram,
Ives,
Kaulbach,
Kendry,
Klock,
Kloepfer,
Landerkin,
Lang,
Langelier,
Laurier,
Legris,
Lewis,
Lister,
Livingston,
Logan,

Cameron,
Campbell,
Cargill,
Carscallen,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),
Champagne,
Charlton,
Chauvin,
Clarke,
Cochrane,
Copp,
Corby,
Costigan,
Cowan,
Craig,
Davies,
Dechene,
Dobell,
Domville,
Dugas,
Dupré,
Earle,
Edwards,
Ethier,
Featherston,
Fielding,
Fiset,
Fortin,
Foster,
Fraser (Guysborough),
Fraser (Lambton),
Frost,
Ganong,
Gauthier,
Geoffrion,
Gibson,
Gillies,
Godbout,
Guay,
Guillet,
Guité,
Haggart,
Hale,
Haley,
Henderson,
Heyd,
Hughes,
Lount,
Macdonald (Huron),
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonell (Selkirk),
MacPherson,
McAlister,
McCarthy,
McCleary,
McCormick,
McDougall,
McInnes,
McIsaac,
McLennan (Glengarry),
McLennan (Inverness),
McNeill,
Madore,
Migneault,
Morin,
Osler,
Paterson,
Penny,
Pope,
Poupore,
Powell,
Préfontaine,
Prior,
Reid,
Richardson,
Robertson,
Rosamond,
Russell,
Scriver,
Seagram,
Sproule,
Stubbs,
Sutherland,
Talbot,
Tarte,
Taylor,
Tisdale,
Tolmie,
Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Wallace,
Wilson,
Wood (Hamilton),
Yeo.

And that the quorum of said committee do consist of twenty-one members.

No. 9.—ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION.

Messieurs

Bain,
Bazinet,
Beith,
Bell (Addington),
Bell (Pictou),
Bergeron,
Bernier,
Blanchard,
Boisvert,
Bostock,
Bourassa,
Bourbonnais,
Broder,
Burnett,
Calvert,
Campbell,
Cargill,
Carscallen,
Casey,
Christie,
Clancy,
Cochrane,
Davin,
Dechene,
LaRivière,
Legris,
Lewis,
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonell (Selkirk),
Mackie,
MacLaren,
McCormick,
McGregor,
McGugan,
McHugh,
McInnes,
McLennan (Glengarry),
McLennan (Inverness),
McMillan,
McMullen,
McNeill,
Martin,
Maxwell,
Meigs,
Montague,
Moore,
Morrison,
Mulock,
Douglas,
Dugas,
Dupont,
Dupré,
Dyment,
Edwards,
Erb,
Featherston,
Ferguson,
Fisher,
Frost,
Gauthier,
Gibson,
Gilmour,
Godbout,
Graham,
Guay,
Guillet,
Guité,
Haley,
Harwood,
Henderson,
Hodgins,
Hughes,
Hurley,
Hutchison,
Ingram,
Joly de Lotbinière (Sir Henri),
Lang,
Oliver,
Parmalee,
Pettet,
Pope,
Poupore,
Proulx,
Ratz,
Reid,
Richardson,
Rinfret,
Robinson,
Roche,
Roddick,
Rogers,
Rosamond,
Seagram,
Semple,
Sproule,
Stenson,
Stubbs,
Sutherland,
Talbot,
Taylor,
Tolmie,
Tucker,
Turcot,
Tyrwhitt,
Wilson,
Yeo.

And that the quorum of said committee do consist of fourteen members.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved:

That the said report be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

LIBRARY COMMITTEE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved:

That a Select Committee composed of Messieurs Bain, Borden (Halifax), Bourassa, Caron, (Sir Adolphe), Clarke, Davies, Davin, Flint, Foster, Fraser (Guysborough), Laurier, Lount, McNeil, Monk and Scriver, be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in the direction of the Library of Parliament so far as the interests of this House are concerned, and to act as members of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the Library; and a Message was ordered to be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours therewith.

Motion agreed to.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved:

That a Message be sent to the Senate informing their Honours that this House will unite with them in the formation of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the subject of the Printing of Parliament, and that the members of the Select Standing Committee on Printing, viz.:—Messieurs Bergeron, Bourassa, Charlton, Dupont, Ellis, Foster, Gibson, Hughes, Landerkin, LaRivière, Macdonald (Huron), Maclean, McMullen, Montague, Oliver, Parmalee, Préfontaine, Richardson, Somerville, Sutherland, Taylor and Tisdale, will act as members on the

part of this House on said Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT.

Militia and Defence of the Dominion of Canada, for the year ended 31st December, 1896.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—THE ESTIMATES.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows :—

ABERDEEN.

The Governor General transmit to the House of Commons, Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending on the 30th June, 1898, and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," the Governor General recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, 1897.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved :

That the Message and Estimates be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

SHERIFF OF PRINCE ALBERT.

Mr. DAVIS asked :

1. When was Harold E. Ross appointed sheriff of Prince Albert, Saskatchewan?
2. When did he cease to act?
3. Was he dismissed, or what was the reason he ceased to be sheriff ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). 1. Harold E. Ross was appointed sheriff of judicial district of Saskatchewan by Order in Council of 4th April, 1887. 2. 24th May, 1887. 3. By Order in Council of 24th May, 1887, O. E. Hughes was appointed sheriff in the place of H. E. Ross, to be appointed inspector of weights and measures. The records of the department show no reason for the change.

SUPERANNUATIONS.

Mr. SPROULE asked :

How many officers in the public service have been superannuated from the 13th July, 1896, up to the 5th of April, 1897? What are their names? What is the age of each? How long in the service, and what is the amount additional charge on the superannuation fund?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). In answer to the hon. gentleman, I beg to read the following list :—

Name.	Age	Service. (Years.)	Annual Superannuation Allowance	Gratuity.
			$ cts.	$ cts.
Seymour, D. J	30	3	.....	87 48
Reddan, C. J.	30	9	....	562 50
Scribner, J. F	36	$8\frac{2}{12}$	....	544 44
Turbide, Télesphore	48	15	180 00	
Nettle, R	81	39	1,140 41	
McPherson, A. F	56	25	700 00	
Perkins, L. A.	72	29	255 20	
MacLean, W. H	74	32	160 00	
Prinyer, John	77	30	120 00	
Chadd, G. J.	59	11	88 00	
Foster, Henry	72	16	128 00	
Kearney, Chas	60	15	60 00	
Allard, Wm	59	22	176 00	
Neagle, John	73	48	436 80	
Cockburn, Alex	74	40	487 14	
Higgins, Wm	72	45	361 20	
Edmonds, James	74	31	219 98	
Beaton, A. R.	74	30	150 00	
Fuller, Thos	74	16	1,024 00	
Bolton, R	60	36	404 60	
Thayne, E. S.	60	12	288 00	
Verrault, J. E	49	17	150 00	
McGirr, Wm	41	15	540 00	
Scovil, W. B	72	18	288 00	
Smith, H. H.	50	18	1,590 00	
Egan, James	67	18	432 00	
Code, A	67	18	468 00	
Bolster, G. I	62	18	360 00	
Huggard, R. T	63	20	560 00	
Gorman, Samuel	60	22	264 00	
Woodrow, James	64	38	1,120 00	
Meloche, F. X	57	17	408 00	
Jeffers, Joseph	69	15	180 00	
Larseneur, T. F	62	36	980 00	
Mayer, E	63	35	840 00	
Forbes, E. H.	71	18	288 00	
Dubé, L	69	24	288 00	
Lapointe, P	66	27	324 00	
Plante, J. B	59	26	312 00	
Charles, W. H	66	22	241 12	
Ellis, William	71	17	986 00	
Harper, M	68	17	238 00	
Reddin, James	74	18	432 00	
Lawlor, R. A	44	14	420 00	
O'Doherty, Cath	59	22	132 00	
Jenks, J. N	40	3	.....	200 00
Destroismaison, R.	34	$3\frac{2}{12}$	....	110 84
Niles, S. P.	71	$9\frac{1}{12}$	.....	84 72
Shannon, John	57	$9\frac{10}{12}$	.....	163 89
Looby, John	42	6	.....	250 00
Ross, H. E.	41	$9\frac{9}{12}$	.....	568 71
Durocher, O	31	$3\frac{9}{12}$	.....	171 88
Marion, J. E.	31	$2\frac{9}{12}$	.....	114 56
Belliveau, M.	28	$1\frac{3}{12}$	.....	52 07
Champagne, J	28	$3\frac{2}{12}$	....	95 00
Mongeon, C	49	$4\frac{2}{12}$	.....	173 61
			18,220 45	3,179 70

42 superannuations.
14 retired on gratuities.

The superannuation of these officials makes their allowances a charge on the superannuation fund, but there is a large saving to the treasury. In some cases the officials had to be superannuated on account of age or infirmity, and their places have been

filled. But in the majority of cases the offices have been abolished.

IMMIGRATION AGENT TO IRELAND.

Mr. TAYLOR asked:

1. Has Mr. Edward O'Kelly, late of Pembroke, been appointed immigration agent to the North of Ireland?
2. If so, when was he appointed?
3. What salary is he to receive, exclusive of travelling expenses?
4. Is Mr. Kelly a British subject?
5. Has he not been a hotel-keeper at Duluth, Min., U.S.A., and at West Superior, Wis., U.S.A., for a number of years past, and until within a few months previous to his appointment?
6 Was he recommended by Mr. T. Murray, ex-M.P. of Pembroke?
7. Is Mr. Kelly a half-brother of Mr. Murray's?
8. What are Mr. Kelly's duties? Will he keep an office in Ireland, or will he have a roving commission?

The MINISTER OF INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). 1. Mr. Edward O'Kelly has been appointed Immigration Agent to Ireland, but not particularly to the North of Ireland. 2. He was appointed on the 1st day of April, 1897. 3. His salary is $1,800 exclusive of travelling expenses. 4. Mr. O'Kelly is a British subject. 5. So far as the Government is aware Mr. O'Kelly has not been a hotel-keeper at Duluth, nor at Wes Superior, or any other place. 6. He was recommended by Mr. T. Murray, ex-M.P. of Pembroke and many others, competent to give reliable opinion upon his qualifications. Mr. O'Kelly's recommendations were of the very highest order, and he was appointed exclusively on account of his peculiar qualifications for the immigration work in Ireland which had for some time been entirely neglected under the late Government. Mr. O'Kelly had for over nine years been an official valuator and commissioner for the Imperial Government under the Irish Land Act, and holds the highest testimonials from persons of prominence as to character and capacity. His great knowledge of the country to which he has been commissioned and of its inhabitants, and the experience which he has gained in the employ of the Imperial Government is expected to be of especial value in his work, and the Government considers itself most fortunate in being able to secure the services of a gentleman who is so well equipped for the important work which is placed in his charge. 7. Mr. O'Kelly is not a half-brother of Mr. Murray. 8. His duties are to endeavour to procure the best available class of settlers for Canada. He may or may not have an office from time to time, but his position is that of a travelling agent.

COAL TRADE IN NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. GILLIES asked:

1. Does the despatch in the Halifax "Morning Chronicle" of 11th December, 1894, represent correctly the utterance of Mr. W. S. Fielding, the then Provincial Secretary and Premier of the province of Nova Scotia and now Minister of Finance, who in company with Mr. L. H. Davies, now Minister of Marine and Fisheries, at a public meeting at Sydney on the 10th of December, 1894, is reported in said despatch as having stated as follows:—

"Referring to the coal trade, he said the Liberal party would not preach one doctrine in Cape Breton and another in the rest of the Dominion. If the coal business could not be carried on without protection, then it is better not to carry it on at all: protection was not a necessity for its welfare."

2. Does the report in the Montreal "Herald" of the 13th March, 1897, represent the Minister of Finance correctly when waited upon at Montreal on the 12th March by representatives of the coal interest who urged upon him the necessity of maintaining if not increasing the present duty on coal? The Minister is reported as having stated as follows:—

"If, however, your view is correct and it turns out that the United States duty is raised to a high figure, then we shall claim and exercise the right to revise our views respecting the Canadian duty and we shall feel bound to impose a duty not only on bituminous, but also on anthracite coal, which at present comes into our markets from the States free of duty."

If reported correctly in both cases, how does the Minister of Finance reconcile these two conflicting statements?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I do not remember the despatch in the Halifax "Chronicle," to which the hon. gentleman refers, and I am not in a position to make any statement respecting the accuracy of a report which I have not seen for several years. I have advocated the free exchange of coal between Canada and the United States, but otherwise I have not advocated free coal. Whether speaking to the coal miners of Nova Scotia or to the people of other sections of the country I have always held that the article of coal could not be considered alone, but must be dealt with in connection with others, with regard to the interests of the Dominion as a whole. The words quoted from the Montreal "Herald" are a correct report of a single sentence of my Montreal remarks.

L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER, N.S.

Mr. GILLIES asked:

Is it the intention of the Government during the present session to provide in the Estimates for the repairs and extension of the L'Ardoise Breakwater, county of Richmond, Nova Scotia?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). This subject is under consideration.

PROPOSED SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAY COMPANIES.

Mr. LANGELIER asked:

Whether it is the intention of the Government to disallow the Act passed at the last session of

the legislature of Quebec, authorizing the government of that province to pay to railway companies entitled to subsidies in land converted into money, seventeen and a half cents in lieu of the last thirty-five cents to which they are entitled?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The provincial statutes of the province of Quebec are not yet before the Department of Justice, and have not yet been reported on.

BREAKWATER AT THE MOUTH OF THE RIVER NICOLET.

Mr. BOISVERT (Translation) asked :

Whether the Government is aware that part of the breakwater of the port of refuge constructed at the mouth of the River Nicolet was carried away by the ice last spring ?

Is it the intention of the Government to place in the Estimates this session an amount sufficient to provide for needed repairs to the said breakwater ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). (Translation.) In reply to the question put by the hon. member, I may say that my attention was called to the extent of the damages done to that breakwater. As to the second part of the question put by the hon. member, I may inform him that it is now being taken under consideration by the officials of my department.

SOUTH SHORE RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. BOISVERT asked :

Whether it is the intention of the Government to afford assistance this year to the South Shore Railway Company, so as to enable the company to construct its line from Sorel to Lévis?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I can give the hon. member no other answer than I gave to a similar inquiry yesterday, that the whole subject of the giving of bonuses or subsidies to railway companies is under consideration, and has not been determined upon by the Government.

FISHING LICENSES IN BONAVENTURE, P.Q.

Mr. McALISTER asked :

Has notice been given to James Robertson, of New Richmond, in the county of Bonaventure, province of Quebec, that license for his salmon fishing stand would not be renewed this year?

If so, why is such renewal refused?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I am not aware personally, and I am advised that the department is not aware, that any such notice has been given.

Mr. LANGELIER.

POST OFFICE AT BEAR ISLAND, N.S.

Mr. GILLIES asked :

1. Who is postmaster at Bear Island, in the county of Richmond, Nova Scotia, at the present time?
2. When did Michael Morgan cease to be postmaster?
3. For what length of time did he fill the position of postmaster at Bear Island?
4. Was he dismissed from office?
5. If so, for what cause?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). As the answer from the department has been delayed, I am able at the present moment only to give the hon. gentleman a summary of it, but I will furnish him with an additional statement if he desires more particular information. The postmaster at Bear Island was Mr. Michael Morgan. He was appointed in September, 1892, and on 1st March, 1897, the office was abolished as being of no real public utility, the revenue for the whole year having been only $11.97. Under these circumstances the office was abolished, and with that of course the postmastership came to an end ; but in no other respect was there a dismissal.

HOUSE OF COMMONS RESTAURANT.

Mr. SPEAKER. Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I should like to mention a matter to the House. I am informed that a gentleman outside of the House stated that he had been informed and believed that the Order passed by the House of Commons was not enforced—that is the Order as to the non-sale of liquor in the restaurant—and that members of the House could obtain what they want on this side without going to the Senate. I think it just as well that this statement should be formally and distinctly contradicted. I can hardly believe that any gentleman can have stated exactly what is reported, because the facts are so absolutely contrary to the statement. Ever since the Order was passed by this House the instructions have been that there shall be no sale within the precincts of this House, and these instructions have been absolutely and strictly enforced by me. They have been not merely nominally enforced, but I have taken every precaution in my power to see that the rule was thoroughly carried out. To-day I sent for the restaurant-keeper and questioned him, and he utterly and entirely denies that any sale has been made by him of beer, wine or spirits, or that any is kept within the precincts of the House. I furthermore instructed the serjeant-at-arms to make an investigation, and I have this report from him to-day :

In compliance with your instructions of this day, I have made a careful examination of the restaurant premises, and have the honour to report that no wine, beer or spirits is being kept therein by the caterer.

This report shows that liquor is not only not on sale, but that it is not kept on the premises.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I am anxious to avail myself of the very earliest opportunity of correcting a statement which I made, speaking on the spur of the moment, in reference to transactions of a public nature that occurred more than a quarter of a century ago. I was under the impression that the Government brought down, in 1870, a proposal to impose a duty on coal, and that that portion of the budget was defeated in the House and withdrawn by the Government. I find upon referring to the Votes and Proceedings of that date, that the Government brought down the duty and it was imposed in 1870; and in 1871, the Government being defeated by a large vote of the House, yielded to that determination on the part of a large majority of the members, and withdrew that impost from the tariff. I wish to take the earliest opportunity of explaining to the House this mistake which I made in reference to matters which occurred more than a quarter of a century ago.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Perhaps the hon. gentleman's colleague (Mr. Foster) will also correct his statement, that the child was strangled eight years before it was born.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all. I will not retract the truth.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. GIBSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 8) in further amendment of the Railway Act. He said: There is very little to be said in reference to this Bill in addition to the remarks which I made upon its introduction. The Bill was framed by myself as a layman and not by a lawyer, and I have had some suggestions sent to me by the members of the legal profession with the object of rendering more perfect the object sought by this legislation. When the Bill reaches the committee stage I shall move some amendments, and explain them to the House. The first clause of the Bill says:

> Notwithstanding anything in the Railway Act, all debts due for work done, wages due, or material supplied in the construction of a railway to which the said Act applies, shall be the first lien upon such railway.

When this Bill comes before the committee, I shall add to that clause so as to make it apply to promoters and other agents to whom the company is indebted during the construction of the railway, and I shall also move to add at the end of the Bill,

> That this Act shall apply to all railways now under construction.

The object of the Bill, as I have already stated, is to protect our Canadian contractors against persons coming in from a foreign country and engaging in railway construction, persons who have no money of their own, and who come with high sounding titles and form a construction company within the promoters, or perhaps more particularly speaking, in the name of the railway corporation itself; nay, by putting up a bogey or stool pigeon in the shape of a contractor who takes his contract from the construction company. This results in many cases in a loss to our Canadian contractors. In one particular instance within the knowledge of the members of this House, instead of the construction company or the railway company bearing the expense of building the road, the whole cost of construction was borne by our Canadian subcontractors and they are still at a loss for their money. I might also say, Mr. Speaker, that the two most important railways in this Dominion, the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and in fact all Canadian railway companies who are doing an honest and legitimate business are not opposed to the passage of this Bill, for the reason that they are willing at all times to pay their just debts, not only to their main contractors, but also to the sub-contractors. Legislation of this kind should have been on our statute-books years ago, and many of our Canadian contractors are to-day suffering because of the want of it. I trust that when the time comes for the Bill to be discussed in detail, it shall receive due consideration from the members of this House.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. SPEAKER. When shall the House resolve itself into committee on this Bill?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Now.

Mr. HAGGART. Had not the Bill better be referred to the Committee on Railways and Canals? All these Bills go, as a matter of course, to that committee.

Mr. GIBSON. I have no objection to send the Bill to any committee of the House, and I will gladly adopt the suggestion of the ex-Minister of Railways and move:

> That this Bill be referred to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

The Bill is a just one, and I am not afraid of it before any committee.

Motion agreed to.

OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY.

Mr. CHARLTON moved second reading of Bill (No. 10) to secure the better ob-

servance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday, as a day of rest. He said: Mr. Speaker, I shall not detain the House at any length upon this Bill, and I beg the ear of the House while I present matters which I think are of sufficient importance to be worthy of its careful consideration.

I do not stand here to advocate a religious measure. The Bill does not propose to say what a man's faith shall be, what his religious usages shall be, where he shall go to church, whether he shall go to church at all or not, or what his conduct in a religious sense in any manner whatever shall be. The Bill deals with the question of the Sunday rest from the civil standpoint alone. It presumes that Sunday rest to the labourer is a civil right, and that this Parliament has the right, and should exercise the right, to secure to labourers rest on Sunday—rest which, in many instances, they are unable to enjoy without the intervention of the law, and the enjoyment of which is not with them a matter of free choice, for they are often compelled to labour upon this rest day against their wishes and in violation of what ought to be under the law a privilege and a civil right. There need be no fears of religious legislation in connection with this Bill. I do not know that I can even say that the Bill is earnestly promoted or sustained by the religious sentiment of this country, so far as the laity of the various churches are concerned. It seems to be to a large extent a matter of indifference to professing Christian people in Canada whether or not a law is enacted for the purpose of securing to labourers their right to the Sunday rest. We do occasionally have resolutions passed by synods, conferences, assemblies and presbyteries bearing upon this matter; but we have no indication of any great degree of popular feeling on the subject. If some section of the country wants to impose a duty for the purpose of bleeding one class for the benefit of another, if some material interest is at stake, we shall have delegations visiting Ottawa to impress upon the Government the necessity of acceding to their wishes; but so far as I am aware, no delegation of professing Christian people has ever visited this capital to urge upon this Government or upon any other Government in power, the propriety of enacting a Sunday rest law. Therefore, I think I am warranted in saying that religious fears may be dismissed, and that, so far as any purpose may be supposed to exist on the part of Christian communities to force upon the people of Canada an obnoxious religious measure, such fears are not well founded.

I repeat that this Bill deals with the question of the Sunday rest from a civil standpoint only. While it affirms that the right to enjoy that rest should be deemed on the part of the labourer a civil right, and asks for a cessation from labour on the Lord's Day, the personal conduct of all individuals is left perfectly free. They can go to church or refrain from going to church, or spend the day in any other way they choose, so far as any enactment of the law is concerned; the law merely providing that the labourer shall have the right of rest and the enjoyment of religious privileges on that day, if he chooses to exercise that right. The law will step in and prevent his being deprived of the exercise of that right, which should be one of the most precious of all rights in the eyes of a Christian man.

This Bill is no novelty in legislation in civilized and Christian countries. As long ago as A.D. 958, under King Edgar, a Bill was passed in the British Parliament with regard to Sunday observance; and since that time not less than thirty enactments relating to this matter have been placed on the Statute-books of Great Britain. Every American state, save three, has laws on the subject. Within the last decade, France, Holland, Belgium, Austro-Hungary, Denmark, Sweden and Norway have passed laws with reference to the observance of Sunday as a day of rest, and laws with regard to this matter are in contemplation, and I do not know but consummated before this time, in Russia and Spain. So, I repeat, that legislation in this line is not a novelty, and when I present this Bill to-day, I do it sanctioned by precedent and usage in England and other countries for ages past.

The Bill, of course, proposes to impose certain restraints. It proposes to impose restraints with regard to labour. It may be urged that this Parliament is exceeding its proper jurisdiction and its proper functions in saying that that which is a natural right, the right of labour, shall be restricted or in any wise curtailed. But it often becomes necessary to curtail what are properly natural rights, for the purpose of promoting the public good. For instance, it is held to be perfectly proper to pass enactments for the compulsory education of children. The parent is the natural guardian of the child, and naturally has the right to decide what the child shall do and what he shall not do; but the law steps in and overrides the parent's natural guardianship and the exercise of what appears to be a natural right, and says that the child shall go to school and be educated. That interference on the part of the state is made because it is desirable in the interests of the state that the child should receive education. The law may and does sanction the selling of liquor; but the same law provides that liquor shall not be sold on Sunday. It abridges the right of the man who has the privilege of carrying on a legal business, to carry on that business on the Lord's Day. The law makes provision with regard to sanitary needs and regulations. The agent of the law can go to your house or mine and command the abatement of any nuisance that may exist on the premises, although under the law the house is the castle of the subject. The law

imposes restraints and limitations upon the exercise of personal and property rights, and it does all these things because it assumes that the action taken is taken in the interest of the great mass of the people, and is for the public good.

It is upon that basis that we justify the enactment of a Sunday rest law. The purpose of the law is to secure the good of the great mass of the people, to secure to those, who perhaps otherwise would be unable to secure that boon, the right to exercise the privilege of Sunday rest upon the seventh day of the week. Sunday rest is, of course, the outcome of modern or Christian civilization. It is not asserted that it was a feature of the Greek or Roman civilization, it is, of course, the natural outgrowth of Christianity, but when we admit that Christianity strengthens the demand for Sunday rest, we assert that it does so merely because it strikes hands with every demand made in the interest of humanity, and this qualification relieves us from the charge of defending here what is exclusively a religious usage or right. We simply find Christianity in touch, in sympathy and in alliance with everything that makes for human good, with everything that tends to uplift mankind, and for that reason Christianity sanctions what this Bill asks of this House—an enactment to secure the labourer in the enjoyment of his civil and religious liberty and in the right to enjoy uninterrupted the exercise of the privilege of rest upon the seventh day of the week.

Now, it may be said that this argument is ill-founded. It may be said that the requirement which I am advocating to-day is one that is contained in the Decalogue, that it is simply the fourth Commandment, part of a religious code, which I am seeking to have embodied in the civil law. I reply that the fact that it is embodied in the Decalogue does not militate against the assertion that it is a proper subject for legislative action. There are other commands embodied in the Decalogue that are proper subjects for legislative action. There is, for instance, the Commandment "Thou shalt not kill." It might as well be argued that that should be left as a matter of conscience, and that the law should not interfere to enforce that Commandment. There are the Commandments: "Thou shalt not steal," "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour"—all these Commandments, in their enforcement, are supplemented, and properly supplemented, by legislation. These Commandments cannot be made binding without the intervention of human legislation. It is for that reason this legislation is asked for, it is in order to secure to the labourer the right to enjoy his day of rest.

But it may be said that this law is unnecessary. It may be said: leave the labourer to judge for himself whether he will rest upon the seventh day of the week or not; allow him the privilege of being a free moral agent in this matter. But unfortunately, in the condition of society that exists to-day, hundreds of thousands of labourers are deprived of the power of exercising their own choice in the matter. Men working for railway companies, men working for corporations, men whose employers demand that they shall work on the seventh day of the week, are powerless to resist that demand. If they do, they lose their situation, and these men ask for the intervention of law to secure to them this right, which otherwise they would not be able to secure or enjoy. Selfish greed and disregard of the rights of others stands in the way of those men securing the right to which they are entitled and which by this Bill it proposes to give them.

I might be asked to point out, as a justification for the enactment of this law, some beneficial fruits or results of rest from labour on the seventh day of the week, and I shall very briefly refer to a few facts, which, I think, warrant me in asserting that beneficial results do follow from Sunday rest. One of the great economic evils of the day is over-production. We have too much food produced, too many textile fabrics, too much of everything. Our markets are glutted, prices are cheapened, the whole course of business is deranged from over-production, and the employment of labour during seven days in the week is calculated to make this evil greater. The employment of labour seven days in the week is calculated to enlarge the volume of over-production, which in six days in the week is already too great. And for that reason, on economic grounds, the adoption of this system of securing a rest day for labour would produce important and beneficial results.

Another reason for this enactment is that without Sunday rest, in all cases, we find among people physical deterioration. It is said by travellers that when you go into countries in Europe where there is no Sunday rest you scarcely ever see an old man, you find the labourers wan and worn and lacking that stamina and vivacity which characterize the labourers in other countries who have their Sunday rest. One of the fruits of Sunday labour is to lower the moral tone of the people, another is the increase of drunkenness and social disorder, another is the decline of public virtue, and the most lamentable of all, and the summing up of all, is national degeneracy. Some of the fruits of Sunday observance, on the contrary, are most commendable and desirable. One of the fruits of Sunday observance, secured by legislative enactment, is protection to the labourer from the greed of capital, from the greed of those who would deprive him of this right for the purpose of swelling their own dividends and the dividends and gains of corporations.

We have as fruits of Sunday observance, better sanitary conditions in society, better public health, a greater degree of cleanliness, a greater degree of self-respect among the people. This is admitted on all hands to be one of the fruits of Sunday observance. We have, as another fruit of respect for the Sabbath, an increase of Christian homes which are graduating schools of Christian citizens, and without which we cannot hope to have a free and independent electorate in this country or a population that will maintain their civil and religious rights. The Christian home is a matter of great importance to the continuance of the liberty of the people and the security of the state. If we do not secure to the people rest from labour on that day, Christian sentiment in the country will gradually and continuously diminish and with it the number of Christian homes.

Another effect of the observance of the Sabbath is the promotion of temperance and of regard for law and obedience to law. These reasons that I have enumerated are of themselves sufficient, from a material standpoint, totally without regard to religious considerations at all, to justify the enactment of this law. The law is calculated to secure good morals, to promote social purity, both matters of the utmost consequence to the statesman who desires to see his country prosperous and its institutions stable. The law is one which is calculated to secure the rights of conscience. The labourer who is deprived of his right to go to church on the Sabbath because a corporation demands that he should go to work, the labourer who cannot join his family in going to church or Sabbath school —that labourer has his conscientious rights trampled upon. He is deprived of the rights of a free citizen, he is deprived of the rights that appertain to civil and religious liberty in a free land. No greater outrage can be imagined than that perpetrated on the labourer who is required to work on the Lord's Day and is too poor to throw up his situation, and who can appeal to no law to protect him in the enjoyment of the right which he ought to enjoy, as a free citizen, of going to church with his family. This law of Sabbath observance is admitted on all hands to be one which aids materially and directly our national development. And this assertion is borne out by the fact that the nations that do regard the Sabbath and observe the requirements of the rest day are the nations that are making the most rapid progress, nations that enjoy the greater stability and greater freedom and have a more desirable condition of affairs as regards material matters than nations that disregard the requirements of this law. I deduce from these statements two conclusions: first, that from the religious standpoint, a law designed to secure to the labourer the right of Sunday rest is a law which tends to secure men's moral and religious advantage; and, in the second place, viewing this question from the civil standpoint that the law is one which is calculated to make for men's social, temporal, and worldly interests. If these deductions are correct, certainly nothing more is necessary to prove that the enactment of such a law is desirable.

Now, it might be well to inquire what authorities favour the enactment of a law of this kind. I have pointed out already that this kind of legislation is not a novelty, but that it has existed in England for more than 900 years, and that Sunday legislation finds a place upon the statute-books of nearly all civilized nations.

I desire now to name a few of the authorities—jurists, statesmen, and ecclesiastics—who favour this regulation. And first, with regard to ecclesiastics, I hardly need to say that scarcely a Protestant clergyman is found who is not in favour of a Sunday rest law. Some two or three years ago, I gave a list of Catholic authorities favourable to an enactment of this character, among them Pope Leo XIII, Cardinal Taschereau, Cardinal McCloskey, Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop Ireland, and other eminent ecclesiastics of the Catholic Church. Among the jurists who have declared in favour of such enactments as this, I would name, Blackstone, Sir Matthew Hale, Field and Webster. I might multiply the list indefinitely, but I choose only a few of the most prominent names in order to show that this principle is upheld by good authorities, by the highest legal as well as the highest ecclesiastical authority. Among these statesmen who have expressly declared themselves to be favourable to Sunday rest enactments, are Disraeli, Gladstone, Shaftesbury, Bright, Lincoln, Garfield, Blaine and Cleveland. Not only is the principle favoured by ecclesiastics, jurists, and statesmen, but it is favoured also by almost all the labour organizations on this continent at least. Among the labour organizations that have explicitly declared in favour of Sunday rest enactments, not from any religious principle at all, not because they are influenced by religious considerations, but because they realize the importance of securing to the labourer his weekly day of rest, are the Locomotive Engineers Association, the Knights of Labour, the Brotherhood of Railway Brakemen, the American Federation of Labour, and the Telegraphic Association of America. So much for the authorities that may be quoted. I might indefinitely extend this branch of my remarks.

Now, Sir, as to the Bill itself. The Bill does not profess to cover the entire field of Sunday observance requirements. It confines itself to matters of national jurisdiction, leaving to the various provinces of the Dominion the care of such branches of this question as pertain more properly to provincial jurisdiction. The Bill confines itself

to four separate clauses. The first provides that Sunday newspapers shall not be issued; the second relates to the opening and closing of the Dominion canals; the third pertains to railway traffic, and the fourth also to railway traffic—that portion of it connected with excursions. Now, these are all matters, with the possible exception of Sunday newspapers, that come exclusively within the jurisdiction of this Parliament, and that would be ultra vires of any provincial Parliament in the Dominion.

And, with regard to the Sunday newspapers, while the provincial legislatures might act upon this question, I hold that it is more desirable that it should be acted upon by the central Parliament. The Sunday newspaper is an evil that confines its baleful operations to no locality, to no city, to no state, but spreads itself over the nation. And, inasmuch as the Dominion Parliament has charge of questions pertaining to the importation of literature, to the transmission of literature through the mails, of copyright and other things having to do with kindred matters, I have always contended that this was the proper source of authority from which legislation should proceed with reference to the Sunday newspaper. And I was borne out in this position by the eminent jurist and statesman, who once led the Government in this House, Sir John Thompson. That eminent gentleman was a supporter of the first two clauses of this Bill. He voted for them, and gave me his active assistance and sympathy in prosecuting this measure, and securing its passage through the House. Two sections of the Bill actually did pass the House of Commons, but were lost in the Senate. The rise of the Sunday newspaper in the United States and the present condition of affairs as affected by the Sunday newspaper there is a matter of very great interest indeed. During the war of the rebellion, one or two newspapers published Sunday editions, one of them being the New York "Tribune." After that edition had been continued for three or four months, it was stopped; and, in an editorial, Horace Greeley stated, as his reason for discontinuing it, that experience had proven to him that it was a step in the wrong direction—that he was entitled, that the compositors in his office and all the men connected with his establishment were entitled to Sunday rest, and he clearly foresaw that to persist in the publication of the Sunday newspaper would be to let loose in the United States a social demon. The Sunday newspaper was afterward resuscitated. At first it had to struggle along and not many were issued. But they received the support of the people, and, one after another, newspaper establishments were swept into this vortex of Sunday publication, because they were placed at a disadvantage with their rivals, who had Sunday editions, unless they followed their example. To-day there are 700 daily newspapers published in the United States on Sunday. Now, these newspapers have had their effect upon the newspaper literature of the United States.

When I ask the question: Has the newspaper press of the United States deteriorated? Every man conversant with the subject will say unhesitatingly, Yes, it has deteriorated. It does not begin to occupy the moral standard or the literary standard that it did occupy in that country before the introduction of the Sunday newspaper. The Sunday newspaper press, its influence upon the social life of the country, its influence upon the moral life of the country, is debasing and disastrous. It begets at the very best a trivial literary taste, and it banishes solid reading. It publishes a Sunday edition of twenty, thirty or forty pages, mostly gossip and scandal, material which ought never to go into the family circle. It banishes religious reading, it banishes solid literature of all kinds, and is an unmitigated literary curse, social curse and religious curse in the United States. The natural attitude of the Sunday newspaper upon all moral questions is hostile, or upon all religious questions at least. It is a violation of God's command, and it naturally scouts at the idea of obedience to those commands. It naturally becomes the enemy of all influences that are calculated to secure in the nation regard to or respect for those religious commands which are so essential to the well-being of the nation and to the continuance of the national life. The natural outcome of the Sunday newspaper evil is what is known in the United States as the foul press, a class of newspapers that are unfit to read. At last the nation is beginning to wake up; and reading-room managers are banishing from their reading-rooms this class of newspapers. The other day the New York "World" and the New York "Journal" were denied admission into the reading-room of Newark, New Jersey, and into the reading-rooms of other cities. They are simply unfit to read. They are unfit to be placed before men, much less to take into families. The natural outcome of entering upon the downward grade introduced by the Sunday newspaper is this foul press, this bestial press, which is the name by which you may characterize a very large percentage of the newspapers of the United States. This is telling most disastrously day after day upon public life, upon society, upon public morals, and is sapping the foundations of national prosperity and strength in that country, sapping public virtue, and rendering the outlook as to the future of that country most dubious and pessimistic. Well, Mr. Speaker, this Bill proposes that we shall avoid the introduction of this peculiarly characteristic American institution, that we shall prohibit the publication and sale of Sunday newspapers

in Canada, that we shall not wait until this evil has acquired the magnitude and the volume that it has acquired in the United States, and has got beyond control; but that we shall throttle the monster in its cradle, and prevent its obtaining a foothold in this country so as to pollute our public life and endanger the stability of our institutions. This is the reason why, in my estimation, we should go for national instead of local control in dealing with this matter of Sunday newspapers.

The second section of this Bill provides that the Dominion Government itself shall not be a Sabbath-breaker, provides for the closing of the Dominion canals which are exclusively under the control of the Dominion Government on Sunday from six o'clock in the morning until nine o'clock at night. It may be possible that conditions exist on some of our canals which would render the strict enforcement of this regulation of doubtful advantage or propriety; and every person in favour of Sunday rest who takes an intelligent and liberal view of the question, of course recognizes the necessity of permitting what are legitimate works of necessity or works of mercy. I say it may be that a strict adherence to the provisions of this section would not be in the public interest. However, this is a question that can be considered later on in committee, and if it is impossible to close such canals as the Sault Ste. Marie Canal throughout the whole of Sunday, why the matter might be left with the Governor General in Council to regulate it in exceptional cases. But the principle is a sound one, and should be embodied in the Bill.

Sections 3 and 4 of this Bill relate to railway traffic. Of course, it is unnecessary to say that the matter of the regulation of railway traffic is one beyond the jurisdiction of provincial legislatures, and that it must be dealt with here if dealt with at all. I felt so great an interest in this matter, and was so anxious to avoid prejudicing the interests of railways, that on Sunday last I visited Montreal for the purpose of interviewing the general manager of the Grand Trunk Railway and the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway with regard to the provisions of this Bill as they might affect railway traffic. I first saw Mr. Hays, of the Grand Trunk Railway. I had sent Mr. Hays a Bill last session, so he was not unfamiliar with its provisions. He informed me that he had no objections to the provisions of the Bill, would offer no objections to its becoming law; that he thought the Bill was one the provisions of which were justifiable, and would meet with the acceptance of railway authorities. The Bill, of course, makes no attempt to curtail through business, it would be ruinous to the interests of the roads to do so. But it has a proviso that whenever the United States Government shall prohibit the running of freight trains upon the Lord's Day, the same provisions shall at once go into force in Canada, under the operation of this Bill. I then went to Sir Wm. Van Horne, and practically he made little objection to the Bill. He said with regard to the Sault Ste. Marie Canal that he would like to see embodied in that section a provision that the arrangement with regard to that canal might be suspended by Order in Council if it was found prejudicial to the public interest at any season of the year. That, and one minor matter about making up freight trains, were all the objections that he offered to this Bill. So I may say to the House that the managers of these two great railway corporations are quite willing that this Bill, with these provisions in regard to railway traffic, shall become the law of Canada; and in committee we will see that Sir Wm. Van Horne's suggestions with regard to the Bill receive due consideration.

I promised when I commenced, that I would not detain the House long. I have endeavoured to present briefly and as pertinently as possible the reasons which, in my estimation, warrant this House in giving its assent to the provisions of the Bill now under consideration. I feel very deeply that this is a matter of vital importance to this country. We cannot afford to treat this matter as one which is of very little consequence to us. The course which this country make take in reference to this matter will tell very seriously upon our future. It is time that the Government of Canada should place itself upon record in recognizing the soundness of the principle of Sunday rest. It is a civil right which should be secured to the labourer so far as the enactment of the provisions of this Act can secure that right to him. Labour, Sir, should be protected, the labourer should be protected—should be protected in his rights of conscience, and can be protected in those rights of conscience only by the intervention of law, and by the kind offices of those who make the laws in this Paraliament. Broad considerations of public welfare should govern our action in this matter. We should divest ourselves of prejudices. We should never for a moment allow ourselves to think that we are enacting religious laws, when we are merely securing for the labourer a right to enjoy what is a civil privilege, the right to rest from labour upon a day which not only we are told in the Decalogue is a day of rest, but a day which it is admitted is a necessary day of rest by all authorities that have dealt with the question. The state in this matter should be upon the side of justice. It is a matter of mere justice that the labourer should be protected in the enjoyment of this right, that the state should be on his side. The state should protect him, the state should secure him from being deprived of that right which is so essential to his material, his moral, his social and his religious weil-being, and which has also so

important a bearing upon our national life, Who, Sir, shall be able to tell us what the importance of that bearing is? We have the future before us. We are a small country in point of population, we are a mighty country in point of resources. We have a million square miles of arable land; we can furnish 6,400,000 farms of 100 acres each to tillers of the soil; we can accommodate a population of from 75,000,000 to 100,000,000 and afford them the means of sustenance in this Dominion. We have not only this vast public domain of fertile area, but we have fisheries of boundless value, we have great timber resources, great mineral resources—we have all undeveloped resources that are necessary to build up a first-class power, and we are engaged to-day, in the business of laying the foundations of that future nation. Do we realize how important that function is? Do we realize what the future has to ask of us, to expect from us? Shall we quarrel here over little matters concerning division of spoils and railway subsidies, and whether we give two or three per cent more or less of protection to this man or that, and neglect laying the foundations of the future, on truth and justice, broad and strong in building up a great nation in Canada; and should we not stop to consider whether the provisions of the Bill now before the House are not provisions essential to secure the stability, the prosperity, the growth of the nation that we hope to build up on this northern half of the American continent? Sir, I solicit from the House the favourable, the candid consideration of this question. I ask the House to divest its mind of all prejudices in regard to this matter, to look at it, not from the standpoint of party politics, not to consider whether the promoter of this Bill has been on one side of the House or the other side of it, but to look at the measure itself, to weigh the consequences that will result from the adoption of this measure, to weigh the consequences that will result from the lack of a law of this kind, and, having considered these points, having arrived at a conclusion, as hon. members must necessarily do, that it is necessary to respect and stand by the safeguards of justice and truth, and to remember that the law which has been given for the good of man cannot be safely disregarded—remembering this I trust, Sir, that the House will give to the measure which I now propose not only its consideration, but its support.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to detain the House very long on this question, but I have a few words to offer. We all admit that this is an important question. Of course, it might be argued that sometimes when this matter is up for discussion, hon. members do not pay very much attention to it; but there may be reasons adduced for that attitude, and good reasons. As I look at this Bill, which is one presented to the House year after year, the first question that comes to my mind is this, is it necessary? Now, I may say that I believe a great many members of this House think it is not necessary, and that it is one of the reasons why they pay very little attention to it. There is a great deal to be said in favour of the argument that this Bill is not necessary. There is no country on the face of the earth, and that is putting it strongly, and yet it is not putting it too strongly, where the Lord's Day is better observed than it is in the Dominion of Canada. We need not refer to the United States, because we all know about that country, and we need not refer to the countries of Europe; but I would venture to say that if we go to England and Ireland, or even to Scotland we would find that the Lord's Day is not as well observed in any of those countries as it is in this Dominion. That is a matter of great pride to us as Canadians; but, at the same time, that is, I admit, a strong argument in the mouths of those who say that a Bill of this nature is not necessary. But another question occurs to me—is this Bill practicable? That is to say, can a Bill be framed which will be workable? Now, what has been our experience in this House? A Bill for the better observance of the Lord's Day has been presented year after year, and has passed the second reading on almost every occasion, perhaps on every occasion, and yet when the Bill has got into Committee of the Whole, objections have been raised to one point and another which could not be answered by those who were in favour of the Bill, objections which could not be surmounted, and so the Bill has fallen through on account of those objections. It is not enough to say that the object of the Bill is a good one, but we have to ask ourselves whether a Bill can be framed that will not do injustice to any one and that will accomplish the objects aimed at. The expression of the House so far has been that it has been impossible to frame a Bill of that nature. So I think we may say that, so far as experience goes, we have not been able up to this time to frame a workable Bill on these lines.

Mr. CHARLTON. We have not tried one; we have not had such a law.

Mr. CRAIG. There is another point, a very important point, and it is as to the duty of this Parliament to pass such a measure. I have heard high authorities express the opinion that it is not our duty to do so. On one occasion, desiring to obtain some advice on this point, I asked an hon. member—and if I mentioned his name he would be recognized as a high authority—if it was the duty of Parliament to pass measures of this character, and he said the duty of passing such a Bill belongs to the provincial legislatures. I think in a great measure that is true. It is said there are some points touched upon by this Bill that are not under the control of the provincial legislature, but I think it will be found that a Bill to carry out

the better observance of the Lord's Day can be more properly passed and executed by the provincial legislatures than by the Dominion Parliament. I must give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) credit for his perseverance in the face of, I was going to say, opposition, but I will say objections that have been urged against this measure which he has introduced year after year. I also give the hon. gentleman credit for being quite sincere in what he is doing. If he has not the satisfaction of seeing this Bill become law, he has the satisfaction of knowing that all over the country a great many people give him credit for his action in this matter. There is one misapprehension, however, which I desire to correct, and it is this: a great many people have the impression that the hon. mover is almost the only man in the House who is anxious to have better observance of the Lord's Day. That is an entirely false impression. I believe the great majority of hon. members are willing to do anything in their power to accomplish the object in view. The hon. gentleman has said that this is not a religious Bill. We admit that contention. The hon. gentleman says the object he has in bringing it forward is for the better protection of the workingmen of the country in the enjoyment of the day of rest. That is a good object, and we all sympathize with him in seeking to attain it, but it is a most difficult result to accomplish. I find that there are four sections in this Bill: the first relating to Sunday newspapers, the second to the canals, the third to railway traffic and the fourth to excursions. Well, now, if we wish to protect the workingmen of this country in the better enjoyment of this day of rest, it occurs to me that this Bill ought to be broader and wider, and ought to touch more subjects than it does. I suppose the hon. member (Mr. Charlton) thought that at the present time it was going as far as practicable, but nevertheless, it seems to me that it discriminates against a great many men who would have no protection in this matter and who are not included in the provisions of the Bill. I sympathize with the hon. member (Mr. Charlton) in what he says about Sunday newspapers. They are objectionable, and I trust the day will never come in Canada when we shall see Sunday newspapers spread broadcast throughout the country as they are in the United States. I believe, Sir, that the strongest protection to this day of rest is the moral sentiment of the people. If that is gone the day of rest will be gone also, but as long as we have such religious sentiment in this country, and as long as we have as high a moral tone as exists now, there is no danger of the Sunday newspapers getting a foothold in Canada. I see no reason at all for making a law with regard to the closing of the canals. That matter rests with the Government of the day. They are the servants of the people, and are supposed to do what is wanted by the people, but I presume that there are occasions on which the canals must be opened on Sundays. I, for one, am satisfied to leave that in the hands of whatever Government may be in power. I believe they will exercise all due caution, and will see that canals are not opened on Sunday except in case of absolute necessity. I am in favour, Mr. Speaker, of anything which will tend to the better observance of the the Lord's Day. I believe at the same time, that we have great reason to be proud of the manner in which that day is observed in Canada. The workingmen of this country are to-day protected by provincial laws, and they are also protected by the moral sentiment of the people in the enjoyment of this day of rest. From my own observations in looking around, I have not seen that their rights in this respect are infringed upon, and if the hon. member (Mr. Charlton) will show to this House, that the rights of workingmen in this respect are not protected then I am sure that the House will only be too glad to assist him in accomplishing his object. While I am in sympathy with this measure, and while I am quite satisfied that the Bill should have a second reading, I am at the same time afraid that its fate shall be what it has been in the past, that it will not be able to run the gauntlet of the committee, and that we shall not be able to frame a Bill which shall accomplish the object which is aimed at.

Mr. CASEY. There is a great deal to admire and agree with in what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) has said in moving the second reading of this Bill. He has told us very properly of the beauties of the due observance of the seventh day of rest, called in the Bill, the Lord's Day or Sunday, and he has told us very truly that we should approach this question in a spirit devoid of religious prejudices. In all that I thoroughly agree with him. On the other hand, there is a great deal in many of the points which have been raised by my hon. friend from Durham (Mr. Craig), and I am inclined to doubt seriously whether this House is within its rights in even passing the Bill, as it stands, to a second reading. I propose to enlarge a little on some of those points, because the subject is one which requires to be cleared of the mists which appear to cling around it in the public estimation.

Now, the title of this Bill would lead us to believe that it contained general provisions for the better observance of the Lord's Day, and that it was in effect an attempt to provide for the people of Canada the only legislation that there is on this subject. If the popular mind accepted that view of the case it would be mistaken. The Bill does not make general provisions for the observance of the Lord's Day, but, as its author tells us, it deals only with the

publication of Sunday newspapers, the closing of canals, the prohibition of way traffic upon railways, and excursions by rail or steamboat. These cover only a very small part of the ground, and if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) wishes to secure a general observance of the Lord's Day as a day of rest, he will have to apply his Bill to all classes of the population. Let us hear something about a day of rest for cab drivers, livery men, coachmen, domestic servants, and a great many other classes which might be mentioned. In my opinion, domestic servants are subject to a great deal more imposition in this respect than the servants of railway companies, for there is a very elastic interpretation of their duties involved in laws and precedents. They may be called upon, at the risk of losing their position, to work at almost all hours of the day and night, Sundays and Saturdays, and if there is a case for providing legislative relief for railway men, there is a still stronger case in regard to domestic servants.

Why are not the employees of electric railways included in this Bill? We know that in many cities in Canada the trolley cars run on Sunday just as regularly as they do on any other day of the week. We know that in the cities of Toronto, Hamilton and Ottawa, the question whether Sunday cars shall run or not is an extremely live one, and one bitterly debated between different classes of the population. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) believes that he has a right to deal with the matter at all, why does he not deal with this phase in his Bill?

But let me come at once to the main objection to the adoption of this Bill by the House. With the exception of the one clause relating to the closing of canals, I do not believe there is a section of this Bill that is within the powers of this Federal Parliament. The British North America Act provides distinctly that property and civil rights shall be within the jurisdiction of the different provinces; and, Sir, if the operation of railways upon Sundays is not a question of property, and if the status of the railway labourer in regard to being compelled to work upon Sunday is not a question of civil rights, then I do not understand the meaning of that classification at all. If any endorsation of this opinion of mine were needed I find it in the fact that in the province of Ontario, under the leadership of the hon. gentleman who is now Minister of Justice in this Government, there has been ample and widely observance of Sunday, with regard both to railways and other matters.

It was under the premiership of Sir Oliver Mowat, the Christian statesman, as we are all happy to call him, that the legislature of Ontario enacted broad and comprehensive Sunday legislation. That hon. gentleman no doubt believed then, and no doubt believes now, that the province had the right to deal with that question, and I think the plain wording of the British North America Act bears him out. But even if his opinion were contrary to mine on the subject, I would be undoubtedly bound to accept his view, on the ground of his superior constitutional knowledge. I claim, therefore, that we have the authority of the Minister of Justice of this Government for the contention that Sunday observance is a question purely within the limits of provincial authority.

It was not without reason that the British North America Act provided this classification. The observance of Sunday is a question upon which the people of all Canada are not unanimous. We have a very Protestant province in Ontario—in some parts of it a strongly Presbyterian province. In my own constituency, I may say, that religious view almost entirely prevails; the people there keep the Sabbath, or the Sunday strictly, according to their conscience. In the province of Quebec, on the other hand, a different view is taken of the obligations of that day. There the restrictions imposed by the Mosaic law are less regarded. The Sunday is looked upon more as this Bill proposes to look upon it, as a day of rest, and perhaps a day of recreation. I am not going to discuss the propriety of one or the other of these views. My Presbyterian constituents look upon Sunday not only as a day of rest, but as a day to be kept holy from wordly concerns and to be devoted to their spiritual welfare. Our friends in Quebec believe in keeping holy that day according to their own views and their own consciences. They do not believe they desecrate it by what they consider innocent amusement and recreation. Now, how is it possible to ask two populations, so different in their views of the obligations of Sunday, to come under one rigid law regarding the observance of that day? It was for that particular reason amongst others that the subject of civil rights was assigned to the different provinces, to decide according to their own will, and that the different provinces have assumed the special right to legislate on Sunday observance.

I think the provision in the British North America Act was thoroughly justified by the differences in our populations. I think the provinces which have taken advantage of that provision of the Act are thoroughly justified by the law and equity of the case. We need not go outside of the province of Ontario to find a different standard of Sunday observance. Go among our German friends in the county of Waterloo, and you will find that they do not look on the Sunday in the same light that our Presbyterian people do. I do not say which view is right or which is wrong. I say it is the civil right of every man in Canada to observe the Sunday according to his own conscience, so long as he does not in so doing interfere

with his neighbours, outrage their feelings of decency, and thereby make himself a public nuisance. All this is outside of the provisions of the Bill. I am not saying that these provisions are too sringent, or that they are not stringent enough. I am merely arguing that they are provisions which should not be enacted by this House, but should be brought before a provincial parliament.

Let me call the attention of the House to the completeness of the existing legislation of Ontario on this subject; I am not so familiar with that of the other provinces. Chapter 203 of the Consolidated Statutes of Ontario is called "An Act to prevent the profanation of the Lord's Day." It provides that no sales shall take place on Sunday, that no ordinary work shall be done, with certain exceptions, that political meetings, tippling, and so forth, shall be prohibited on that day. It is rather a queer collocation of words to place tippling and political meetings together; but so it seemed good to the wisdom of our provincial legislators, and we shall have to accept it. It is not lawful for any person on that day to play at skittles, ball, foot-ball, rackets, or any other noisy game, or to gamble with dice or otherwise, or to run races on foot, or on horseback or in carriages or in vehicles of any sort. Is not that pretty comprehensive legislation? and its constitutionality is not disputed. Except in defence of his property from any wolf or any other ravenous beast or a bird of prey, it is not lawful for any person on that day to go out hunting or shooting. It is not only forbidden to a man to catch fish on Sunday, but to go out fishing, which some members of this House may realize is a very different thing. It is not lawful for any person on that day to bathe in any exposed situation in any water within the limits of any incorporated city or town, or within view of any place of public worship, or private residence. Sunday excursions by steamboats plying for hire or by railway or in part by any such steamboat and in part by railway, and having for their only and principle object the carriage of Sunday passengers for amusement or pleasure only, and to go and return on the same day by the same steamboat or railway, or any other, owned by the same persons or company, shall be unlawful. This is legislation on one of the very points embraced in the Bill of my hon. friend from North Norfolk. Is has stood for years as the legislation of the Ontario legislature, and has been enforced time and again; its constitutionality has never been disputed, and I think it fills the Bill with regard to Sunday excursions. The owner of any steamboat or railway by which any such Sunday excursion is wholly or partly made, is liable to a fine of $400. Then provisions are made for the mode of enforcing the provisions of the Act and collecting the penalties. So far as Ontario is concerned, I think the Sunday observance ground is pretty well covered. Subsequently, I think last year, an Act was passed in regard to the running of electric cars on Sunday, and it applies to all electric railways which have been constructed since that Act. On these grounds alone, I think we ought to hesitate before giving this Bill its second reading.

At the same time, if there is anything in the Bill which the majority of the House consider to be within our jurisdiction, and which they think could be worked into practical shape in the Committee of the Whole, I have for my part no objection to see it pass the second reading, with the distinct understanding that its second reading shall not be taken as a precedent or an endorsation of the principle that this House has the right to legislate generally on the question of Sunday observance.

Coming down to particulars, I will take first that clause which is undoubtedly within our powers and which provides that no canal belonging to Canada shall be open for traffic on Sunday. I beg to point out that this is utterly inconsistent with the clause which permits through traffic over our railways on Sundays. Why should this Bill provide for the stoppage of through traffic by vessels when it does not provide for the stoppage of through traffic by rail? It provides that vessels shall be laid up every Sunday, while through trains of cars are allowed to continue their journey. What would result from this provision in the case of the Welland Canal, the hon. gentleman must know, from his knowledge of the locality. He must know what a tremendous blockage of freight would occur, what difficulty there would be getting that blockage started again on Monday, and what loss of time, and perhaps of markets and money to shippers would result. I am afraid he will find it difficult to advance reasons for the stoppage of vessels and the enforced idleness of sailors, who would not be doing anything while going through the canals on that day, and who would be simply wasting time on the Sunday, while he allows through railway traffic to continue.

As to the publishing of Sunday newspapers, I fully agree with my hon. friend in his detestation of the sort of Sunday literature that is published in the States. I fully agree with him that if such Sunday literature as that became common in Canada, it would have a most disastrous effect on our young Canadian population. But it is not only on Sunday that such literature is published, and what is required is a law which will prohibit its publication on every day of the week. I do not know why it should be a special crime to publish immoral matter on Sunday and not on any other day. In my opinion, it should be an offence to publish such literature on any day, and I will go as far as anybody in providing legislation to prevent it. I do not like to see a

new crime, a new indictable offence, created under the terms of this clause. Who wants to see a little newsboy chased by a policeman down the street, kept in the cells Sunday night, and brought before a magistrate on Monday morning for the offence of selling newspapers on Sunday ? Would not such a law tend more to the demoralization of the newsboys than anything they are apt to see published in any Sunday newspaper in Canada ? As to the importation of immoral matter from abroad, we have a law against that, and it should be enforced.

Then there is an exception made in favour of the gratuitous publication of religious papers on the Lord's Day. I know, as a matter of fact, that a great many people who subscribe to church papers, have them distributed some time on the Lord's Day, either after service at the church door, or to the children at Sunday school, or in some other such way. These papers are not gratuitously distributed, but distributed to subscribers who have paid for them, and this clause would utterly prevent the distribution of such papers in that way. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman wishes to accomplish that, but his Bill certainly would have that effect. Then, how are you to define "religious publications" ? I asked for that definition on a former occasion, and have never yet had a clear explanation. We have amongst us some colonies of Mormons. Those of us who are not Mormons do not look upon propagandist literature of the Mormon church as being very good Sunday reading, but the Mormons no doubt will claim that it is religious literature and as such entitled to be circulated on Sunday. I do not know but that such literature might be as bad reading for our young men and maidens as, let me say, the Sunday "World." Then there is a sect in Canada, whose tenets I do not intend to dispute at all, who believe that the day we keep as Sunday should not be kept as a holiday at all. They keep the Saturday instead, and make it a point of doing as much worldly work on our Sunday as they can without scandalizing their neighbours, and, in some cases, they do it rather ostentatiously. In the western end of my county a man was put in jail for that offence, and a great deal has been said and published about it, which has been circulated by the press of that Seventh Day Advent Church, under the head of religious literature, although its object is to destroy the obligation of keeping the Sunday. I do not think that a better observance of the Lord's Day would be promoted by the circulation of such literature.

As this Bill is not what its name would lead us to expect, a Bill for securing a better general observance of the Lord's Day, as it is a Bill which I believe to be beyond the powers of this Parliament and within the powers of the local legislatures, as it concerns a matter which has been amply dealt with by the local legislatures, I think the House should hesitate very much before passing it to a second reading. I submit my views on this point to those who lead the House in matters of law and policy, and shall submit to their ruling in the matter, but that is my personal and strong opinion on the subject.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). If I were to follow my own judgment in this matter, I would have no hesitation in saying that, with the exception of clause No. 2, the whole of this Bill is ultra vires of this Parliament. All the other clauses seem to me to come clearly within the purview of the provincial legislatures, but I remember that, on a former occasion, the late Sir John Thompson, when Minister of Justice, held the view that clause No. 1 came within our jurisdiction. I confess that I could not see very clearly then, nor can I yet, the force of that opinion, but I am disposed to yield now, as I was then, to the opinion of such an eminent authority. On that occasion, Sir John Thompson agreed to accept this Bill, in so far as the two first clauses were concerned, but would not entertain the other clauses. I am disposed to adopt the same view, but I must say to my hon. friend that when the Bill comes to the committee, I think the whole of section 1 will have to be reconstructed. If we adopt the view held by Sir John Thompson, that we have the right to legislate, in so far as newspapers are concerned, I have no hesitation in saying that the sale of newspapers should be prohibited on Sunday. I cannot see any good reason why an exception should be made in favour of newspapers to the general law prohibiting selling on the Lord's Day, but while I have no hesitation in coming to this conclusion, I submit to my hon. friend that there are, perhaps, strong reasons for recasting the clause, because, if it were to go as it is now, it might be construed to mean that the proprietors or managers of newspapers cannot engage in any work on the Sunday, even for the purpose of preparing the publication of their newspapers on the Monday. This, perhaps, would be straining somewhat the moral obligation, which rests upon all Christians, to observe the Lord's Day, but I imagine that in this age, with the extension the press has taken, every one must admit that newspapers have to be published on the Monday morning, and that necessarily the labour of publication must commence some time during the Lord's Day. That has become necessary by the condition of our civilization at present. Therefore, when in committee, I shall be obliged to ask my hon. friend to reconsider that section so as to make it operate only in so far as the sale of newspapers is concerned.

As to the rest of the Bill, I think that the objections which were raised by Sir John Thompson himself are still good, that there are very strong reasons, indeed, why the Parliament of Canada should not interfere with the traffic by railway. The traffic by

railway has assumed such proportions that a measure of this kind might be so onerous and so damaging to shippers generally, that I must, for my part, adhere to the opinion that Parliament at that time expressed, that it would be unwise to interfere with that traffic. With regard to the excursions on the Lord's Day, I must say frankly to my hon. friend that I am perfectly clear and positive that this Parliament has no possible jurisdiction over that subject. I cannot conceive how the Parliament of Canada could have any more power to prevent steamboats or railways carrying passengers on the Lord's Day than they would have to prevent a cabman carrying a passenger on that day. Parliament would not undertake to legislate upon that subject. This is one of the civil rights which must be left to the provinces, and which each province had better determine for itself. In my province, it is not an offence to have these excursions, while in some other provinces they would be looked upon with disfavour. This is a case in which the morals, education and habits of the people must be considered. I claim for the province of Quebec that, though the observance of the Sabbath is not so rigid as in other provinces, it is as religious as others. It is altogether a matter of opinion. I remember the case of a good Scotchman who happened to live in one of the settlements in my province in which Scotchmen and Frenchmen live contiguous. He expressed the opinion that the French Canadian people were good people, obliging, civil, good Christians and good neighbours, but they played cards on the Sabbath, and he could not understand it. Playing cards is an inoffensive pastime, and is indulged in on Sunday evening in my province. No man would think of not going to church faithfully in the morning. But he allows himself some recreation in the evening. My hon. friend must allow some latitude of habits and manners in observing the day. I think he ought to be satisfied if his Bill, on this occasion, as on the former occasion to which I have referred, is passed with only the first two clauses.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

RAILWAY RETURN FARE TICKETS.

Mr. McLELLAN (Glengarry) moved second reading of Bill (No. 11) respecting railway return fare tickets. He said: I do not feel that it is necessary that I should offer a lengthy explanation of this Bill. It was before the House last session, and I think that the reason it did not pass then was that it was referred to the Railway Committee and, owing to the large amount of business that came before the committee at the last part of the session, my Bill was one of those left over. This Bill is intended to extend justice to men who find it necessary or prefer to travel second class. At present many railways that run second class cars do not issue second class return tickets on proportionately favourable terms with the return first class tickets, so that they discriminate against the class of people that are least able to pay for their passage. The object of the Bill is to compel the issue of second class return tickets at the same percentage of reduction as in the case of first class tickets. Of course this applies only to railways that run second class cars. From this the House will clearly see that it is not my intention by this Bill to put the railway companies to any inconvenience. Suppose two passengers from Ottawa to Montreal and return. One asks for a first class return ticket which is given him. The other asks for a second class return ticket, but is refused. He must then pay full second class fare to Montreal and, on returning, pay the same fare back to Ottawa. By the time he comes back to Ottawa his railway fare will have cost him nearly the same as that of the man who rode first class, in a car that costs very much more money to construct than does a second class car. The objection was raised last session that this would interfere with excursion trains. That is not necessary. Excursions are specially arranged by the companies, for special purposes only, and the Bill can be so modified in committee of the whole as to meet these exceptional cases. I consider that this is a measure of justice; it will prevent discrimination against the poorer class of people, many of whom would enjoy a ride in a second class as much as in a first class car. This is not a party matter or a matter of politics, and every hon. member in this House should be willing to do this measure of justice to the classes of people who desire to take advantage of these rates.

Mr. LISTER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a question. Can he give us any precedent for the legislation he is asking for? Does he know of any country in the world which has a statute such as he proposes here?

Mr. McLELLAN (Glengarry). I know there are certain restrictions placed on the railway companies in regard to the carrying of passengers and the percentage of profit they make upon the capital invested. Then again, a few sessions ago, certain members on the Government side claimed that it should be made compulsory upon railway companies to issue passes to members without any payment at all. If the members of the Government and other hon. members who sit in this House consider that they themselves are entitled to free passes, I think surely the poorer classes of the people of this country, when they are willing to pay a fair and proportionate amount, are justly entitled to privileges that are similar

to those which are enjoyed by those who are better able to pay their fare.

Mr. LISTER. I hardly think that my hon. friend is serious in the legislation which he proposes here. There is hardly a session of this House but that some hon. gentleman feels it to be his imperative duty to introduce some legislation that may have, in his judgment, the effect of popularizing him with the electors of the country. It may be, Sir, that railway companies are not always just. That may be true ; but I think it would be inexpedient at the present moment, with the information which this House has before it, to propose this legislation—because I do not believe that my hon. friend really expects this Bill to pass—which might have the effect of impairing, to a certain extent, the earning power of the railway companies. The hon. gentleman must not forget that in Canada, a sparsely-settled country, we have as great railway facilities as are to be found, I believe, in any other country in the world. He must not forget that in days gone by when transportation was difficult, the capitalists of England and of other countries invested enormous sums in the building of railways in Canada in the hope, no doubt, of getting a profitable return ; but these investments have proved to be very unprofitable. These railway companies are bonded for enormous sums of money, and the constant agitation that is taking place in Parliament, year after year, must of necessity prejudicially affect the securities of these railway companies, not only the securities that have been floated, but the possibility of getting further loans to improve their lines, and borrowing further sums of money. I do not think that a Bill of this kind should be passed without first being well considered by a committee of the House. These railway companies have invested their money in these lines, their property is there ; yet hon. gentlemen feel justified in getting up in this House, over and over again, and treating the property of these companies as if it did not belong to them at all, but really belonged to the people of this country. When we gave them charters we gave them certain rights, and amongst these rights was the collection of tolls. Parliament has control of these tolls. Parliament has the right to say how much should be charged, at least the Railway Act provides that the Governor in Council should fix the tolls. If the hon. gentleman's Bill was an amendment to the Railway Act, placing it in the power of the Governor in Council to provide for what the hon. gentleman seeks here, one could readily understand it. But the hon. gentleman proposes, not to confide in the Governor in Council, which is the forum before which these railway matters must come ; but he wishes absolutely, without investigation, without seeing how it would affect the revenue of the companies, without seeing whether it would impair that revenue so much as to make the working of the lines impossible on account of reduced tolls, without inquiring whether it would have the effect of preventing them from paying interest on the bonds ; in fact, Sir, by a leap in the dark, he proposes to impair, it may be, very seriously the revenue of the railway companies in Canada. The hon. gentleman, I do not think, intends to do any such thing. I rather believe that the hon. gentleman does not desire that the earning powers of the railway companies should be so diminished as to justify them in withdrawing from their work in this country. My firm conviction is that the hon. gentleman has introduced this Bill without that thought and consideration which usually characterize most things which he does in this House. The hon. gentleman talks about passes. I do not remember that the statement he made a moment ago, is strictly accurate ; I do not remember that hon. gentlemen now on this side of the House were in favour of abolishing railway passes. I think that if it came to a vote, probably he would find that these passes would be abolished altogether. But that is a question by itself, it is not germane to this discussion at all. That is something that must be considered by itself. The question may arise in future whether, in the interests of the country at large, it is right and proper that the members of this House should have the right as members to travel upon these railways in attending to their public duties. It may be a question whether it would not be proper that no member should accept a pass from a railway company. It may be that that question which has been so long agitated, and which so many people are in favour of resolving affirmatively, may be adjusted in the same way as has recently been done in the Ontario legislature, namely, that the members of the House should surrender to the railway companies their mileage, and in return for that they should receive a certificate which would entitle them to travel free upon railways. In my judgment that would be a fair solution of this much vexed question—to give the railway companies the mileage of hon. members, and then these would be under no obligation to the companies, if they are now, which I do not believe. I do not think any member of this House is under any obligation to any railway company, or would act in respect of railway legislation any differently than he would if he had not received these passes. I do not think, Sir, there is any House in the world more independent of railway companies, and of other corporations, than the House of Commons of Canada. I have had much experience as a member of important committees of this House, the Railway Committee and the Committee of Banking and Commerce, before which all corporation Bills must be presented, and I have no hesitation in saying that it would be im-

possible to find in all the world a more independent set of men than those who sit upon these committees; and the country has no right to complain, it cannot complain because there is no reason for it. No wrong or injustice has ever been done by Parliament to either the people or to the companies. The members of this House have always tried, to the best of their ability, to do what is right and just for the companies, while always safeguarding the rights of the people. I think that in dealing with my hon. friend's Bill, all these matters should first be considered. We have no right to confiscate the property of these people, we have no right to confiscate the property of railway corporations, or to pass railway legislation that may impair to any extent the contract which this country has made with them. The honour of the people of this country is involved in the treatment of this question. When my hon. friend suggests that railway corporations should be compelled to grant second class tickets, on one fare and a return fare basis, why does he not make the Bill apply to steamboats, and stages, and other transportation companies throughout the country? Why should it be directed against railway corporations alone? I believe my hon. friend, on reflection, will come to the conclusion that this Bill has been introduced without sufficient information, and that he will decide, either to refer it to a committee, or to withdraw it altogether. In any case he should be in a position to furnish information upon the points I have alluded to before he asks Parliament to enact such a law.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat (Mr. Lister) stated at the outset of his remarks that in the past many Bills had been introduced in this House largely with a view to effect. Surely the hon. gentleman cannot complain of legislation of this kind without his mind taking him back to motions made by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House when they were in Opposition. There was our old friend the Bill which was constantly being introduced by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), setting forth that it was a great abuse for members of the House to accept positions under the Crown. Yet we see hon. gentlemen opposite at the very inception of their term of office breaking that rule. Then there was the measure for the abolition of the duty on binding twine. That, too, has been buried with other Bills of the past. Then, again, there was the proposition put forward that a reduction should be made in the salary of the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER. I desire to ask the hon. gentleman to what section of the Bill he is addressing himself. I think he should confine himself to the Bill under discussion.

Mr. LISTER.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The hon. gentleman is talking on railway fares, and I think we can take a ride.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman is taking a ride too far.

Mr. BENNETT. I think the examples I have already given will justify the statement made by the hon. gentleman that too often legislation is attempted in this House for the purpose of effect alone. I do not, however, view the proposition of the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) in that light, and the answer put forward by the hon. member for Lambton is against any interference with the rights or privileges of railway companies on the ground that it may affect or interfere with their earnings or possible dividends to stockholders.

Mr. LISTER. They pay no dividends—no railway companies here pay dividends.

Mr. BENNETT. It may happen that they may do so in time to come. Parliament interferes with railway companies by an Act providing that they shall not charge more than 3 cents per mile to those who may wish to avail themselves of the opportunity of or privilege of riding over them. If Parliament can interfere so as to prescribe a 3-cent-per-mile rate as a fair remuneration, I believe Parliament is, to that extent, interfering with the rights and privileges of the railway companies.

Mr. LISTER. That is in their charters.

Mr. BENNETT. If necessary, perhaps you might insert this proposed change in every charter and make it retroactive.

Mr. LISTER. It would be ex post facto legislation.

Mr. BENNETT. Parliament has often considered this fact, that railways may be interfered with to this extent, that they shall not be allowed to exercise their own free will as to apparatus in connection with their cars, for coupling purposes and otherwise, and Parliament intervenes and provides that at very great expense, regardless of the feelings of the railway companies, that they shall have automatic couplers and other arrangements which must result in putting the companies to great expense in making such changes. A railway company has a perfect right to conduct their business as they please, and it is the privilege or right, at all events, of Parliament to interfere, and declare that the company shall do this or that for the protection of the lives of their employees. Although, at any time, in the event of an accident occurring to an employee a right of action exists against the company. Then, again, I believe that the law respecting common carriers would hold this, that he who proffers to a railway company his goods to be carried has a perfect right to have them carried on that railway, and in the event of the destruction of goods,

through refusal, a railway company is liable in an action for damages. Surely these provisions must be all in the same line as that on which the hon. gentleman has argued, and must operate as an interference with the rights and privileges of the railway company. I am not aware of any case in point in Canada, but I believe on the other side of the line there have been cases brought by men of colour, negroes, who have been refused admission to trains, and in such cases there must have been a strong interference with the rights and privileges of the railway companies, because they were forced against their will to accept passengers whom they did not desire to ride on their lines. If, however, it is good law for the Government of this country to intervene, and say that no railway shall carry a passenger at a higher rate of fare than 3 cents per mile, surely it must be an interference with the profits and earnings of railway companies for if there were no statutory enactment of that kind, they might have power to charge what they wished, which would result in a considerable advance in their earnings. On the principle of reason and common sense, if these cases afford examples of the fair exercise of parliamentary power, even though they do conflict with the rights and privileges of the railway companies, surely it is only fair to say to the companies that second class passengers must have the same rights and privileges as are accorded to first class passengers. The hon. gentleman makes the complaint that the law is only applicable in the present case to railway companies and not to steamboat lines. Well, that is only one of many reforms desirable, but every reform cannot be secured at once. If the hon. gentleman's Bill goes to committee, and comes back and is moulded into legislation, the effect will be such, I trust, as to compel some hon. gentleman to feel that it is his duty in the interest of the travelling public that they should have the same rights accorded them in regard to steamboats as, I trust, this Bill will accord over lines of railway.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not agree with the provisions of this Bill. I think it is small for Parliament to legislate in a matter of this kind. I do not consider this House has any right to dictate to railway companies what they should charge for carrying passengers, any more than it has the right to regulate the rates of freight, except so far as that is provided for in the company's charter. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has referred to the fact that we make laws that railway companies shall apply automatic couplers to their cars. That is in the interest of public safety, and it is our right and duty to protect life and limb, and, therefore, Parliament has wisely taken action in that direction, and I believe during the present session a measure will be placed on the Statute-book which will largely protect and safeguard the people in that respect. But here is a Bill providing that railway companies shall issue second class return tickets at reduced fares because they issue first class tickets at reduced fare. I think it is beyond the duty of Parliament to pass this Bill, that it has no right to interfere in these matters, and that if it possesses such powers, it should go further and provide that steamship companies, stage coaches, and other conveyances carrying passengers should be placed under like provisions to those applying to railways. But he has not gone that far, and he has only introduced this Bill for the purpose of affecting railways alone. To my mind the public has very little to complain of, because second class tickets are generally issued at a very low rate indeed. Since I have had the honour of a seat in this House, I have never heard any request from the public for a Bill of this kind. In no other country that I know of has such legislation been passed, and I believe that the less we interfere with the internal affairs of a railway company the better it will be for all concerned. As has been pointed out, railway corporations are not so flourishing in this country that we need to hamper and obstruct them in every way we possibly can. When we have protected the safety and convenience of the public, I do not think we should go any further. This law might have more effect upon the financial standing of railways than the hon. member (Mr. McLennan) has probably foreseen, and it should be remembered that passenger rates at the present day are down to the lowest point ever known. The railway companies, no doubt, see for themselves that it is in their own interests to reduce rates as far as they can. There has been no grievance pointed out in this matter, and there has been no public demand for such legislation, so that I believe the Bill is not one which should receive the sanction of this House.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Mr. Speaker, the House I am sure, readily appreciates the motive which impels my hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) to again introduce this Bill. The reason which he gave is in itself a very commendable one, his object being, as he says, to come to the help of the poorer classes who travel second class on railways. I do not see, however, that the ground which he has taken can meet with the acceptance of this House. As the law exists at the present time, there is no injustice so far as I can see, done second class passengers. If the law compelled railway companies to issue first class return tickets, then the argument of my hon. friend would be irresistible, and railway companies should give the same privilege to second class passengers, but there is no law at present to compel railway companies to issue return tickets at all,

and if they do so it is because it is a matter of business. They do it from no spirit of philanthrophy, or from favouritism to the wealthier class of people, but they do it because they believe that it will be an inducement to travel and that they will get more returns into their coffers. We may assume, that if the railway companies were not gainers by that system they would put an end to it, and so, as a matter of business the railway companies find it to their advantage to continue the system. Why is it that they afford the privilege to one class o passengers and not to another class? It is evidently because the same business reasons would not apply to second class passengers as apply to first class. Under these circumstances, I ask my hon. friend (Mr. McLennan), if it is advisable to attempt to curtail by legislation the manner in which railway companies should carry on their business. It seems to me that it is a most vicious principle to attempt to interfere with what is the legitimate business of any class of citizens of this or any other country. It is quite clear to my mind, and it must be apparent to everybody, that if the railway companies have not afforded this privilege to second class passengers, it is not through any want of courtesy, but simply because the interests of their business prevent them from so doing. If the Bill were to pass, the probable consequence would be that rather than have their business interfered with in this manner, the companies might think it advisable to refrain altogether from issuing return tickets. The arguments are altogether against the Bill of my hon. friend (Mr. McLennan), but I will not depart on this occasion from the procedure which was adopted formerly. On looking over the debates when this Bill was discussed last year, I find that it was allowed to go to a second reading and then referred to the Committee on Railways and Canals, where probably the discussion on it would be more adequate than it could be on the floor of this House. I think, therefore, that the Bill should be read a second time and go to the committee.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry) moved:

That the said Bill be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Motion agreed to.

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

After Recess.

BUILDING SOCIETIES AND LOAN AND SAVINGS COMPANIES.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton) moved second reading of Bill (No. 12) further to amend the law respecting Building Societies and Loan and Savings Companies carrying on business in the province of Ontario. He said: This is a very short and simple Bill, and explains itself possibly much better than I can. The principal object of the Bill is to give confidence to parties who lend money to building societies. Up to the present time the law has been such that a building or loan society might be organized, and the capital paid in, and a board of directors elected who might re-lend all the capital back to the shareholders upon their stock. This has been found to be an obstacle when these building societies went to the foreign market to borrow money. We purpose by this Bill to do away with that. The first clause reads as follows:—

No permanent building society or loan and savings company incorporated under the Act of the legislature of Ontario respecting building societies, or carrying on business in the province of Ontario thereunder, shall make loans or advances to its shareholders upon the security of their stock in the said society or company to a greater amount than one-tenth of the aggregate amount of the fully paid-up capital of the said society or company.

This is a step in advance, and I am quite satisfied it will give such security to the foreign lenders of money that they will have much more confidence in our building societies in the future than they have had in the past. I purpose to add a proviso to this clause, which will still further restrict the lending powers of a company. It reads as follows:—

Provided that, subject to the above limitation, any loan corporation may pass a by-law prohibiting absolutely the lending to shareholders upon the security of their stock, or limiting the aggregate amount which may be so lent, and it shall not be lawful for any corporation to repeal such by-law until the liabilities of such corporation be discharged.

This I think is a very necessary safeguard in connection with the loaning powers of these societies. Another point: Under the old law, shareholders, no matter how many shares in the company they were responsible for, were permitted to have only so many votes as would be represented as fully paid up shares by the aggregate amount they might have paid up on all their shares. We purpose to do away with that, and to give the shareholder a vote for every share he is responsible for. Then, we provide:

No shareholder who is in arrear with respect to any call on his shares, or is in default to the society or company, shall be eligible to be elected a director.

This, I think, is a very necessary provision. The third section provides:

Subsection 2 of section 1 of chapter 24 of the Statutes of 1882 is hereby repealed.

That subsection must be repealed, so that it will not clash with section 2 of this Bill.

Subsection 2 of Chapter 24 of the Statutes of 1882 reads as follows :—

Provided further that, with respect to any new shares issued under the provisions of this Act which have not been paid up in full, the holder thereof shall, in respect thereof, be entitled to as many votes at general or special meetings of the society or company as the amount paid up on such new shares held by him would represent in fully paid-up shares of the society or company, issued irrespective of this Act.

This subsection we purpose to repeal by this Bill. Clause 4 of the Bill is, I think, a very important one. It exempts executors and trustees from personal liability to the company for shares that may be uncalled or unpaid-up. I think it would be unfair if executors and trustees who do not own the shares they hold, were called upon to pay up such shares when in arrears, as they are liable to be under the old law, simply because they are acting the part of a friend to a widow or orphans. Clause 4 is as follows :—

No person holding stock or shares in such society or company as executor, administrator, guardian or trustee of or for any person named in the books of the society or company as being so represented by him, shall be personally subject to any liability as a stockholder, but the estate and funds in his hands shall be liable in like manner and to the same extent as the testator, intestate, ward or person interested in such trust fund would be if living and competent to hold the stock in his own name ; and if the trust is for a living person, such person shall also himself be liable as a stockholder or shareholder ; but if such testator, intestate, ward or person so represented is not named in the books of the society or company, the executor, administrator, guardian or trustee shall be personally liable with respect to such stock or shares as if he held it or them in his own name as owner thereof.

If the executor or trustee holds these shares, and those for whom he holds them are not named on the books of the company, it is taken for granted that he is the owner of the shares, and should be held liable for them, and responsible to the company for all calls made in respect of them. The next clause also, I think, is an important one.

5. No person holding stock of such society or company, as mortgagee or pledgee shall be personally subject to liability as a shareholder, but the person pledging such stock as such security shall be considered the holder thereof and shall be liable as a shareholder with respect thereto so long as he is entitled to redeem the said stock.

That means that if any shareholder pledges his stock or if any person holding stock pledges it to a third party, the person who pledges the stock is the one who shall be held responsible and not the party who lent the money upon it. I think that is a very important clause which those engaged in lending money will appreciate and understand. Another very important clause is the sixth, which provides :

6. If any such society or company issues partly called shares at a premium, and the reserve fund is afterwards reduced, the rate of premium payable to the society or company upon any subsequent call may be reduced in the proportion of the reserve at the time of such call to the reserve at time of issue,—the amount of the reserve in each case being taken to be the amount shown by the next preceding yearly audit.

It is well understood that societies of this kind have frequently increased their stock and at a premium. Some years past the capital stock of these societies sold at a very high premium, but unfortunately, of late years the premium has not continued as it was in former years. Therefore we think that it would be unfair that a man who subscribes stock when it was at a premium of 30, 40 or 50 per cent should be called upon to continue paying calls on the same basis.

There are further clauses I wish to add to the Bill, of which I gave notice in the Votes and Proceedings, on page 68. These additional clauses I propose to add to the Bill when we go into Committee of the Whole. I think that the Bill is one which this House should seriously consider and pass to its second reading and then refer to the Committee of Banking and Commerce, where, I have no doubt, it will receive proper attention.

At this late day I need not refer to the advantages which these loan societies have been to the country at large. In days gone by, when these societies did not exist, the farming community particularly had very great trouble in raising small loans from banks or individuals and had to pay very exorbitant rates of interest. Happily for the borrowing public, these days have passed away, and to-day, in consequence of the large amount of capital brought into this country by these loan societies, we can now borrow money on good security from most of them at from 5 to 6½ per cent. That is a very great improvement on the old days when you had to go to a private borrower and pay ten or twelve per cent, and then were required to have two or three endorsers. To-day a man can go to a loan society and if he has good security, he can get money at a reasonable rate of interest.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 8.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 9th April, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 17) to incorporate the Winnipeg, Duluth and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Macdonell, Selkirk.)

Bill (No. 18) to confer certain powers on the Board for the management of the Temporalities Fund of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Bill (No. 19) respecting the Manitoba and South-Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Landerkin.)

Bill (No. 20) respecting the Hull Electric Company.—(Mr. Lavergne, for Mr. Poupore.)

Bill (No. 21) respecting the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Oliver.)

Bill (No. 22) respecting the Trans-Canadian Railway Company, and to change the name of the company to the Trans-Canada Railway Company.—(Mr. Davis, Saskatchewan.)

Bill (No. 23) to incorporate the Methodist Trust Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Britton.)

Bill (No. 24) to incorporate the Manitoba and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Douglas.)

Bill (No. 25) to confirm an agreement between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Hull Electric Company.—(Mr Gibson.)

Bill (No. 26) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada.—(Mr. Gibson.)

Bill (No. 27) to incorporate the Royal Victoria Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Quinn.)

Bill (No. 28) respecting the Ontario Pacific Railway Company, and to change the name of the company to the Ottawa and New York Railway Company.—(Mr. Snetsinger.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. CHOQUETTE moved the adoption of the first report of the Committee to supervise the official report of the Debates of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I think this report has just been sent to the Clerk's table, and read. I have heard no reason given as to why the quorum should be reduced. The proper course to pursue is to place the report on the records, and let it be moved on another day.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The only question involved is a reduction of the quorum to five members, which is the usual number.

Mr. FOSTER. We have heard no reason given for the reduction. The rule is to allow the adoption of the report to stand over until the next day.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Stand.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the point is insisted on, the hon. gentleman will have to give notice.

THE ESTIMATES—A TYPOGRAPHICAL ERROR.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I should like to draw attention to a typographical error in the Estimates which have been laid on the Table of the House. While I understand fully that this cannot be corrected at the present moment, I should like to have it understood that as regards items 83 and 84 the figures opposite those items have been interchanged in the printing of the Estimates. Item 83 should read $80.000, and item 84 $100,000 ; instead of item 83 reading $100,000 and item 84 $80,000. The items are connected with advances in connection with butter making in the North-west and in connection with cold storage.

Mr. FOSTER. You cannot change the latter one.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not now.

EASTER ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire from the First Minister, if any statement can be made as to the time that is likely to be covered by the Easter adjournment. Those of us who live a long distance away would like to get some information as to this, if it is possible for the Government to give it now.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The usual adjournment is generally from Thursday of holy week until the following Tuesday, and therefore the Government propose to ask the House to adjourn from Thursday next to the following Tuesday.

An hon. MEMBER. Inclusive ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No, not inclusive. We will meet on Tuesday at 3 o'clock.

Mr. HUGHES. From the close of the session of Thursday ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Mr. ELLIS. May I make this observation? Those of us who live five hundred miles from here, and remain on Thursday, have to travel half the day of Good Friday in order to get home.

The PRIME MINISTER. The intention of the Government is as I have announced. We have no particular wish in the matter, and we are in the hands of the House, so far as that is concerned. If the general wish of the House were to the contrary, that the House should adjourn from Wednesday to Tuesday, we have no objection.

Mr. GIBSON. I have been asked, as one of the whips of the party, what the intention of the Government is on the matter brought up by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Ellis). I wish the First Minister could say now, that we might go home on Wednesday night so as not to do violence to our conscientious scruples by travelling on Good Friday. It should be remembered that Holy Thursday is also a holiday.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. GIBSON. I am not speaking now as a Presbyterian, but as the whip of the Liberal party. I would like the First Minister to decide this question now. If the House should adjourn from Wednesday night until the following Tuesday, it will, I believe, meet with the approbation of gentlemen on both sides of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GIBSON. Except, perhaps, those who live in Ottawa.

The PRIME MINISTER. If the tenderness of the conscience of my hon. friend (Mr. Gibson) is shared generally by the members of the House, the Government will have to yield to that, and adjourn on Wednesday instead of Thursday.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. McINNES. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to make a few remarks on a question of privilege. It appears that the remarks which I made last Monday in support of a motion asking for the disallowance of a British Columbia statute, have not pleased the Toronto "Globe." On the contrary, that paper has taken exception, and violent exception, to some of my statements. The portion of my speech which they object to is as follows:—

> Take the attitude of the "Globe" in this matter. Why, Sir, from judging its past, you would have supposed that it would have stood up firmly for the people, in favour of securing to the great masses of the people their rights, that the attitude upon this question of the men who control it, would have had a clear and certain ring of "neverism" about it. What is the fact? I have no hesitation in saying that from the time, some months ago, when they took up this matter with extraordinary, sudden and intense interest, their attitude has been characterized by cant and deception. Sir, they have been beating about the bush for month after month, suggesting what they dare not openly state. They have dealt in a profusion of arguments that have been ingenious at times, but invariably unprincipled. Now, after all these months of pretended discussion and unfair statement of facts with regard to this matter, they finally pretend to come to the conclusion and that conclusion is definite only in this that the Canadian Pacific Railway, their masters, should build that line.

They have seen fit, on account of my using that language, to write editorially in the "Globe" of April 6th, as follows:—

> Let him carry his rhetoric to Victoria if he wants to manage the local affairs of his province. And let him abuse the "Globe" to his heart's content. He has perhaps the right to lie and slander under the protection of the privileges of Parliament, and we cordially agree that he is an expert at the business.

In the issue of the same paper of yesterday it concludes an article in the following language:—

> If the "Globe" made an attack upon Mr. McInnes, it was in reply to a scandalous charge against this paper made deliberately on the floor of Parliament, a charge that we brand as a falsehood, and its author as a liar and a slanderer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I may say that, in the first instance, when this matter was brought to my attention, I had not the slightest idea of bringing it before the House, but after the "Globe" has reiterated the statement, and after it has repeated the insult, I feel that were I to allow it to pass by with that contempt which I would like to give it, my silence might be construed into an acknowledgment, that possibly I did make statements which were either untrue or unwarranted. I have nothing whatever to detract from what I stated last Monday. What I said, I believe, was true. I believe that I was altogether warranted in making the statement which I did, by circumstances which are within my knowledge, and within the knowledge of most hon. gentlemen present.

And, Sir, I can say that I am more inclined to believe in the absolute truth of every statement I made, on account of the extraordinary exhibition which the "Globe" has made of itself in regard to this matter, and the bald denials it has given without a scintilla of argument in refutation of what I stated. I felt that I had a duty to perform in connection with this British Columbia question. The matters which I brought forward, and the statements which I made in support of my motion, were not made either to please or displease the "Globe." I did not bring the matter forward, or speak as I did to either please or displease the Canadian Pacific Railway or any person else. I conceived that I had a duty to perform towards my province, and that it was my duty to ventilate a condition of affairs which certainly, in my opinion, demanded prompt and firm action on the

part of this Parliament. I am not at all overcome by the attack which the "Globe" has made upon me, feeling that I have simply done my duty in this matter. I say again, Sir, that it is only because further silence on my part might be construed into an acknowledgment that I had misstated facts, that I wish to call your attention briefly to the statements I made, and to give you some reasons which I think will amply justify every statement that I have made.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McInnes) stated that he rose to a question of privilege. In that case, the hon. gentleman will understand that he should conclude with a motion, but if the hon. gentleman rises to a question of personal explanation, that is a different thing. The hon. gentleman himself stated that he rose to a question of privilege. May I ask, is it a personal explanation or a question of privilege.

Mr. McINNES. Mr. Speaker, I am not sufficiently familiar with the rules of this House to know exactly what I should do, but I certainly wish to have an opportunity afforded me of showing that the remarks which I made in my speech of Monday last were absolutely warranted.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman is making a personal explanation he can proceed. I merely wish to have it in proper parliamentary form.

Mr. McINNES. Then, Sir, I rise to make a personal explanation. I said, among other things, on Monday last:

> I have no hesitation in saying that from the time, some months ago, when they took up this matter with extraordinary, sudden and intense interest, their attitude has been characterized by cant and deception.

There can be no doubt about it, Sir, that the "Globe" did take this matter up with a sudden, extraordinary and intense interest at the start. Why, Sir, it surprised people in eastern Canada to see the "Globe" taking such an interest in this undertaking. It was a new scheme to the people of the east. No person in the east seemed interested in it five or six months ago; but notwithstanding that fact, the "Globe" came out in the early part of November of last year and dealt with this matter editorially. It published strong editorials day after day and week after week, and it has continued that course up to the present time. We did not know at that time what was the reason for that sudden and intense interest; we had no clue; but I am going to show that subsequent events proved that there was a very good motive, from its standpoint, for the "Globe" dealing with this matter with such intense interest. I say that its attitude has been characterized by cant and the grossest deception. It is not my purpose to go through the files of the "Globe" to show that this has been so. Time will not permit, but no person can look through the files of that paper without coming to that conclusion. A case has occurred, however, in the past week which I think will show hon. gentlemen that there is ample justification for the statement I make. In its issue of April 1st, dealing with this matter, the "Globe," amongst other things, has this to say editorially:

> Whatever it may have parted with, it, the province, retains royalties, which will enable it to reap a considerable benefit from the working of the mineral resources of the country. It is estimtaed that the 5-cent royalty on coal would yield in the Crow's Nest Pass region $1,248,800 per square mile, or $179,827,200 in all, the area being estimated at 144 square miles.

In the issue of April 7th, the "Globe" reverts to the same argument, and after quoting my figures with regard to the enormous amount of coal in that coal basin, it says:

> Whichever price we take, we know that the provincial royalty on coal is 5 cents a ton, and this, on the second estimate quoted by Mr. McInnes, would give a total royalty of nearly two billion dollars to the province, whose railways we are asked to build! Figuring on the more moderate estimate of the Geological Survey, Mr. Elias Rogers estimates that the royalties coming to the province will aggregate $179,827,200. For the Dominion to build the road while the province receives all the revenues by way of royalty or taxation is, we think, out of the question, and it is chiefly upon this ground that we oppose a disallowance which is evidently sought merely as a step towards Government construction.

This statement is absolutely incorrect, and it comes either from designed deception or from an ignorance which is inexcusable in regard to this matter. The province has not retained the right to collect any royalty at all on coal in the lands alienated to the British Columbia Southern Railway Company. It is true, in the case of lands taken up under the British Columbia Land Act, the coal, should there be coal, is reserved to the Crown, with the right of the Crown to exact a royalty from it, when worked, of 5 cents a ton. That provision applies only to such lands as are taken up under the Land Act of the province. There is not a scintilla of truth in this statement in the "Globe," which has been reiterated on several occasions, that the province still holds the right to place a royalty of 5 cents a ton on the coal which has been alienated to the British Columbia Southern Railway Company. It may be said that the province has the right to tax anything in the province. Undoubtedly it has; but it could never and would never put a tax upon that coal, for this reason, that if it now imposed and exacted a royalty on the coal worked in that region, it would have to exact a royalty on the coal now worked in the province, and the unfortunate fact is that the coal trade in British Columbia will not at the present time stand any

such royalty. The result is, that the province could not discriminate between the coal mines in the interior and the coal mines on the coast. Therefore, this whole argument of the "Globe," based on this idea, is utterly fallacious; yet it states that this is the chief ground on which it opposes disallowance. You would have thought that the "Globe" would have been actuated by higher principles; and, indeed, from the former part of the editorial of that day you would have thought that it would have agreed with the Hon. Mr. Davies, and would have supported the policy of the Liberal party in regard to disallowance. It stated, however, that this was its chief reason for not supporting disallowance. That reason is now swept from under its feet, and I am going to wait and see whether it will now come out and support a motion for disallowance. Sir, it will not support it, and for a very good reason. It is not for the reason that it assigns in this editorial, or because it believes in the Liberal principle of non-disallowance. It is because if that Act were disallowed, some of the prominent directors of the "Globe" would fail to make the big haul which they are now making because of their interest in the charter of the British Columbia Southern Railway Company. I have stated that for months past the "Globe" has been suggesting what it dared not openly state. There can be no doubt about that. So apparent has that been that one of the prominent Liberal papers of Ontario—a paper which I do not think takes a second place even to the "Globe"—a paper which has been consistently Liberal, whether it pleased the people in Quebec or anywhere else—the Hamilton "Times"—took occasion on the 26th of February to make the following remarks on the "Globe's" attitude on this subject:

> The onus rests with the "Globe" to show that the interests of the people will be better served by handing the railway over to the C.P.R. than by allowing the control to remain in the hands of the Government. So far, the "Globe" has lamentably failed to make out a case in favour of C.P.R. control. Its arguments are all on the defensive. It does not attempt to show how the country will be benefited by allowing the C.P.R. to control and operate the road. Its argument in favour of C.P.R. control takes the form of an apology. It excuses the proposed deal. It does not champion it.

That language is almost identical with the language I have used; and, coming as it does from that high Liberal authority, I do not think any exception can properly be taken to my remarks in that regard. Sir, I said that the conduct of the "Globe" in this matter had been characterized by lack of principle, and I said it advisedly; for we cannot forget that the time was when the "Globe"——

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the hon. member allow me to make a suggestion to him? So far as personal explanations are concerned, I certainly think that the limit has been somewhat passed; but I would suggest to the hon. member that he should state to the House now, if he proposes to go on, that he intends to move a motion that will put him in order; because I do not want a precedent established that personal explanations may be accompanied by such a lengthy argument. If the hon. member wishes to continue in the same line, he will be good enough to move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. McINNES. Then, Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will move the adjournment of the House. I was proceeding to say that I charged, and charged advisedly, that the action of the "Globe" in this matter was characterized by lack of principle. I say that because we cannot forget that for years past the "Globe" was the avowed opponent of the Canadian Pacific Railway. To-day we find it the greatest friend in the country of the Canadian Pacific Railway. We see it advocating subsidies being granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway for bogus concessions in return. In the past the "Globe" has always opposed monopoly and everything which partook of the nature of monopoly; but, Sir, we see the "Globe" to-day supporting a policy which will create the greatest monopoly that has ever existed in this country. The "Globe" in times past has appeared to be very much interested in the progress of that western country, but its attitude at this time will have the effect, if effect is given to it, of placing the future of that country in the hands of a grasping monopoly the like of which has never before existed in this country. I say again that the "Globe" has been unprincipled in this matter, that it has been a mere political weathercock, that it has acted more like a nickel-in-the-slot machine that is prepared to do any turn or take any stand that is lucrative to its owners.

I said further:

> After all these months of pretended discussion and unfair statement of facts with regard to this matter, they finally pretend to come to a conclusion, and that conclusion definite only in this, that the Canadian Pacific Railway, their masters, should build that line.

It is evidently to that statement, above all others, that the "Globe" takes such strong exception. Sir, I have not one syllable of that to withdraw. There are circumstances which amply justify it. True, I come to a conclusion from circumstantial evidence, but, as hon. members know, many a man has been hanged on circumstantial evidence, and evidence nothing like as strong as that which can be adduced to show that the "Globe" is implicated in this deal. There are several circumstances which point to that. The first is that the "Globe," although in the past has been the avowed enemy of the Canadian Pacific Railway—none stronger in the country—is yet, at the present, pleading for the Canadian Pacific

Railway to construct that railway as against every other line. Sir, if the "Globe" were not interested in this matter, why should it not, at all events, pursue a policy that would give to the people of British Columbia an independent means of exit? On the contrary, they not only pooh-pooh the idea of a line independent of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but they are not even in favour of the good Liberal principle of the Government owning that line, notwithstanding it can be shown that the line would be a paying concern and would cost the taxpayers of the country not one cent. There is another fact which shows that the "Globe" and the Canadian Pacific Railway are a unit in this matter, which shows that there is a mutuality of interest, and gives us reason to conclude that its attitude is dictated by the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is a peculiar coincidence that at the very time the Canadian Pacific Railway became interested in this line in the North-west, the "Globe" took it up. We did not hear a word about it before in that organ, but the very moment the Canadian Pacific Railway became the purchasers of the British Columbia Southern charter, with all the grants included in it, the "Globe" took the project up and boomed it for all it was worth. There are other facts in this connection that are very suggestive. Two of the prominent directors of the "Globe" undertook to sell the British Columbia Southern Railway charter to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the Canadian Pacific Railway thus became interested in that charter and in the maintenance of all the grants given to the British Columbia Southern Company by the province of British Columbia. We know further that prominent members of the Canadian Pacific Railway are shareholders in the "Globe." Put all these facts together, and you have a mutuality of interest between the "Globe," the Canadian Pacific Railway and the British Columbia Southern Railway, which necessarily forces on us the conclusion that the course of the "Globe" in upholding the purchase of the Canadian Pacific Railway, in advocating subsidies to the Canadian Pacific Railway for bogus and empty concessions in return, is not disinterested, but, on the contrary, characterized by deception and fraud.

Notwithstanding all this, the editor of the "Globe," in last night's issue, comes out and says that he is above all these things which are going on in the directorate of his company. He would have us believe that he is immaculate in his sanctum and utterly uninfluenced by what is going on among his directors, that he knows nothing about it, and is not actuated or influenced by it in the least. Sir, I cannot accept that. There is not a man in this House who will believe that when the president and one of the most prominent shareholders in the "Globe" company are interested in a scheme, their organ will be absolutely disinterested and unprejudiced. There is not an hon. member who will believe that if the Canadian Pacific Railway has shareholders on the "Globe" directorate, who are interested in this matter, as I have shown they are, the "Globe" will pursue that disinterested course which, under ordinary circumstances, it might be expected to pursue. That is too much to expect. No business is transacted in that way. There is not a newspaper office in the country that would be worked that way. We all know that the man who pays the piper can select the tune. We also know that by the tune which is played we can very often tell who is paying the piper, and when the editor of the "Globe" comes out with his Brobdingnagian blast, the great majority of the people will be more inclined to believe that it is but an echo of the wishes of the great mercenary owners of that paper.

Now, I wish to point out that if the statements which I made the other day in this House lacked point, if they were not incisive, if they did not hit the nail on the head, why in the world did not a straight argument come from the "Globe" repudiating them. Surely if what I said were absolutely incorrect, if there was not a scintilla of truth in it, there would be some reply to it besides the cry: "You are a liar and a slanderer." The people of the country will not be satisfied with that. They have a right to insist that the "Globe" should come down with some definite statement to disabuse the mind of the public regarding the connection of that paper with this scheme, or else they will accept the statements which have been current and which I reiterated in the House last Monday. I would say to the editor of the "Globe" to come down off the perch a little. I would ask him to rid himself of this assumed spirit of indignation. I would ask him to get rid of that appearence of injured innocence which he assumes and come down to facts. Let him deal in facts, because that is what the people want in this matter. There is no use in dealing in recrimination and offensive language. for that serves no purpose at all. Let him explain if it is a fact that the directors of the "Globe" are interested in the British Columbia Southern Railway and coal lands out there. Let him state if, through the instrumentality of the directors of the "Globe," the Canadian Pacific Railway were induced to purchase that charter when previously they could not be induced to do so. Let the "Globe" explain why it was that, just as soon as the Canadian Pacific Railway and just as soon as the directors of the "Globe" became interested in this matter, the "Globe" came out editorially in support of the scheme? Let them explain, furthermore, why, in connection with this matter, they have abandoned principles which are undoubtedly

Liberal principles; why they are opposing the Government construction of that line, when it would, beyond a doubt, be a paying investment to this country. Let them explain why they are not opposing monopoly in regard to this matter as they have denounced it in the past. Let them explain why they are turning their backs upon the west and abandoning us to a stupendous monopoly. And let them explain, above all, why when their conduct is questioned, they have only torrents of abuse to turn upon the person who thinks it his public duty to call attention to the matter. Sir, until these matters are cleared up, I have no fear in standing in this House or any place else in public and stating what I have stated; and I am perfectly willing that the general public should judge who is the liar and the slanderer.

I can tell the "Globe" that I do not intend to be prevented from doing my duty by any methods of blackguarding that they may indulge in. If vilification coming from the hirelings of monopolists and a corrupted press could have deterred me from speaking out in matters of this kind, I should not be here to-day. I have opposed monopoly hitherto and I will oppose it and denounce all who, to my mind, are coquetting with it. During the elections of last June, I fought for what I thought to be best for the monopoly-cursed masses of the west. I have their confidence, and do not intend to betray it even in the altered atmosphere of this Parliamentary chamber. Whatever I might be inclined to do under ordinary circumstances, these are most extraordinary circumstances; when I see that fair western province with all its wealth threatened with complete subjugation to monopoly, I consider I would be unworthy of a seat in this House, I would be untrue to the interests of the people I represent if I did not cry out against the impending calamity and denounce those who are endeavouring to profit by the ruin of my province. My duty is clear; I have taken a stand and I intend to keep it, whether it pleases the "Globe" or any person else or not. I take the stand that seems to me to be dictated by my duty in the interest of my constituents, of my province and of the country generally; and I am ready and willing at any time that my constituents should have an opportunity of saying whether they endorse my action and conduct upon this matter, or whether they prefer the despicable attitude taken by the "Globe." I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

Motion to adjourn, negatived.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the leader of the Government, as I do not see the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) here, if he can take the House into his confidence for a moment and tell us when the tariff will be brought down.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). In the absence of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, I may say that I have reason to believe that he will be in a position to make that announcement on Monday.

THE FRANCHISE ACT.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick) moved second reading of Bill (No. 7) to consolidate and amend the law relating to the election of members of the House of Commons. He said: In my explanation at the time of introducing this Bill, I stated that the object was, in the first place, to consolidate the present law with reference to Dominion elections, and that in the consolidation will be found certain amendments. When I state that at the present time one who wishes to understand the law with reference to Dominion elections finds it necessary to consult fourteen or fifteen different statutes, hon. members will be impressed with the necessity and wisdom of consolidating the law upon this subject. This Bill provides for the repeal of the Franchise Act of 1885 and the substitution of provincial franchises, provincial lists and provincial polling divisions. With reference to this particular part of the Bill, I take it for granted that it is almost universally admitted that the time has arrived when it is necessary to make some changes in the franchise law. That appears to have been admitted on all sides and the only question which it was at all necessary to discuss is as to the direction that these should take. The Franchise Act of 1885 was found to be cumbersome and expensive, expensive not only to the state—and that will be accepted by hon. members when I say that since that law came into force in 1885 an expenditure of over a million dollars has been incurred under it by the state—but also to those who had occasion to take part in political matters. I think I can venture to assert that each revision of the tariff that took place involved an expenditure of from $200 to $300 by every member of this House. Not only were the public subjected to this inconvenience and expense, but we also found that we were deprived of a real genuine voters' list at the time of elections. I think it will be found the three elections that have taken place since 1885 were held on voters' lists that were two years old. I think, though I am not positive, that in one case it was found that the voters' list was almost three years old when the elections took place. It seems, as I have said, to be universally admitted that some change is necessary. What we have now to consider is what system shall be adopted in place of the cum-

bersome and expensive system to which I have referred. The present Government have decided that the best way is to revert to the system which existed from confederation until 1885. And not only did they think it proper to revert to the system in existence during that series of years, but when we attempt to find what conclusion was arrived at as to the amendment of this Act of 1885, we see that those who took part in framing and carrying out that law also thought it better to revert to the system in existence before 1885. We find that in 1894 the late Sir John Thompson, the Minister of Justice of that day, having made up his mind that it was proper to alter the law as it then stood, came to the conclusion that the best system he could substitute for the Franchise Act was the system which we have here adopted, that is to say, the provincial lists.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to interrupt him at that point for the sake of clearness ? He has made a very broad statement which, so far as my recollection goes, is not quite correct. I would like the hon. gentleman to make that clearer.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I will make that quite clear. My way of making it clearer would be to read from the speech made by Sir John Thompson at the time he introduced the Bill in 1894. In introducing the Bill on the 20th of May, 1894, as I find in the House of Commons Debates, page 3367, he said :

> We propose important changes in the Franchise Act, and, without making a speech upon them or giving reasons, I would briefly state that we propose to adopt, as the basis of the franchise, the franchises of the various provinces of Canada.

Mr. INGRAM. Read it through.

Mr. HAGGART. You have not finished the sentence.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, I finished the sentence, but I did not finish the speech. I hope that is the distinction that my hon. friend wishes to make.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman will allow me—I do not wish to interrupt him unnecessarily—my view of it is this, and I think the speech will carry it out, that Sir John Thompson proposed to adopt the provincial franchise lists as the basis of the Dominion list, but that he continued to keep the two cardinal principles of a control over those lists by the Dominion authorities, and an execution of the law by the Dominion authorities.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Quite true, I never said the contrary.

Mr. FOSTER. It is clearer now than it was before.

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, it is not, but I will make it quite clear. When introducing the Bill, Sir John Thompson said :

> The change is also proposed in this Bill which I indicated a few days ago : that the questions upon which so much difference has arisen in the past, as to the basis of the franchise, shall be adjusted by adopting the franchises of the several provinces. While I admit that this is a new departure, I deny what has been so widely asserted, that it is, in any important or practical degree, a surrender of any principle that we have contended for in times past. The number of differences which exist between the provincial franchises and the Dominion franchise as established by our own Act, are so few as not to be worth the contest and the expense which are involved in keeping them up, and the adoption of a general system which will apply both to the local and Dominion legislatures, has recommendations as regards simplicity and facilities for economy, which cannot exist under a dual system such as we have been keeping up for the past few years.

Now, I have here the law of 1894. There are differences between the Bill of Sir John Thompson and our Bill, and I think these differences were fairly pointed out by the ex-Finance Minister, that is to say, that in addition to the provincial franchises, Sir John Thompson provided that, under certain conditions, parties who would not be on the provincial lists, may be added. The second point of difference between that system and ours is that the revising officers appointed by the Federal Government remained in office, so that the revision of the lists would be made by them. We suppress the revising barrister. These are the only two differences.

Mr. FOSTER. That is about right.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Now, the question will arise as to whether, under existing conditions, it is worth while keeping up a system which would entail all the expense necessitated under the Bill proposed by Sir John Thompson. The difference of expense is very material, and it is a question as to whether circumstances justify that additional expense. I think that when we come to examine this Bill in detail, we will find that the difference between the provincial and the federal franchises is so small at the present time—and we will take that as our guide for the future—that they are not worth the additional expense of providing a supplementary list, which was really provided for by Sir John Thompson's Bill. Take the provinces of Ontario and Quebec with which I am most familiar. In the province of Ontario the revision of the municipal lists, in a great majority of cases, with the exception of cities and towns, takes place before the county court judges ; and what better revisors can we have than the county court judges ? In our system in the province of Quebec, with which I am more familiar, the revision of the list is made by way of appeal to the judges of our Superior

Court. That revision, made under the control of the judges of our Superior Court, is very much more perfect, very much more exempt from the objections that might be urged against the old system, than the condition of things that exists with the revising barristers. I think the judges of our Superior Court in Quebec—and I speak of them with some knowledge—are in a position to do good service, and any revision made by them will commend itself to all honest and fair-minded men in this House.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That desirable condition of things does not exist in some of the provinces.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I understand the hon. gentleman refers probably to the province of Nova Scotia, and perhaps Manitoba; therefore, I speak with some diffidence on this point. But those are matters of detail that we will have occasion to consider when we come to discuss the Bill. For the convenience of members, I do not intend to debate the Bill at any greater length, but merely to state its principles.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It might save a good deal of discussion in the future if the hon. gentleman will allow me to ask a question. I understand from the hon. gentleman's remarks that the appeal is made to a judge of some court, which is a very desirable thing in making the list. I take it from the tenor of his remarks that that is the principle upon which he feels inclined to go.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think my hon. friend thoroughly took in what I said about it. I was speaking of the conditions existing in my own province; and I think in the province of Quebec any revision of the list which would be made before a judge of the Superior Court—and I speak with intimate knowledge of the great majority of these judges—would commend itself to any fair-minded man having anything to do with those lists.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Quite so. The hon. gentleman spoke so highly of a reference to the judges that I thought he would not deny it to the other provinces.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No doubt, as a matter of inference, my remark would apply to the other provinces, but I was speaking from practical knowledge of my own province. For the convenience of members I have prepared an analysis of the Bill, pointing out the changes which it makes in the existing system. As the analysis is somewhat lengthy, I will hand it to the "Hansard" without reading it, if there is no objection.

Mr. CASEY. Hand it to the "Hansard."

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Hon. gentlemen having this before them, will see at a glance what changes are made, and the reasons for those changes in each section. If the House will permit me, I will hand it in to the "Hansard" so that hon. members may have it in that way.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

(The following is the analysis handed in by the Solicitor General):—

Schedule three is a list of the Acts repealed. It will be seen that these are the Electoral Franchise Act and the amendments thereto; the North-west Representation Act and the amendments thereto, with certain exceptions; the Dominion Elections Act and the amendments thereto, and certain other Acts relating to elections. It will be observed that there is a printer's error in this schedule. Sections 2 and 3 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter 7, are the sections defining the electoral districts in the Territories, and these should not be repealed.

The following clauses are reproductions, without substantial change, excepting in the order and arrangement of the sections, of corresponding provisions in the existing law. Clause 4, 6, 8-11, 14-21, 30-32, 34, 36-38, 40-46, 49-63, 63-67, 77, 78, 80, 82, 84, 84-89, 90A, 91, 93-115, 118-125, 127-130, 133-135, 137, 141, 144, 145, 147, 151, 152, 154.

Taking up in their order the several clauses in which there are changes from the existing law, we have clause 3, Interpretation. Paragraphs (a), (b), (d), and (e) are taken from Sir John Thompson's Bill (No. 143) of 1894.

The sections of the Act providing for the adoption of the provincial qualifications for voters, voters' lists and polling divisions render these definitions necessary.

The necessity for the other new definitions will be seen when the Bill is examined in detail.

Clause 7 adopts generally, but subject to the provisions of the Bill thereinafter contained, the provincial qualifications for voters.

Clause 13 defines, as at present, the persons who are disqualified to act as election officers, with the addition of persons disfranchised under the Act of 1894 for bribery.

Clause 22 is substantially a re-enactment of the provision cited from the Act of 1874 (section 29), requiring the returning officer to procure provincial voters' lists, &c. (See clause 4 of departmental draft.)

Clause 23 adopts generally the provincial polling divisions. (See clauses 27, 28 and 29.)

Clause 24 adopts generally the provincial voters' lists, subject, however, to the subsequent provisions of the Bill. (See clauses 25, 27.)

Clause 25 provides that, where there are no lists for provincial elections, there shall be none for Dominion elections.

Clause 27.—Where no polling divisions under the law of the province, but polling places and voters' lists for such places, these shall be used at Dominion elections also. (Clause 6, departmental draft; and see Ontario Act, 56, cap. 4, as to Algoma East and West, and the British Columbia Act, C.S., B.C., c. 39, ss. 9-12.)

Clause 28.—Returning officer to constitute polling divisions and fix polling places, where he is required to do so under provincial laws. (See departmental draft, clause 3 (e), and Ontario Election Act, section 56, and Prince Edward Island Act, 53 Vic., c. 1, s. 22.)

Clause 29 provides for a case where a provincial polling district is not wholly in electoral district, and is taken from the Ontario Act cited. (And see departmental draft, clause 5.)

Clause 33.—As to the Nomination. Subsections 1 and 2 are a re-enactment of the section cited,

except that Algoma and Nipissing are not included in the exceptional districts.

The third subsection is new, and provides for simultaneous by-elections.

Clause 35.—Nomination, &c., in the exceptional counties, Algoma and Nipissing being dropped.

Clause 39, as to form of nomination, will reenact the sections cited. This section will apply to the territories, as well as the provinces.

Clause 47, as to duties of returning officers, if poll is granted. The only change is that indicated by the brackets in paragraph (c), rendered necessary because under the new system there will in some cases be no lists.

Clause 48.—As to poll-clerks. No change except that it applies to North-west Territories.

Clause 64 provides for oath to be taken by agents of candidates, and is taken from the Ontario Act cited.

Clause 70.—Regulations for voting, &c. The amendment of subsection 2 provides for cases where there are no lists, and for cases under the Prince Edward Island Act, where the elector may be required to prove his qualification. The amendment of subsection 3 is also to meet the case of Prince Edward Island elections. (See Prince Edward Island Act, 53 Vic., c. 1, s. 55 et seq.)

Clause 76.—Voters unable to mark ballot papers. No change, except that indicated in subsection 2. Qy. Aimed at Japanese et hoc genus omne? It is taken from British Columbia Statutes.

Clause 79.—The changes are required, to provide for elections in Prince Edward Island. (See the sections from the Provincial Elections Act, above cited.)

Clause 81.—The change indicated by Mr. McCord's note is made because of the repeal of the Franchise Act.

Clause 83.—Change noted by Mr. McCord made because Franchise Act repealed.

Clause 90.—References to Franchise Act omitted, and subsection added as to scale of costs. At present there is no such provision, and this has given rise to differences of practice in the several courts.

Clause 92.—The change is explained by Mr. McCord's note.

Clauses 116 and 117.—The notes explain the change.

Clause 126.—From the Ontario Act cited. Corrupt practice by candidate, or with his knowledge and consent, committed in excusable ignorance, not to subject to penalties.

Clause 131.—From Ontario Act cited. Technical or unintentional breaches of the law on the part of persons other than candidates, not involving moral culpability or affecting the result of the election, not to subject to disqualification.

Clause 136.—The corresponding section of the Dominion Elections Act contained provisions that no person should be excused from answering on ground that an answer would tend to criminate him; but this is no longer necessary, on account of the general provision in the Canada Evidence Act, 1893, and is omitted.

Clause 142.—Corrupt practices not triable at Quarter Sessions. There is at present a doubt as to whether the offender cannot be so tried, notwithstanding the provisions in the Elections Act, arising from the very general language of section 539 of the Criminal Code. The amendment will remove the doubt.

Clause 146.—From the Ontario Act cited. Payment of expenses after one month, upon approval of judge.

Clause 148.—Tariff of fees. Subsection 2 gives Governor in Council power to make new tariff, and at present provides that such tariff shall be laid before the House of Commons at the next session. It is proposed to make this within the first fifteen days of the next session.

Clause 153.—Case of delay of nomination or polling, caused by riot, &c. Gives returning, or deputy returning, officer power to hold same on following day or days.

Clause 155.—Election not to be declared invalid for non-compliance with provisions as to limitations of time, unless court thinks result affected thereby, or non-compliance due to improper conduct of candidate or agent. (From Ontario Act cited.)

Mr. FOSTER. Before this motion is carried we must have a little discussion over the matter, not only of the Franchise Act but of some other matters which have been incidentally alluded to several times during the course of the session, and which it is my purpose to bring up a little more formally at the present time. In the first place, I want to call the attention of the House to the circumstances under which it is now sitting. Contrary to the often expressed opinion of the present leader of the Government, the House has been called together at a very late season of the year with all the inconveniences which arise therefrom. I think no man has been more insistent probably than the leader of the Government on that point. In looking at some remarks made by him not very long ago, it is a little amusing to us to see that I am forced to-day to take up and repeat the cry for principle in this matter from this side of the House which my hon. friend not more than a year ago made from his position upon this side of the House. at that time with very little, at this time I think with very great reason.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Before the hon. gentleman proceeds further, I rise to a question of order. I submit, Mr. Speaker, to your ruling that the hon. gentleman is obliged to confine himself to the principle of the Bill now before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must say that I was assuming that the hon. gentleman would turn this portion of his argument into presenting particular reasons against the second reading of the Bill on this occasion. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that he cannot go into a general discussion of the policy of the Government on a motion for the second reading of this Bill, and that he cannot do so by moving a motion to adjourn, but that he must confine his remarks to this particular Bill now under discussion. I assumed that the hon. gentleman would turn his remarks so as to show the impropriety of reading this Bill the second time now.

Mr. FOSTER. I am going to enter into a discussion of the impropriety of reading this Bill the second time, and I am going to make a motion that instead of the Bill being read the second time now, it be not now read the second time. I am perfectly

in order in making the motion I propose to submit to the House.

The PRIME MINISTER. Not at all.

Mr. FOSTER. I will give the hon. gentleman the motion I am about to submit.

The PRIME MINISTER. Whatever the motion may be, the hon. gentleman cannot divert the discussion from the principle of the Bill now before the House. If the hon. gentleman wishes to attack the general policy of the Government, I shall be very glad to give him an opportunity of doing so. What is, however, before the House at the present time is the principle of the proposed Franchise Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. No doubt the objection raised by the First Minister is correct. But I am assuming that the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) does not intend to proceed out of order, but will make his remarks apply to the motion he is about to submit.

The PRIME MINISTER. Whatever motion the hon. gentleman may make, it must be germane to the principle of this proposed Franchise Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes; it must be applicable and germane to the principle of the Franchise Bill, or be a motion to postpone.

Mr. FOSTER. It may be, then, that the hon. leader of the House has been a little premature in taking the point of order.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think not.

Mr. FOSTER. What I shall move is, that this Bill be not now read the second time, but that it be read the second time some time posterior to the present; and I suppose when I move an amendment in that sense, I am bound to give the House reasons why I make it. If I am not within the rules of the House in trying to impress on the House good and solid reasons why hon. members should vote for my amendment, then I do not understand the purpose of parliamentary discussion. If Mr. Speaker rules that I have no right to make a motion to postpone the second reading of the Bill to another time and give my reasons therefor——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman knows I could not do that.

Mr. FOSTER. And I think so. So my hon. friend's point of order is altogether premature, and is not well taken. I was going on to say that there were some things that were a little amusing in regard to our present position.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). What has that to do with the motion?

Mr. FOSTER. The Postmaster General confesses his ignorance very early in the debate. He says he does not know what that has to do with the present question. If he will possess his soul in patience, I will give him some reasons, and I will do so in a very gentle and amiable mood. I am speaking entirely for the public interest; I am speaking for the business and producing interests of the country, and in doing that I am not speaking entirely in party interest. In 1894 the present leader of the House, then sitting on this side of the House, made some remarks that he will find reported on page 30 of "Hansard" of that session, as follows:—

> It has been the unwritten law of Canada for a great many years past, that Parliament should be summoned at an early period in the year, at the latest, towards the end of January.

Again, he said:

> The reason is obvious. In this country we have no privileged class. All the members of this House, with scarcely an exception, are engaged in the ordinary avocations of life, and it is an object of paramount necessity that, after having discharged their duties to the country, they should be able to go back to their ordinary business pursuits about the opening of the busy season. In years past, I say, it was the unwritten law of Canada; still, this year the Government have departed from that law. They waited, and waited, and waited, until the opening of the busy season was in sight, before summoning Parliament, and as to this not a word of explanation has been offered.

Well, if that in 1894 was a good argument for hon. gentlemen to employ as an impeachment of the then Government as to the lateness with which we called the session, what must be the cogency of such an argument at this time, in 1897? It is true, that in 1894, after a commission had been going through the country seeking information with respect to the tariff with the avowed idea of introducing a revision of the tariff, my hon. friend was right to a certain extent in insisting that Parliament should have been called together at an early date in order that the country should know what the revision of the tariff would be. If that argument had cogency then, how much more cogency does it possess to-day when those hon. gentlemen have not yet made public the principles on which they propose to revise the tariff, as the Government in 1893 did in the case of their revision first, stating to this Parliament and to the country definitely and clearly that the revision was to proceed upon well known and well understood principles, the principles of protection. But here is a Government that has concealed for nine months the principles on which they propose to revise the tariff and have refused to announce them to Parliament and to the country, and yet they have called Parliament at this the second session at so late a date as 25th March instead of early in January, which the present leader of the Government said was the unwritten and a well established and very salutary rule of this Parliament. So if my hon. friend happened to be the leader of Her

Majesty's Opposition to-day with how much greater force would he urge the eloquent words which he used in his plea in 1894 for the condemnation of the then Government. The hon. gentleman in another place proceeded to say :

> There is not the prosperity among the farmers one would be led to expect from the increase of their exports. Why? Because the farmers sow, and reap, and sell, but they do not toil for themselves ; they toil for monopolists.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER—

> It is the old story—" Sic vos non vobis mellificatis apes."

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is open to the interrogatory as to whether the same monopolies which in 1894 were those that gathered the sweetness from the toil of those industrious bees—the said bees being the farmers—and if so, whether my hon. friend is without rebuke and without fault if he has allowed his great power in this Parliament to remain unused for nine or ten months and allowed the monopolies to suck the honeyed sweetness out of these same labouring and industrious bees. But, Sir, my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) was not content to rest there. He says on this matter of legislating on the fiscal policy :

> We must take warning from what has taken place in the United States, and if we wish to avoid the crisis which they are now passing through, our duty is at the very earliest possible moment to reverse our system and go back to a more sane fiscal legislation.

He has had that early moment for nine months ; he has had that insane policy, according to his own view, practised in this country for eighteen years ; he has had an opportunity of going back to a more sane policy ; is my hon. friend without blame and without fault before the country ?

Mr. CHARLTON. What has that to do with the Franchise Act ?

Mr. FOSTER. There is another man who does not know what this has to do with the question. I must ask him to cultivate the Christian virtue of patience. He knows pretty well what that is. My hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) has had a very good and a very salutary exercise of his moral qualities on that, in a certain Bill which he has been introducing into this House for the last eight or nine years, and which I think he devoutly hopes he will have to introduce for eight or nine years more, for I verily believe, that if the hon. gentleman had the good fortune to get his Bill passed he would feel himself bereft of the only child he has.

Well, Sir, my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) went on in the same fashion. I will not quote any more, but the point of my quotation and argument—this for the benefit of my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton)—is this : That if, under the circumstances of 1894, when we had stated the principle upon which we would revise the tariff, and when every business man and business interest in the country knew the principle upon which we would revise it, he brought us to task for being late in meeting Parliament and bringing down the tariff ; what is the blame that attaches to him, when he and his party for eighteen years have declared that they intended to completely revolutionize the present fiscal system, and when he and his party have not had the courage, if they have changed their minds, to give the change to the public, and to state at least before this House—they have been in for two sessions now—the principle upon which they would proceed in the revision of their tariff, and, in the absence of which statement, the threats of eighteen years are held out against every business interest in this country to-day. What blame must attach to the Prime Minister, if, for nine months, he has kept this country waiting, and this Parliament waiting, for the mere enunciation of his view and that of his Government with reference to the tariff system.

But, Sir, there is another reason why we should have been called together earlier, and there is another reason why we should pass through the necessary business of this House with all that haste which is compatible with reasonable and careful work. And what is that ? Not having been called together until the 25th of March, my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) knew that there were urgent reasons why we should be out of this early. The reasons that usually exist ; reasons of business, which my hon. friend eloquently portrayed in 1894 ; the reasons of the business men in this House who have large interests, and whose interests demand their attention early in the summer or late in the spring ; and that, therefore, the business of this Parliament ought to begin early and finish early, so that these men could go back to their business with the least sacrifice possible to them for their doing the public work. These reasons are as strong to-day as they were then. But, there are other reasons this session. My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) knew that this was the Jubilee year. He knew that the Canadian colony, in conjunction with the other colonies of Great Britain, would wish to be represented by its official head at the Queen's Diamond Jubilee celebration, and he knew that he himself as Premier ought to be in his place there as the head of this colony, along with the heads of the other colonial possessions of Her Majesty. He knew, that that would necessitate an early departure for England. My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier), even though he had the utmost confidence in his colleagues, that they would be able to manage the ship of state, if he were to take his hand, for a little while, from off the helm—I am almost doubtful if he has that implicit

confidence at the present time, from certain rumours that have been floating about, and I am afraid that he will hardly find it possible to leave the helm without his strong and firm hand upon it. But, even suppose that he thought he could do so, he ought to have had a little unselfishness in his nature. There are other members of Parliament who are loyal as well as he is, and who would like to get through the duties of this session and go to London with him, if he would allow them to go in the same vessel with His Majesty, my Lord Pax, as my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) christened him. Other gentlemen would like to go over and pay their devoirs, and assist in this celebration, and so it is of great interest—and it is a plea urged by the Prime Minister, and by those who sit around him, and by his organs of the press—that we ought to hurry on with the business in order to let Canada's Premier and public men get over to London in time for the celebration of the Queen's Jubilee. That is another reason why we should hurry through with the business of this House as fast as is compatible with careful analysis and careful legislation.

Mr. CASEY. I rise to a point of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. I see the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey) has risen, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CASEY. I am waiting for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) to sit down, as he should do.

Mr. FOSTER. Now I am seated.

Mr. CASEY. In pursuance of the suggestion that we should hurry through with the business of the House, I wish to ask your ruling, Mr. Speaker, as to whether the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is carrying out your decision of a little while ago. I understood you to rule, Sir, that whether he was discussing the second reading, or the amendment for the six months' hoist, or otherwise, the arguments he adduced should be addressed to the principles of this Bill. I understood that you allowed the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) to continue, merely in the hope that he would connect his arguments with the principles of the Bill. I now ask your ruling, as to whether, after ten or fifteen minutes, he has succeeded in doing that. I ask your ruling, Sir, for the reason, that if this sort of discursive speech is permitted now, it would mean an enlarged and irrelevant discussion on every Bill that comes before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Foster) who has the floor, stated that he proposed to conclude his speech with a motion in reference to the postponement of this Bill. I certainly think that the arguments which he has been adducing may be applied as reasons for the postponement of the consideration of the Bill.

Mr. CASEY. I understood your former ruling to be, Sir——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey) wishes to understand.

Mr. CASEY. I am merely asking for an explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER. On the motion before the Chair for the second reading of the Bill, it would limit the discussion to the principles of the Bill; but on an amendment, postponing the Bill for a certain period, either a discussion on the principles of the Bill, or a statement of cogent reasons for that postponement, would be in order.

Mr. FOSTER. Your ruling was very clear to us on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, and I am very glad that the laboured explanation has let a little light into the mind of my hon. friend (Mr. Casey), who seems now to think that there is a little cogency in these arguments. I do not think, however, that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey) ought to tax the Speaker inordinately to explain everything to his mind. I was going on to say that there were business reasons and jubilee year reasons, why the business of this House should be just as quickly done as it possibly can be.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). That is what you are doing now.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. I want to go on to the third point. If my premises are true in this respect, and I think no man will deny them, I come to this conclusion: That if the Government goes upon that line, and is sincerely desirous to do so, the Government is in duty bound to leave off all legislation that is trivial, unnecessary, or, in fact, that is not absolutely and practically necessary, and that it is its bounden duty to put the most important business that the House has this session to come before it, to put that business first upon the docket, and not to interpose between that business and the time of this House, a motion on a subject like the present. Now, I think my argument on this point is clear to my hon. friend.

The Government have brought down a good many topics of legislation, and more they have left out that they might have brought down, if the session had not been so late, and if the session did not promise to be comparatively short. For instance, we would have expected in a usual session to see a Bill introduced by my hon. friend the Postmaster General, if possible, to carry out consistently the views of that hon. gentleman when he was on the Opposition side of the House; and if later experience has made it doubtful in his mind whether he can be consistent on that point, and whether the Government of which he is a member can be consistent, for virtue's sake, the law should be invoked to keep

himself and his colleagues from violating what he declared to be one of the certain and absolute principles of good conduct of any Government. Who does not remember when my hon. friend called up his logic, and warmed that logic with all the intense fervour that belongs to him, morally, mentally and physically, and launched upon this House what I myself on the other side at that time felt was a blow that I could not dodge, namely, that no person should be eligible to be appointed to any office in the service of the Government while he was a member of the House of Commons, or, at least, until one year had elapsed since the dissolution of the Parliament of which he was a member. My hon. friend made a declaration of virtue which he and his colleagues have shown by their acts that they cannot live up to to-day. What is the law for? It is to help men to be virtuous, and my hon. friend should have lost no time in introducing into this House, as a prominent member of an all-powerful Government, a Bill to prevent these hon. gentlemen from falling into that temptation to which they are yielding almost every day of the session.

We might have expected to see several other Bills—for instance, one Bill for diminishing the number of Cabinet Ministers and reducing their salaries; for that was a principle very strongly laid down by my kind and amiable friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). We miss his eloquence. We miss his resounding voice raised against all sorts of abuses, and we have a lively recollection of the supreme moral and political height to which he rose in denouncing the iniquity of having thirteen or fourteen full-fledged Ministers in the Dominion Cabinet at a salary of $7,000 each. My hon. friend, who has lapsed on the line of the appointment of members of the House of Commons to office, was a good second to the hon. member for North Wellington. He stood at his back manfully. He held that $4,000 was quite sufficient—$7,000 was quite too much. We would have expected that a Bill would have been introduced to satisfy my hon. friend from North Wellington and my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock).

Then, who has forgotten that up there in Rideau Hall sits a man from Great Britain, who toils not, neither does he spin, but who every year takes so many thousand dollars of taxes which the poor patrons and the hard-working farmers of this country, especially those in my hon. friend's own constituency, have to toil and sweat and delve in order hardly to pay? And yet my hon. friend in the full flush of his great powers as a Cabinet Minister, one of the most important in a business Cabinet, fails to do his duty; and, through all last session, and so far this session, has not brought in a Bill to reduce the Governor General's salary. Why not?

We might have expected this, and more, but hon. gentlemen have not brought down these measures. We shall expect them next session. On account of the lateness of the time we met this session, and the demands of this Jubilee year, we shall excuse the hon. gentlemen this session, if they do not bring in these Bills; but next year we intend to demand them.

But the hon. gentlemen have given notice of some Bills which they intend to bring down. They have brought down a Superannuation Bill, and placed it first on their docket; but it turns out that it does not abolish superannuation. That is a Bill which they might very well bring in on commencing their term; and we would give them every facility to carry it through, and attempt to make as good a Bill of it as possible, if it is possible with the Bill they have. Then, there is a Bill for the extension of the Intercolonial Railway. Nobody would have any objection to a Bill for the prosecution of a great public work like that. There is another question very much vexed, especially for my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. McInnes), and very much vexed for the paternal "Globe," which has taken this young member under its care and administration to him a very severe castigation—on its knee, speaking metaphorically—to which the hon. gentleman objects; and he is to-day sending back his remonstrance in no mild terms. Then, there is the Fast Line Service, which is a matter of important public policy. Nobody could have objected if that measure were put at or near the fore-front of this session's legislation. Where it is, we do not know. We do know where Mr. Dobell—I forget his constituency—is. That is a measure which I suppose will be brought before us as soon as he returns. Then there is the prohibition plebiscite.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. We certainly wish to hold the Government to its pledge. I have evidently struck a sympathetic chord in the heart of my hon. friend from King's.

Mr. DOMVILLE. You have struck oil.

Mr. FOSTER. I knew I should do so, and I am glad to give him pleasure in that slight way. It is not quite as satisfactory as it might be, but that is the best which I, as a cold water man, can do for him. I shall expect the First Minister to bring that Bill down and to pass it in good faith, as he has pledged the country that he will do.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have heard of pledges before.

Mr. FOSTER. So have I.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have also heard of moments of weakness.

Mr. FOSTER. I have heard not only of moments of weakness, because, I suppose,

most human beings have such moments, but deliver me from that chronic weakness which manifests itself in my hon. friend from year to year, and almost from decade to decade. Then some provision must be made for the public works of the country, and then there is the tariff measure. I have put that measure last because it is the most important. It is the only one that the country takes any decided or active interest in. What I want to know is why the Government have allowed the tariff measure to lie over for nine months or more, and are anxious to have it lie over still longer, on the plea that they must first introduce and carry through the Franchise measure. My argument is that in a session begun late and which ought to conclude early, it is the duty of the Government to put before us, as soon as possible, the measure which the country is most loudly and imperatively calling for. That measure, beyond doubt, is the Tariff Bill. If there is no doubt at all as to which is the most important Bill, there is equally not the least doubt as to which is the least important for this House to consider this session. The least important is the Franchise Bill to which the Government propose now to give precedence. Why, it is practically of not the least use, by the admission of my hon. friend himself, who told us in this House, not long ago, that he did not suppose there would be any use at all for that Bill except at a general election which would not take place for three or four years yet. He declares he is pretty strongly entrenched, he thinks he has a good and strong working majority, but that is the very strongest argument against his taking up the time of this House, to the exclusion of weighty matters, with a measure, which, even if passed into law, he does not propose to make use of for four or five years. There is no doubt in the country or in the House as to which of the measures promised in the Speech from the Throne is the least important this session. Why, then, should the most important measure be delayed and the least important be proceeded with? My hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) undertook, the other day, to break the force of the argument by showing how long we took to bring down our budgets in previous sessions when we were in office. I just want to say two things in reply to that argument, if you can call it one. In the first place, you must recollect that this Government is to be judged by a nine months' delay, and not by a delay simply from the 25th of March of this year, in bringing down its tariff. When a Liberal-Conservative Government had the direction of affairs, it did not wait until the second session of Parliament to bring down its tariff but brought it down during the first session and gave it precedence of other measures. And not only is it nine months, instead of a few days, which is the delay on the part of this Government to bring down its tariff measure, but there is another fact to be borne in mind. Every tariff revision, undertaken by a Liberal-Conservative Government, was one which involved the least uncertainty and disturbance of the business of the country. Why? Because every tariff revision that took place under a Liberal-Conservative Government was effected on the basis of a principle which was announced beforehand and which the whole country knew. So that although there must necessarily, under any circumstances, be some doubt and uncertainty, still the greater part of that is removed when the country knows what the principle is which the Government are going to conserve in bringing down its tariff. In 1878, the tariff was preceded by explicit declarations of principle on the part of the then Opposition in this House. It was preceded by their canvas before the country, by their declarations before the people, and whether the Government took 20, or 30, or 50 days. after the opening of the session, to bring down their tariff, the people knew that it would, when it came down, be a tariff which would conserve and protect the industries of the country, and consequently they could mould their business according to the principle then declared. In 1893, I made on behalf of the Government of that day, from that side of the House, an explicit statement as to what would be the character of the revision we proposed to make in 1894. None of my hon. friends opposite can deny that. In their own party platform, adopted in 1893, they quoted the words I used, and found fault with the principle I enunciated in 1893, as that upon which the tariff was to be revised. When do you have the maximum of disturbance and uncertainty with regard to an approaching revision of the tariff? You have it, as you had it in the United States, after that contest in which the Democratic party, with their half free trade declarations, came back from the polls with a majority in both Houses, and when, as it took them a year and a half or more to bring down their tariff, all that time in the United States there was the direst uncertainty. Why? Because the people took these men to mean what their pledges before the elections meant, namely, that they were to revolutionize the principle upon which the tariff was framed and make it free trade, as far as the revenue would permit. We see to-day in the Dominion of Canada a case stronger than that. The Democratic party. however far they went, never went so far as to authoritatively give the people of the United States to believe that they were going to introduce anything like free trade. It was to be a revenue tariff with incidental protection. But even that threw the business of the United States into the direst confusion. To-day what have you in Canada? What have you had for nine months?

What have you had since the beginning of January, 1896? You have had a party verging on towards power and afterwards coming into power, with every pronouncement, for the eighteen years preceding and up to the time the people placed them in authority, based upon the assumption that they were going to destroy the very principles upon which the business of the country had been based for the last eighteen years. Is there any doubt about that? None in the least. Take what their leaders have said. Take what they have formulated in this House. Take what their organs have said, and running through all the diversities—and heaven knows there are diversities enough to suit the minds of the most exacting in matters of change and differences, running through all the diversities, with all the different flags which they raised, with all the different colours which they flaunted, no matter how many submottoes they may have had, there was one that never was absent, that was put on the highest place on every flag, and that was "Death to Protection." Was it commercial union that my hon. friend advocated as he did, what would commercial union have done? Whatever else it would have done, it would have destroyed the protective principle in the policy of this country. Was it continental free trade—and my hon. friend espoused that plan, not in a moment of weakness, but as an exhibition of chronic weakness which led him to take up every fad which came to his hand no matter how absurd—what would continental free trade have done? Whatever else it would have done, it would have destroyed the principle and policy of protection. My hon. friend advocated unrestricted reciprocity. He said at one time that he nailed it to the top of the mast and that he was going to keep under that flag, until it floated triumphant, no matter how long that took. Whatever else unrestricted reciprocity would have done, it would have destroyed the principle and policy of protection. Then my hon. friend took free trade as it is in England. The same remark applies to that. And when driven by better business men in his own party, he had to leave all his previous fads and avail himself of the declaration that he would adopt a revenue tariff, free from every vestige of protection; that also would have the effect of destroying protection. How well their policy was summed up in that terse and vigorous sentence of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright):

> Our policy, from first to last, has been to destroy this villainous protective system.

By free trade, by revenue tariff, or continental free trade, no matter which, the cardinal idea and doctrine was the destruction of the principle of protection. Now, I say that the business interests of this country were alarmed by a threat of eighteen years standing, backed up by the statements and declarations of hon. gentlemen opposite, up to the very day that they triumphed at the polls. Why, my hon. friend has only to take "the official report of the Liberal Convention held in response to the call of Hon. Wilfrid Laurier, leader of the Liberal party of the Dominion of Canada," held at Ottawa, Tuesday, June 20th, and Wednesday, June 21st, 1893. It is a little refreshing to go back to that time. I simply quote a few utterances to prove the point I am making. That father, that venerable father and mentor of the party, the good Sir Oliver Mowat, raised his voice in that conclave first of all. Amongst other things he declared that:

> After the next general election, it may be truly said by the whole country that it was at the Liberal Convention at Ottawa, in June, 1893, that protection, and bad government, and consequent political unrest among our people received——

What, a gentle opiate? No—

> —their death-blow.

Death to protection. Turning from good Sir Oliver and coming to the more wicked members of the convention, let me show what my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) himself said:

> This simply means——

He said in reference to that statement of mine as to protection:

> —that the Government are going to scratch the paint and put on a new coat of varnish, and call it tariff reform.

Are not these strong words? I wonder if, in the next twenty-five days, we shall be in a position on this side to just quote that sentence. If the Minister of Finance is to believed, we shall, because I take it that no Government could respect itself for a single moment, let alone face the independent and intelligent electorate, and put a high protective tariff on coal, half the coal affected not being produced in this country, but used by the farmers to a very large extent, and not treat every other industry in like manner. So we are looking for developments. The hon. gentleman went on:

> Mr. Chairman, again upon this occasion, I want it to be well understood that we take direct issue here and now with the Government. The Government tells us that the principle of the National Policy they are going to maintain; and we answer to the Government, that the principle of the National Policy must be taken off, not only the branches.

He says further:

> But I appeal to your judgment, in the face of the experience of the last fifteen years under the system which was introduced by the Conservative party, which was dubbed the National Policy, to say if that system is not vicious in principle, iniquitous in its terms, and dangerous in its consequences.

These are very inclusive words. They allow no honest man a single loop-hole of escape. If a man who goes before the

country with these words on his lips and asks the country to give him power to put these words upon the Statute-book, forgets the words and does not put them on the Statute-book, and then justifies himself, not upon principle, but upon simple party expediency, that man ought not to look again into the face of the electorate of Canada. He goes on :

I say that it is vicious in principle. I want to know—and I put the question so as to be heard throughout the length and breadth of this country——

That is where we want it to be heard—

—by virtue of what principle will you tax a man to enrich his neighbour?

Would the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), if he were here, rise up and answer this question : By what principle do you tax the poor farmer who was to warm himself by the heat of anthracite coal, that tax being levied in order to increase the the gains of—according to Mr. Hardy—a foreign monopoly in the province of Nova Scotia ?

By virtue of what principle will you tax the farmer in order to give work to the workingman? On what principle will you tax the workingman in order to give better prices to the farmer?

Now, if there is any logical conclusion from that, it is that the principle of protection as the hon. gentleman stated, is vicious and ought not to be allowed as the basis of the policy of this country. But he goes further :

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I submit to your judgment, that the servile copy of the American system which has been brought amongst us by the leaders of the Conservative party, is, like its prototype, a fraud and a robbery, and I call upon you, one and all, to pronounce at once and give your emphatic support to the proposition that we shall never rest until we have wiped away from our system that fraud and robbery under which Canadians suffer.

Nine months have gone by since the present Government came into power. Has my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) been resting ? He proceeds :

I submit to you, therefore, that the system of protection which is maintained by the Government, that is to say, of levying tribute upon the people, not for the legitimate expenses of government, but for a private and privileged class, should be condemned without qualification. Let it be well understood that from this moment we have a distinct issue with the party in power. Their ideal is protection ; our ideal is free trade. Their immediate object is protection ; ours a tariff for revenue only. Upon this issue we engage the battle from this moment forward, and I ask you once more, never to desist until we have achieved victory, until we have freed this country from the incubus which has been weighing it down for fifteen long years.

Now, Sir, I cannot leave these quotations without giving one from that sturdy champion of free trade, from that whiskered knight of unceasing and irrevocable enmity and opposition to the principle of protection, the gallant gentleman who does not happen to be in his seat this afternoon, who, I have no doubt, at this moment suffers other pains than those rheumatic pains for treatment for which he has to go off to the springs in New York—pains of conscience that he who denounced the coal tax in all its moods and tenses over and over again from his seat in this House, has to remain a member of the Government and sit alongside a gentleman who rises and in his very face and eyes declares that the Government are going to keep the duty upon coal :

However, Sir, these opportunities are gone, and it is our duty now to face the situation as best we may, and I believe, with Mr. Laurier, that the first duty——

You see he says that this is the first duty, not that the Franchise Bill is the first—

—the first duty of the Reform party, the duty which lies next at hand, the duty which is most clearly within their power to perform, is at once and completely to reform the tariff of this country, to reduce it to a revenue basis, to see that no money from this time forward shall, so far as we can prevent it, be taken out of the pockets of the people for any other purpose than for the legitimate needs of the community. Gentlemen, as regards protection, I may say at once that I think that no man who has taken the trouble to examine the working of the protective system, will fail to endorse the statement I make, that liberty and protection are a contradiction in terms.

You can have no true liberty under a protective system ; you can have no true liberty under a system the function of which is to create a privileged class and to concentrate an undue proportion of the wealth of the community in the hands of a few individuals. I contend that protection, besides being the cause of the worst political corruption, is the deadly foe of every Liberal who desires to see his country a free country.

Now I am not going to take up the time of the House much longer. I can quote from all the present members of the Government ; but I wish just now to read a short quotation from the platform which was introduced by the present Minister of Finance, at that time the leader of the Government of Nova Scotia, the Hon. Mr. Fielding, who was, I believe, the chairman of that committee, and who reported the resolutions. The resolutions are long, and this one upon the tariff question needs only that I read one or two sentences of it to show its drift :

The Tariff.—We, the Liberal party of Canada, in convention assembled, declare :

That the customs tariff of the Dominion should be based, not as it is now, upon the protective principle, but upon the requirements of the public service.

And so on, and so on, which brings in unnumbered evils. Then it goes on :

The issue between the two political parties on this question is now clearly defined.

The Government themselves admit the failure of their fiscal policy, and now profess their willingness to make some changes; but they say that such changes must be based only on the principle of protection.

We denounce the principle of protection as radically unsound and unjust to the masses of the people, and we declare our conviction that any tariff changes based on that principle must fail to afford any substantial relief from the burdens under which the country labours.

This issue we unhesitatingly accept, and upon it we await, with the fullest confidence, the verdict of the electors of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I do not generally complain of disturbance when I am speaking, but I have to face those hon. gentlemen opposite, and a little disturbance in front of a speaker is, as every one knows, more disconcerting than a great deal behind him.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. COCHRANE. It is the Ministers themselves.

Mr. FOSTER. They are the only guilty ones. Now, what have I proved? I have proved that the slogan cry of eighteen years has been: Death to protection, from the party who is now in power. I have proved that the flags under which they have led their forces to battle, that the party platforms they have enunciated, that the comments of their leaders upon those platforms all through, have had, whatever note of variation there may be, one strong and well-defined consistent note, and that was: Death to the principle and death to the policy of protection. Now what I wish to conclude from this is that when a party with that record of eighteen years behind it, comes into power, the people of the country are thrown, as far as business is concerned, into the condition of maximum uncertainty and doubt; because they fear that those men are going to carry out their pledges; they fear that the principle and policy of protection are going to be overturned, and that in their place something directly opposite is to be substituted. They, therefore, have a maximum of uncertainty and doubt in every business relation in which they are engaged. That to-day is the condition in this country. If my hon. friend, nine months ago, had declared to this House the principle upon which he would revise the tariff, that doubt and uncertainty would have been to a certain extent mitigated. He did not do it. All these years that slogan cry has been confronting every producer and manufacturer and disturbing their interests, and although my hon. friend sits here, and his party sits here, and do nothing with reference to that matter, every business interest in this country is feeling to-day a money loss in the present, and the utter paralyzation of effort for the future. They know not which foot to put forward, or upon what they rest when they have put a foot forward.

The PRIME MINISTER. They know we will keep our pledges.

Mr. FOSTER. I am thankful to my hon. friend for that. If my hon. friend had a reputation in this country of having fulfilled every pledge that he ever made—which he has not; if the party opposite had the reputation in this country that a party ought to have, that on an issue like the trade question they knew their principles and were willing definitely to abide by them, there would not be so much doubt.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is some hope, then.

Mr. FOSTER. More than that. For the last fifteen months—and I defy my hon. friend to deny it—a whip of terrorism has been held over the business men and producers of this country, whose business and whose interests were founded in any degree at all upon the principle of protection which has been enforced in this country for eighteen years. Does my hon. friend think that he can go through this world of Canada for fifteen months and not know what is going on? Go to Champlain, if you like; go to Bonaventure, if you like; go to Wright, if you like; go to Brantford, if you like; go into any constituency before the general election or since, and I state what cannot be denied, that the Liberal manufacturer has been hopeful. Why? Because a promise has been made simply to his ear. There sits one to-day, there sits another, and you can find them all through this country, who, when you speak to them of the platform pledges of their party, say: We know a thing or two worth more than that, we know it won't touch us. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) sitting there, knows that he has made that statement over and over again, that the manufacturing interests of this country need not be afraid, they will not be hurt.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Nor need they be.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend acknowledges the corn, he could not do other than that. In every by-election which has taken place, the manufacturing and producing interests have been approached, if not by the leaders of the party, by the heelers of the party, and have been given to understand: The tariff is not made yet, you had better consult your own interests. What is the use of imperiling your own business by taking part in that election? You had better keep quiet. They have held that whip over the business interests of this country. My hon. friend knowing, his broken pledges of the past, and knowing the electioneering system which has been carried on in this country on that line, naively looks up in this House and says: Why don't people believe us, then? People have had a little too much experience. They do not altogether believe, and yet they cannot

free themselves from a doubt which the pledge makes. They are between two, and this being between two, in that sense, is just what causes the great uncertainty. If they absolutely believed the party, they would cut their cloth for free trade garments at once; but as they do not, they are cutting no cloth at all for their garments, for they do not know whether it is to be free trade or whether it is to be protection.

Mr. LISTER. Would protection to gold mines hurt you?

Mr. FOSTER. How would it affect the oil interests? There is no man in this House who knows better than my hon. friend—and I know it, and my hon. friend knows that I know it—there is more than oil that is bothering hon. gentlemen opposite. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who does let out those little things so easily sometimes, let it all out of the bag the other night when, standing up before us, he made the remark: You cannot hurry us too much with the tariff, we have got to consult our leading friends before we can bring it down. A political tariff they are making it; it is not a tariff in the interest of the country. They knew all that before. They went through the country and held some commissioners' meetings. They knew more about the subject after that, and now when it is necessary to put the result down in black and white, they find it necessary to consult their leading friends.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). There are mouldering branches, and we have to take all those off.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a mouldering branch.

An hon. MEMBER. He will be taken off.

Mr. FOSTER. He will be lopped off at the next general election.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I should like to see you there at the time.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman may go into another county.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, that is allowable. This is a free country, and it is a good thing to have another county to go to sometimes. The leader of the Government knows that. Since hon. gentlemen opposite have been in power, have they done anything to show that they will promulgate a policy that will be calculated to promote the best interests of this country? Nothing whatever. There is the same attitude of uncertainty and inconsistency maintained. I desire to call the attention of the House to this matter. I am about to read a delectable parable from the leader of the Government. This was delivered in 1882.

Mr. LISTER. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. I knew hon. gentlemen opposite would laugh. They laugh that they are to be held to a principle which is more than five minutes old. A member rose in Parliament and swore by all his political tenets that such and such was the only principle upon which a tariff could be built; but because he did so eight years ago, the hon. member for Lambton says that does not count. No, it does not count for hon. gentlemen opposite. If it were made five minutes ago, it does not seem to count. But I am going to address an argument to the country, where it will count. In 1882 my hon. friend moved the abolition of the coal duties. He spoke on that question and on kindred questions, and among other things he combatted the idea that because the United States pursued a bad policy we ought to pursue a bad policy.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for Kent laughs; no, it is the hon. member for Lambton.

Mr. LISTER. Now you are jumping the fence.

Mr. FOSTER. The present leader of the House is reported in "Hansard"—fortunately it is not a newspaper report—to have said:

> Well, then, if the hon. Minister assents to this position, and his followers also assent to it, why do they legislate against nature?
>
> They will tell me that the Americans also legislate against nature. Can this reason ever be given in a civilized country, that because one nation legislates against nature, we should also legislate against nature? The hon. gentleman reminded me of what is said of the Chinese mode of duelling. In Paris, where duels are frequent, a man who is offended calls his adversary out and they settle the matter between themselves,—

I call the attention of the Commissioner of Inland Revenue to the following, as it may be an aspersion upon an adopted country:—

> —but in China, if a man is offended, he commences by opening his bowels, and, when this is done, the bloody sword is sent to his adversary, who also opens his bowels, so that instead of one man going to the grave against the laws of nature, two men do so.
>
> On this continent, instead of having one nation legislating against the laws of nature, you have two pursuing that course.

The argument holds to-day. The United States have entered into this duel. It has taken the sword, it has opened its bowels. It has sent the sword to my hon. friend the First Minister; but on the way it got into the hands of the Finance Minister, and what he did was to open his own bowels. The argument was then irresistible; you cannot sustain a bad principle in Canada because it is sustained in another country. The United States is placing the duties higher against this country, and so the argument is still stronger. Does the hon.

gentleman propose to legislate on a bad principle because they did so in another country, and it is legislating against nature? We shall see. The hon. gentleman made a still later utterance; it was delivered in Montreal. He declared:

We are told that we must not destroy the manufacturers of Montreal. I say that we are not going to destroy the industries of Montreal. I contend, on the contrary, that the application of the ideas that we defend will inaugurate an era of prosperity such as Montreal has not known since the inauguration of the National Policy. The present system raises a maximum of taxation, not only on the consumer, but also on the producer. They have a tax on iron, which is also a raw material of every industry. The tax on coal, which is also a raw material of every industry, is 60 cents a ton. Although I have not the latest quotations of coal, I am sure that this tax is equivalent to 40 per cent. Now, I am asked, what are you going to do? I have just told you what we are going to do. We are going to have a tariff for revenue, and we are going to abolish completely the duties on raw material.

I say that if we were to have a revenue tariff, raw materials would be free. Raw materials are not free to-day under the protective system. There are certain raw materials which are free. Wool is free; thank heaven they have not thought of taxing it. Cotton is free also. But is iron free? Cotton is a raw material, and wool is a raw material for certain manufactures. But there are two articles which are raw materials of every manufacturer, and these articles are coal and iron, and are they free? If you have a revenue tariff, the object would be to develop the country, and all raw materials should be free under such a tariff.

Can there be a more explicit statement than that made to the business of the city of Montreal, and consequently to the country, that the hon. gentleman's tariff would include the removal of duties upon raw materials, he specially mentioning two leading articles, coal and iron. The Minister of Trade and Commerce was present with the hon. gentleman. He stands exactly on the same footing, for he declared in this House as follows:—

Now, if there be a principle of political economy clearer than another, it is the principle that the worst tax which could be imposed is a tax on a necessary of life like coal. Moreover, it is a tax exceedingly partial and unjust in its operations. It will fall on the poorest classes of the community in the depth of the Canadian winter. It is absolutely sectional, pressing heavily on the people of Ontario, and not at all on the great mass of the people through the other provinces. It will form a standing grievance. It is a most doubtful benefit to Nova Scotia.

That is the opinion of the present Minister of Trade and Commerce—it was his opinion, at least. Now, what said the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies)?

Protection is false and delusive, and if the coal industry cannot live without being propped up by protection, then we say it is as well for this country that the coal industry should go.

That hon. gentleman is an important member of the Cabinet. The leader of the Government was present in the constituency of Brant at the by-election which took place not long ago. He was a little guarded in his utterances. He spoke all around the subject, he did not give a definite idea of what he would do; but he had a colleague with him on the same platform who was perfectly definite, and the leader of this House sat and listened to the speech delivered by the leader of the Ontario Government, my hon. friend being in the constituency at that time with the intention of carrying it for his party and defeating the Liberal-Conservative candidate. Mr. Hardy said:

Was it going to hurt the manufacturers of Brantford to get free coal? Every year from $30,000 to $50,000 were ground out of them that a few New Yorkers who controlled the mines of Nova Scotia should get the benefit. The Grand Trunk Railway was said to pay almost a half a million a year in duties on coal. Suppose they were added in part to the wages of the men—(applause)—or in part in dividends. That would bring about a new era in the history of the Grand Trunk. So, with free iron, free raw material for all the factories, that policy of free raw materials would give a far more live protection than was now given.

Could anything be more explicit? and yet Sir, the latest development is that the Finance Minister in this House and Sir Oliver Mowat in the other House, vouch for the fact that the Minister of Finance spoke by the book. The Minister of Finance went down to the city of Montreal, and to one particular interest he made this statement:

If it turns out that the United States coal duty is raised to a high figure, then we shall claim to exercise the right to revise our views respecting the Canadian duty, and we shall feel bound to impose a duty, not only on bituminous coal,——

Does the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) hear that—

—but also on anthracite coal, which at present comes into our markets from the States free of duty.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Is that the tariff or the Franchise Bill?

Mr. FOSTER. The country is vainly hoping and wishing it may be on the tariff, but the Ministers are outside of it yet, I know, and it will probably take more than the Easter holidays for them to consult their leading men and get together on it. Well, Sir, that is my last point in the argument.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. He describes it as argument.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) has not been attending to his legislative duties. He comes into the House now, after the main part of my argument is over, and he wants me to repeat it. Surely he won't ask me to do that. The argument summed up is this: That for

eighteen years the party platform has given out with one sound, that when they came into power there should be a complete death to protection, and the leaders of the Liberal party, in their platform, in their speeches, in their resolutions in this House, have affirmed the same over and over again, that if they got into power they would wipe out protection. They have not yet removed that doubt and uncertainty by declaring explicitly whether they would carry their professions out or not, and so they leave the whole interests of the country in fear and trembling that they will fulfil their pledges. They have been in power nine months and there is still this utter and irreconcilable diversity between them, which makes it yet impossible for any man to say—judging from their statements—what they will do with the tariff. What is the consequence of this? It is that the business interests of this country are suffering, and suffering badly. I need only advance two or three points to make that clear. The revenue shows it. The revenue has been constantly diminishing, until, when it comes down to nearly the point that it is supposed that the tariff will be brought in, people who have great interests at stake in matters of revenue, hurry to take advantage of the time that is left them to get their merchandise out of bond, and to pay the duties for the time being rather than they should have to pay the duties which may accrue if the merchandise is not taken out now. The decadence of the revenue shows that there is this doubt and uncertainty. Sir, the newspapers that are upholding the Government have spoken strongly about it; and the "Globe" newspaper more strongly than any. On the 4th January, 1897, under the caption "An early session," the "Globe" said:

> The reform of the tariff is perhaps the first question that calls for consideration. * * * The fixing of customs tariff is, of course, the most urgent of all the matters that the Government has to deal with. It is frankly admitted that, while the adoption of protection is one of the easiest of economic changes, its abandonment, in a country like Canada, at all events, is fraught with no small difficulty. But it is not unreasonable that the business community should like to know at as early a day as possible what the reduction is to be. The tariff is one of the prime factors in importation, and the basis upon which that will take place during the ensuing season will be of the first consequence to every merchant and trader in the Dominion.
>
> While the uncertainty lasts, there will be a hesitancy about importing, and a hesitancy about buying from the importer—two conditions which will not tend to improve the business situation. The manufacturer, too, will be inclined to go slow, until he learns definitely about the tax on his raw material and on his manufactured product. If the former is to be reduced, he would feel inclined to lie on his oars until the era of cheaper raw material arrives. It is not necessary to go into detail. The hurtfulness of uncertainty in the business world is too well known to need illustrating, and, being well known, the new Government should be careful not to superadd that disadvantage to the other disadvantages under which trade and industry have been, and are, labouring—the necessity for bringing on an early session of Parliament and taking the country into its confidence as soon as possible.
>
> The country above all things wants an early session of Parliament, and a Budget speech soon after the assembling of Parliament.

That is from the Toronto "Globe" on the 4th of January, 1897. January passed, February passed, most of March passed, and then the House got together. The House met on the 25th, when all these troubles and difficulties had been augmented and added to, and yet we are likely to be here for a month more without the voice of the Government being heard by the business interests of Canada as to what their fate will be in the tariff revision. The "Monetary Times" is not a party organ, and from a late issue of that journal, I read:

> The universal cry that comes up from business circles in all directions, in almost all places, is of continued and most monotonous dulness. This condition of things settled down upon this country months ago, and has continued ever since, with blighting effects upon trade and industry, until the condition has become almost unbearable. The banks are experiencing the full effect of all this, and loudly complain of stagnation, want of enterprise, want of active demand for money, and diminished profits. This continues and shows no signs of abating. Failures are constantly occurring, many of them where they were least expected, and amongst those who were thought to be prosperous and doing well. * * Our readers are well aware of the real cause of this wretched state of things, namely, the uncertainty as to tariff legislation.

And I find on looking over the columns of the "Globe," not in its party columns, for it has now discreetly ceased to say anything about this uncertainty and inability of its party to do what it sees its party is not able to do; that is, to bring down the tariff in good time. I find in the financial columns of the "Globe" of April 3rd, only last Saturday, the following:

> Wholesale trade has not been so dull for many years, and no improvement is expected until after the tariff changes have been announced.

Now, Sir, there is no need for my reading from other papers to make that stronger. That is a sample not only of what is being said in the press, but of the cry that is coming from the business people. The same cry comes from the bankers, the producers and the merchants everywhere. The same cry comes up from all of them to the Government: end this uncertainty, stop our losses and give business a chance to recuperate. Here we are to-day, not only without the tariff, but without any prospect of the tariff being brought down. Why is this? They are unready to bring down the tariff, and if they are unready now, after announcing their principles for eighteen years, and after being nine months

with the reins of government in their hands, what claim can they lay to be a Government of business men and of business habits. The United States people passed through the throes of an election only a few months ago. Their Congress met under the new regime on the 15th day of March, and on the 31st day of March, through that body—where legislation is not easily passed—they had passed a complete revision of their tariff, and it was sent to the Senate within sixteen days of the opening of Congress. And not their second session either, but their first session. This is the second session of hon. gentlemen opposite. Why have they not the tariff down? Because they are unready—is that the reason? What becomes of the statement made by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) out at Aylmer when an election was on? He has seen the statement in the newspapers, and heard it quoted in the House——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). What statement?

Mr. FOSTER. I well tell you. And from that time to this he has not denied it, and he is not now plucking up courage enough to deny it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not heard the statement made in this House.

Mr. FOSTER. He said that when the hon. leader of the Opposition heard the statement, he would hear a statement that would surprise him.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The report in the papers is false.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no doubt my hon. friend is a very diligent reader of the papers. He is too old a politician not to see what his enemies say of him, or not to be flattered by the good things his friends say of him. I was out at Aylmer, and everywhere I was met with the statement, "They are going to have the tariff down right away; Mr. Davies says so." And what is the hon. gentlemen reported as saying? He said:

It had been charged that the Liberals had no policy and no intentions. Well, I would let you into a few secrets only for the presence of these newspaper men. But I can tell you this, that within a week of the opening of Parliament we shall produce our Budget and our tariff; and we shall give Sir Charles Tupper one of the surprises of his life.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman will, I am sure, allow me to say that I never made such a statement.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What does my hon. friend mean by the interruption? It is rather rude, I think. I was reported by a number of papers at that meeting—among them the Montreal "Star," an independent paper, the "Citizen" of Ottawa, an Opposition paper, and several others. Not one of them put that statement in my mouth. I did not make it nor anything like it. What I did say was that within a few weeks of the meeting of Parliament I had no doubt the tariff would be brought down. That statement was never made in this House before. If it had been, I should have taken the first opportunity to repudiate it. The hon. gentleman will do me the justice of admitting that it was never quoted or referred to, in my hearing at least. The latter part of the statement is right, that we would give the hon. leader of the Opposition a surprise, and I think we shall.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentlemen is now in for a surprise himself. He says he was reported in the Montreal "Star," an independent paper, and in the Ottawa "Citizen," which was not a friendly paper, and that in neither of these papers was he so reported. This is the "Citizen" I am reading from.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, the hon. gentleman cannot be reading from the "Citizen." Is it the "Citizen's" report of the next day?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I read the "Citizen's" report, and did not see the statement. I saw the statement, which was incorrect, in the Ottawa "Free Press," which was the only paper, I understand, that gave it.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has stick-to-it-iveness enough at any rate. What the hon. gentleman now says is that he made the statement that in several weeks the Government would have their measure down. Well, one finds it difficult to know what effect that statement would have two days before an election. At all events, the tariff is not down. What is the reason? Has there been any time within the last eight years when they have not been able to declare before the people that they had well-defined and certain principles on which to base their tariff? Now, I find that in "Hansard," on page 47, in Sir Charles Tupper's speech, this quotation from the "Citizen's" report:

I can tell you, that within a week of the opening of Parliament we shall produce our Budget and our tariff, and we shall give Sir Charles Tupper one of the surprises of his life.

My hon. friend was probably not in the House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I was not in the House, and I have not heard of it before.

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

After Recess.

Mr. FOSTER. There are some things, Mr. Speaker, that would help one to the conclusion that the Government is not ready with the tariff, but we are loath to think that a party which, for the last eighteen years, has been on every occasion declaring its fixed principles as to the basis which should underlie tariff revision, which has not only done that outside of the House but has formulated in the House, time and time again, resolutions embodying its views, and which has been in power now for nine months, during which it ought to have been able to have had a tariff ready, if not at the last session, certainly at the beginning of this session—I say that one is loath to conclude that a Government and a party, in these conditions, does not bring down its tariff because that tariff is not ready. If the tariff is not down because of the unreadiness of the members of the Government who have it particularly in hand, there is only one other reason for the delay, and that is because the Government is unwilling to bring it down at this particular time. When the whole country is crying out for relief from its uncertainty and doubt, when the Government have it within their power to solve that doubt and uncertainty, when it is their first duty, as their own chief organ has declared over and over again, to relieve this uncertainty and anxiety at the earliest moment of the session—I say when the Government, under these conditions, are unwilling to bring down their tariff, there must be some vital reason for this unwillingness. It cannot be founded upon any reason, so far as the tariff of the United States is concerned. Taking into consideration the party utterances and the great party victory in that country last autumn, taking into consideration the action of the Ways and Means Committee, taking into account as well the fact that that Ways and Means Committee performed its labours almost unanimously and presented the result of its labours to Congress, and that the House of Representatives, in less than fifteen days, adopted the representations of the Tariff Committee, and sent them to the Senate, where the dominant party has a majority at its control, there can be no reason at all, based upon the constitutional conditions in the United States, why our Government should be unwilling to bring down their tariff. Nor can they base their unwillingness on the ground that the business interests are not waiting and longing for the tariff. The only reasons that I can see why the Government are unwilling to bring down their tariff are certain party and petty reasons which will exist until certain provincial elections are decided, until which time, for reasons best known to themselves, they are unwilling that their tariff measure should see the light of day.

I doubt if ever, in the history of Canada, or in the history of any constitutionally governed country under the constitution of Great Britain, there has ever been seen what we are witnessing at present. Outside of a declaration of the general principle which underlies the revision of the tariff, whether it be the principle of protection or the principle of free trade or the principle of a tariff for revenue alone—outside of the declarations of the principle, in a general way, which serve to guide the public mind and the business interests of the country, it has been the law, up to this time unbroken, that no Finance Minister and no Government should give any intimation to any of the different interests which would be affected by the tariff as to what would be the policy of the Government when the tariff was brought down, with reference to that particular industry. That has not only been the rule of this Dominion Parliament and of the Government of Canada, but it has been a salutary rule, and the moment that you break away from that rule, the moment you single out any one interest——

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman should really state how that affects the question under discussion. The hon. member knows the form of the resolution which he is to propose, and as he is certainly apparently bringing us very far afield from the object of this discussion, I think he should explain the point of his resolution, so that we may see whether his remarks apply to it or not.

Mr. McGREGOR. He should not say the same thing over twenty times.

Mr. FOSTER. It is necessary sometimes to repeat——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Order, reply to the Speaker's ruling.

Mr. FOSTER. Having answered my hon. friend from Essex (Mr. McGregor), let me say, in reply to Mr. Speaker, that I am not making my speech from the standpoint of one who has not thought it out and does not know exactly the trend of it. I am not speaking against time, but making an argument which, I believe, is fair and pertinent, and I have no hesitation in saying that when my resolution is before the House, every point I have made will be found to hinge directly upon that resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must accept the hon. gentleman's statement.

Mr. FOSTER. I would not make that statement unless I believed it were true.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand the hon. gentleman to continue his remarks on his own responsibility.

Mr. FOSTER. I do; I am not taking up time in any sense. I was about to say that this rule is a salutary one, and that if we break away from it, we do not know where we may find ourselves. If the hon. the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) or the Government are going, prior to the bringing down of the tariff, to make any intimation to any individual or corporation or industry or interest, which will give that individual or corporation or industry a fair knowledge of what it may have to expect under the tariff, and so give it a chance to run its business in accordance with the coming tariff, the Government is, in the first place, breaking the whole genius and spirit of tariff-making, as we have continued it in this country from confederation up. On the other hand, it is unfair if such hints or intimations be given to one industry and not to others. It is favouritism and most unfair for one to be singled out to receive the information while it is kept from all others. Is it a fact or not that the Finance Minister and the Government have, during nine months, ostensibly and so far as public utterances go, carefully concealed what they proposed to do with any single item of the tariff? There are interests just as great as the coal interests. There are interests which, if they are not as great, yet are just as important to those engaged in them, interests which have been hampered and have suffered heavy money loss because they could not do business on account of not knowing the mind of the Government with regard to the coming tariff. Those industries are scattered all over the country, and I say it is unprecedented and a breaking of that salutary condition I have spoken of, to single out one industry in advance of the tariff and set that industry completely at rest, if not as to the exact amount of duty which shall be levied on their products, at least to give them the minimum duty and to lead them to suppose that, under certain conditions, a higher duty will be placed on their product. My hon. friend beside me spoke about it as a rigging of the stock market. That was not an extravagant expression to use.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The hon. gentleman is out of order in referring to a past debate.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must not refer to a past debate.

Mr. FOSTER. I am very happy to be able to congratulate my hon. friend on having at last taken successfully a small point of order. It has been spoken of as a rigging of the market, and it has that effect undoubtedly. Suppose that the intimation had been given six or seven months ago to the pork packers of this country, to the cotton men, to the woollen manufacturers, to the leather producers—to any industry that you choose to name, as to what would be, at least, the minimum of the tariff they might expect, would not the course of business in those industries have been very different from what it has been, and would not those particular industries have been placed upon a very different basis, and would they not have been saved from the loss which has come from these long months of uncertainty and doubt? I think there is no doubt about that. The only safety of the Government is to tell all interests at the same time what they propose to do with them, or else to give no intimation to any interest as to what is to be done. What would the iron makers of Hamilton or New Glasgow not have given to know, nine months ago, whether they could go on with their production, certain that nothing less than a certain amount of protection would meet them when they came to make their after sales. What would not the cotton men have given for similar assurances? So I say that to single out one industry, and that the coal industry, leads us to ask what are the reasons for so doing. What are the circumstances? The Nova Scotia legislature has still a year and a half of its time to run. But it is dissolved hurriedly and the Government goes to the people. On any provincial issue? No, Sir, on no provincial issue whatever. The manifesto issued by the Premier and the leader of the Government party presents simply one issue, and that is the coal duties, upon which, he says, the prosperity of that great industry depends. Is that a proposition that will hold water? Mr. Murray, the provincial Premier, says: I dissolve and go to the people on the issue that I want the Administration at Ottawa to know the mind of this people and that it is in favour of the protection of the coal industry of this province. And before he has got to the people, the Finance Minister makes a speech in the city of Montreal stating on his word as Finance Minister, backed afterwards by a strong member of the Government in another place, backed afterwards by the Finance Minister's own statement here, in the face of his leader and his colleagues intimating that he was authorized to make that statement—that, under certain conditions, which conditions have already been realized, the duty on coal will not be lowered, but that if anything is done, it will be made higher. What becomes, then, of the provincial Premier's issue? Does he believe the Finance Minister? If he does, then the question is settled, and, that being so, why does he want an election in Nova Scotia? Does he not believe the Finance Minister and his Government? That is scarcely credible. What is the only other reason

for this delay? It is that there are certain things about that tariff that it is feared when they are made public, will have an adverse effect upon the party interest in Nova Scotia, and there is a desire to get these elections over before the tariff is brought down. Is that the reason hon. gentlemen opposite are unwilling to bring it down? It looks so upon the face of it. Here we have an important industry, at the head of this syndicate, of which Mr. Hardy, the Premier of Ontario, at Brantford, spoke as a syndicate of outsiders, of New Yorkers and said, that for the sake of these, the farmers of Ontario and the railways of the country have to pay the higher duty on their coal. These men, this syndicate, wherever they may reside or however many they may be, are told a thing which puts their business on a solid basis, if the tariff does not come down for fifteen months or more. Do you mean to say that all these things can be put together and you can keep this country from believing that this unwillingness to bring down the tariff is due to the political necessity felt by hon. gentlemen opposite to carry their party in the province of Nova Scotia safely through the elections before any disturbing questions with reference to the tariff are raised? And that when the way it may affect certain interests in Nova Scotia is known the effect might be to alter very much the political sentiment in the province? Are they delaying, not for business reasons, not because of the condition of the United States tariff, but because of the party and political necessity which they feel is laid upon them to have those elections out of the way before they bring down the tariff? And for this the business interests of the country are asked to wait, day after day, week after week, and month after month. By-elections are on in the province of Manitoba. When this tariff comes down, it may be found tha certain promises which were made to the western people have not been carried out. It is of great moment to the Liberal party that they shall have the by-elections there over, as far as possible, before the tariff comes down. If that tariff is in any degree disappointing to the west, and if my hon. friend the Finance Minister is going to give the coal interests of Nova Scotia high protective duties, how can he avoid giving the implement men their duties, how can he avoid giving other industries their duties? And if he gives these how can he avoid the difficulty that the men of the west to whom they have promised free trade will feel that these promises have not been fulfilled, and that they have been deceived in this matter and consequent discontent and dissatisfaction will arise. This aspect of the case is one which ought not to be ignored. If these hon. gentlemen are unready, they are at fault. I cannot think that, when they have had nine months to spend upon this question, after long years of constant iteration of their policy, they are not ready. And, if they are unwilling, and there is no reason for delay except party and political reasons, I can only say that is not sufficient reason why we as Her Majesty's loyal Opposition, should sit on this side and not raise our protest against any further deferring of the tariff measure which the business of the country needs, and especially deferring it in favour of a Bill for which there is no present necessity, however much necessity there may be hereafter. Now, these are the points of my arguments and remarks: That we are in a short session, called late, and ought to get through at an early period; that it is the business of a Government that wishes to get through with its business well and speedily to present and press forward first those Bills which are of the greatest importance and to leave to later in the session any business which is not of present practical importance. The most important of all measures promised is the tariff measure, and it is that which the country is looking for and asking for; and I say that the Opposition would not be doing its duty to the business interests of the country if it did not protest against the intervention of a measure which is of no practical importance at the present time. But pressing this measure would not be so bad, even though it was of no practical importance, were it not for the fact that it is the most contentious measure that could be brought before this House. Hon. gentlemen opposite know that. We know the history of this legislation in this House. My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) knows that the Bill he is introducing by the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) is retrograde in its principles, looked at from the Dominion point of view. He knows it is a Bill which, if carried out——

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). The most obnoxious Bill ever placed on the Statute-book.

Mr. FOSTER. This one will certainly be so, I agree with my hon. friend. I am glad that for once, at least, I can agree with him, that this Bill, when it goes upon the Statute-book, will be the most obnoxious Bill that has ever been placed there.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). The old Bill, I mean.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friends opposite know that this is designed to strike the Conservative party; they know that it is designed for that purpose. The principle that is involved in it is as to whether gentlemen sitting in this Parliament shall have control of their own constituencies, or whether they shall give that control over to a possibly adverse power, a power over which they can exercise no control at all. The principles of that Bill, if I understand it rightly, propose to take our constituencies, and the power of forming these constituencies, from the gentlemen who sit here as

a Dominion legislature, and hand it over to a provincial legislature, which may be hostile or may not be hostile, it makes no difference either way. If they are hostile, it may be used to the disadvantage of the party which is in power; if they are favourable, it may be used to the advantage of the party that is in power; but neither of these things is defensible. It also gives to a power entirely out of our own control the right to say what shall be the polling divisions of the constituencies of gentlemen who sit in this House. Now, if there is one principle that is well established, it is this, that a legislature should have control over its own constituencies, that it should fix the bounds of its own constituencies, that it should be the executive power which carries out its own elections, and that neither of these things should be given to a power outside of itself, one which may be hostile or one which may be favourable, there is no difference in the principle of the thing at all. Now, Sir, to bring into this Parliament a Bill so against the genius of our federal institutions a retrograde motion, so far as the growing community and progress of this country, from a federal point of view, is concerned, is bad enough; but to bring it in and pass it under local conditions now existing, which put the governance of these elections, of the bounds of the constituencies, of the men who vote, entirely into the hands of law-givers over whom we have no control, who may be hostile to us, and whose laws at present existing upon the Statute-book are not to the credit of the provinces, nor are they for the purity of elections or the straightforward and honest declarations of the will of the electors—it is on these grounds, I say, that this Bill is a contentious Bill. If my hon. friend expects that Bill to pass in a few days, he is quite mistaken. Every line of that Bill will have to be fully and exhaustively discussed, every line of that Bill will be fought by Her Majesty's loyal Opposition, not in a way merely contentious, but with a view of making it a measure, so far as it possibly can be made, which will give justice to all parties. The Bill as it is presented before the House, does not do so; and if Her Majesty's Opposition can defeat that Bill and substitute a better principle, it is the determination of the Opposition to do so. That makes it a Bill which will require time, and it is utter folly for the Government, who wish to get quickly through with their business, who have business admittedly important that ought to be before the House and that must be passed, to interject between that business and the present time a Bill of this contentious nature, which must be debated lengthily, which must be fought inch by inch, and which this House must criticise first in its principle, and afterwards, if it be defeated on that point, in the details of the Bill to its very last section. I am making now a plea for taking this Bill out from the consideration of the House until a more important measure has been discussed and has been passed, namely, the tariff measure. My hon. friend who sits beside me, in the way of counsel, asked whether it would not be better that this House should forego consideration of that Bill for this session entirely, inasmuch as there was no present need for it. My resolution is not going so far; it is simply going to say that until the tariff measure is brought down and is disposed of, the House can very well leave aside the discussion of this measure which has been brought before us this afternoon. That is the length to which my resolution will go. More than that, I will state that if the other measures which hon. gentlemen have to pass through, measures which are not of this contentious kind, the Estimates which we must have for the service of the country, if it is necessary for the Government to take some little time to discuss and consider these, we are ready to discuss and consider them with a view to getting them most speedily through this House. But it is different with this Bill: it is different because this Bill is absolutely of no importance at the present time. It is a Bill which goes against what we believe to be absolutely essential to the dignity and the independence of this House: it is a Bill which puts the fortunes of this House as to constituencies, as to constituents, as to polling divisions, as to the administration of the law, entirely in the hands of bodies over which we have no control, and bodies which may be hostile to us; but whether hostile or not, makes no difference in the principle, as I have said before. With these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move:

That all the words after "That" in the original motion be struck out, and the following be added in lieu thereof:—

"The further consideration of this Bill be deferred until the tariff promised by the Government for this session, has been disposed of by this House."

Mr. CAMERON. I have listened with great attention to a three-hours' speech delivered by the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat. Of the three hours of the time of the House taken up by the ex-Finance Minister, five minutes exactly were devoted to the principles of the Franchise Bill; all the rest of the hon. gentleman's speech was extraneous to and entirely beside the matter now before the House. I have said that I listened with considerable attention to the hon. gentleman's speech; but had I known the line of argument the hon. gentleman was going to pursue, I must confess that I would not have paid the same attention to it, because to my certain knowledge, two-thirds of it I have heard three times in the House during this present session, either from himself or from the gallant baronet who sits beside him. Now, three times in one session, and in speeches

of three, four or five hours is altogether too much of a dose for hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. Now, Sir, I think that I might well charge the hon. gentleman with having obtained the right to address the House, and with having addressed the House, under false pretenses. I assumed, in my simplicity and innocence, that when the hon. gentleman rose to reply to the clear and lucid statements of my hon. friend the Solicitor General, that we were going to have an exhaustive argument on the Franchise Bill. Instead of that the hon. gentleman has boxed the compass; he has been here, there and everywhere. This tariff, the tariff that worries the life out of the hon. gentleman, that is a nightmare to him, that he dreams of at night and thinks of every hour of the blessed day, appears to worry the hon. gentleman. Don't be worried; it will come down in due time; and perhaps when the hon. gentleman does see it, it will not be exactly as he would like to have it for the purpose of embarrassing the Government.

It was, taking it altogether, an extraordinary speech, closing with an amendment to which I have no objection. I do not want to be offensive, and I never was so in the House; but I do not believe I could describe the hon. gentleman half so well as an hon. gentleman in the Imperial House of Commons described just such a speech as the hon. gentleman has delivered. The words are not mine, Mr. Speaker, I only use the classical language of a distinguished member of the Imperial House of Commons, and say the speech of the hon. gentleman was the veriest tommy-rot as applied to this Bill. The hon. gentleman in the early part of his speech occupied at least half an hour in assigning this reason and that reason for the postponement of this Bill. The House was called too late, he said. That was a tremendous sin on the part of the First Minister. But fortunately or unfortunately it was a sin committed by the Tories for the last thirty years, off and on, and in fact was very frequently committed by them. But whether it was a sin or not, what on earth has it to do with the discussion of the Franchise Bill? The Bill is before the House, the second reading has been moved, the hon. gentleman made a speech in reply, and we are now discussing the Bill. Assuming, for argument sake, that the House was called rather late in the season, surely that is no argument against proceeding with the Bill, discussing its principles and its various clauses? The hon. gentleman has stated that the Bill ought not to have been introduced, that it ought not to be proceeded with, that it ought not to be discussed until this terrible tariff comes down. The tariff is not down yet, but we have a Bill before the House, and surely hon. members are going to occupy the time of the House in discussing some measure that is not before the House. Then the hon. gentleman was much concerned about the spring ploughing and the farmers. Why, Sir, he has supported a Government ever since he came into Parliament that never thought of the farmers; they paid great attention to the combinesters and the large manufacturers, but they had very little time for the farmers, and we may now well say, as was said by a farmer during my last campaign: The late Government gave eighteen years to the combinesters; we hope the new Government will give a few years to the interests of the poor farmers. Yet the hon. gentleman regrets that Parliament was called so late because it interferes with the spring ploughing. Why, he never had a plough in his hands in his life; I doubt whether he could tell the head from the tail.

Mr. FOSTER. I never saw a plough.

Mr. CAMERON. The hon. gentleman could not handle one. Again, the hon. gentleman is very much concerned regarding the possible absence of the Premier from the Queen's Jubilee. My own opinion is that the hon. gentleman himself would like to be there. He wishes at all events the leader of the House to attend the Queen's Jubilee, and he asks what is the Liberal party going to do when the great Liberal leader is absent. Why, we are not so badly off as is the party opposite; we can spare the leader of the Liberal party, and if he goes to England we can find ten men to lead the House in his absence, indeed when I look around I see a score of members who are well able to lead the House in the absence of the Prime Minister. Hon. gentlemen opposite have not, however, a man to lead them except the old baronet from Cumberland, and we all know the experience of the party during the few months he was head of the Government. He led them into the ditch, they are there now, and my earnest prayer is that they may remain there a long time. Then the hon. gentleman had a fling at my friend the Postmaster General. My hon. friend introduced a few Bills, probably good in principle and perhaps they might have been better in practice, but because he does not as a Minister of the Crown introduce those Bills now and press them, the hon. gentleman is terribly concerned. Why, it has taken all the Postmaster General's time from daylight to dark and well into the small hours of the morning to unravel post office matters and try and correct the scandals that were perpetrated by the Tories when they were in power, and I believe it will take the Postmaster about the remainder of his natural life to straighten them out. Post offices sold, mail contracts sold in open market—it will take a long time before the Postmaster General will be able to undo what hon. gentlemen on the other side of the

House when in office accomplished with marvelous success.

I am not going to follow the hon. gentleman through his three hours' speech on the trade question and various other questions; I am going to deal with the Bill introduced by the Solicitor General to repeal what some people call an infamous Act, and with the principles involved in the Bill the Solicitor General has submitted and for which he asks the sanction of Parliament. The hon. gentleman says it is a trivial and unimportant Bill, one of no consequence. The Tories did not think a Bill relating to the franchise in 1885 was a trivial and unimportant Bill. The leader of the Government at that time did not say exactly that he was prepared to shed the last drop of his blood and die in his tracks for the Bill, but he and his followers fought for the Bill, and those members who were in the House at that day are well aware that day in and day out for over one week, with no adjournment except for dinner, the House continued to sit for the purpose of pressing this Bill through. By numerical strength and force they pushed it through the House. I agree with the view frequently expressed that a worse Bill, a more scandalous Bill, a more infamous Bill never was placed on the records of Parliament than the Franchise Bill of 1885. Sir, that Bill admittedly was not introduced in the interest of the public, surely it was not introduced in the interest of the Liberal party, or in the interest of the great mass of the people. Pray in whose interest was it introduced? It was introduced into this Parliament, it was discussed, it was forced through for the purpose of advancing the interests of the Tory party. And it did so. For twelve years, by virtue of the Franchise Act and by virtue of the still more infamous gerrymander Act, hon. gentlemen opposite were able to return to Parliament after the general elections with a majority behind them. I believe now, however, that the good sense of the Canadian people is so strong and determined that not even the Franchise Act or the Gerrymander Act could restore hon. gentlemen opposite to the Treasury benches. Sir, that law was uncalled for, nobody asked for it, there were no petitions presented to Parliament in favour of it. On the contrary, if my memory serves me, there were petitions presented against it, at all events, there were many and strong remonstrances made against the passing of that Bill. It was not called for, it was not required, and before its passage we acted under a law practically the same as the Solicitor General has now introduced. Did the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) ever complain of the old franchise system? Was there a man in Parliament who ever complained of any injustice or wrong being done under it? No, Sir, every one was satisfied. We heard nothing in those days of a want of dignity in the Parliament of Canada adopting the local Franchise Acts, and using the local lists. Everybody was satisfied, until the tempter in an evil hour seduced from their allegiance to the country the Ministers who then occupied the Treasury benches, and pawned off this so-called Franchise Bill on the country. We were told then, that the Bill was introduced in the interests of the country, but we knew it was intended for the purely political purpose of obtaining an undue and illegitimate advantage over the Liberal party. Nobody knows that better than the hon. gentleman who now leads the Opposition. Sir, the honest sentiment of the country in 1885 was opposed to that Bill. The honest sentiment of the country has been opposed to it from that day until this hour, and the honest sentiment of the country will be opposed to it until the Bill of my hon. friend the Solicitor General becomes the law of the land. The Conservative members of this House well know the iniquities of the present franchise law. They know the hardships of it, and the difficulties of working it, and in their calmer moments they admit that the statements which I now make are correct. The experience of twelve years of that law has from, day to day, intensified the feeling in my province against it. It was ostensibly introduced by the then First Minister in the interests of the public, and Sir John Macdonald declared that the principle of the Bill was that the franchise should be uniform throughout the Dominion. He said:

> A system of representation applicable to all the provinces was a necessity.

And he further declared:

> That the same class should be represented in every province, that the same franchise should be applicable to all the provinces, that the same interests should be represented in all the provinces.

Well, Sir, after we discussed that Bill for weeks and weeks together, the principle upon which it was based at its inception was abandoned by the First Minister, and the franchise was not made uniform throughout Canada. We have not the same classes represented in all the provinces; we have not the same interests represented in all the provinces. Ontario and Prince Edward Island have a different franchise, Quebec and British Columbia have a different franchise, Ontario, Quebec and British Columbia have all different franchises, and hardly two of the provinces of which this Dominion is composed have the same franchise under the existing law. In my judgment it is time that this Act should be repealed, and its worst features eliminated form the Statute-book.

Sir, the reasons for the passage of the present law never existed, and they never will exist, and the Act has produced grave injustice to the Liberal party in the province of Ontario, and no doubt throughout

the whole Dominion. We were told when this Bill was introduced in 1885, that it was simple, easily worked, and economical. But the experience of twelve years has proven that the law is complicated, that it is open to various interpretations by the revising officers, and that the revising officer of one riding takes an entirely different view of the qualifications, from the revising officer of another riding. In order to show the House that this is so, I intend to submit one or two facts, because I find that in discussing a question of this kind, facts are more important than all the rhetoric, or all the eloquence—if I did possess such a thing—that I could possibly use. I find that one of the revising officers, when an application was made to him to add a large number of income voters placed upon the list in a western constituency, gave the following judgment on the following declaration. The declaration was made in due form of law under the sanction of the statute, in the following words :—

I am in the receipt of wages to the value of $300 a year and over, and have been so for one year prior to the 1st of January, 1886 ; and have been a resident of the city for that same period.

Now, would it be believed that this sapient and all-wise returning officer appointed by the Conservative Government, rejected that declaration and so disqualified over thirty voters. He says in his judgment :

I want information, and information must be supplied in an intelligible form. The "1st of January, '86," in figures, not written, must be supplied in so many words, and not by contractions.

And so this wise revising barrister, whom the late Government appointed in 1885, disqualified thirty voters because "1st January, '86" was in figures and not in writing. This learned gentleman goes on to say :

The words "$300 or over" convey no meaning. The law requires it to be "not less than $300."

Well, if it was over $300 it could not be very well less than $300, don't you see, but this wise returning officer, appointed by the Conservative Government, disqualified a large number of voters, because in the first place the figures were not written, and in the second place, because the words "$300 and over" were used instead of "not less than $300." I commend that judge for his skill and I would advise him to make application to hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House for information. There never was another statute in which the loop-holes for fraud and misconduct were greater than in this Franchise Act. The complicated franchise it provides is difficult to understand, and you hardly ever find two revising officers agreeing in regard to them. But it was open to other frauds, which have been perpetually committed for the last twelve years. Let me give you some instances. There is one constituency in which it was found when the voters' list was placed in the hands of the returning officer, that 125 names were on the list twice in one polling subdivision, and that 15 names were inserted three times. There was a chance for men who had slept their long sleep for ten years presenting themselves ; and this was done as systematically and regularly as the ballot stuffing that has become notorious from one end of the Dominion to the other. Over 50 men whose names were on that list had not been living in the riding for years, but had been living, some in the United States, and some in the North-west Territories ; 119 names were added on the revision, but only 12 of these were names of residents of the province of Ontario. Over a dozen minors were added to the list by the revising officer. There is another constituency and another municipality in which, at the revision, 150 names were stricken off the list submitted to the revising officer. Will it be believed ?—every one of these 150 names was found on the list when it was handed to the returning officer. There you see, is room for fraud, and fraud has been perpetrated, and hon. gentlemen opposite for twelve years have had the benefit of these irregularities and these frauds. More than that : scores of names were added by declaration, not one of which was on the list when handed to the revising officer. All these men whose names were added were Liberals, but their names did not appear on the voters' list when it came to polling day. There were five names on the voters' list of men who had been dead, some for ten years, and some for five years. Several names were duplicated in almost every polling subdivision in that constituency. In my own riding, in one polling subdivision, there were 19 men on the list described as stage-drivers, although there was only one stage-driver in the whole division. There were 19 men on the list that nobody in the township knew—certainly nobody in the polling subdivision. This is the kind of law which hon. gentlemen opposite want us to keep in force—a law that encourages fraud, that offers a premium for fraud, and that when worked out under the manipulation of the revising officers, benefits the Conservative party. In a western town it was found that 119 names of men who were not living either in the town or in the county were on the voters' list ; 80 of them had sold out and left the place years before. Forty-six of the eighty were living in the United States, and 17 were dead. Fifty good names were left off the list altogether. The dead men whose names were on the voters' list that came before the returning officer were just as sure to vote as the sun is to rise to-morrow. They are very much alive when polling day comes. Somebody is there to attend to them. That is not all. In my own riding at the last revision, I found that one man

who owned 200 acres of land in West Wawanosh, who had lived there 25 years, and had voted at every election during that time until January, 1896, had no vote. His name was on the assessment roll, the collector's roll, and the local list, but not on the voters' list. Another man who had occupied 200 acres of land for four years was left off the voters' list. Another man in the town of Goderich, who had lived there for 30 years, who owned the property where he lived, and who had voted at every election, was left off. Another man, Patrick McCarthy, who had lived in the town for 35 years, was on the local list, the assessment roll, and the collector's roll, but not on the Dominion list when election day came. Another man, James Munro, who had lived there 40 years, and had voted at every election during that time, was on the assessment roll, the collector's roll and the local list, but not on the Dominion list. Scores of names added at the revision were left off the list on polling day, and scores of names that had been stricken off the list were on when polling day came. A law under which such things can happen is a law that ought to be repealed at the earliest possible moment. I care not what the hon. gentleman calls it, to my mind it is anything but trivial and unimportant. It is one of the most important laws we have on the Statute-book—a law which sends the members to this Parliament, and which we ought to see honestly carried out; but it has never been honestly carried out. There were in my own riding at the last revision about 100 names left off that should have been on, or on that should have been off, and you may be sure that those who were on that should not be were not the names of Liberals. In one municipality there were 100 such. There are seven municipalities in my riding, so that on that basis there were 700 votes that were either left off intentionally or put on intentionally, where neither should have happened. All this is owing to this vicious law, as vicious a law as ever found a place on the Statute-book of this country; and this Government would not be worthy of its name as a square, honest Government, willing to carry out the will of the people who sent it here, if it did not repeal this law. When I make these charges, I do not attribute them all to the revising officers. In fact, I am not sure now these things happened—whether by the manipulations of the revising officers or their clerks or at the printing bureau at Ottawa. That they did happen is capable of the clearest proof, and the fact that they can be proved ought to be sufficient to justify us in repealing this law.

Now, there is another reason why this abominable law should be removed from the Statute-book. We were assured when this Bill was introduced by the late Sir John Macdonald, that it would be a law simply and easily worked, and above all that it would be an economical law. Now, I appeal to the experience of hon. gentlemen opposite whether it be true that this is an economical law. Why, the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) told us that the money extracted from the Dominion Treasury for the purpose of paying the army of officials created under this law amounted to the sum of $1,250,000; but that is nothing to what it really costs the country to carry out this law—a law so bad so vexatious, so costly, that hon. gentlemen opposite, for twelve years, dared not enforce it, except upon four different occasions. Some elections were held upon lists two years old, and in some cases three years old, so that every young man of twenty-three or twenty-four was disfranchised because hon. gentlemen opposite dared not enforce their law, on account of the enormous cost, and that is what the hon. gentlemen terms a trifling matter. That is the law which the hon. gentleman is pleased to describe as one that does justice and fair-play to the rising generation and the voting population in this country. I am amazed to hear the hon. gentleman make such a broad assertion. The hon. Solicitor General told us when introducing the Bill, that the cost of enforcing this law at different revisions amounted to $1,250,000. I now make the statement boldly on the floor of Parliament, that every revision of the voters' lists apart from what it cost the country, cost each candidate in each riding at least $350. I know that in my riding we can never revise the lists for much less than double that sum. Our Conservative friends have to pay the same sum. They do not neglect their duty in looking after the voters' lists, and the result is that in every constituency in the Dominion the revision costs, on an average, I venture to say, $700 to the candidates, apart from what it costs the Government. We have over 200 constituencies. Multiply $700 by 200, and you have the cost of each revision, outside the expense to the Government, amounting to nearly $150,000. You will thus see, Mr. Speaker, the enormous sums extracted, under this so-called Franchise Bill, out of the pockets of the candidates and the electors and ratepayers of the Dominion. Well, I submit, that that is not a condition of things that ought to exist in a country like this, and we ought to repeal this law, which we have had now for twelve years on our statutes, and which, the Lord knows, we have had long enough.

There are other objections that, in my judgment, are of paramount importance. I have only glanced hastily over the Bill of my hon. friend, and I do not see in it any provision for one man one vote. If there is not such a provision in the Bill, the hon. gentleman ought to insert it. Let the man vote and not the property he holds. The man's judgment will then be exercised and not the judgment of the inanimate thing.

I say here, especially after the extraordinary revelations that were made in the election trial in the city of London, that there is no one source that tends more to corruption or a violation of the election law, than cumulative voting. Voters with us are scattered all over. A great many, I am sorry to say, go to the United States, a great many go to the North-west Territories, and when an election takes place, especially in a close constituency, it is of importance that these scattered fragments should be gathered together. Both parties make the greatest possible effort to get in the outside vote. A man's fate, as a candidate for parliamentary honours or perhaps even as a Minister of the Crown, may depend on his getting in the outside vote. I have had some experience of this. In my by-election of 1892, I found three men, who had lived in British Columbia for years, brought in on passes from that province to vote against me. From Crystal City in the North-west Territories, eight men came in on passes over a certain railway to vote against me and all their expenses were paid. From Manitoba and the North-west Territories and British Columbia, over fifty outside votes were brought into West Huron to vote against me, and all their expenses paid. The majority against me was sixteen, and as I could not go to the expense of bringing in men from outlying provinces and from the United States, the result was that these fifty votes gave my opponent his majority of sixteen and some to spare. If my hon. friend the Solicitor General will take my advice, he will, on the further consideration of this Bill, give one man one vote. Look at the terrible condition of things that was revealed in the London election trials. Both parties struggled to get the party vote from Hamilton, Detroit and Toronto, and other places. I am satisfied that there is nothing which tends so much to the violation of the election law as the right of a man to vote in as many constituencies as he can reach.

There is another thing which I am not sure is in my hon. friend's Bill or not, and that is the right to appoint returning officers. I am not sure whether the Government have reserved still to themselves the power of nominating returning officers. If they do, my own inclination is to oppose that clause. I believe that the correct and fair and honest principle, would be to make the local officials returning officers—the sheriffs and registrars of counties, men who have got their offices for life, who have responsible and honourable positions to fill, and who are not likely therefore to commit fraud. Under the present system, what have we had? We have had jail birds, penitentiary birds, appointed as deputies. We have it on record that in one case a man who was appointed a deputy returning officer had been convicted 42 times by the police magistrate.

Mr. BEATTIE. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. He was never convicted of any offence.

Mr. CAMERON. What do you know about it?

Mr. BEATTIE. I know all about it.

Mr. CAMERON. I was not referring to the hon. gentleman about it at all. I only said that one man had been convicted 42 times, and from the hon. gentleman's interruption I am afraid there is something in it. All I can say on the subject is that at one election trial it was sworn to that one deputy returning officer had been convicted 42 times, and is now in jail.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the hon. gentleman allow me? The statement was made that a returning officer had been a jail bird, not a deputy returning officer, and let me further state that in my last election, one of the deputy returning officers was arrested three days afterwards for fraud and forgery. That is a sample of the appointment of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. CAMERON. If so, he ought to be committed, but it strikes me forcibly that I saw somewhere that in the west they brought deputy returning officers from the city of Winnipeg, and one of these had just got out of the penitentiary where he had been for a year or two. At all events, whether that statement be correct or not, we ought to have returning officers who would not select such men as their deputies, and you can accomplish that best by making the sheriffs and registrars of counties ex-officio returning officers.

I do not propose to discuss this matter much further. The hon. gentleman who preceded me said nothing practically about the Franchise Bill, but his leader, on the introduction of this Bill, did make some observations to the effect that it would be beneath the dignity of this Parliament to leave our franchise at the mercy of the local legislatures. Well, I know one country where the local legislatures fix the qualification; they have either universal suffrage or property qualification. If my memory serves me right, in the United States Congressmen are elected by universal suffrage, but the suffrage is fixed by the different states as they see fit. They may give a vote to a mule, they may make an income franchise, or establish a property qualification or do anything they like. Yet every United States Congressman is elected under the franchise adopted by his own commonwealth. Sir, I never heard any complaint of that system. I believe that it is wholly unexceptionable, and I believe tha this Government could do no better thing than follow that course. The hon. gentleman says that he would favour universal suffrage rather than have the local legislatures prepare the voters' lists. I am as

strongly in favour of an extended franchise as any man could well be. We have nothing to complain of in our province. We have an extended suffrage there. Every man who is a British subject, who is over 21 and a resident of the district for 12 months, I think it is, has a right to vote But suppose we do accept the hon. gentleman's theory and declare universal suffrage for the Dominion, the most objectionable feature of the Franchise Act still remains What I complain of and what my hon friends complained of when this Bill was passing Parliament and ever since it was enacted, was that the tools, the instruments the partisans of the Government are revising officers in a great many cases, and we have got to fight them. In making up the provincial lists, the judges and the junior judges are revising officers. Most of these gentlemen are Conservatives. The Government has been continuously Conservative for eighteen years, and the judiciary has fallen into the hands of the Tories, especially in the local courts. We do not complain of that. The judges are men who realize their responsibility, and are independent, to a large extent, with very few exceptions of politics. They care but little what Government is in power. They have their fixed allowance and they draw their pay regularly and are independent of the Government. On the whole we have nothing to complain of. But I want no franchise, federal or local, under which there must be revising officers appointed by the Government, and I care not whether the Government is Liberal or Tory. If we were to act as human nature prompts, we would treat hon. gentlemen opposite to a good dose of their own medicine. But we do not do business that way. We want justice to all parties. We say: Abolish the revising officers, save an enormous amount of money to the Canadian tax-payers, and let those who are seeking to have their names put upon the voters' list and those who have a right to be there so placed that their claims shall be fairly and honestly treated. The First Minister and his colleagues have taken a step in the right direction. They are implementing their pledges. I had no doubt that in every respect those pledges will be carried out. But, in order to complete the work they have undertaken, they must do something more than abolish the Franchise Act; they must abolish a still more infamous Act that was placed upon the Statute-book by the Tories—I refer to the infamous Gerrymander Act. When the hon. the Premier has repealed the Franchise Act, when he has repealed the Gerrymander Act and reconstructed the counties, not upon party lines, but having due regard to the judicial and municipal boundaries—when he has done that he will have satisfied the great mass of his supporters, and I believe he will have satisfied the great mass of the people of this country. He and his colleagues will then have accomplished a task that will live in the memory of Liberals and of all honest and independent men long after they themselves have passed from the scene of action. I hope the hon. the Premier will very shortly introduce a Bill to repeal the Gerrymander Act.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the indulgence of the House for a very few moments while I discuss the amendment moved by the hon. the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster). But before doing so I must pay some attention to the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cameron) who has just taken his seat. The hon. gentleman complained that a good deal of time has been taken up in discussing a matter not at all pertinent to the question before the House. But the hon. gentleman himself has sat down without giving a single reason why this Bill should be proceeded with. The House, I am sure, was prepared to listen to any reasonable argument that might be adduced by that hon. gentleman to show why the Bill should be proceeded with now and why the Bill which is more important than all others, this session, the Bill relating to the tariff, should be delayed. Now, the hon. gentleman made reference to what he is pleased to call—I would like the hon. gentleman stay in his place and hear what I have to say.

Mr. CAMERON. I will come back and hear you; I like to hear you.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman will have that pleasure if he will remain only a few minutes. We can quite excuse the hon. gentleman for leaving. A gentleman who dealt, to put it mildly, in such extravagant statements, might be expected to walk out before he hears the reply. The first thing we heard from him was a reference to the "infamous" Franchise Act It does seem to me that no more extravagant and no more bald statement could be made. Yet it has been made use of until it has become a by-word of the Liberal party from one end of the country to the other, and they have come to believe that the Franchise Bill of 1885 was aimed at one political party and that its design was an infamous one. I challenge any gentleman in this House to show—independent of the defects incident to any legislation—and it is only by putting a law in force that we learn its defects—to show that it is a bad law and particularly to give the slightest evidence that the Conservative party had the slightest advantage in the administration of the law with regard to the voters' lists. Let me turn to the county I have the honour to represent. The judge there is a Liberal, a strong Liberal. I am bound to say here, in justice to that gentleman—and I think, on the broader ground, the same applies equally to every judge in Ontario, and I have no reason to think that it does not equally apply to every revising officer

from one end of Canada to another—that he was perfectly fair. He laid down one rule at the outset; both parties knew what it was and were kept to it, so that there could be no injustice. Now as to leaving names off the list. Is it not perfectly plain that whatever system you adopt, some names will be left off. It is utterly impossible to frame a Franchise Bill so as to have every name put upon the list that might reasonably be expected to appear there. I must call attention to another statement that was made, namely, that there is a disagreement among the judges. Well, is that a new thing? If a layman were to make a statement like that in this House, he might be excused; but when a member of the legal profession says that because judges disagree regarding the voters' lists that is a reason for taking it out of their hands, it does seem to me the most extraordinary statement coming from such a source that I ever heard. Then the hon. gentleman spoke with regard to dead men voting. I am sorry that he did not call my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Heyd) as a witness. I am sure he could tell him about the dead men who came from London to Brantford to vote, who were caught red-handed in the Liberal committee room, who were arrested in the Liberal committee room, and led off by a friendly policeman. Then the hon. gentleman has a nightmare over the gerrymander. I would like to know if the Liberal party ever gerrymandered. I would like to refer him to the province of Ontario, in the very year in which this franchise Act was passed, in 1895, when the present Minister of Justice was at the head of affairs in that province. Why, Sir, he is a pastmaster in gerrymandering, he is the prince of gerrymanderers in this country. He was able to shape constituencies in the province of Ontario with loaded dice. He is perfectly safe, he is able to defeat the will of the people in that province. And how far did he go? Why, he went so far in the very judicial county in which the hon. gentleman resides who spoke last, as to cut a township in two in order to serve his own party. Yet this hon. gentleman had never heard of a gerrymander before. Then he is shocked again for fear the Government will appoint as returning officers other than those who are registrars and sheriffs in the province of Ontario—because he speaks more particularly for that province. Now, let me ask that hon. gentleman, How do these gentlemen earn their positions under the local government? Are they not picked up because they have been partisans in the past? They earned their wages before they received them, and they walked out of the legislature and were placed in these positions. I say if there are partisans in this country, these gentlemen are partisans of the worst kind. I say the great army of officials in the province of Ontario have been appointed to these positions simply in order that they might do service to their party afterwards. I am not making a charge against returning officers in that province. I believe that men may be appointed by this Government as returning officers in the province of Ontario, or elsewhere, who are not so degraded, who are not quite so low as to violate their oath any more than the returning officers did who were appointed under the late Government. It does seem to me to be a serious charge, and I think it hardly a fair charge for any hon. gentleman to shelter himself behind. Let the hon. gentleman point to the cases where wrong has been done. That some person may have gone wrong, may be the case. But is that a fair argument to use here because you can point to a single instance in a whole election, or a few instances? The hon. gentleman cannot hope to make a case out of an exception; it should be substantially the rule before there is an outcry. Now, I do not propose to go further with that. I simply wish to say that the hon. gentleman who made his little speech and then went out, was somewhat disappointing to the House, at least to this side of it, and I am not at all sure that he was not disappointing to the First Minister. That hon. gentleman sat down without giving any good reason why we should not proceed with the Tariff Bill, rather that with this Franchise Bill. Now, I think every hon. gentleman in this House must feel impelled to support the amendment moved by the ex-Finance Minister. The arguments which were adduced in favour of his amendment are wholly unanswerable. No doubt, the course of hon. gentlemen opposite will be a surprise to both sides of the House, and a surprise, I fancy, to the country. The whole country is in such a state of feeling that no matter what position the hon. gentlemen may take, it will be a surprise. If the hon. gentlemen should turn their backs upon their pledges, on the strength of which the most of them have come to this House, will it not be a surprise to a great many of their friends? Will not one-half of the people at least be greatly surprised that they should take a position of that kind? Then let us suppose that hon. gentlemen should live reasonably up to their pledges; will they not surprise the electors in whose ears they have been whispering during the general elections and the by-elections, that no great changes would be made in the tariff? The people will be surprised if the hon. gentlemen keep their pledges; but so far they have not made a record in that direction. I am sure those who have been threatened in this country with complete commercial annihilation, those who have been kept in business suspense for nearly nine months, may possibly have little fear that anything will overtake them, because they can

refer to the records of the hon. gentlemen in carrying out their pledges in other directions. Let me say that no case like the present has ever occurred in the history of Canada before. There was no time when there was so much uncertainty with regard to any previous revision of the tariff in Canada, and when the people did not have at least something before them. Before the adoption of the National Policy, it was only a case of how much the tariff might be raised by percentage. Then we had the National Policy, to which the Liberal Conservative party were committed; they were committed irrevocably to the maintenance of that tariff, and there could be no question then as to the permanency of the tariff if that party were sustained in power. There could be no doubt in the minds of the people after the general elections as to what the character of the tariff would be. There might be many things regarding details that had to be worked out, and that must always more or less affect the commercial interests of the country; but the general principle was so clearly laid down and adhered to, that the business of the country became inseparably connected with it, and there was not a single doubt in the minds of the people as to the broad grounds upon which the policy of the Conservative party would proceed. Now, I wish to point out to my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce one or two things. I am glad to see him here, because he has declared to the country that thirty million dollars were taken annually out of the pockets of the people that never went into the treasury. Now, Sir, he and his friends have been nearly ten months in office. The hon. gentleman has slept, and no doubt has taken his ease, at least during nearly ten months. Now, during that time, without making a very close calculation, according to his statement, about twenty-five millions dollars have been filched from the pockets of the people that have not gone into the treasury. Now, I want to ask that hon. gentleman and the First Minister, if it be true that a greater amount by far than the customs revenue of this country is taken each year improperly from the pockets of the people, how is it that ten months should have been allowed to elapse without their taking any steps to stop a course that is so vicious, so detrimental to the public interest, and that is producing such results as have been stated by the Minister of Trade and Commerce? I say, Mr. Speaker, it does seem to me that no delay can be excused in putting a stop to an evil of that kind if it exists, as hon. gentlemen have stated.

There is another class of people, the farming community, to which the hon. gentleman who last addressed the House referred, this class being composed of about three-quarters of a million of people interested in this matter. We have had pointed out to us more than once the great evils under which the farming community has suffered during recent years. The evils were described as being of a very serious character, and if they were half as bad as stated and crystallized into the platform of the Liberal party, surely a remedy ought to be at once applied. In addition to the large sums of money declared to have been taken from the pockets of the people, what do we find? We find that hon. gentlemen opposite, in 1893, declared:—

> It had decreased the value of farm and other property; it had oppressed the mass for the enrichment of the few; it had caused a great loss of population; it had checked immigration; it had impeded commerce; it had discriminated against Great Britain, and it had been the means of fostering trusts, corporations and monopoly.

Now what would be the remedy? All hon. gentlemen would have to do would be to come down with their tariff, and the people will secure commercial emancipation at once; the farmers will look for a rise in the value of their property; the masses will be provided with labour; the discrimination against the masses will cease; combinations and trusts will cease, and all the wrongs suffered would terminate at once. It appears to me that some reason ought to be given, other than a Franchise Bill that will not be required for four or five years. Why should the Government delay a single hour in bringing down the tariff and proceeding with that important measure if their statements be true? It has been stated in general terms by the ex-Finance Minister that this side of the House was willing to proceed with this Franchise Bill and that the Opposition were willing to assist the Government in making it a good measure. That is a very reasonable proposition. This is a Bill that should occupy the place that properly belongs to it in the business of the House, that position in which it should have been placed at the outset considering all the circumstances, and especially as hon. members desire a short session. I am sure the First Minister must know that party politics do not go so far as to divide us in a matter of national importance. We all agree that this should be a short session in order that the leader of the Government may go to England and occupy there that proud and prominent position which belongs to a great nation like Canada. He must also realize that the statement made by the ex-Finance Minister was made in good faith. But we are met with what would be called obstruction, if the same thing came from the Opposition. This could be called useless legislation—I say unless as regards the present time, because no hon. member will declare that this Bill would be necessary this session or next session, or that it is imperative that it should pass now. I am free to say that the Franchise Bill, like all such laws, must be changed from time to time, and we on this side of the House are willing to pass a

measure consistent with the advance made in public opinion, one that will be free from defects and embodying the wisdom learned by experience. He are quite prepared to take that position when the proper time comes; but as a humble member of this House I protest against proceeding with a Bill not needed now, but one which will simply be the means of delaying the legislation of this Parliament. Surely hon. gentlemen opposite cannot hope by pressing a discussion on a Bill of such importance—one that is contentious in its character, one that involves very serious changes, and one that involves the surrender of a Dominion franchise in favour of the franchise of the provinces—to forward public business. I care not if the franchise were such that they could be adopted in detail, or that we could make them conform in principle and essence to the principles of a Franchise Bill for the whole Dominion, I yet contend that there is no reason why we should adopt them and surrender our Dominion franchise. Vast changes have taken place during recent years in the franchises of the different provinces. In Ontario the franchise has been almost completely changed. In 1885 it was a property qualification; it was not then one man one vote. We have now in Ontario practically manhood suffrage. We have, moreover, in all the cities a system of registration such as is not provided for in this Bill. All these changes have taken place during recent years, and it is idle to say that the franchise as it formerly existed might be adopted without change. I simply point out these matters for the purpose of showing the difficulty of entering upon the discussion of a Bill that must necessarily occupy much time. If it was one that could be dealt with summarily, that would occupy only a day or two, that required little examination, there might be reasonable excuse for saying that the House might proceed with it; but this Bill will require considerable discussion, not for the purpose of raising contentions, but for the purpose of making it such a Bill as is required by the country. This Bill involves a new departure, it constitutes a new franchise, because as regards Ontario it is widening the franchise to manhood suffrage. The Bill refers to qualifications and conditions. This is simply one of the conditions that attaches to the franchise in Ontario, and under it a voter must be a resident within the province and also within the electoral district. I shall not enter into a discussion of the difficulties that will be met in seeking to accomplish the object aimed at, for I shall have another opportunity of doing so; but I wish, in conclusion, to enter my protest against proceeding with this Bill, knowing as I do, that it must be apparent to hon. members that the present discussion is fruitless, instead of proceeding with the tariff revision for which the country is now waiting. Hon. gentlemen opposite may declare that the business of the country is not disturbed, but they are too close observers of public events not to have noticed that there are several branches of trade which have been severely injured. For instance, take the woollen business of this country, and we know that as a result of the delay in the revision of the tariff, it is almost a daily occurrence that certain of them are going to the wall. For the few reasons that I have given, and for many more that I have not attempted to urge upon the House, I shall vote for the amendment of the ex-Minister of Finance.

Mr. McMULLEN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

REPORT.

Annual Report of the Department of Public Works.—(Mr. Tarte.)

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 12th April, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 29) in further amendment of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. BERGERON. Explain.

Mr. McMULLEN. My object in introducing this Bill is to secure the appointment of a Civil Service Board, clothed with authority to inspect the inside and outside services of the civil service of the Dominion, and to dispense with and remove any incompetent or unnecessary civil servant. From the opinion I have formed regarding our civil service, I do not believe that under the management of any Cabinet we shall get our staff of civil servants reduced to the proper number unless by the adoption of a measure of this kind and the appointment of a board such as that proposed. However willing Ministers may be to discharge their duty in the several departments. I have come to the conclusion that influences of one kind and another will be brought to bear in order to retain civil ser-

vants in departments when virtually there is little or nothing for them to do. Another point is this. I notice that whenever even the present Government has made a move in the direction of discharging their duty with respect to the removal of unnecessary or incompetent civil servants, the cry is immediately raised that it is done for party and political purposes. I want to relieve the Cabinet from the position of being charged with acting from party and political motives when civil servants who are absolutely unnecessary or incompetent are still retained in power, and that they are so retained perhaps because of influences brought to bear on Ministers, or partly also because if they are turned out, the Government is charged by the Opposition with acting from party and political purposes. In Canada I believe to-day we have not less than perhaps 1,000 civil servants more than are absolutely necessary to perform efficiently the public service of this Dominion, and it must be remembered that we are paying a large amount annually for our civil service. I contend it would be greatly in the interest of the country—it is an absolute necessity, if we are to secure the reductions which can be made, that a board of this kind should be appointed. I propose that it should be placed in an independent position, in a position similar to that now occupied by the Auditor General, so that the members of the board would not be subject to dismissal by any Minister or the Government, but could only be removed by the joint action of both Houses for cause. Three members would compose the board. It would be their duty, and indeed they would have the right under the law to enter every department and demand the submission to them of all books and statements of labour and duties performed by each clerk, and after carefully and thoroughly investigating the duties performed by the several clerks of the department or any branch of it, the commissioners would have power to dispense with the services of those officers they considered were not necessary. The Bill requires that within fifteen days after the suspension or dismissal of any clerk the fact be reported to the head of the department, and it is further provided that within fifteen days after the opening of the session of Parliament each year a list of those removed by the board shall be submitted to Parliament as the names of those superannuated during the year have to be submitted at the present time within the first fifteen days of the session of Parliament. My impression is, that if this Act meets with the approval of the House and becomes law, it will effect a much improved condition of things in our civil service. I have discussed the matter with men in the civil service who are well posted with regard to its present condition, and I am glad to say, that I have received from those gentlemen every encouragement to proceed with the Bill. They believe that a board of this kind will be the means of weeding out unnecessary, inefficient, and undesirable officials, and that it will free the country from enormous expense in retaining useless officers. This is an explanation of the several provisions of the Bill which I hope will receive unbiassed and careful consideration from hon. gentlemen. I trust that the Government may be able to lend it their countenance and assistance, and that through its influence the civil service may be gradually improved, and the expenditure considerably reduced.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). If the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) would go a little further, and take off the shoulders of members of Parliament and of the Government, the responsibility of appointing officials, I believe he would do the country a great service.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I regret that I had not the advantage of hearing my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) make his opening remarks in introducing his Bill. I am not sorry to find that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are driven to the conclusion, that it would be an extremely unsafe thing to leave our civil service in the hands of the present Government. In that, I quite agree with the hon. member (Mr. McMullen), and I think it is quite possible that the First Minister has, perhaps, prompted this move. The hon. gentleman has likely introduced the Bill at the instance of the First Minister. We all remember the pitiful wail sent up by the leader of the Liberal Government from 1874 to 1878, in regard to the terrible position in which he found himself. He discovered that he was besieged and overwhelmed by hungry supporters, and he had to stand day and night over the treasury of the country to prevent its being pillaged by adherents of the Liberal party. The hon. the First Minister now knows how to sympathize with his predecessor, the leader of the Liberal Government, in his desire to preserve some regard for the honest administration of public affairs, and, at the same time, to ward off the attempt of the Liberal party to besiege him at every turn. The former leader of the party told us himself that he was compelled almost to sacrifice his own life in defence of the treasury. Anything that will relieve the civil service of this country from the oppressive and tyrannical acts of the present Administration, will be hailed, if not in this House, at all events, in the country, by a general acclaim of approval. I have no hesitation in saying that this Government has already demoralized the public service to such an extent that it will take years to restore it to its former condition. There is no person, I will not say "no person," but I will say there is no intelligent man in this House or out of it, who does not know that the very foundation of a good, economical,

and wise administration of public affairs rests upon the members of a civil service who must feel that the position they occupy is one of respectability and of high character, and that they are bound to give the faithful discharge of their duties. No Government, however wise; no Government, however able; no Government, however honest, can faithfully discharge their duties to the people, unless throughout this widely extended Dominion they maintain a civil service of high character and high attainments. Sir, the first element of that independence of character, the first element of that faithful performance of duty, centres upon the fixity of the tenure of their office. Introduce and carry out this wretched system of spoils of office, which this Government has introduced for the first time in the history of Canada——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes. Introduce this system of spoils and your civil service is at once demoralized. I say without fear of contradiction from any person who searches the records of this country, that it is for the first time in our history, that a Government has shown that they are prepared to drive out of office men of the highest character, men in the very prime of life, men whose experience qualify them to perform their duties in a faithful and fearless manner, and to bring into the public service, men without experience, without character, without standing, and without any qualifications to discharge their duties. Why, Sir, what have we seen in the Interior Department. I do not intend to take up the time of the House at any length on the introduction of this Bill, but I ask you to look at the Interior Department, and what do you find? Why, Sir, you find men who were not brought into the department by the Conservative party, but by the Liberal party, men whom the Liberal party sustained and upheld in office in consequence of their great ability, and who were maintained in office by the Conservative party, you find these men of vast experience driven out of office, in order to make room for men, whose only attempt at the discharge of public duty so discredited them, that they were driven out of the position which they held. I say that, in my judgment, a greater outrage was never perpetrated in this country, and never could be perpetrated, than the disgraceful manner in which the present Government have subordinated one of the most important departments, that of the Interior, to the interests and to the necessities of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) who now presides there. Does any person doubt that the gentleman who was sent by the Government of Manitoba to perform the important duties of representing that province at the World's Fair, and who so discredited himself as to bring a torrent of indignation about his ears and about the ears of the Government that appointed him, because of the scandalous manner in which he mismanaged the duties which he had undertaken to perform—does any person doubt that, for the purpose of securing the aid of that gentleman in obtaining an election by acclamation, the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) has brought him here, thus discredited, without any of the qualifications necessary for the discharge of his duty? He has dragged even the Crown in the dust by driving out of the office he was entitled to hold a man of the highest position, who had discharged the duties of that office with such signal ability as to command and obtain the confidence of the Governments of both of the great parties in this country. I say to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that he has not introduced his Bill a moment too soon. He proposes to transfer the powers of the Crown to a commission, whether to enable them to appoint and dismiss, I did not quite gather. That may have been owing to my not having had the advantage of hearing the hon. gentleman when he introduced his Bill. But if it is a Bill that will protect the civil service of this country from such outrages as those to which they have been subjected since this Government came into power—not in one department only, but in a great many departments—if it is a Bill of that character, it will be hailed with great satisfaction by the people of this country, whose only hope of having the duties of the civil service ably and efficiently performed is that their independence of character shall be guarded and their rights respected by the Government and the Parliament of this country. When this Bill reaches a more advanced stage, I will deal with its provisions at greater length; but when I felt the outrageous manner in which the civil service had been tampered with, I could not forbear expressing the indignation felt throughout this country by every intelligent and independent man who realizes how that service has been tampered with, and the baneful and fatal results that must follow to the best interests of the country.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). My hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) had not consulted me before introducing his Bill; but I have no hesitation at all in saying at once that if the Bill of my hon. friend has for its object and will have the effect to remove some of the temptations which beset public men in office, it shall have my most cordial support. My hon. friend referred a moment ago to one of the Ministers of the Crown who had said that he had to keep guard over the treasury to prevent it being plundered by political adventurers. It is a pity for Canada that we have not many more men of that kind. It is a pity we had not a man of the stamp of Alexander Mac-

kenzie to watch over the public treasury when the section B contract was made, or when the Quebec Graving Dock matter was going on, or when the Lévis Graving Dock affair was in progress, or when the Langevin block was being constructed. Sir, the hon. gentleman has this for my answer: all public men are subject to temptation; but there is this difference between the party on the opposite side of the House and the party on this side—that we are willing to remove these temptations from us by law, while they have been always ready to yield to them. If it is possible to remove these temptations, I say once more that I am disposed to tie my hands and the hands of my colleagues to that extent. With regard to the charges which the hon. gentleman makes as to the manner in which the civil service has been treated, I may say that for the first time since confederation notice has been given that the civil service shall be non-partisan, that its members shall no longer be the henchmen of the men in power. We do not want the members of the civil service to do our bidding as some of them did the bidding of the hon. gentleman opposite, when he calculated that the Government would receive $50,000,000 from the sale of public lands. We want every man in the service of the Government to discharge his duty fairly by the country, and so long as he does that, he has nothing to fear. But the moment a man becomes a political partisan or is found to have been a political partisan, he has no favour to expect or to receive at our hands.

Mr. McMULLEN. I may be allowed to explain, for the benefit of the hon. leader of the Opposition——

Mr. FOSTER. Spoken.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has a reply.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Bill does not go so far as to propose to take out of the hands of the Cabinet the appointment to office of any person who is recommended to them as a fit and proper person. My reason for not going that far with the Bill is this. Every member has the right to certain patronage in his constituency; and if you transferred the right of appointment as well of the right of dismissal to the supervisors, then the civil service would be absolutely and entirely under the control of that commission. I am not prepared to say that that might not perhaps be an advisable thing for the House to consider; but at present the Bill simply proposes to authorize these men to inspect the staff and to decide whether the number employed, either in the inside or the outside service, is too great, or whether any of those employed are inefficient or that the services performed are not up to the standard. In these cases they have the right to suspend, and to report the fact to the head of the department. On the other hand, if they find that there is not sufficient work to afford continuous employment to the officers of any department, which they inspect, they have the right to reduce the number of officers in that department to what they consider necessary to carry on efficiently the service of the country. I may add that I have not been inspired nor instructed in any shape or form by the hon. leader of the Government or any other member of the Government with regard to this Bill. It is a subject that has received consideration from me for years past, and I have thought it was necessary in the interests of the country that some change should take place. The Bill is solely and entirely a project of my own, with the object of making the service cheaper and more efficient.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a question. He proposes to create three new officers in the shape of commissioners. Does he propose to put them in the civil service ?

Mr. McMULLEN. That is a question that can be decided when the Bill comes before the House. The present Auditor General is, I think, in the civil service. I think he contributes to the Superannuation Fund. For my part, I am in favour of whatever will give these men the most independent and untrammelled action, free from the dictation of any party.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader of the Opposition told us that he could not forbear letting fly his indignation on the first occasion that occurred. The hon. gentleman seems to be greatly troubled in that way this session. He has an almost unlimited supply of indignation to let loose on any occasion or without occasion.

Mr. FOSTER. There is great occasion for it.

Mr. CASEY. The real occasion of the indignation of the hon. gentleman, I have no doubt, is that he is not controlling the civil service himself. It is less the manner in which it is conducted than the hands in which it rests that seems to affect the conscience of the hon. leader of the Opposition. He was rather unfortunate in his reference to the late Mr. Mackenzie standing guard against the pillage of the treasury by his supporters, because he thereby reminded us of the fact that Mr. Mackenzie's successors —the Government of which the hon. gentleman semi-periodically used to form a part, and which he supported—saved themselves that trouble. They did not stand on guard, and the difference has been quite perceptible in the public accounts ever since.

Mr. LISTER. They left the lid open.

Mr. LANDERKIN. And the key out.

Mr. CASEY. They did. As an old civil servant, the hon. gentleman's opinion ought

to be worth something, if he had only confined himself to the subject before the House.

Turning to the Bill I may say that I had hoped its scope would be rather wider than appears from the hon. gentleman's (Mr. McMullen) last explanation. It is twenty-two years now since I first asked this House to agree to the principle that appointments to the service should be made by some other means than political patronage, and although circumstances ever since have been rather adverse to the adoption of any such principle, my opinion remains unchanged. Of course, there are a number of appointments such as country postmasters and small collectors of customs and so on, which must always remain matters of local patronage, because the offices are so trifling that they must be filled by people in the locality, and those who fill them cannot form part of the professional civil service. Our object ought to be to create, at headquarters, a professional civil service, which should be selected, in the first place, on business principles, in which dismissals, when necessary, should be made on business principles, and in which promotions should be made on the same principle. If that were done, I am satisfied, as my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is, that the number employed could be greatly reduced, while at the same time, the salaries of those remaining could be kept quite adequate to their duties. In some cases the salaries might be increased, because the fewer men employed, the more would have to be done by those who are employed, and the more money they would earn. I am not in favour of a cheap and nasty civil service, but want men properly selected and well paid.

The root of the whole trouble in connection with dismissals by an incoming Government is to be found in the manner in which appointments were made. The service was overloaded by the late Government, and no doubt would be overloaded by this if it stayed in as long as the old Government did. A number of men, who have practically no duties to perform, are put on to suit the exigencies of politics, and I do not believe that any Government could possibly be proof against pressure of that kind. For that reason, I always advocated the principle of a non-political civil service, in which admissions, promotions and dismissals should be under the control of a Civil Service Board, who should not be members of the civil service themselves, but appointed, like the judges, during good behaviour, and as independent of the control of the Government as the Auditor General is. A great many modifications would be required in the details of the plan, but the great principle has been in force in England for nearly fifty years, that men should enter the public service as they do the service of any private corporation, on account of their fitness for the work, and should be retained, promoted or dismissed on the same ground.

I know a great many hon. gentlemen would feel the loss of patronage involved in this reform, but I am sure that those who support this Government and those who supported the late Government, must feel that the possession of that patronage is a most serious weakness to them. They must feel that more enemies are made by its exercise than by almost anything else they can do. I shall reserve any further remarks on that point until the Bill comes up for its second reading, when we can discuss its provisions more intelligently.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the attention of the Government to an article which appeared in the Toronto "Globe" on Saturday, the 10th instant, from which I extract the following :—

> Another proposal for a fast Atlantic service has been laid before the Government within the last few days, and it is so entirely novel and striking that, if it is considered, it may put a new phase upon this important question. The proposal made by the promoters and their associates in England is to establish a twenty-knot service for the conveyance of mails, passengers and express freight from Milford Haven, in Wales, to Middle Milford, in the Strait of Canso, N.S., these two points having been ascertained to afford the shortest, safest and quickest service on the basis of the idea upon which these proposals rest, which is an Imperial idea, as well as one calculated to meet the wants of Canada. The English syndicate which is to furnish the capital, is offering to put on four express steamers of the requirements of the Imperial and Canadian governments that will make the trip from Great Britain to Canada, from port to port, in four days, representing a saving, as compared with the fastest passage between Daunt's Rock and Sandy Hook, applied to the proposed route, of three days and eighteen hours.

I would ask the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce whether such a proposal has been submitted to the Government as indicated in this article.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I would say that no proposal in due form, having reference to such a project, has been made. Some suggestions and letters were laid before us. As I understand, this article, which I have not had the opportunity of reading, refers to communications between Milford Haven and the Strait of Canso, but the hon. gentleman is aware that the statute under which alone proposals could very well be considered does not contemplate that at all.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask whether the statement published in the papers as to Mr. Chamberlain, the Colonial Minister's declaration on the floor of the House of Commons of England, that a contract had been signed between the Government of Canada and the contractors for a fast service, is well founded.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes, Mr. Chamberlain's statement was well founded, and the matter is now under the consideration of the Imperial authorities.

THE BUDGET.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would remind the hon. First Minister that he led us to hope that there would be a declaration made as to the period at which the Budget would be brought down.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). In accordance with the understanding mentioned. I now desire to say that my expectation is that, if nothing unforeseen should occur to prevent it, the Budget will be brought down on the third day after the close of the Easter recess, that will be the first day after the reassembling of the House, or Thursday the 22nd April. The House will reassemble on Tuesday, and on Thursday the 22nd, I expect the Budget speech will be delivered.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has made up his mind that the Budget cannot be delivered before the 20th, the day on which the Nova Scotia elections are to be held.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I regret it very much, Sir ; for if the Liberals of Nova Scotia needed any assistance, as I do not think they do, I have no doubt that the Budget—the facts I shall present at any rate, whether I put them in good form or not, the tariff I shall have the honour of presenting—will be one which when well known, will largely assist the Liberal party throughout the whole Dominion.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). There may be some merit in bringing the Budget down on the first Thursday after the 20th April. One advantage is that we may hope to have the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) in the House at that time. Therefore, if agreeable to the House, I will propose :

That the Order of the House for Committee of Ways and Means, and any motion in relation thereto, be made the first Order of the Day, after questions, on Thursday, the 22nd April and subsequent days, until the debate on such Order is completed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. FOSTER. May I ask the hon. leader of the House what business he proposes to take up on the Government days between now and the 22nd April ?

The PRIME MINISTER. We are engaged at the present time on a debate on the Franchise Act, and there is an amendment by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) to be disposed of before we can think of going on with other business.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Now that the object of my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) has, I think, practically been subserved by the declaration of the Government as to the day on which it will bring down the Budget, I will ask my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) to withdraw the motion which he has now before the House. It was made solely with a view to expediting the bringing down of the Budget and, that having been fixed, time, I am afraid, will be lost if it is followed up in the present position of affairs.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) was not quite in order in proposing the withdrawal of the motion——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was simply a suggestion.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think hon. members will allow me to suggest that the discussion is wider than is quite proper on the calling of the Orders of the Day.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope you will not rule absolutely on this subject, Mr. Speaker. Any debate at this time is designed to facilitate the business of the House. As my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) has suggested, that, as we have now the promise of the Government that the tariff will be brought down on a definite day and the debate proceeded with de die in diem, I will be very glad to withdraw my amendment provided my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) will agree that he will not press the second reading of the Franchise Bill until the tariff measure has been gone into.

Mr. SPEAKER. The discussion is really so much out of order——

The PRIME MINISTER. Perhaps I may be allowed to say that the matter suggested will be subject of a conference between my hon. friend and myself between now and to-morrow.

THE HULL ELECTRIC COMPANY.

Mr. POUPORE moved second reading of Bill (No. 20) respecting the Hull Electric Company.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That Bill has not been printed in French.

Mr. SPEAKER. With reference to that, hon. members will observe that none of these private Bills have been printed in

French, but all that we shall take up are printed in English. Of course, rule 93 of the House of Commons applies to private Bills as well as to public Bills, and, if any hon. member insists upon the objection that, before the second reading private Bills must be printed in French as well as in English, I shall have to rule in his favour. I must say, however, that it has not been the practise of the House to do so, for the reason, I think, that the Bill, long before it reaches the committee for consideration, will be printed in French. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will not insist upon the point.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 17) to incorporate the Winnipeg, Duluth and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Macdonell.)

Bill (No. 18) to confer certain powers on the Board for the management of the Temporalities Fund of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Bill (No. 19) respecting the Manitoba and South-Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Landerkin.)

Bill (No. 21) respecting the Alberta Railway Company.—(Mr. Oliver.)

Bill (No. 22) respecting the Trans-Canadian Railway Company, and to change the name of the company to the Trans-Canada Railway Comany.—(Mr. Davis.)

Bill (No. 23) to incorporate the Methodist Trust Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Sutherland, for Mr. Britton.)

Bill (No. 24) respecting the Manitoba and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Douglas.)

Bill (No. 25) to confirm an agreement between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Hull Electric Company.—(Mr. Sutherland, for Mr. Gibson.)

Bill (No. 26) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Sutherland, for Mr. Gibson.)

Bill (No. 27) to incorporate the Royal Victoria Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Quinn.)

DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. MARTIN asked:

What is the date of the dismissal of Mr. Martin as postmaster at Eldon, in Prince Edward Island? What was the nature of the charges preferred against him, if any? Has he been furnished with a copy of those charges? Has he been given an opportunity to defend himself against those charges? Was his case examined by the investigating commissioner who is inquiring into such cases in Prince Edward Island? If not, why not?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I would state that there is no post office named Eldon in Prince Edward Island. The hon. gentleman probably refers to some other post office.

DISMISSAL OF JAMES ROSS, SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Mr. MARTIN asked:

What is the date of the dismissal of James Ross as sub-collector of customs at Mt. Stewart, in Prince Edward Island? Were there any charges preferred against him? If so, what was their nature? Was he given an opportunity to refute them? Was his case examined by the investigating commissioner? If not, why not? Was he dismissed for political partisanship? Has a successor been appointed? If not, why not?

The COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). James Ross, sub-collector of customs at Mount Stewart, P.E.I., was dismissed by Order in Council dated 21st October, 1896. The reason for his dismissal was that no appropriation was obtained for payment of his salary for the fiscal year 1895-96, and provision was only made in the Estimates for the current fiscal year for payment of his salary to 30th September, 1896. Charges of political partisanship were preferred against him but were not investigated. He was not dismissed on that ground. No one has been appointed in his place, as it was not deemed necessary to fill the position.

DISMISSAL OF DANIEL McDONALD, SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Mr. MARTIN asked:

What was the nature of the charges preferred against Daniel McDonald, late sub-collector of customs at Vernon River Bridge, in Prince Edward Island? Were the charges referred to the investigating commissioner? Did Mr. McDonald have an opportunity to refute charges? Has a successor been appointed? Was there an appropriation last session for sub-collector's salary?

The COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). No charges were preferred against Daniel McDonald, late sub-collector of customs at Vernon River Bridge, P.E.I. He was dismissed by Order in Council, dated 21st October, 1896. The reason for his dismissal was that no appropriation was obtained for payment of his salary for the fiscal year 1895-96, and provision was only made in the Estimates for the current year for payment of his salary to 30th September, 1896. An officer was appointed at Vernon River Bridge on the 1st January,

1897, because the outport of Orwell was abolished by Order in Council dated December, 1896, and it was reported to the department that there was more necessity for an officer at Vernon River Bridge than at Orwell. The salary voted for the officer at Orwell became available for the new man at Vernon River Bridge.

DISMISSAL OF DUNCAN CRAWFORD, POSTMASTER, WOOD ISLAND.

Mr. MARTIN asked:

Was Mr. Duncan Crawford, late postmaster, Wood Island North, in Prince Edward Island, dismissed for political reasons? Were any charges preferred against him? What was their nature? Did he get an opportunity to defend himself? Was his case inquired into by the investigating commissioner now travelling over that province? If not, why not? What was the salary attached to the office?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Duncan Crawford, the postmaster at Wood Island, was relieved of his office because he was an active political partisan. The evidence being regarded as conclusive, no formal investigation was necessary. The salary is thirty-two dollars a year.

SALARIES OF POSTMASTERS.

Mr. MARTIN asked:

Does the Postmaster General propose to increase the salaries of postmasters in sections where a daily service has been substituted for a weekly or bi-weekly service? Has a uniform scale of increase been agreed upon? On what basis are increases made? Have applications to be made for increase of salary?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The salaries of postmasters, with the exception of those at city post offices, are based upon a scale of percentages in proportion to the revenue. This scale has been in force for many years, and no change in the rate is contemplated.

PHYSICIAN TO WALPOLE ISLAND INDIANS.

Mr. CLANCY asked:

When was Dr. George Mitchell, of the town of Wallaceburg, appointed physician to the Indians of Walpole Island? Was he appointed by Order in Council? Has the said Dr. George Mitchell been dismissed? If so, has his successor been appointed? What is his name, and the amount of his salary?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). 1. On the 8th May, 1891. 2. He was not appointed by Order in Council. 3. He has been dismissed. 4. His successor has been appointed. 5. His name in Dr. W. W. Hay, of Wallaceburg, Ont., and his salary is $500 per annum.

INDIAN AGENT JOHN McIVER.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). In further reference to the question asked by Mr. McNeill respecting Mr. John McIver, Indian Agent, the other day, I may say that the names of the agent's sureties are the London Guarantee and Accident Company, Christina McIver, Donald Randolph McIver and John McIver.

INDIAN AGENT CROWE.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I also desire to answer a question asked the other day, the answer to which has been temporarily mislaid. Mr. McNeill asked:

1. What are the irregularities in connection with the duties of his office of which Mr. Crowe, late Indian agent on the Saugeen Reserve, has been adjudged guilty, and which in the opinion of the Government rendered him unfit for the position he held?

2. Was Mr. Inspector Macrea instructed to inquire into charges of this nature, or were his instructions to inquire into political charges preferred against Mr. Crowe?

3. Has Mr. Crowe been asked if he has a defence to these charges?

My answer is as follows: 1. The irregularities in connection with the duties of his office of which Mr. Crowe, late Indian agent on the Saugeen Reserve, has been adjudged guilty, and which in the opinion of the Government rendered him unfit for the position which he held, consisted in allowing Indians to cut bark without the authority of the Department and to dispose of it without the payment of dues. 2. Inspector Macrae's instructions required him to investigate the matter in regard to which Mr. Crowe has been adjudged guilty of irregularity. 3. Mr. Crowe had every opportunity of offering defence at the investigation held under oath by Mr. Macrae and he has consequently not been asked if he has any further defence.

STATION-MASTER AT POINT TUPPER.

Mr. GILLIES asked:

1. Who is station-master at the present time, upon the Intercolonial Railway, at Point Tupper, Cape Breton?

2. When was the present station-master appointed?

3. Upon whose recommendation was he appointed?

4. For what length of time was Mr. Finlay Macdonald station-master at Point Tupper?

5. Was Mr. Macdonald dismissed from this position?

6. When was he dismissed?

7. For what reason, and at whose request was he dismissed?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. No permanent appointment of station-master has been made. T. P. Moffatt is acting station-master. 2. Acting station-master was appointed in February last. 4. From January, 1891, until

February, 1896. 5. His services were dispensed with. 6. He was notified in February that his services would no longer be required. 7. He did not devote his time to the service of the railway. The department did not feel that it would be of any material advantage to the railway service to have this gentleman studying law in Halifax, while in receipt of a salary as station agent on the Intercolonial Railway.

In regard to question 3, I do not think the hon. gentleman should expect me to answer it. I do not consider it is necessary or in the public interest that the Government should disclose the names of persons with whom it consults confidentially on matters of appointments, and therefore, I do not feel called upon to answer it, although I should like to comply with the wish and to gratify the curiosity of the hon. gentleman.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think, Mr. Speaker, I must call your attention to the fact that it has been the universal practice of all governments in this House to answer such a question.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is entirely discretionary with the Minister as to how he should answer a question put by a member of the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But the hon. gentleman does not propose to answer it at all.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. Minister does not desire to answer it, I cannot say anything, nor can any member of the House.

PROPOSED SAVINGS BANK AT MAGDALEN ISLANDS.

Mr. CHOQUETTE (for Mr. Lemieux) asked :

Whether it is the intention of the Government to establish a savings bank at the Magdalen Islands?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) has applied to the department for the establishment of a savings bank at Magdalen Islands. There are some difficulties in the way, but the Government have endeavoured to comply with the request, believing it to be a meritorious one, and it is expected that a savings bank will be established at Magdalen Islands in due course.

MAILS TO MAGDALEN ISLANDS.

Mr. CHOQUETTE (for Mr. Lemieux) asked :

1. What steps were taken during the course of last winter to provide for the carrying of the mails to the Magdalen Islands?
2. Is it the intention of the Government to assist those who shall undertake to carry the said mails for the future?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). At Mr. Lemieux's request, it was determined, if practicable, to take the mails to the Magdalen Islands during the course of last winter, and whilst negotiations were being had for securing a steamer for such purpose it was ascertained that the Islands were ice-bound, which rendered it impossible to carry out the plan and it therefore had to be abandoned for the time.

PROPOSED STEAMBOAT LINE BETWEEN QUEBEC AND GASPE BASIN.

Mr. CHOQUETTE (for Mr. Lemieux) asked :

1. Whether the Government are aware that the north shore of Gaspé, from Cape Chat to Gaspé Basin, is wholly unprovided with means of communication by railway or steamboat?
2. Is it the intention of the Government to aid in the establishment of a steamboat line to perform a weekly service between Quebec and Gaspé Basin?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I believe the hon. gentleman is correct in saying that the north shore of Gaspé is almost wholly unprovided with means of communication either by railway or steamboat. In reply to the second question I beg to say, that the matter is now under the consideration of the Government.

WHARF CONSTRUCTION AT GRAND RIVER, P.Q.

Mr. CHOQUETTE (for Mr. Lemieux) asked :

1. How much has Mr. Atkinson, a contractor of Quebec, received from the Government for the construction of the wharf at Grand River, county of Gaspé?
2. Is the Government aware that about seventy-five to one hundred workmen, who worked on the construction of the said wharf, have never been paid?
3. Has the Government returned to the said Atkinson the deposit placed by him in the hands of the Minister of Public Works as security for the execution of the work? If so, on what date was the deposit returned?
4. What is the date of the last payment made by the Government to the said Atkinson?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. $8,800. 2. The department has seen to the payment of certain claims preferred for wages by men who worked for Mr. Atkinson on the wharf at Grand River, P.Q., but there remains a balance claimed by certain of the workmen which up to the present time Mr. Atkinson has refused to recognize, he stating that he did not owe the amounts claimed. 3. No. 4. 28th June, 1895.

THE LANGEVIN BLOCK—CONTRACTOR'S CLAIMS.

Mr. CHOQUETTE (for Mr. Lemieux) asked :

1. Whether Mr. Charlebois, the builder of the Langevin Block, has still claims pending before the Government?
2. If so, what is the amount and nature of said claims?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. Yes. 2. The total amount claimed by Charlebois is $296,338.05, being made up as follows :—

Claim on account of contract proper.....	$252.593 57	
Claim on account of iron roof	15,813 99	
Claim on account of iron stairs	3,854 58	
Making a total of.....		$272,262 14
In addition to that sum, Mr. Charlebois further claims that a deduction of		22,113 64
should not have been made from his contract when the estimates were rendered, and if to that is also added a sum of.....		1,962 27
amount still to the credit of Mr. Charlebois by the department, the total amount of his claim is.....		$296,338 05

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE.

Mr. HUGHES asked :

1. What changes in the general administration of the Royal Military College, which Major General Gascoigne, its president, officially stated, on the 14th August, 1896, were to be immediately effected, have been carried out?
2. What are "the great and many advantageous changes" in the college administration referred to by Lieutenant-Colonel Kitson, commandant, in his speech to the Royal Military College ex-Cadet Club in the Windsor Hotel, Montreal, on 27th February, 1897, as "soon to take place" ?
3. What other changes in the college administration are contemplated?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). 1. No changes in the general administration of the Royal Military College have been recently carried out. 2 and 3. The report of the Commandant of the Royal Military College on the subject referred to in this question is now under the consideration of the Government.

Mr. HUGHES. I draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that he has not answered the first part of the question.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is answered by the reply that I have made, that the report of the Commandant is now being considered by the Government.

Mr. TARTE.

CAPTAIN OF DREDGE "PRINCE EDWARD."

Mr. MARTIN asked :

1. Was there any charge of offensive partisanship preferred against Captain John N. McDonald in dismissing him as captain of the dredge "Prince Edward," in Prince Edward Island ?
2. Was any question raised as to his ability and faithfulness in the discharge of his duty?
3. What was the ostensible reason for his removal?
4. Is it the intention of the department to appoint a successor, or is it intended to have Captain McDonald reinstated?
5. Was Captain McDonald's case inquired into by Mr. Palmer, the investigating commissioner ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. No official complaint has been lodged in the department. 2. No. 3. The reason for his removal was that his services could not be utilized in the winter months, the dredge not being in commission. 4. It has not yet been decided whether or not Captain McDonald shall be re-engaged, the dredge "Prince Edward" not being yet in commission. 5. Mr. Palmer has not been instructed to make any inquiry into Captain McDonald's case.

WOOD ISLAND HARBOUR DREDGING.

Mr. MARTIN asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to proceed with the dredging of Wood Island Harbour and Murray River, Prince Edward Island, during the coming summer?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). The question is under consideration.

MANITOBA SCHOOLS QUESTION.

Mr. HAGGART asked :

Have the Government any intention, as a sequence of the recent arrangements between themselves and the Government of Manitoba, to rescind the Remedial Order made by the Governor General in Council on the 21st March, 1895, and formally communicated to the Government of Manitoba with the object as set forth in said order, of restoring to the Roman Catholic minority of the province the rights and privileges of which the said minority have been deprived with respect to education, or do the Government propose any parliamentary action in relation to the said matter?

He said : If there is any controversy as to what is the effect of the Order in Council, I will put the question by leaving out the words :

Of restoring to the Roman Catholic minority of the province the rights and privileges of which the said minority have been deprived with respect to education.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The policy of the Government upon this question has already been announced, and

they do not think it advisable to take any further action in reference thereto.

INSPECTOR WEIGHTS AND MEASURES—PORT ARTHUR.

Mr. MILLS (for Mr. Taylor) asked :

Who has been appointed to the position of assistant inspector of weights and measures at Port Arthur, in place of W. W. Russell, deceased?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). No permanent appointment has been made. The duties are being performed, temporarily, by Mr. G. W. Francis.

TARIFF INQUIRY—THE EVIDENCE.

Mr. QUINN (for Mr. Monk) asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to cause a translation to be made into the French language, of the evidence and proceedings of the Tariff Inquiry Commission, in order to place the same within reach of French Canadians interested in the said inquiry?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The tariff inquiry having been publicly conducted, the proceedings were somewhat extensively published in the newspapers of the day, and the Government have not thought that any further publication of them is necessary.

Mr. FOSTER. Might I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) another question in connection with that ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. Part of these investigations were not publicly conducted, as I understood. If any persons had objected to publicity they were allowed to make their communications privately ; will that part of the commissioner's investigation be brought down ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, Mr. Speaker. If the House deems it necessary, and I hope it will not, to have the whole matter printed, we would be obliged of necessity to withhold that portion which was given to us confidentially.

DUTY ON TIMOTHY SEED.

Mr. BAZINET asked :

1. Whether it is the intention of the Government to impose a duty of 50 cents per bushel, or any other specific duty, in addition to a duty of 15 cents per bushel ad valorem, on timothy seed imported into Canada?

2. Is it also the intention of the Government to impose a duty of 2 cents per pound and 20 per cent ad valorem, or any other duty, on clover seed imported into Canada?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). It is not deemed expedient to make any statement at present respecting the duties mentioned.

POSTMASTER—AYLMER WEST.

Mr. INGRAM asked :

Upon what date was David N. Price appointed postmaster of Aylmer West? What date was he dismissed? Was he fully qualified for the position? Did he perform his duty to the satisfaction of the department, and if so, for what reason was he dismissed?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). A vacancy at the Aylmer West post office occurred on the 20th of June, 1895, by the death of the then postmaster. The office was kept vacant for more than one year and after the defeat of the late Government, but before their resignation Mr. D. H. Price was appointed postmaster. He was promptly notified, to wit, on the 29th July, 1896, by the new Government that his appointment would be cancelled. This was done on the 17th of March, 1897, by the appointment of Mr. Ashbaugh as postmaster. The reason for the cancellation of Mr. Price's appointment was that inasmuch as the late Government had kept the office vacant for more than one year there was no urgency in its being filled up by the defeated Government before their resignation, and, therefore, their act in appointing Mr. Price was regarded as one that could not be assented to. No complaint has been made as to the manner in which Mr. Price discharged the duties of the office.

SMUGGLING AT HERSCHEL ISLAND.

Mr. DAVIS asked :

Is the Department of Customs aware that smuggling is being carried on by the crews of American whalers from Herschel Island into Mackenzie River Basin?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). It was reported to the department in December, 1895, that illegal trade was being conducted by United States whalers at the mouth of the Mackenzie River. On 5th March, 1896, the department received a letter alleging that smuggling was going on at Herschel Island.

HUDSON BAY CUSTOMS PORTS.

Mr. DAVIS asked :

1. Is the Department of Customs aware that goods are being brought in at the ports of York Factory, Moose Factory and Churchill?

2. Has the Government any collectors of customs at these ports?

3. And if not, by whom is the duty collected ?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). 1. The Department of Customs is aware that goods are being brought in at the outports of York Factory and Moose Factory, but not at Churchill ; there is no customs office at Churchill. 2. Customs officers are stationed at York Factory and Moose Factory, but not at Churchill. 3. Goods imported by residents of Churchill

are usually passed at the outport of York Factory.

AYLMER WEST POSTMASTERSHIP.

Mr. INGRAM asked:

Did the Postmaster General, or any other member of the Government, instruct Mr. Alexander Smith, the Reform party organizer for the province of Ontario, to make any inquiries into the postmastership of Aylmer West, in East Elgin, and if so, what report did Mr. Alexander Smith make to the Postmaster General or other member of the Government, having relation to the above position?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). No.

MOUNT ALBERT AND HOLT MAIL CONTRACT.

Mr. HUGHES asked:

1. Who carries the mail between Mount Albert and Mount Albert Railway Station?
2. Who carries the mail between Mount Albert and Holt Post Office?
3. When was the contract between Mount Albert and Mount Albert Station entered into? What is the present contract price? Is there a contract? Has the contract been signed?
4. Who was the last mail carrier?
5. What is the date of the contract between Mount Albert and Holt? What is the contract price? Is there a contract? Is the work performed by day labour, or on what terms is it performed? What price is being paid per trip?
6. What was the lowest tender for the contract between Mount Albert and Mount Albert Station? Whose was it? Why was it not accepted?
7. What was the lowest tender for the contract between Mount Albert and Holt? Whose was it? Has the price per trip between Mount Albert and Holt been raised over his tendered price? Is the contractor doing the work for the price stated in the regularly presented tender?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). 1. The mails between Mount Albert and Mount Albert Railway Station are carried by Mr. Parish Steeper. 2. The mails between Holt and Mount Albert are carried by Mr. Parish Steeper. 3. There is no contract for the Mount Albert and Railway Station service at present, the lowest tenderers having declined to undertake the service unless they could obtain the contract for the Holt and Mount Albert service which is arranged for under a separate contract as it has been for some years past. Mr. Steeper is at present performing the service under a temporary agreement pending the making of a regular contract. 4. The last mail carrier on the Mount Albert and Station route was Mr. John Roseman. 5. The contract for the Holt and Mount Albert service went into operation on the 1st January, 1897. The price is $62 per annum. At this price the rate per trip would be nearly 20 cents. 6. As the contract for the Mount Albert and Railway Station service has not yet been entered into, it would be inadvisable to give any information regarding the tenders at present. 7. The lowest tender for the Holt and Mount Albert service was that made by Mr. Parish Steeper at $62 per annum. Mr. Steeper is performing the service at this rate, and there has been no advance in the price.

THE EXPEDITION TO HUDSON BAY.

Mr. DAVIN asked:

Whether it is the intention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to have the North-west Territories represented in the exploratory expedition to Hudson Bay?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will answer this question and at the same time a question to the same effect that stands on the Order paper in the name of the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis). The Government have considered the matter, and have determined that it would be in the public interest that Manitoba and the North-west Territories should be represented on that commission, and a representative of Manitoba and the North-west Territories will be appointed.

HARBOURS OF OWEN SOUND AND COLLINGWOOD.

Mr. DAVIN (for Mr. Bennett) asked:

What aggregate amounts have been expended by the Public Works Department in the harbours of Owen Sound and Collingwood, respectively?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte.) The expenditure to date since the 1st of July, 1867, is as follows:—Collingwood harbour, $220,286.18; Owen Sound harbour, $236,755.

BORING FOR COAL IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. MARTIN asked:

Is it the intention of the Government to place any sum in the Supplementary Estimates for the boring for coal in Pleasant Valley or Wood Islands, in the province of Prince Edward Island?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The hon. gentlemen will get the information when the supplementaries are brought down.

IMPORTATION OF COAL OIL.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron) asked:

At what points in Canada can coal oil imported from the United States in tank cars be delivered?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). At the following points:—

Ontario—Belleville. Berlin, Brantford, Brockville, Chatham, Chippawa, Colling-

wood, Cornwall, Fort Erie, Galt, Gananoque, Guelph, Hamilton, Kingston, London, Lindsay, Napanee, Oshawa, Ottawa, Owen Sound, Pembroke, Perth, Peterborough, Petrolea, Prescott, Port Arthur, Port Hope, Port Stanley, Sarnia, Sault Ste. Marie, Smith's Falls, Stratford, St. Catharines, St. Thomas, Toronto, Welland, Whitby, Windsor, Woodstock.

Quebec—Coaticook, Fraserville, Joliette, Montreal, Quebec, Rimouski, Sherbrooke, Sorel, Stanstead, St. Hyacinthe, St. Jerome, St. Johns, Three Rivers.

New Brunswick—Campbellton, Chatham, Edmundston, Fredericton, Moncton, Newcastle, St. John, St. Stephen, Sussex, Woodstock.

Nova Scotia—Antigonish, Halifax, Lunenburg, Pictou, Sydney, C. B., Truro, Yarmouth.

Manitoba and North-west Territories—Brandon, Calgary, Lethbridge, Regina, Winnipeg.

British Columbia—Kamloops, Nelson, New Westminster, Vancouver.

POST OFFICE AT STRATHROY.

Mr. CALVERT asked:

1. What was the number of tenders received by the department for the erection of the post office at the town of Strathroy, county of Middlesex?
2. What were the names and amount of each tender?
3. What was the name of the party to whom the contract was granted?
4. What amount (if any) was paid for extras?
5. What did the officers of the department estimate the cost of said building, before contract was let?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. Eight. 2. Lewis & Cluff, $14,475; Wm. Stuart, $17,711; Tambling & Jones, $18,670; F. Toms, $18,900; James Strachan, $18,992.60; Johnston & Fawcett, $19,646; P. Navin, $20,222; Campbell & McBeth, $21,870. 3. Lewis & Cluff. 4. $475. 5. $25,000, including site, heating and clerk of works.

THE QUARANTINE REGULATIONS.

Mr. DAVIN moved for:

Copies of all letters, petitions and other documents bearing on the changes made in the quarantine regulations between the United States and Manitoba, the North-west Territories and British Columbia, and particulars of changes made at each station in the personnel of officers employed to carry out the quarantine regulations.

He said: In rising to make this motion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Government to the sentiment of fear that pervades that portion of the North-west Territories which I represent, Western Assiniboia, respecting the changes which have taken place in quarantine. But I have made the motion cover more than Western Assinibola, for the reason that I am assured that the feeling of alarm has extended into Alberta and into Manitoba as well. There are three classes of animals mainly affected by the change—sheep, cattle and swine. We are mainly concerned with sheep and cattle. Some four years ago, in consequence of a tainted flock of sheep having been brought in by Mr. Philbrick, the flocks and herds of Western Assiniboia and other parts of the country became affected with a virulent scab. The consequence was great loss, not merely in the animals that had to be killed, but also as to the saleability of our sheep and as to the wool clip. I spoke to the Minister of Agriculture on the subject at the time, and he passed an Order in Council giving a quarantine of thirty days. Now, that thirty days' quarantine is removed by the regulations passed by the present Government at the instance of the hon. Minister of Agriculture. The consequence is that there is great alarm. I have here a communication from the Canadian Land and Ranch Company, Limited, Crane Lake, N.W.T signed by:

	Sheep.
Joseph Dixon	1,400
A. J. Wallace	3,500
Martin & Harris	800
E. E. Heffer	300
G. W. Quick	1,900
Hassett & Cooil	1,100
W. Brown	1,850
Martin Bros	1,325
J. G. Farr	3,000
Canadian Land and Ranch Co	15,000

Now, I may say just in passing, as a matter of mere comment, that the name which heads this list is that of a strong supporter of the Government. This is what Mr. Andrews writes me:

Dear Sir,—I am requested by the wool-growers of the Maple Creek district to ask you to use your influence to get the Government to again establish the quarantine of thirty days on all sheep coming from the United States to the North-west Territories or British Columbia. (2.) We have already suffered very severely from scab in this district, which was brought in by a herd of sheep imported by a man named Philbrick, from Montana. These sheep were sold in small lots to sheep-owners in the district, and in every instance scab of the most virulent type made its appearance, causing the loss of thousands of sheep. As it made its appearance just at the beginning of winter, several owners were nearly ruined. Not only did a large percentage of their sheep die, but their next season's wool crop was hardly worth clipping, and they could not dispose of their fat sheep for mutton, as the district was quarantined. It took two years to stamp out the disease, and, as the late Government put on a quarantine against American sheep, no more scabby sheep have been imported. It is well known that sheep may have become infected by scab in passing over infected ground, or from corrals or cars, and that it is impossible to detect the disease in its early stage; but, if the sheep are held for thirty days, and inspected two or three times during that period, scab could be detected, if it is there. I inclose you the names

of the wool-growers who have asked me to write to you. There would have been many others, had we had time to have seen them.

Yours truly,

D. H. ANDREWS.

Then follow the names I have already given. Mr. Johnson was one of those who called my attention to this matter some four years ago. He has published a communication to one of the members from Alberta, in one of the western papers, in which he made precisely the same estimate made by the writer of this letter. He pointed to the same source of loss and emphasized the fact that while scab in sheep so affected might appear at once, it also might appear only in fifteen days. So that you see, Mr. Speaker, the wool-growers and sheep-owners in the west are alarmed at what has taken place, and there is a general impression that the Minister of Agriculture was rather precipitate in his action.

There are others who feel equally alarmed wth regard to cattle. They feel that our ranches will be overrun by American cattle. I believe that in Western Assiniboia there is no difference of opinion at all on this subject, but I am told that west of Western Assiniboia there is some little difference of opinion. For instance, I am told that some persons connected with the Corcoran ranch have said that the Chicago market is as good for them as the Montreal market. I do not know whether they go so far as to say that the quarantine was of no use, but they have expressed themselves as I have just stated. I am told, however, that that feeling is not general even there. I can say for Western Assiniboia, at any rate, that any cattlemen who have approached or written me on that subject have emphatically condemned the new regulations. What they say is that their ranches will be overrun, and that our ranches are valuable, whereas the Americans' are not, but are eaten off and daily becoming worse. There cannot, I think, be any doubt that our ranches are in excellent condition, and that the action of the Americans in heading their cattle at the beginning of every winter, on to the boundary line at Wood Mountain and Willow Bunch or still further west, shows what value they attach to our ranches as winter ranches for their cattle.

There is a communication to which my attention has been called, signed "Canada for the Canadians," which was sent to the Medicine Hat "News," and appears in that paper of 25th February, 1897, and just as some of those who signed the letter which I read to the House are strong supporters of this Government, I may say that the gentleman who writes this letter is an avowed supporter of it. He expresses belief that we have now a Government in power who will hear appeals of this nature, and, under such circumstances I feel still more confident in bringing his opinion before the House. This writer in the Medicine Hat "News" asks: What, under the existing condition of things, is to become of the stock-raiser and farmer in the great North-west who is just beginning to realize the profit there is in stock-raising in Manitoba, Assiniboia and Alberta, with "its vastitude and ranges," of which there is not the like on the continent of America? And right well, he goes on to say, do the Montana stockmen, as well as the stockmen of Dakota, Wyoming, Idaho and all the western grazing states know it. For many years they have looked on with jealous eye, but could not partake of the fruits which were and should be henceforth protected for the young and enterprising Canadian cattlemen. He goes on to say:

It is a well-known fact that the North-west ranges are the best in quantity and quality that are in the west to-day. It is also well known that the ranges of Montana, Dakota, Idaho, Wyoming, &c., are a thing of the past.

He says that the American ranchmen are rejoicing at the change and are laughing at the idea, and saying: What a snap it is for us, and he concludes by deploring the imminence of the inroad of American cattle into our valuable ranches. Again, he asks:

Are the Canadians who are just commencing the stock-raising industry, to be crushed out and made to return whence they came, and give all to the Yankee across the line, and his immense herds to feed and grow rich on the fat of our land? These same Yankees made their beginning in the stock-raising industry years ago, the same as our young Canadians are doing to-day, but time has allowed the Yankee to accumulate his thousands.

More than once, in this connection, he emphasizes the fear that the comparatively poor Canadian stockmen will be crushed out by the rich Yankee stockmen. He says:

Are the American stockmen going to crush out our young industry? The Canadian stockmen will need all the range this country has in a very short time, and so why should the American stockmen be privileged to come into our country and lease large tracts of territory for their immense herds, for the nominal sum of one cent per acre? These herds are sure to bring disease with them. They will eat out the range, leaving it as bare as the desert. How is the young stockman to compete with this foreign capital, literally bleeding the country? It will crush the young stockmen out for ever, unless he can procure some protection from the Government.

Here again is what he says, and I call the attention of the Government especially to it:

Although we believe in free trade to a certain extent, we do not believe in giving the already equipped and established Yankee stockmen the pasture that is intended for our Canadian citizens. Give the Canadian stockmen a chance, and in one-half the time it took the American cattlemen to accumulate what they have, our Canadians will double, as they have in every branch of business since confederation.

Then he says, as I told the House at the

beginning of these remarks in introducing these letters :

The present Government is willing to hear you, and willing to protect you.

And then he goes on to make a very important statement.

At the present time there is a disease breaking up near Fort Benton, Mont. The nature of this disease is unknown to stockmen, but it threatens absolute destruction to many thousand head.

And again :

Why cannot there be some plan suggested that will protect our Canadian ranges or our own citizens, instead of allowing the American stockmen to monopolize the country and give nothing in return? It certainly will hurt the country and tend to depopulate it.

We are, in politics, Liberals and free traders, so long as we get the equivalent in return for what we give ; but in this important matter we get nothing.

Politics should have nothing to do with so important a matter as this, and every right-thinking person whom it may concern, should do something to assist the Government in adjusting the measure so that it may be an everlasting benefit to ourselves.

Should the Government remove the quarantine? The duty should be raised to 40 per cent to all American stockmen, who are sure to flood the country with their countless thousands of horned cattle, horses and sheep, if once the quarantine is removed in the British North-west Territories. But the actual Canadian citizen who is actually engaged in stock-raising and is helping to build up the country, should be privileged to get his young cattle in the United States from parts where disease is not known, free from duty.

And he closes with these words :

This is one way out, where the actual Canadian citizen will have protection, and in a very few years will be able to compete successfully with other stockmen. On the other hand, if he has no protection, he will be completely crushed out of business by the wealthy American stockmen.

Now, that is from a man as far west as Medicine Hat. I have here a communication from Parkbeg which, as hon. members know, is considerably east of Maple Creek :

Dear Sir,—Many thanks for your prompt attention in the matter of reports. I would like to call your attention to—but, doubtless, it has been done by others—that of the agreement made by Hon. Mr. Fisher, the Minister of Agriculture, and the United States Secretary of Agriculture, relating to the quarantine of animals under the heading of "breeding cattle, &c." It says : cattle for feeding or stock ranches must be accompanied by a certificate showing that they are free from any contagious disease. If I understand this rightly, the United States cattle in limitless numbers may be fed in Canadian pastures. This, to my mind, is unfair and detrimental to western stock-raisers, and certainly ought to be amended. Some one should see to it. I know of no better man than the member elect.

Yours respectfully.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that these communications establish that there is uneasiness in regard to these quarantine regulations, and therefore I think it is desirable that the papers that I ask for in this motion should be brought down, explaining the changes in these regulations. I further ask for "particulars of changes made at each station in the personnel of the officers employed to carry out the quarantine regulations." I will not dwell at any length on my reason for asking for this list. Hon. members will easily surmise why I wish this information, but I have no desire to divert the attention of the House from the subject which is the pressing subject in regard to these regulations that is before the House and the country, viz., whether the Minister of Agriculture has not been a little precipitate in having the Government pass the Order in Council that has been passed, and whether he should not consider the rescinding of these regulations, or, at least, the making of inquiries with a view to seeing whether it is not his duty to rescind them, in order to protect our stockmen in Assiniboia and other parts of the west.

Mr. LISTER. I am sure we all must regret the absence of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) when a somewhat important motion, as this is, is brought up for discussion before the House. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) who has just spoken. I think the Government is entitled to the thanks of the stockmen of Canada and of the country at large for the steps they have taken to facilitate the sale and transportation of stock from Canada to the United States and from that country to Canada. My hon. friend (Mr. Davin) is evidently not familiar with the facts. He has spoken from a brief furnished to him by gentlemen who seem to imagine that these new regulations will have the effect of destroying the industry in the North-west. But, Sir, a moment's consideration must satisfy you that such cannot be the case. The hon. gentleman surely knows that cattle coming into Canada, whether into the older provinces or the North-west Territories, must pay a duty ; and he knows that if these cattle are transported again to the United States they are met at the boundary line, and must pay duty on going back. So that, so far as the fear of cattle being brought into Canada to compete with the Canadian producer of cattle in the United States market or any other market is concerned, it is without foundation. I know as a fact, at least I believe, that the hon. gentleman who occupied the position now held by the Minister of Agriculture, made efforts to bring about the simplification of the quarantine regulations between this country and the United States, regulations which every person at all familiar with the trade knows where such an obstruction as to make it impossible to deal in cattle between the two countries. Why, Sir, what was the fact ? While we sent large numbers of sheep to the United States, we were unable to export cattle. Why ? Because we were met

at the border with quarantine regulations. It was necessary that the cattle should remain in quarantine for nine'y days. The result was a tremendous cost to the importer, making it impossible for him to trade profitably with the United States.

Why, Sir, if my hon. friend will take up the London "Free Press," if he will take up the Brockville papers, if he will take up the Buffalo papers, within a few days after these new quarantine regulations came into effect, he will find that thousands of cattle at once went from Ontario to the United States, and found a market in the city of Buffalo. It was not profitable to ship away our cattle at that time to England, and the new regulations enabled the Canadian stockman to ship his cattle to the United States last winter and receive profitable prices for cattle that otherwise he would have had to winter over and ultimately send to England for sale. Why, the Buffalo papers day after day remarked upon the tremendous impetus given to the cattle trade. Twenty carloads would come in, forty carloads would come in, during the day, finding a ready sale, and the consequence was that the Canadian farmer had a market open for his surplus products that he would not have had had not these quarantine regulations been brought into operation by the present Minister of Agriculture. What is the position? Was there any greater safety then than there is now? At that time the animals imported into the country had to be put in quarantine; now, instead of going into quarantine, a veterinary surgeon appointed by the Government, certifies that these cattle are free from disease, and upon that certificate the United States authorities allow them to enter that country. We in like manner accept from the United States officer his certificate to the same effect, and we allow those cattle to come into Canada. As a matter of fact, we import no cattle at all, except for breeding purposes; and I venture to say that any cattle imported into the North-west Territories must be for the same purpose—not for the purpose of entering into competition with local breeders, not for the purpose of feeding and going back again to the United States, but for the purpose of improving the herds in the North-west Territories. No cattlemen would take their cattle from Montana, or from Idaho, or any other state, into the North-west Territories, paying a duty to Canada, and then take them back to the United States, paying the 20 per cent duty which is exacted there again. It would not be profitable, and not being profitable, it will not be done. I apprehend that the gentleman who wrote those letters, parts of which my hon. friend has read to the House, were apprehensive that injury might result, when, as a matter of fact, no injury has resulted. The quarantine service of Canada and the United States did not work satisfactorily. It was overloaded with officers, it was costly to the country, and it was an impediment to trade between the two countries. These difficulties and objections have been removed to a great extent. So far as safety is concerned, I venture the assertion that we are as safe to-day as we were when the quarantine regulations were in force which compelled us to keep those animals in quarantine ninety days. In my own town we had a quarantine, and I venture to say that in all the years it was in force I do not think one single animal was destroyed on account of disease. They were put in there, poorly attended to, often at great expense; they were not entrusted to the man in charge of the quarantine, but to the hired men themselves. Only animals were imported into Canada that were brought in for the purpose of breeding. It was a subject of irritation, but it was a subject of loss and complaint; and I repeat the statement which I have made, that the Minister of Agriculture, in removing those objections, in carrying out what I believe his predecessor intended to do, and tried to do, has bestowed upon this country a great benefit that it would not have enjoyed were it not for the regulations being changed and made as they are to-day. It is quite possible that within a very few days the tariff of the United States may be so high as to prevent the importation of cattle into that country at all; but at the present moment, and for months past, vast quantities of cattle have been exported to the United States to the great profit of the farmers of this country. Papers which support my hon. friends opposite have spoken in terms of the strongest commendation of what has been done; and I venture to say that there is no paper in Ontario East, and I doubt if there are many in the west, thoroughly understanding the subject, which would be prepared to take exception to what has been done by the Government. The Government are entitled to the thanks of every stock-raiser in this country, and I believe they will receive it. A return to the old condition of affairs would be taking a step backwards, a step not in the interests of the people of this country.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There is no one, I think, who will for a moment say that the subject which has been brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) is not a very important one indeed. It has many phases, one of which has not been touched upon, either by the hon. gentleman who moved the motion or by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister), who has continued this discussion. I may be pardoned, perhaps, if I go for a few moments a little outside of the line which these gentlemen have taken, and refer to another phase of the question which will be very interesting to the House, more particularly in view

of the history of this question, because it has had a long history so far as negotiations in regard to the cattle trade are concerned. But first let me say a word as to the first part of the subject which the hon. member for West Assiniboia discussed, namely, the sheep question, in which the western districts are, if we are to believe their representations in papers submitted to the department, very greatly interested indeed. Under the late Government representations of a very urgent nature were made that on account of the scab which was prevalent in the territory across the line, a quarantine should be established in regard to the importation of American sheep. At first it was asked that a ninety-day quarantine be established, and afterwards is was agreed upon that pos sibly a shorter time would prove to be effective in keeping out that disease, which the sheep-raisers of Alberta, particularly, were very anxious to have kept out. Whatever may be said with regard to the policy of the Government, and of its popularity in other sections of the country, I venture to say that if the Government have entirely abandoned the sheep quarantine as regards those territories, it will be a move against which the sheep-raisers of Alberta will determinedly set their faces. Now, as to the cattle quarantine, it is important to look at this subject in view of a statement which was made by the Minister of Agriculture, whose absence I regret, equally with the member for West Lambton. Last year when this subject came under discussion in the House, some conversation took place across the floor as to whether the Government had absolutely abandoned the policy of securing the removal of the embargo enforced against Canadian cattle. At that time the Minister of Agriculture, in answer to a question put by myself, declared that he had not at all abandoned that policy, but that he had a firm hope that he would eventually succeed in getting that embargo against Canadian cattle removed. I take it, from the policy which the Government has pursued, that they have at least absolutely abandoned that hope, because the Government are quite aware that in the abandonment of the quarantine against American cattle, they can no longer with a shadow of reason entertain the hope of securing the removal of the British embargo against our cattle, which was imposed in 1892. Sir, I must say this, that I do not think they are abandoning much, because, after the conferences which I personally had with the Department of Agriculture in England, I was convinced that the attempt to secure the removal of that embargo was a vain attempt, and any hope we might have entertained of securing the removal of that embargo was a hope practically without foundation. But it is just as well for the country to understand the intimation which is unmistakably given in the removal of quarantine against American cattle, that the Dominion Government has abandoned even the effort to secure the removal of that embargo which has worked so strongly and effectively against the interests of Canadian cattle. I now want to refer for a moment to a statement made by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) as to the credit which should be given to the Dominion Government for this very prompt and important action on their part in securing reciprocity, so far as this matter is concerned, not a reciprocity involving the absolute abandonment of the duty or of any duty, but the mutual removal of the quarantine between this country and the United States. The hon. member for Lambton knows very well that there is not a very great deal of credit due this Government for that work. I am willing to give the Government any credit due them on any subject, whether of an agricultural or any other nature, but the hon. member for Lambton must know, and the Minister of Agriculture must know that that quarantine was never put up on account of the action of the United States in quarantining Canadian cattle, but it was put up because of the action of the Canadian Government against the United States for the protection of our herds from disease, and we maintained the quarantine against American cattle, not for the purpose of obstructing trade with the United States, but because we always hoped and fondly hoped that by keeping up that quarantine against American cattle, which was one of the requirements of the arrangements made with the Imperial Government, we would maintain the health of our herds and would finally secure release from the embargo, and entrance into the British market, and such an advantage, for one hour, would be more beneficial to the Canadian farmers than access to the local market of Buffalo from now till the end of the century. Sir, when credit is spoken of as being due to the Government, I am bound to say that in five minutes we could have secured the removal of the American quarantine against our cattle, simply by saying to the United States Government: We will take down our quarantine and give free admission to your cattle. But we maintained it with a view to secure the greater market of Great Britain, which was of immense advantage to the Canadian farmers. I am not saying that the question cannot be argued from both sides. When I looked at it, I considered it with the view that there were two sides to the argument. If we were to abandon the hope of securing the removal of the embargo in Great Britain, if there was good hope of securing the removal of that embargo by keeping up the embargo against American cattle, then the question was not one for argument, the facts and advantages were all on one side. But if we were to abandon the hope of securing the

removal of the British embargo, the question was a debatable one, and there were arguments to be used on both sides. There are arguments to be advanced for the removal of the quarantine, and there are arguments for its maintenance; but so far as any credit due to the Government is concerned, I repeat that this is a question with which the late Government might easily have dealt, if we had not looked at the broader question of securing the British market for our cattle exports. I desire to refer to a statement made by the hon. member for Lambton as to the importance the American market has proved itself to be for Canadian farmers. I have no doubt when these new regulations came into force a considerable number of cattle were taken to the other side of the line; but it is my information that the trade did not pay, and that if the hon. gentleman will follow the inquiry into recent months and recent weeks he will find that what promised to be a very flourishing trade has proved exceedingly disappointing to those who engaged in it. There is another phase of this question to which I desire to refer for a moment. When the hon. leader of the Government visited the county of Brant he said to the people there: See what we have done; we have only been in power an exceedingly short time, and yet we have given you free trade between Canada and the United States. I know it was a lapsus linguae, that the hon. gentleman did not mean that he had secured the removal of customs duties on either side, because he knows that quarantine regulations and tariff regulations are two different things; and I am pleased that the hon. gentleman was in error in that regard, for I am justified in supposing that it was not a shadow which told of coming events by the candid manner in which the hon. member assured the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) that while the quarantine regulations were off, the duty was still on, and hence there was no ruinous competition in the cattle-raising business in the North-west Territories of Canada. I hope that the little utterance of the member for West Lambton is correct, and that even if the quarantine regulations are permanently removed, we will at least have the protection of our own market for our farmers in regard to this line of the product of the farm. I can only say in conclusion that the removal of the sheep quarantine will be a disadvantage. I can only hope that the removal of the cattle quarantine will not be an injury. The hon. member for West Lambton says no injury has been done. I tell the hon. member that sufficient time has not elapsed to discover whether any injury has been done. The future will tell whether the health of our herds is affected; but, personally, it seems to me that the maintenance of the sheep quarantine in the North-west would be exceedingly advantageous to the people there.

Mr. MONTAGUE.

Mr. McMILLAN. I desire to say a few words on this question. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has forgotten that the Government of which he was a member was the first to relax quarantine regulations with respect to cattle. They removed the quarantine regulations so that cattle could come in from the United States to our North-west. It was owing to the action of the late Government in not enforcing quarantine regulations against American cattle, but allowing them to come into the North-west during a number of years that, in my estimation, was the cause of our cattle being scheduled in the British market. That was known to the Government, and, in fact, known to every one in the trade, and we have suffered on that account. This Government undoubtedly deserves great credit for what they have so far done for the farmers. They have accomplished more. They have secured the settlement of the quarantine question and, at the same time, they have ensured adequate protection to the health of our cattle. Let me read to the House the regulation under which cattle now come into Canada, that is, fat cattle and cattle for feeding, including range cattle for stocking ranches:

> This class of animals shall be accompanied by a certificate of inspection, signed by an official veterinarian, showing that the animals are free from contagious disease and that no contagious disease of cattle (excepting tuberculosis and actinomycosis) exists in the district whence they came.

Therefore, with the exception of these two diseases, our cattle are free from every other disease, pleuro-pneumonia included, because of which the British Government scheduled our cattle. If I have been correctly informed, and I think I have been, it has been a benefit to the people of the North-west, because large numbers of even beef cattle have gone to the States from Manitoba and the Territories. Our settlers who go into the North-west will be very much benefited because they can go to the United States and purchase stockers for their farms. They have been coming all the way to Ontario for these cattle, and they have been put to the expense of getting them to the ranches from such a great distance. This arrangement will relieve the settlers in the North-west from a good deal of expense, and more especially the young settlers who want a few ranch cattle. We have been very much benefited in Ontario indeed as will be shown by the following statement:—

> The total value of the live stock exported from Toronto during March was $110,643. For the same month, last year, not a dollar's worth of live stock was exported from here. The exports were divided between Portland and Buffalo, the latter point, however, taking the bulk of this stock. On Saturday, fourteen cars of stock were sent over the Grand Trunk to Iowa, several cars containing calves for feeding purposes. These

were sent from Myrtle. There were also eleven cars of stock for Buffalo and five for Portland.

Now, Sir, although I hold it would be a benefit to have every animal we raise fattened for the market in this country, yet we have a large number of farmers who are not in a position to fatten their stock and who are compelled to sell. I hold that the quarantine regulations that have been entered into between the Government of Canada and that of the United States, have been a great benefit to that class of farmers. When the McKinley Bill came into force between 30,000 and 40,000 head of stockers went annually to the States, and we know that the McKinley Bill stopped that trade. I believe that the quarantine regulations are such, that if the disease appears in any locality the Government can at once enforce these regulations. Our cattle breeders have held for a long time, that it was necessary that animals for breeding purposes should be allowed to come to Canada from the United States free from quarantine regulations, so long as a certificate was given that the animal imported was free from disease and that no disease existed in the locality whence it came. The Order in Council had hardly been passed when the buyers from the United States were scouring Ontario to purchase cattle there, and take them to the States. It is a benefit to the breeders of the province of Ontario to get animals from the United States to mix with their stock, because there is some excellent stock in the States. I hold that the late Government was very negligent with respect to the quarantine regulations and also with respect to the complaints about scab in sheep. I myself rose in this House and warned the late Government that unless a very strict system of inspection was put in force, our sheep would soon be scheduled. But they paid no attention to it until the disease came into the country from the United States, and then got to Great Britain. If the regulations had been enforced properly, we would not have had our sheep scheduled as they have been. The late Government was unwise in its generation, and they did not lock the stable door until after the horse was stolen. I believe that the present regulations will be of great benefit to the people of this country even suppose the American tariff increases the duty on animals and prevents us shipping stockers or beef cattle. The free interchange of animals for breeding purposes would benefit both Canada and the United States. The new arrangement made by the present Government enables us not only to ship from Portland, but also from Boston and New York to the British market, and this will prevent the grievances the farmers laboured under in having to pay higher rates from Canadian than from American ports. That benefit will continue to us even though a higher tariff is enforced against us by the United States. The present Minister of Agriculture has done a great benefit to the farmers and stock-breeders of this country, and he has succeded in doing more than was done by the late Government for many years. To say that there is no thanks due to the Minister of Agriculture for negotiating this arrangement at Washington, is not a correct statement to make. The farmers in this House knew their wants and knew what would benefit them and they unsuccessfully urged on the late Government to take measures to bring this arrangement about. The conduct of the late Government is another evidence of the rank folly of having a Minister of Agriculture who did not understand the business, and who did not understand the needs of the cattle shippers and farmers of this country.

Mr. MONTAGUE. May I be allowed just a personal explanation. My hon. friend (Mr. McMillan) and myself, are, I am afraid, upon the same side of the question, and if the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMillan) had listened to the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) he would have understood so. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) stated, and stated properly, that the negotiations which finally resulted in the removal of the vexatious quarantine between the two countries were started by myself, and in consequence, the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMillan) can have no fault to find with me on that score. What I did say was this: That the late Government only considered it a question of discussion for the removal of these quarantine regulations, when we had absolutely abandoned the hope of securing the removal of the British embargo. I am sure the hon. gentleman from Huron (Mr. McMillan) agrees with me in that conclusion.

Mr. McMULLEN. There is one point in connection with this discussion which we should make clear. The ex-Minister of Finance has said, that the action of the present Government, entering into an arrangement with the United States for the betterment of the quarantine regulations, is an evidence that they have dropped all hope of the removal of the embargo on cattle from England. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) knows, if he is a close reader of what has taken place in England, that the embargo occupies a very different position to-day from what it did when he was Minister of Agriculture, and when his party were in power. He knows that then the embargo only took the shape of a schedule order by the Minister of Agriculture suspending the admission of our cattle. He knows that since then, and before the present Government came into power, it took the shape of a statutory enactment, and occupies that position to-day. Now, during the time that there was any hope at all of removing that embargo, and when a vigorous and active

and earnest effort should be made for its removal, hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, and they did not make that vigorous, active and determined effort to have it removed. The result was, that the English Government passed the embargo into a statutory enactment, so that its removal, if made at all, has to be made by a repealing Act of the British Parliament. Under these circumstances, the present Minister of Agriculture, seeing that England had proceeded in the determination of perpetuating that condition of things, made the very best move he could make. That was to secure the closest, most liberal and most unrestricted intercourse for the sale of cattle between Canada and the United States; and he has done that. But what was the cause of the embargo in the first place? Was it because there were no quarantine regulations between Canada and the United States? It was because, although they did exist, they were so loosely, recklessly and carelessly administered by hon. gentlemen opposite, when they were in power, and the English Minister of Agriculture became aware of the fact.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. McMULLEN. That has been proved over and over again in this House, and the documents will bear out what I say.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If the hon. gentleman will permit me, I will say that, on some future occasion, I will bring a letter which was sent to me by the present president of the British Board of Agriculture, the Right Hon. Walter Long, in which he said that the British Government never had a shadow of fault to find with the manner in which we carried out the regulations.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) read to this House all the correspondence in connection with that unfortunate incident, and proved beyond all question that the responsibility rested at the door of the Government here, and there has never, to this day, been an answer made to that charge.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him, who is the higher authority as to what influenced the Imperial Government—the British Minister of Agriculture or the Postmaster General of Canada?

Mr. McMULLEN. What the Postmaster General of Canada presented here was a complete recapitulation of the communications that passed between the Government of Canada and the Home Government on that whole question. The English Government outlined a certain course which the Canadian Government should take in order to get that embargo removed. Were the suggestions of the British Government carried out?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is another question altogether.

Mr. McMULLEN. They were not at all, as the hon. leader of the Opposition knows. One suggestion was that several of the herds shipped to England should be slaughtered in order to ascertain whether pleuropnuemonia existed in Canada or not. Can the hon. leader of the Opposition say that that suggestion was carried out?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. An utterly impracticable suggestion.

Mr. McMULLEN. It was not carried out, and the reason was that it would be too great an expense to do so The ex-Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Montague), in presenting the case to the House, did not do it fairly. Hon. gentlemen opposite occupied the Treasury benches when the opportunity existed for the removal of the embargo, and neglected that opportunity. They did not exert themselves as earnestly or zealously as they ought to have done to get that embargo removed. The present Government, however, entered office after the embargo had taken a statutory form, and when the prospect of getting it removed was much less than when it was in the form of a scheduling order. That is the difference.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken in the view he takes of this question. The evidence is clear and incontrovertible. The papers brought down and laid on the Table of the House of Commons by the Imperial Government showed that Canada had made out such an overwhelming case in favour of the removal of all the disabilities imposed by the schedule, that the Colonial Minister, who had the whole matter under his charge, and with whom all the negotiations were carried on, declared, in a communication to the Department of Agriculture—a thing almost unparalleled in the history of the Imperial Government—that he was satisfied, from the case that Canada had presented, that no pleuro-pneumonia existed in this country. The Liberal party were then in power, and the Marquis of Ripon exerted all his influence—in fact, went further than a British Minister almost ever goes—to induce his colleagues in the Government to cancel the order. If the Government of Canada were able to make out a case that satisfied the Colonial Minister that the restriction ought to be removed, I want to know whether it lies with any person in Canada to say that there was any failure on the part of the Canadian Government. I think that settles the matter conclusively. Lord Ripon felt strongly, as the late Minister of Agriculture said since his removal to the House of Lords, that the adoption of an Act prohibiting cattle from being landed alive in Great Britain was a matter of pure protection. I, myself, felt, when the present Government came into power, that the removal of the embargo

was practically hopeless, and it was the deplorable condition of the agricultural interest in England, brought so forcibly to the notice of the Imperial Government, that induced them to adopt this policy. It was not in my opinion, for the purpose of protecting British cattle from the introduction of pleuro-pneumonia or other disease from this or any other country, but for the purpose of protecting the interests of British agriculturists.

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

After Recess.

Mr. SPROULE. I rose before six o'clock to say but a very few words upon this motion in reply to some remarks that were made by the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) and the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). I was a little surprised at the position taken by the hon. member for South Huron to-day and the fulsome eulogy he expended upon this Government for the concessions which they obtained from the United States, in the shape of permission to export our cattle to that country without undergoing the quarantine that was previously imposed. It is only a few years ago when the hon. gentleman advocated very strongly the importation of free corn on the ground that it was absolutely necessary in order that we might feed our cattle as cheaply as possible. He contended that the most profitable trade to our farmers would be the feeding of cattle in Canada until they were in prime condition and then exporting them to the old country. At that time there was a discussion as to the advantage which Canada had secured through the efforts of our then High Commissioner (Sir Charles Tupper) in getting the embargo taken off cattle exported to Great Britain, and the hon. gentleman took the view that the removal of this embargo was no great advantage to us, because it would be much more profitable to our farmers to ship our cattle in prime condition than to ship them as stockers, and that it would be in their interests if our Government would prevent the exportation of stockers. He said that he himself every year fed a number of cattle, and the disadvantage he found he had to labour under was the difficulty of obtaining coarse grains, and contended that if corn were allowed to come in free, we would be enabled to feed our own cattle cheaply, so that even if Great Britain did schedule our cattle, that would be to our profit, because it was much better for us to feed our own cattle for export to the old country. The sooner the day came, he said, when Canada would not export half-fed cattle or stockers, the better it would be for Canadian farmers, and therefore he did not consider the late Government entitled to any credit for the removal of that embargo or for its efforts to have it removed. To-day however, the hon. gentleman appears to have changed his views, and thinks it is a great concession to be allowed to ship our cattle without quarantine to the United States, and he instanced with much satisfaction the number of stockers which had been sent to Buffalo last spring. I really can find no reason for this change of policy on the hon. gentleman's part except in the fact that this concession was obtained by his friends. Just as it depends a great deal whose ox is gored, so it depends a great deal who it is that does the act, and he congratulates his own friends to-day on obtaining something which a few years ago he argued was no advantage to our Canadian farmers.

The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) complained very strongly that the late Government had not made the strong effort they should have made to have the embargo raised on our cattle, and he went on to argue that that embargo was put on our cattle because the quarantine regulations were not enforced by this Government, but were very laxly carried out. I believe he went so far as to say that the British Board of Agriculture declared it was because of that fact that the embargo had been imposed. The late Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Montague) replied by citing the contents of a letter from the president of the Board of Agriculture (Mr. Long), which distinctly stated that the board had never complained of the way in which we had carried out our quarantine regulations, and that it was not at all on that account the embargo was put on Canadian cattle. At the time the first complaint was made, in 1892, two cases supposed to be pleuro-pneumonia were found in a consignment of cattle on the "Huronia" and "Mount Seaton." The late Government did everything possible, firstly, to satisfy the British Board of Agriculture that there was no pleuro-pneumonia in Canada and, secondly, that the herd from which these cattle came was not affected but was healthy in every respect, and that, therefore, there was no possible reason why they should be slaugthered. The hon. member for Wellington condemned the late Government for not having ordered the slaughter of the cattle from which these two cases were taken. He said that, at any rate, they were open to the suspicion of having been brought in from the United States, owing to the lax enforcement of our quarantine regulations, and therefore prejudiced our case in the old country. He forgot to tell the House that in tracing up the sources from which these cattle came, it was found that one came from Wolfe Island, near Kingston, and that the herd from which it came was closely inspected and again examined and every single animal in it found to be healthy

in every respect, free from pleuro-pneumonia or any other infective disease whatever. It was found that the other animal came from Pilot Mound, in Manitoba, and that also was traced to a herd which was found to be healthy in every respect. What need had the Government to go further? There would not have been a man in this House more ready to condemn the Government if they had gone beyond that and slaugthered the cattle belonging to the settlers after it was found there was no pleuro-pneumonia or any other disease whatever among them.

The hon. gentleman has overshot the mark in his anxiety to eulogize the present Government for the concessions they have obtained with regard to quarantine. The late Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Montague) began negotiations with this object in view, and had the late Government remained in power a little longer, there is no doubt we would have obtained the same relaxation, with better regulations than are made today. I regard the regulations that have been made on this quarantine question as very lax, and I do not wonder that the people in the North-west Territories are apprehensive of danger arising from them. It is no wonder that they dread the bringing of the sheep scab into that country, as one of the results of these lax regulations. There is another reason why they are not satisfied, and one which is worthy the serious attention of the Government. It is this: At certain seasons of the year, the pasture south of the boundary line is very sparse, and the American ranchers are disposed to bring their cattle north for grass, and the regulations are so lax that there is nothing to prevent their doing this and possibly importing disease. But even if they do not import disease, the Americans will obtain a very important consideration in being allowed to graze their cattle in our country where the pasture is good at a season of the year when with them the pasture is bad. Some hon. gentlemen may deny this but here are the regulations:

Fat cattle and cattle for feeding, including range cattle for stocking ranches.

Section 22. This class of animals shall be accompanied by a certificate of inspection, signed by an official veterinarian showing that the animals are free from contagious diseases and that no contagious disease of cattle (excepting tuberculosis and actinomycosis) exists in the district whence they came.

It is the easiest matter in the world to get that certificate. Men bringing in cattle from the ranches can get it at any time. How are the parties charged with the authority of administering these regulations to know whether the certificate is official or not? An American ranchman brings that certificate along and his cattle can feed in our country the whole season. Some of our ranchers think that this is going to be very injurious to them. If it does nothing else, it gives the use, free, to Americans of our pasture lands for which our ranchers pay an annual rent, and which our ranchers think ought to be preserved for the use of our own cattle. Our ranchers therefore do not think these regulations are stringent enough to secure to them the consideration and protection they ought to have in their own country. Then the Americans can bring in horses without any inspection:

Section 40. Horses may be admitted for general purposes, for sale, or for stocking ranches, and also cow ponies for cattle ranches, or horses which form part of settlers' effects, on inspection at port of entry only.

N.B.—Inspection of horses admitted under the above clauses shall not be enforced unless ordered by the Minister of Agriculture, when deemed expedient or necessary.

Therefore, it is quite clear it is not deemed yet expedient or necessary, and American horses may come in without any inspection or examination. Our settlers object to this. I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) to this, if he were in the House or the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), because I think it is worthy of serious consideration, and it appears to me more stringent regulations will have to be made before you can secure to our settlers what they are entitled to in their own country. Then I take the question of sheep. Now it is true that the importation of sheep for breeding and feeding purposes may be permitted subject to inspection. But inspection at a port of entry will not always show whether sheep are troubled with scab or rot. The disease may be in its incipient stage, and in that case, it cannot be detected by the best veterinary surgeon. I find that sheep for slaughter will be admitted without certificates or inspection. What is to prevent people representing that their sheep are brought in for slaughtering purposes? They may be brought in in large numbers and no record will be kept of them. They may mix with the ranch sheep of our North-west, and cause a repetition of the same trouble that the ranchers had to meet in 1892, when they suffered severe losses through the scab. To my mind the regulations are too lax, and I am quite sure it will be found that they will have to be changed before very long, or else there will be practically no security for the settlers in the North-west and nothing to prevent the mixing with their flocks of sheep from south of the boundary line.

While I am quite satisfied that it is of great benefit to us here at some seasons of the year to be able to send our stockers off to the United States under better quarantine regulations to Canada than we had, still I do think this system will lead to evil in the future which will necessitate a change in the regulations. Then, with regard to Manitoba and the North-west Territories, especially the North-west Territories, I think

that when these regulations are practically worked out it will be found that they are of no practical advantage to the settlers there, and the Government will be obliged to change them and change them quite materially. I do not wish to detract from any credit that the Government is entitled to for anything they have done in connection with the Department of Agriculture. I think the present Minister is endeavouring to do his best, and with many of the things he has done I am heartily in accord. But I do say that he is not entitled to so much credit in this case over the late Government, because they were going to do the same thing. Until it was seen that it was impossible for the Canadian Government to secure the withdrawal of the embargo upon our cattle in England, it was inadvisable to do anything about the relaxation of the quarantine regulations. But when it was found that this could not be done, the late Government attempted to do what the present Minister has done. The idea being carried out, in my opinion it might have been carried out with better and stricter regulations, regulations that would inure more to the benefit of the Canadian farmer than those that have been adopted.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to occupy the attention of the House for a few minutes with a discussion of this question from a strictly non-partisan standpoint. I regret very much that a question of such importance to the country, and especially to the western country, should have led to so much discussion, which was, to my mind, more historical and partisan than matter of fact. On this question it may be admitted, perhaps, that I speak with some authority, as I happen to represent the constituency that is probably most deeply interested in this quarantine question, by reason of the number of stock held in it and by reason of its situation. I would like to set before the House as clearly as possible the different questions that are affected by this matter, and that, with all deference to preceding speakers, have been rather mixed up. I should like to sort these questions out, so to speak, so that there may be a clearer understanding of the effects in regard to each one.

Now, as to the good intentions of the Minister of Agriculture and the Government in bringing about this change of the quarantine regulations, I do not suppose there can be any question. This was not a partisan move, but one intended in the general interest of the agricultural community. In the discussions in the Agricultural Committee last session, men of all parties spoke in favour of the abolition of these quarantine regulations—not that I spoke in favour of them, for I did not. There is a certain difference of interest between the west and the east in this matter of stock and cattle generally, which I would like to point out to the House. While in the east, the drift is towards the States from Canada, in the west the drift is from the States to Canada; so that, while there is an antagonism in the eastern states to our Canadian stock going over there, so in the west there is an antagonism to American stock coming to our side of the line. There are reasons for this which do not need to be particularized now. I am simply stating a fact which must be borne in mind when considering and discussing this question. Now, we in the west believe in governments that will work in the line of the greatest good to the greatest number; and, as the greatest number of people is in the east, we do not expect that our special interests will receive special consideration at the hands of the east to their own prejudice. At the same time, we would not be doing what is right by those who sent us here if we did not represent the special interests of the west as the people of the west understand them. We do not expect impossibilities on the part of the Government; but we certainly cannot expect the Parliament or this Government to legislate satisfactorily in regard to our special interests unless Parliament is thoroughly informed as to what those special interests are. In regard to the matter of sheep quarantine, I am bound to say that the experience of the past has been that a quarantine is necessary for the prevention of the disease called scab being introduced into the flocks of sheep on the Canadian side of the boundary. This disease was introduced some years ago accidentally, and it cost the southern range country many thousands of dollars before it was got rid of. Not only was there the loss of sheep dying through the disease, and the cost of eradicating the disease, but, during the continuance of the pest, the sheep could not be sold and had to be held on the ranges, being thus dead stock, for two if not three years. The loss was tremendous; and it is desirable that it should not be repeated. Now I am aware of the provisions contained in the new quarantine regulations for the protection of sheep from the introduction of disease; and, while I believe that these regulations are probably sufficient for the conditions prevailing in eastern Canada, I certainly, on the information I have, cannot consider them effective in regard to the protection of sheep in western Canada, that is to say, in the ranching country. Where sheep are brought in by two, or three, or a dozen—and that is the only way, I believe, in which they are brought in from the states to eastern Canada—they are distributed among the bands in small numbers which are kept in closed fields in the farms of eastern Canada, and it is a very small matter to know whether disease has been brought in, and to isolate that disease if it has been brought in. But in the west where bands run into the hundreds of thousands, the introduction of disease among them is a serious matter, and

once it is introduced it becomes almost uncontrollable except at tremendous cost and loss. Therefore, the House will see how important it is that provisions to prevent the introduction of disease should be made as effective as possible. I am afraid that in the drafting of these resolutions sufficient consideration has not been given to the conditions prevailing in the west whereby the introduction of disease could be prevented. I am perfectly aware that there is a provision by which sheep brought in must have a certificate from the Government inspector on the United States side of the line, showing that they are in a healthy condition. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the House will agree with me that a certificate from an inspector appointed by the United States Government, when we take all the circumstances into consideration, is not an adequate protection against the introduction of disease into this country. Although I do not wish to say anything offensive, still when we consider the system under which officials are appointed in that country, when we consider the general spirit prevailing in that country, I think you will agree with me that when $100,000 or $200,000 is at stake, it would be an easy matter to fix an inspector, or to secure almost any kind of certificate from a great many of those Government inspectors. This would not be the case in the east, where each importation would only amount to a few dollars anyway, and it would not be worth the while for the exporter to do any figuring with the Government inspector. The case is different in the west, where a deal may run into hundreds of thousands, and where it is worth the while of the party who is bringing the sheep across, or sending them across, to make any terms that may be desirable with the inspector. Now, in regard to cattle, the case is entirely different. There has not been any introduction of disease amongst Canadian cattle from the United States side of the line. I understand that there is not the same probability, and therefore the same stringency in regard to quarantine is not necessary. When the quarantine regulations were first abolished, or when the people in the west heard they were going to be abolished, they were very much excited, and greatly feared that the abolition of quarantine regulations in regard to cattle would injure their interests severely. The instinct of self-preservation is just as strong in the west as it is in the east, and when the cattle ranchers of the west think they are liable to be injured by any Government regulations they certainly become alarmed, without respect to party politics, just as people in the east do. Therefore, when they feared that the abolition of these quarantine regulations would lower the value of their cattle on those ranches, they certainly did get considerably excited. I may say, Sir that that alarm was considerably increased by the very injudicious acts of an employee of the Government who was sent out there. I suppose, to allay the excitement, which he certainly did not succeed in doing. It was published in the newspapers, whether mistakingly or otherwise, that he had grossly misrepresented public opinion in the west in regard to this quarantine matter, and whatever excitement existed before was greatly increased by this deliberate misrepresentation. However, I am bound to say for the information of the House and for the information of the Government, that so far as matters have gone up to the present time, the cattle interests of the west have not been prejudiced by the removal of the quarantine: on the contrary, I notice in a late issue of the Macleod "Gazette," which may be said to be the organ of the cattle industry in that ranching country of the south, that cattle are bringing to-day a better price than at any time during the past two years, that the demand is better and the price is better; and particularly the price is better for the purpose of supplying the British Columbia market. Now, it was the fear of being shut out of the British Columbia market that stirred up the western ranchmen against the removal of the quarantine regulations in regard to cattle. I am not going to discuss the merits of the question as to what is going to be the result of the abolition of these regulations; but I will merely state as a matter of fact that up to the present time the price of cattle is better than it was before, and therefore the excitement that did arise among the cattlemen has been to a great extent, if not altogether, allayed. That is information that I think it well to put the House in possession of, so that there may not to be any misunderstanding. There was another matter that was discussed at some length by the hon. member who moved the motion, and that was the driving of American cattle across the line for the purpose of enabling them to feed on the better grasses on the north side of the line. That is a matter of very great interest in the western country; it has attracted the attention of a great number of stockmen; and it was the fear that the abolition of the quarantine would facilitate this practice of driving cattle across the line that roused them against the abolition of the regulations. Now, let it be thoroughly understood that the quarantine regulations are not necessary to the ranges of our country. I believe that these ranges can be protected by other means than by keeping up a quarantine, if the quarantine is not otherwise necessary. This is not a question necessarily belonging to the quarantine, and is not necessarily affected by the removing of the quarantine; it is a question that stands by itself. But I would like it to be understood that it is an important question in that country it is one of first-class im-

portance, and demands the attention of the Government so that the ranges of our country may be properly protected. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) said he thought there was no danger of this occurring as long as the customs duty remained, because cattle coming across the line would have to pay duty to the Canadian Government, and then, after being fed and when taken across again to the other side, they would have to pay duty to the United States Government. Well, Sir, I have been informed on good authority by ranchers that arrangements have been made with the United States authorities whereby cattle which are allowed to come across to our side of the line for pasture did not pay duty when they are taken back again. If such an arrangement has not yet been made, and if the ranchmen of Montana can benefit by such an arrangement as that, we can easily suppose that the United States Government and the United States officials will be sufficiently patriotic to help out their stockmen in that way. So it is our business to make such regulations in our own interests as will protect our own ranchmen.

There is another class of stock that I think is worthy of more consideration in regard to quarantine regulations than perhaps it has received, and that is horses. I should like to point out to the House that there has been a very considerable importation of horses with glanders into the North-west. Our farmers and ranchmen have lost severely by the importation of diseased horses, and while there has never been any quarantine applied to them in the past any more than there is now, I think it is desirable that efficient quarantine measures should be passed in regard to the importation of horses coming in from the United States. I urge this the more for this reason, that there is in the ranching country of their west a superabundance of cheap horses. The ranges are eaten down by horses having little or no commercial value. In some quarters it is stated publicly, and it is a fact, that horses are absolutely shot simply to get rid of them, so that the grass they would otherwise eat may be eaten by cattle that have commercial value, which horses have not. That condition of affairs prevails not very far south of the boundary line; so if there is a natural tendency on the part of Montana ranchers to allow their cattle to drift north of the line, there is a still greater tendency on the part of those ranchers to allow this cheap class of horses to drift north of the line. The customs duty offers very little hindrance, because it is an ad valorem one, and if the horse is only worth a dollar in Montana, the amount of duty cannot be sufficient to keep the animal on the other side of the line. So it is more necessary when there is, and it is going on now, a practically unlimited drift or importation of cheap horses from the United States to Canada, and inasmuch as they are of little value, and as they are likely to be contaminated with disease, a regulation should be framed to protect our ranchmen and farmers from the importation of these cheap horses. To sum up, I ask, without prejudice either for or against the Government, that the quarantine regulations in regard to sheep be made sufficiently stringent to protect our flocks against scab, and that the regulations in regard to horses be framed so that it will afford protection against the disease called glanders. In reference to cattle, I repeat, that so far as Alberta is concerned, the cattle in that country have not suffered by the abolition of quarantine, but if it has had any effect it has been a good effect, and the cattle industry to-day there is more profitable as to prices than it has been during the past two or three years.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to say a few words in reply, or rather not in reply because the weight of argument on both sides of the House has been for the contention that I ventured to place before the House. My hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) has brought to bear the powerful aid of his authority, and representing as he does the greatest ranching constituency in the North-west, he can speak with more than common authority, and with the qualification that he does not wish to be understood to say anything against the Government, he has supported entirely the contention I ventured to place very modestly before the House in regard to sheep, and has made a very strong plea to the Government to protect the country from that dire and dreadful disease of glanders in horses. Having my hon. friend's support in regard to sheep, and having the support of other hon. gentleman who could also speak with some authority, let me say a word in regard to the one point on which there seems to be a difference of opinion between my hon. friend and myself, and that is with regard to cattle. My hon. friend says there is no danger of the cattle interest being injured by these quarantine regulations because the price of cattle is better in Macleod than it has been for some time. I would remind my hon. friend that the price of cattle always goes up in the spring; and the fact that the market of British Columbia is as good as it was before the quarantine regulations, which are only a month old, went into operation, is really no argument against the fears which I have endeavoured to express on the part of ranchmen south of Regina, that is to say south rather of Moose Jaw, at Willow Bunch, Wood Mountain and south of Maple Creek and of Medicine Hat. Their fears, are that our ranges will be invaded; but my hon. friend says that they may be protected by other means than quarantine. If the Government come forward with another method to protect our ranges, that will meet the wishes and desires of my constituents and of myself personally. I cannot

help reading to the House a few words which came with authority from my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver), but in another character from that of member of Parliament; and at the same time it is only just to say that these words were written on 25th January, before these regulations came into existence. I am not going to say that there is any inconsistency between what he said to-night and what is written here by him, but the principle laid down as to how we in the west should regard our stock interest so entirely meets my approval that I call the attention of the House to it. His opinion is thus stated:

The Winnipeg "Commercial" is at a loss to discover the reasons for the opposition raised by some to the removal or modification of the quarantine regulation. To put the matter in another way, this leading commercial paper, representing the interests of Western Canada, does not know any reason why the quarantine regulations which have been, at least nominally, in force for a number of years without protest from any one in the west, were framed. Possibly there was no reason for them. At any rate, they existed and were approved by those interested. This being the case, it should need more than the word of Dr. McEachren that they were not wanted by the western stockmen, to cause their removal. There should be a reason shown for their removal before reasons against it are called for, and before removal takes place. It may be that the stockmen want these restrictions retained for their mere selfish interest, just as the merchants, or millers, or farmers of Manitoba might want something for their special interest. And if there were no other reason, this would be good enough to warrant full consideration before action is taken.

Well now, Sir, in regard to that I have to say, that the stockmen of Assiniboia still fear that the results of these regulations will be disastrous to them.

The stockmen of Alberta and British Columbia are absolutely unanimous on this question, so far as heard from, with the solitary exception of Dr. McEachren, who, as the hired servant of the Government, anxious to hold a lucrative job, is not unprejudiced evidence. It is possible that the stockmen of the west may want something that they cannot or should not have. But, at any rate, their interest is of sufficient importance from a national standpoint to warrant their being consulted in the matter; and if their interests cannot be conserved directly, some alleviating or compensating arrangement might be made. For the information of the "Commercial," and of the Government as well, the "Bulletin" begs to remark that this is the way to make the country prosperous, and also to win western elections.

I quite agree with that sentiment. I think that the way to make a country prosperous is to legislate or to order in council in such a way as will be in the interest of the great staples of the North-west. And the writer adds:

Something that the Liberal party has only begun to make a record in.

That is to say, legislating in a way to make the country prosperous, and also to win western elections is something the Liberal party has only begun to make a record in. Well, Sir, it is quite clear that I have shown in this debate an impartiality that even transcends that of my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver). He commenced by saying that he spoke without any party proclivity—and we know he has none—and that there would be nothing of a political character in what he might say, and he carefully guarded himself lest what fell from him should condemn the Government. Here am I, an open foe, and I advocate the very course the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) says is the way to make the country prosperous, and to make a record for the Liberal Government in the manner in which they have only recently begun. Let it come in whatever form it may, I welcome the powerful aid of my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver), and after the discussion we have had, I have to express my regret that the hon. the Minister of Agriculture is not here. I have no doubt there is a good reason for his absence, and I suppose he will read what has been said in "Hansard" and take heed of it. It is clear that a case has been made out for the Government to consider the question as regards sheep. We have the positive statement of the hon. member (Mr. Oliver), that in regard to sheep and horses quarantine was necessary; although he thought that in regard to cattle it was unnecessary. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) pointed out, that the quarantine regulations for protecting the country against diseased sheep coming across the line, were not sufficient. As the hon. gentleman has shown, in the United States, and probably in other countries where large interests are involved, nothing is easier than to get a certificate of the kind now required. The point I wish to make most strongly in regard to cattle is this: that an effective check on the inroad of cattle to our ranches has been removed, and unless the Government intends to give us some substitute for that check, the result will be that our sheepmen and stockmen will suffer, and their ranches will suffer because of the attraction that these ranches have for the cattle south of the line.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). Mr. Speaker, as I come from a constituency in the North-west Territories, it is not perhaps out of place that I should say a few words upon this important question. One would think, after listening to my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) that he was the only representative in this House from the North-west Territories. He has told us of the number of letters he has received in connection with this matter from one end of the Territories to the other, but I must say, that although I represent a large district in the Territories, I have not received one letter on this subject. The people in my district are perfectly satisfied with the quarantine regulations as they are to-day, because they have

discovered that they can now get more for their stockers than they could before, and it is perhaps unnecessary to say that we raise a great number of that class of cattle in the district of Saskatchewan. Although my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) has stated that the people of Manitoba have become alarmed at the change of regulations ? I know as a matter of fact, they are not. A few weeks ago a number of buyers came from the United States and purchased stockers in the province of Manitoba, and paid $2 per head more for them than they could have got before the new quarantine arrangement was made. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) has spoken a great deal about sheep. Well, Sir, it appears to me that he is raising a tempest in a teapot, because all the sheep brought from the United States into the Territories since the change in regulations numbered only about 1,000. If there is a qualified man to examine these sheep when they enter our Dominion of Canada, I do not think there would be any danger at all.

There is another phase, Sir, of this question which has not been referred to by hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this subject. The late Government spent a great deal of money in sending immigration agents through Dakota and the western states to try to get emigrants to settle in the Territories. When these intending settlers came to the line they were met, under the old quarantine system, with a delay of ninety days. It is quite clear that a poor man on coming into Canada with a few cattle in the spring of the year, could not afford to stay at the line for ninety days. I believe that if a qualified man gave a certificate that the cattle were all right, they should be allowed to proceed with them and take up these lands. I know personally that the previous quarantine system stopped a great many from settling in the North-west Territories. I have had letters from different parts of the United States, from people who stated that they would have settled in Canada had it not been for the quarantine regulations. I am of opinion, Sir, that there is nothing in the complaint of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) about the ranchers of the United States bringing their cattle to Canada to feed them upon our pastures. In the first place, Mr. Speaker, the Americans in bringing in their cattle would be met with a 20 per cent duty at the line, and if they pastured their cattle on our ranches all summer they would have to pay a duty to the American authorities in the fall on their return. Now, if the police force do their duty it would be impossible that the Americans should get their cattle across the line in any other way than by paying the duty, for the police are supposed to patrol the border and prevent them doing so. One hon. gentleman stated that horses were brought in now at a valuation of $1 per head. Now, Sir, in all my experience in the North-west Territories I never knew of horses being valued at that figure. I know that they value them for far more than that, and that the parties who bring them across the line have to pay duty on a high valuation ; in fact on as much as the horse is worth. So far as glanders are concerned, if the horses are examined at the line by a properly qualified veterinarian, I do not think there would be any difficulty in that respect. As I said before, the people in my district are perfectly satisfied with the existing regulations. They have raised the price of our cattle, and they have given us competition in freight rates, allowing us to ship by Boston, if they have not lowered them. Therefore, we feel that we are in a better position than before. If the question came to a vote I would certainly vote in favour of retaining the regulations as they now are.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). This has been a very interesting discussion on a very important subject ; but my hon. friend (Mr. Davin), the mover of this resolution, will agree with me, I am sure, that the discussion would not be complete unless the Minister of Agriculture had an opportunity of taking part in it. He is unavoidably absent this evening, and therefore, I move that the debate be now adjourned.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

THE MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.

Mr. LaRIVIERE moved for :

Copies of all Orders in Council, Reports to Council, petitions, memorials or other documents relating to the Manitoba school question, not already submitted to this House.

He said : Mr. Speaker, when on the 29th of March last I requested the hon. the Premier to lay before the House the papers that I am going to move for, in order that they might be made use of during the debate that was then going on, I received the promise from him that those papers would be brought down without the necessity of a motion ; but, as none of the papers have been yet brought down, I have to move this evening for the production before this House. I regret, Sir, to find that there is a certain amount of hesitation on the part of the Government to put this House in full possession of all the necessary information that is required in order to look into this question of the schools of Manitoba. I myself made an inquiry of the Government the other day as to what were the propositions that had been made to the Government of Manitoba and the concessions that had been asked for, and which of these, if any, had not been granted ; and the only answer I could obtain from the hon. the Premier was that the negotiations had been verbal, and that there was no record of them, and that the papers connected with

that subject would be brought down. Well, Sir, I am surprised that in dealing with such an important question the Government did not keep any record of the transactions that took place—that, on a question of such vital importance, the negotiations were merely and chiefly verbal. It must be that the Government did not wish to commit themselves or to make known what their attitude was in the premises, when no record was kept of what had taken place. Surely somebody was appointed to negotiate with the Manitoba Government; that somebody must have had instructions; that somebody must have had negotiations, and those negotiations must have been recorded in some way or other. A report must have been made to His Excellency the Governor General in Council of what had taken place, and that report should have been the basis of the acceptance or non-acceptance of whatever settlement was arrived at. But we are told that everything was verbal, that there was no record, and that there is nothing to be communicated to the House. To-day, Sir, we had another instance of the hesitation of the Government to put this House in possession of all the facts in connection with the school question, when, in answer to a question of an hon. member, the hon. the Premier stated that the policy of the Government was well known on that subject, and that it was not necessary to say anything further about it. Well, Sir, I must say once more that I am altogether surprised at the manner in which this matter has been conducted, and more so at the manner in which the Government is treating this House in keeping back all the information which the Government should possess and which the members of this House are entitled to receive. Much more is this the case when we have had from one member of the Government this advice thrown at the minority of Manitoba. When speaking on this very question on another occasion, the hon. Solicitor General said:

> Now, I think, so far as the Roman Catholic minority——

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member must not quote from a previous debate.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I did not say that I was quoting from a previous debate.

Mr. SPEAKER. I leave it to the hon. gentleman's honour whether or not he is quoting from a previous debate; but if it is a previous debate, he cannot refer to it.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Well, if the Government is afraid that I should refer to a former occasion——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. I cannot allow the hon. member to question the ruling of the Chair on a point of order. I am sure the hon. member will regret having said that my ruling is influenced by a question of whether the Government is afraid or is not afraid.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not understand the hon. gentleman to say anything of the kind.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I heard "Order" from the Government benches, Mr. Speaker, and it was to that I referred. I made no reflection at all upon your ruling. Well, Sir, if we are told to-day that the Manitoba school question is not finally settled, that we have only received an instalment, how can we know whether or not the Government has made due efforts to secure the best possible settlement. Well, Sir, I shall not dilate further on this subject, because I am forbidden by the rules of the House to refer to a previous debate, and as this is not the last occasion upon which we may have the pleasure of discussing this subject, I shall reserve any further remarks until the question comes up again.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). There is no objection whatever to this motion being carried and the papers brought down. Quite the reverse. The Government is just as solicitous as my hon. friend that all the light possible shall be thrown on this subject. We did not wait until this motion carried to have these papers prepared. They are being prepared at this moment, and will be laid on the Table at an early day.

Motion agreed to.

DUTY ON REFINED PETROLEUM.

Mr. MOORE moved:

> That in the opinion of this House it is in the best interests of the farming and labouring classes, and the country generally, that the duty on refined petroleum for illuminating purposes be reduced to three cents per Imperial gallon.

He said: In rising to press the motion which I lay before you, Mr. Speaker, I realize that the sentiments to which I am about to give expression will be met by objections from hon. gentlemen on both sides. Notwithstanding this, I cannot refrain from doing what I deem to be my duty to my constituents and a large majority of the people of this country. In the first place, I wish it to be distinctly understood that I do not make this motion with the view of perplexing or in any way embarrassing the Government or any members of this House, or of doing injury to any of the important industries of this country, especially that industry which claims that its existence depends on the maintenance of the present high tariff. I make this motion solely and purely for the purpose of discharging a duty which I owe my constituents and the public, and which I owe to the labourers, the farmers, and the poorer classes of the

people. I am well aware that this question is viewed from different standpoints of interest with regard to the rate of duty which should be imposed. The farmers and the labouring men, who form the larger part of our population, claim that, in justice to them, the duty should be entirely removed. On the other hand, the producers and the refiners of coal oil in this country desire that the tariff should remain as it is, on the ground that if the duty were reduced in any particular, such reduction would wipe their industry out of existence.

A just and proper appreciation of this motion involves a consideration of three important points. In the first place, to give the farmers and labourers and the poorer classes good oil at a cheap price; in the second place, to give the purchaser and refiner reasonable protection; and in the third place, to give the Government a fair and reasonable revenue. In discussing the demands and claims of the first named class, the farmers and labourers, for free oil, for which they have been asking for many years, I believe I give expression to the sentiments of hon. gentlemen on both sides when I claim that there is not a class of people more deserving of encouragement and sympathy than the toiling, industrious tillers of Canadian soil. Surely a class of people which composes half the population of this country, which furnishes 25 per cent of the traffic upon our railways, which furnishes 33⅓ per cent of the trade upon our canals, and one-half the tonnage of Canadian-built ships—surely this class cannot have a subordinate place in the affections of the Canadian people or in the considerations of a wise Government. It should be the desire of hon. members of this House to give cheap and good oil to our consumers. It may be inferred from this expression that we are not getting from the Canadian producer good coal oil at a cheap price at present. Regarding that, with all due respect to the enterprising men who are interested in this important industry, and with due deference to the statements we have seen in the newspapers and the claims these gentlemen are making, throughout the length and breadth of Canada, that the coal oil produced in Canada is equal to and, in some respects, superior to the American article. I beg to say that I have had something to do for thirty years in American and Canadian coal oil, and I have yet to see a gallon of Canadian oil equal in quality to the American. It blacks the chimneys, it blacks the ceiling, it emits a very offensive odour, and whilst our Canadian producers claim that it lasts longer, I claim that if their oil will give the same candle power, the same brilliancy as American oil, it will be consumed as rapidly. I can put this matter in no stronger light than by quoting a remark made with respect to the quality of Canadian oil by the hon. member for the county of Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) some years ago. He said that the Canadian oil was not as good as the American, and any one who had used the American would not use the Canadian article. And what was true at that time, I claim, is mainly true to-day. I hold in my hand a letter bearing date of 7th inst., from a large coal oil dealer along the frontier between the United States and Canada in which he states that he cannot sell Canadian oil because its quality is so poor. I hold that if crude oil, produced in Canada is as good as the American article, then, certainly, we ought to get as good a refined article, and, if we do not get it, the refiners of this country are not entitled to the high protection which they have had. If the crude oil is imperfect, if it has qualities that cannot be eliminated and that prevent it being made into a good refined oil, then the industry does not deserve the encouragement and protection which it has had ever since the discovery of oil in this country.

In the next place, I will consider for a moment the price of Canadian as compared with the price of American oil. The consumers in this country claim that no satisfactory reason has been given why there should exist such a difference in the prices on this side and on the other. On investigation it will be found that the Canadians are paying full duty on what is imported from the United States as well as an equal sum on all the oil consumed and produced in Canada, making our light cost our consumers six cents per gallon more than it costs the consumers in the United States, whether they use Canadian or American oil. If it costs us very much more to produce our oil, that might be a reason for asking a higher price. I see by reports made by experts that the contract price for sinking wells in Canada at a distance of 400 or 500 feet, is only $110 on the average. That is the statement made by a mining engineer representing gentlemen who are very much more interested in retaining the present duty upon coal oil. And, if you take the statements of the United States expenditure in connection with the sinking of oil wells, you will find that up to 1885 it cost an average of $4,000 to sink each well. The wholesale price of oil on the American side is 8 16-100 cents per gallon. The Canadian article costs 15 cents per gallon. Therefore it is quite evident that our consumers are giving to the producers and refiners the full benefit of the duty of six cents per gallon. This duty represents as high an ad valorem rate upon American oil at its present price as a duty of 15 cents per gallon in 1877 on the price at that time. The argument used by the hon. member for Stanstead in 1877, and fully endorsed by the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) was that, in consequence of the great burdens upon the people of this coun-

try, there was a necessity for reducing the duty upon coal oil from 15 cents, and this was accordingly done, being reduced to six cents. And, Sir, the duty which has since been collected of six cents per gallon has been as great or greater a percentage on the market value of the oil than the duty of 15 cents was in 1877. I beg to submit the following figures for consideration. In 1877 there was imported under a tariff of 15 cents per gallon 348,635 gallons of oil, valued at $105,888, upon which was collected $57,328.44 or 54·3 per cent ad valorem. In 1896, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, the quantity of oil imported was 6,682,272 gallons, valued at $596,450, upon which was paid six cents per gallon, or a total of $412,996, which was 69·33 per cent ad valorem. Again, taking the export price of oil as given in the United States abstract of 1896, I find it to be 6·8 cents per wine gallon. Reducing this to Imperial, we find that the price for Imperial gallon is 8·16 cents. A duty of six cents upon this would be 73½ per cent ad valorem as against 54·3 per cent when the duty was 15 cents. I will now undertake to show hon. members of this House what duty on coal oil has cost the consumers since coal oil was discovered in Canada. We find that there has been consumed in Canada from 1877 to 1885, both years included 232,756,786 gallons of refined petroleum. Of this amount 155,489,641 gallons was produced in Canada, and 77,267,145 gallons imported from the United States. The Canadian Government have received upon the imported, reckoning a uniform rate of six cents per gallon, since 1877, $4,636,028. And the oil cost the consumers in Canada during that time $13,965,407.16 more than it would had there been no duty upon it, and that amount more than the same quantity cost the consumers in the United States. And, tracing it back to the time when oil was first produced in Canada it has undoubtedly cost the consumers to keep this industry in existence no less than $22,000,000—an amount equal to what the oil men claim has been invested in this important industry. It is claimed by the classes to whom I have referred that there is no good reason why coal oil should receive more protection than other necessaries of life of equal importance. Light is a very important household necessity; light is the poor man's friend; it cheers his heart when his daily toil is over to reach his well-lighted home where he can rest in the bosom of his family, and read during the long winter evenings. That is the only time he has to devote to study to reading and to learning. Therefore, it greatly contributes to the intelligence, the welfare and happiness of that class of our people. Now, it is claimed on behalf of this portion of our population that the Government should endeavour to give them a good and a cheap light, wnich they are not receiving at the present time. They also draw our attention to the fact that the people in towns and cities and populous centres have, to a great extent, discarded the coal oil lamp, and are now using gas and electricity; so that most of the coal oil now used and likely to be used in the future, will be used by farmers, labouring men and the poorer classes of this country, upon whom the burden of taxation will fall most heavily. This, Sir, is all I have to say in regard to the claim of the consumer upon this Government in respect of the reduction of the duty. In the second place, I will consider for a few moments the claims of the producers and the refiners. Their business is considered an important one, and I believe, Sir, that they have had an unreasonable and unnecessary protection. But the protection which has been accorded in the past has stimulated capitalists to invest their means to a large extent in the business. It has been in existence something over thirty years; and it is claimed that the withdrawal of any portion of the tariff would destroy their industry altogether, that is giving employment to a large number of workingmen, and if wiped out of existence, it would shut up many other works which depend upon the production of crude oil, such as barrel manufactures, the manufacture of gasoline, benzine, naphtha lubricating oil, paraffine wax, paraffine candles, chewing gum, colouring materials and other very useful articles in connection with this industry. But this motion which I present to the House has nothing whatever to do with the production of crude oil or any of its products, but only with that used for illuminating purposes. Therefore, it would not be considered just nor in the interests of the country to take away all protection of an industry which has grown up under the fostering care of both Governments. I may be excused for saying here that in 1876 the coal oil men claimed that any reduction in the duty from 15 cents per gallon would wipe the industry out of existence. In 1877 the duty was reduced from 15 to 6 cents per gallon, since which time the production has steadily increased from 12,813,566 gallons in 1881, to 26,760,247 gallons in 1895. As these gentlemen were false prophets in 1876 and 1877, we may fondly hope that they may be mistaken in 1897, should the Government take into consideration and reduce the duty upon this article in the terms which I have proposed in my motion. In the third place, the pressing demand upon the treasury to pay current expenditures, to say nothing of the extraordinary requests for assistance to build public works of various kinds, may not admit of a great and material reduction in the aggregate of the duties which are imposed upon imported articles, but they may be so adjusted as to bear more lightly upon the poorer classes. So far as this article is concerned, I have no doubt that the patriotic tillers of the soil will loyally yield to any

reasonable tariff which the Government may impose. But the present rate is considered by them unreasonable and exorbitant, and falls with too great a force upon the poor people who are the least able to bear it. In 1877 the hon. Minister of Finance stated that about 800,000 gallons of oil were imported into this country, paying duty, and that probably double that quantity had been imported without paying duty, had been smuggled, in fact. But by reducing the tariff from 15 to 6 cents, he believed the entire amount thus smuggled would be brought in paying duty. I am sure that those anticipations have not been realized, for the reduction in the price of oil has been so great that the inducement still continues, and this contraband trade is still being continued along the frontiers of Canada. Should the duty be reduced to 3 cents, smuggling would no doubt cease. Now, Sir, I find that in 1887 the Minister of Finance reduced the duty from 15 to 6 cents per gallon, making a reduction of 9 cents per gallon. From a statement found in the Trade and Navigation Returns, it appears that there were 570,128 gallons imported in that year; 9 cents per gallon on that quantity amounted to $51,312.25, which the Government would lose. The Minister of Finance said in the House, on February 20, 1877:

> The Government, therefore, have carefully considered this whole question, with a desire to reduce the burdens of the people as much as they could, and yet not utterly wipe out of existence a Canadian industry which had grown up under the protection of the law enacted by hon. gentlemen opposite.
>
> The conclusion I have come to is this: We propose to abolish the excise duty altogether, and reduce the duty on imported petroleum from 15 to 6 cents per gallon. And by this operation we believe the people of Canada will be the gainers by full 9 cents per gallon on every gallon of the 8,000,000 gallons now consumed. * * *
>
> So, therefore, as we are giving the country the benefit of a reduction varying from $750,000 to $1,200,000, we think we may fairly ask the country to recoup us by paying an additional duty of 2 cents a pound on tea that would make us tolerably square and restore the desired equilibrium, so far as it goes.

These statistics inform us that there were imported into Canada that year, 13,482,657 pounds of tea, which, at 2 cents per pound, amounted to $269,653.14, to establish the equilibrium of the loss to the Government of $51,311. The Government apparently gained by this swapping of duties, the sum of $218,332. By this transaction, a burden of $51,318 was removed from the backs of our people, and, as compensation, another one five times as heavy was imposed. As the succeeding Government removed the duties on tea in 1882, there is a grand opportunity for the present able hon. Minister of Finance to follow in the footsteps of his illustrious predecessor, and to reduce the burden which now falls so heavily upon the people in the matter of coal oil to 3 cents per gallon, which would apparently reduce the receipts in customs duty about $206,646. By adopting the plan of 1877, and placing a duty of 2 cents per pound on tea, there would be a return to the treasury of $453,351 on the 22,667,555 pounds of tea now imported, and the equilibrium between coal oil and tea restored and the Government would gain $246,705 in the trade. That I may not be open to the imputation of inconsistency in advocating a reduction of the tariff upon coal oil and, at the same time, advocating the protection of Canadian industries, I beg to say that I most certainly believe in encouraging Canadian industry and giving Canadian producers the control of the Canadian market, so far as it can be done in the interests of the Canadian consumer. But I believe that there is such a thing as going too far in protection, and I believe, Sir, that the tariff which has been imposed upon coal oil by both governments, has been one of the Canadian industries which has had an obnoxious unreasonable amount of protection which has proved to be a great burden upon the people of Canada. I have been a steady advocate of the National Policy, which I believe has been of inestimable benefit to the people of Canada, and, Sir, I have faith to believe that the benefits and the advantages have been so great as to convince even the hon. members on the ministerial side of this House that the well being and the prosperity of Canada requires the continuance of that policy which has placed us in the favourable position we now occupy amongst the enterprising people of the world.

Mr. LISTER. I do not rise for the purpose of discussing whether the duty on coal oil should be reduced to 3 cents per gallon or abolished altogether. In view of the fact that the tariff is now engaging the attention of the Government, I think it is ill advised at this particular moment that particular items in the tariff should be singled out for the purpose of discussion in this House. I have no complaint to make of the tone of the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House; his speech was very interesting, and if the facts stated by him were really facts there would be a good deal in the argument he made. The hon. gentleman told the House that he is in favour of protecting the industries of this country, and he was good enough to say in addition, that if he thought the proposition which he makes here tonight would have the effect of destroying a natural industry here, he would not be prepared to go so far as he proposes in his present motion. So that when the matter comes to be discussed at the proper time, and the action of the Government is announced to this House, the hon. gentleman will then be in a position to form a more correct opinion as to what this industry can stand and what it cannot stand than he is capable of estimating at the present moment. I may say to the hon. gentleman,

I having some knowledge of the question about which he speaks, that the facts have evidently been furnished by some person outside, by some person not at all acquainted with the industry. It is somewhat surprising to me that the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, who was elected to this House as a supporter of a high protective system, coal oil being among other articles protected by the tariff, should be found seeking to break down the tariff that his friends during eighteen long years have stood by and supported. The conclusion to be drawn from that is only one, and it is that the hon. gentleman living on the boundary down in the province of Quebec, an imaginary line dividing his county from the United States, is a protectionist in the day time, and a free trader at night.

Mr. MOORE. Allow me to correct the hon. gentleman. I never smuggled a gallon of oil in my life.

Mr. LISTER. Then the hon. gentleman has been deprived of light; he does not come within the category so pathetically described by him, that light is the poor man's friend; he does not belong to that class. I said a moment ago that this is not the proper time to discuss this question. The Government have to-day announced that the tariff would be brought down a week from to-morrow. When it comes down we will know what the Government propose to do, whether they will meet the views of the hon. gentleman or not. If they meet his views, then this motion is entirely unnecessary. If the explanations that may then be made are sufficient to satisfy him that the industry will be completely wiped out by a reduction of the duty to 3 cents per gallon, the hon. gentleman, who is a protectionist, who has announced himself to be desirous of promoting any natural industry, will no doubt be found supporting the Government even in case the duty should not be reduced to the extent that he to-night wishes it to be reduced. The hon. gentleman's figures, and they are many and complex, are not strictly accurate, and I may say to him moreover that although the present tax appears to be a considerable tax, it is not the burdensome tax the hon. gentleman imagines it to be. There are about 15,000,000 gallons of refined oil consumed, which would give for each family about 15 gallons. Statistics show that cities, towns and villages burn much more proportionately than the country portions of Canada, and the result is this that less than 15 gallons per family is consumed in the country districts. Taking the duty at 6 cents per gallon and the consumption at 12 gallons per family, the total tax, this over burdensome tax, would only reach 72 cents per year. However, that is a matter for discussion, and no doubt it will be brought before the House when the tariff comes down and be discussed by competent men. In the meantime I do not see any particular necessity at this particular moment, and in view of the early date at which the tariff is to be brought down, why we should further discuss this question. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.

Mr. QUINN moved for:

Copy of letter addressed by Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick to Hon. Edward Blake asking for his opinion as to the settlement of the Manitoba school question under the judgment of the Privy Council.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). There is no such record in the archives of the department, I may inform my hon. friend.

Motion negatived.

POSTMASTER AT BEAUHARNOIS.

Mr. BERGERON moved for:

Copies of all papers, correspondence, petitions, &c., connected with the dismissal of Alexis Doutre as postmaster at Beauharnois.

He said: The hon. the Postmaster General stated the other day, in reply to a question of mine, that the postmaster at Beauharnois had been dismissed at the demand of the Minister of Public Works, and that the complaint was that the postmaster kept a political committee in his office. My object in making the motion is to have all the papers in regard to the dismissal of Mr. Doutre. I wish to tell the Postmaster General, that as I understand it, when the postmaster was dismissed he asked for what reason he had been so dismissed. On being informed that it was for active and offensive partisanship, he asked for an investigation, as he believed he was in a position to refute the charge. The investigation was refused, and he then asked to know who the complainant against him was, but he was answered that he would not be told. We were told the other day, however, that the complainant was the Minister of Public Works. When the correspondence comes down, I believe that it will show, that there should have been an investigation, and that if the Postmaster General had acted justly towards Mr. Doutre he would have allowed an inquiry. I trust the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) will bring down all the papers as soon as possible, and it will be my duty then to call the attention of the House to the matter.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Mr. Speaker, there is no objection whatever to the order passing. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) no doubt made his statement on the information he had received, but I think he will find when the

papers are brought down he has made a mistake. If there had been an investigation it would simply have resulted in a waste of public money, because I have in my desk the letter on which the dismissal took place, and I am perfectly satisfied that the statements in that letter are incontrovertible. However, the facts will be open to discussion when the papers are brought down.

Motion agreed to.

EAST AND WEST ELGIN MAIL CONTRACTS.

Mr. INGRAM moved for :

Return showing all mail contracts that were cancelled and all that expired in East and West Elgin since 15th July, 1896 ; also all correspondence, reports, tenders received and contracts entered into for carrying the mail since 15th July, 1896, giving names and amounts.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). There is no objection to the motion, but as regards that portion of it which asks for the production of tenders, my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) will see, that should these tenders refer to any contracts which are not yet completed, I would be obliged to withhold that information until the contracts are completed. It is not customary to give the tenders pending the completion of the contract. It may be that none of the papers asked for refer to contracts in that uncompleted stage.

Mr. INGRAM. All I ask is for the tenders up to date.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will give all the tenders that have been carried into contract. I have no objection to the order going, but I would have to defer producing the tenders in the other cases until the contract is completed.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Detailed statement of the several amounts expended on Port Stanley Harbour since 15th July, 1896, including pay-sheet ; also all reports and correspondence in connection with the harbour and its improvements since 15th July, 1896, up to the present date.—(Mr. Ingram.)

Return showing the number of fishing licenses granted to fish in Lake Erie, opposite East and West Elgin, and their location, whether pound-net, gill-net or seine licenses, and to whom granted during the years 1895 and 1896. Also the names of all applicants for licenses for the year 1897, giving the names of those applicants who were granted licenses and the amount paid by each of them. Also, all telegrams, letters, reports and correspondence of every description in any wise relating to the granting or refusal of such licenses.—(Mr. Ingram.)

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.10 p.m.

27½

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 13th April, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. LANDERKIN moved :

That as the time for receiving petitions for Private Bills will expire during the Easter adjournment, the same be extended to Friday, the 23rd instant, and the time for presenting Private Bills be extended to Friday, the 30th instant, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders, as contained in their second report.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 30) respecting the Central Counties Railway Company—(Mr. McMullen.)

Bill (No. 31) respecting the Trail Creek and Columbia Railway Company.—(Mr. Landerkin, for Mr. Gibson.)

Bill (No. 32) respecting the Columbia and Kootenay Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Landerkin.)

Bill (No. 33) respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor, for Mr. Osler.)

THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Mr. McMULLEN moved :

That the Public Accounts of Canada for the fiscal year ending 30th of June, 1896, and the Report of the Auditor General for the same fiscal year, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Motion agreed to.

EASTER ADJOURNMENT.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved :

That when this House adjourns on Wednesday next, it stand adjourned until Tuesday, the twentieth day of April instant.

Motion agreed to.

THE QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE—THE CANADIAN MILITIA.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the Government to a matter which is interesting us all, and probably the best way for me to bring it to the notice of the House is to move the adjournment. The Queen's Diamond Jubilee is an event which now occupies the attention of the loyal people of Canada, and more especially

our active militia who are the backbone of the country. Although our militia may not, in this House, meet with that consideration which they are entitled to, and although their services have not been called on of late, yet we must look back on their past history, from the war of 1812 to the North-west rebellion of 1885, and consider what valiant services they have rendered to this colony. On the occasion of Her Majesty's Jubilee our militia, as loyal British subjects, as descendants of men who have fought for the Crown in the past, and as men who, at the present day are ready to fight for the Crown again if ever unfortunately they should be called upon to do so again, they desire to have some idea as to what action will be taken in regard to their services in England in regard to the jubilee. I may call attention to the fact, that already five of the colonies have voted money to send their military representatives to England, and even the little island of Jamaica, with a very small population, has given 9,500 pounds sterling to send over a force. I regret very much that my friend the hon. Minister of Militia has suffered so much in the recent railway accident that he is unable to be present. I feel that whatever I have to say, I must say it in the most delicate way, because I would be far from wanting to offend that hon. gentleman, or to lead him to think that I would be trenching on his duties or responsibilities. I wish to guard myself in every way from creating the impression that I am finding any fault with his administration, or that I wish to take away from him the credit of what I am sure he would do if he were present. I have no doubt at all that Sir Richard Cartwright, his representative for the time being, as a loyal British subject, and as one proud of his distinguished history, will do everything that can be done in the interests of the country in connection with this matter. In a certain sense, I speak on the floor of this House for the militiamen of the country, and I see other officers opposite who have also an interest in the militia and who have done good service. I say that we do not want to be behind the other colonies, and that we should not ask our militia force to go over on the strength of public subscriptions.

The people of Canada expect hereafter to rival the other nations of the world, and we do not want it to be supposed that in this country we have to go around, hat in hand, to collect money to send a body of troops over. I do not think the Government should be extravagant; the people of Canada do not wish their money to be thrown away; and the militia do not wish to embarrass the Government. All they want is that Canada should be properly represented. For my own part, I think we should send over a small column, in which would be represented all the corps of the country. I have no desire myself to go to England or to parade myself before Europe. I am not coveting or seeking any honour or position. I simply wish to see that we as a young nation, with 40,000 men under arms, shall be represented by such a body of men that when they march in the parade the people will say, "There goes Canada, a country that is now producing gold in British Columbia, silver in the Slocan and gold in the Yukon." I have no desire to take up the time of the House, and I would ask the acting Minister of Militia to pardon me for bringing this matter up in this way, and to kindly foreshadow something of what is going to be done in this matter. I believe I voice the sentiment of the militia and the people of Canada when I say that Canada is able to send over a small force and to do it properly.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has made a speech without concluding with a motion.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Lemieux, that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Mr. Speaker, as a sequel to what has been said by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville), I would like to read, for the information of the acting Minister of Militia, the following letter:

> Dear Sir,—You know that we are making great preparations for the Jubilee celebration in Montreal. We wish to organize excursions from all parts of Canada and the United States. The railways are ready, but are waiting for the proclamation of the Federal Government fixing the day of the celebration, which is to be the same here as in England, June the 22nd, in order to announce the reduction in fares and the dates of the excursions. Please, therefore, urge the Government to fix the day and to issue its proclamation. We are stopped in our work, in the meantime, though there is not an instant to be lost to complete our organization.

This letter is sent by the president of the Jubilee committee in Montreal.

Mr. PRIOR. Mr. Speaker, I think every hon. member of the House will be glad that the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) has brought this matter up, and I think it is right that a word should be said on this side of the House; for to my mind, this is a question that politics should not at all interfere with, but a question of the honour of Canada, in which both Conservatives and Liberals should take an interest. I think Canada has to-day the best chance she has ever had since confederation of making a name for herself in the old country. If a good regiment of Canadian militia, that would be representative of this country, were sent home on this occasion, it would do more to advertise Canada than any amount of money spent on agents. The regiment would be seen by millions of people, not only from Great Britain, but from all the other colonies; and I think that any gentleman who knows the Canadian militia, and has seen them in training, must admit that there are no finer troops to be

seen anywhere in the world. Perhaps that remark, coming from a militiaman, may sound a little big, but I believe what I say. I do not believe in the scheme that is on foot to let men go who will pay their own expenses. If a regiment goes over, I think the country can very well afford to pay its expenses; and this is the only way to get the best selection of men. If the Government can see their way to put a decent sum in the Estimates in order to meet the expenses of sending over a regiment, say of 500 men, I cannot think that the taxpayers of this country would object. Every province should be represented, and that can only be done, to my mind, by the Government paying the expense. I do think that the Government should send some of the permanent corps and some of the North-west Mounted Police, but these should not be sent unless some of the active militia are also despatched. I know that militia matters, as a rule, do not catch the attention of the House, but this Jubilee celebration is a matter of great importance, and I feel that we are only doing our duty on both sides in bringing it forward. If the Government can see fit to promulgate some scheme whereby every province and regiment—the best men, both non-coms and men, in each regiment—are got together and formed into a good battalion, it would be to the credit of the country, and the taxpayers would consider the money well spent.

Mr. HUGHES. Before the motion of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) is put, I desire to express my appreciation of the spirit which prompts it. There are various aspects from which to regard it, one of which is the sending of a regiment home to the old country. As I understand, the Imperial Government have invited Canada to take part in the celebration by sending over a certain number of troops—I do not know whether the number is specified or not—to take part in the celebration. If that be so, it is altogether likely that all that Canada will be called upon to do in connection with this force, will be to see that it is properly equipped, officered and drilled, and the best men chosen. It is altogether probable that the number of these men will be limited, not to exceed possibly a couple of hundred. However, there is another project on foot which should receive the endorsation of this House. A number of Canadian militiamen who have command of capital, are anxious to equip a regiment at their own expense, to cross over and take part in the celebration. I think the Government would be only doing its duty if it were to supply the transport of such a regiment, and the two contingents might unite and form one force on the other side. However, that is a mere matter of detail, and I merely suggest these ideas in order to assist the Government in coming to a conclusion.

But there is another aspect to the case. While I would be delighted to see a Canadian regiment in the old country, I believe that those who take part in such an expedition will come back sadder and wiser men. They will undoubtedly have a very good time on the other side, but if they expect to dance attendance on the First Minister or to act as a bodyguard for Her Majesty, they will be greatly mistaken. They will have a few days' parade through the streets of London, which will not be a very enjoyable thing in itself, but the greater portion of their time will be spent in Aldershot or some other place outside the city, where they will be subjected to the strict discipline of barrack life. So that while I desire to offer no words of discouragement to those who wish to cross, I must say that I do not envy them.

There is still another aspect of the case which I would commend to the attention of the acting Minister of Militia (Sir Richard Cartwright). We can do as much at home to promote the loyal and patriotic spirit of our militia as we can by sending contingents abroad. Undoubtedly the contingent we would send across would impress the people assembled on the other side with a high idea of the importance of Canada, as part of the British Crown, but nevertheless we could do very good missionary work at home by seeing that proper recognition is given to the Jubilee in this Dominion. I would suggest, as the military spirit is strong in our people, that military displays to be held in different parts of the country should receive proper recognition from our Government, and no more tangible mode could be devised by which our people could show their loyalty. I would point out to the acting Minister of Militia that Jubilee Day, the 21st of June, is a day when nearly all the brigade camps are assembled for their annual drill, and I would suggest the propriety of seeing that these camps should meet at such a time as to enable them to be disbanded in time to allow the various regiments in camp the opportunity of taking part in some celebration in their own localities. I am satisfied, from what has fallen from the lips of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) and others, and from what we have heard of the interest which the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden) takes in this subject, that this matter will receive fair consideration from the Government, and, as far as my district is concerned, aside from politics, the Government will be heartily endorsed in anything they do to celebrate in a fitting manner Jubilee Day.

Mr. CASEY. It is from no doubt of the capacity of the Government to arrange this matter properly that I wish to say a few words, but because they may like to hear, even from their own side, a word of encouragement. I believe, with my hon. friend who has just sat down and the hon. gentleman who preceded him, that we cannot afford to be economical in connection

with the celebration in the mother country of the Jubilee festival. Whatever we undertake to do, we cannot afford to do on a mean scale. Whatever we do will be looked upon as the best we are capable of doing. The younger and more enterprising colonies of Australia and elsewhere will strain a point to make a grand show on that occasion, and I hope, as no doubt will be the case, that Canada will be represented by a force which will take its proper position at the head of all the colonial forces—I had almost said of the colonial exhibition, for surely no grander exhibit could be made of what we can produce in Canada than an exhibit of picked men, and nothing would go further to give prestige to this country in London on that occasion. It must not be forgotten that the lines of streets through which the procession will pass will be a focus for all the eyes of the Empire.

My hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Prior) has well pointed out that the eyes of the people in all parts of the Empire will be centered there, while millions will be there in person, and it will be the centre of interest and news for all the world. As we shall be judged by what we send, I trust that the exhibit will be as creditable as possible. There is one suggestion I would like to press upon the acting Minister of Militia (Sir Richard Cartwright). It has been made already in debate, but I do not intend to break the rule by referring to a past debate. That suggestion is that we should send a good, strong contingent of the North-west Mounted Police as a part of our representative force sent to attend the Queen's Jubilee. That body of men, we all know, is comparatively, a select body, composed of men who are intelligent, educated, well-drilled, and well accustomed to all kinds of work which can be performed by men in their position. There will be contingents of that kind, no doubt, from the Cape Mounted Rifles, if that force is now in existence—I know that there used to be a celebrated force of that name—and also from Australia. The impression upon the mind of the home-keeping Englishman will be great, if he sees a fine body of men splendidly equipped and mounted and is told that these are not regular soldiers, not even volunteers, but the constabulary of our frontier, to guard the homes of settlers from all the perils that the home-keeping imagination may invest that country with. This suggestion does not originate with me, but was made to me by a friend. It struck me, however, as being a highly proper one. I believe there could be no better adjunct to our contingent than a comparatively strong force of the North-west Mounted Police. My hon. friend from Victoria has suggested the idea of a purely volunteer contingent going along with that other part of the contingent which would go partly at the public expense. I am rather inclined to fear that that might arouse some jealousies between the two branches of the force. That is a matter, of course, for the military authorities to consider.

Mr. SPROULE. Speaking from the standpoint not of a military man but of an ordinary citizen, I concur in what was said by my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Domville) and reiterated by my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Prior) that it is time we had some answer from the Government giving an outline of the course they propose to take with reference to the invitation given us to send a military force to take part in the celebration of the Queen's Diamond Jubilee in England. The country is very much interested in this question and is looking to the Government for information as to what they propose to do. And, as the Government is the centre of power and information here, it is from that source above all others, that that information would come with the best grace. While saying that, I fully concur in what was said by the hon. member from Victoria that it would be unfortunate if we allowed the force that went to England to be the result of free choice, their expenses paid by free contributions. I think that the expense should be defrayed by the state. And I would have a representative body of men sent over there. Otherwise, no doubt, men of wealth and influence who, perhaps, would like to have a good advertisement before the world, would get up a force at their own expense which, in all human probability, would not be truly representative of the Canadian militia, but would be made up mainly of the class to which they belong rather than of the average class of the country. I think that the country ought to be represented in its average capacity. We ought to send the class of men that go to make up our military force, and the expense of sending them ought to be defrayed by the state. I do not believe that any citizen of Canada would refuse to pay his portion of that expense, but I feel confident that all would willingly pay their share of what may be necessary in order to make a good showing. With regard to sending a detachment of the North-west Mounted Police, I believe that to be a very good idea. That vast country belonging to us is but little known in England. To send a contingent of the North-west Mounted Police would be a good advertisement of that country in England, and it would be an evidence of the security of life and property in the wilds of that vast country to those who might contemplate going there. We should endeavour to make the best possible display. I have no doubt that we shall acquit ourselves creditably, and that this demonstration will result in bringing people to Canada.

Mr. BEATTIE. I am one of those who think that it is not necessary to send a re-

giment of active militia to England. In the first place to send such a regiment properly equipped would cost, at the least, $200,000. It is not necessary to send a regiment to England to inform the people there that we have a militia here that is well armed, well equipped, and quite capable of defending the country. We have shown on more than one occasion that we can do that. I would be in favour of sending a nice bodyguard of from 20 to 25 officers with the leader of the Government. That would make a nice representation, and I think, would fill the bill, and would cost a very small sum. But, if a regiment is sent, I hope the Government will send it in proper shape. It would be a mistake to send a regiment not properly drilled or not well selected. If the Government is going to send a regiment I trust that it will send one that will be a credit to the country.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the motion is put I wish to thank those hon. gentlemn who have endorsed the suggestion I made to the Prime Minister something more than a week ago, to have the North-west Mounted Police represented in any military display that we may make at the Queen's Diamond Jubilee. I will only say, in regard to the proposal that lies underneath of my hon. and gallant friend (Mr. Domville) that if we do send, we must send creditably; and, if we do send, we should not send in the haphazard and shiftless manner of having the men pay their own kit and their own expenses—for the reason that the country would have no guarantee whatever that we should be properly represented. Some men would be well equipped, other middlingly equipped, and others poorly equipped, and there would be a national military representation not unlike that army that General Falstaff led through Coventry. So, if we have a military display representative of Canada, let it be really representative and let it be creditable. Suppose it cost $200,000, suppose it cost $300,000, I do not care——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not care and, what is more, the country does not care. If we send at all, the people want to have this country properly represented. My hon. friend who laughed misunderstood my argument. I am not now discussing the question whether we shall actually send or not; but, on the hypothesis of our sending, I say we should send at the country's charge, and that the body we send should be creditable and representative. Every remark of my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) with reference to the North-west Mounted Police, I endorse. What the hon. gentleman says reinforces what I suggested to the Prime Minister something more than a week ago. Sir, no better course could be taken by the Government, if they are sending a military body over to represent Canada at the Queen's Jubilee, than to have a contingent from our militia, and a contingent from that body of men which is known so popularly, and known so interestingly in connection with the history of the country—the North-west Mounted Police. Not only that, but, according to the evidence of all military men who have visited the North-west, we have there the finest body of men to be found in the Empire. I have heard generals who have fought on the plains of India, generals who have fought the world over, say that in the British army no finer body of men is to be found than that of the North-west Mounted Police. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it would be a mistake not to have our North-west corps represented, and I hope if there is to be a military display of Canada, that these will be represented. The acting Minister of Militia is probably aware of the answer the Premier gave me; he replied to the question I put to him that the matter was under the consideration of the Militia Department. Now, I hope that the acting Minister of Militia will not only be able to answer the question of my hon. and gallant friend, but also my own question, as to whether, in case there is a military body sent to represent Canada at the Jubilee the North-west Mounted Police will be represented.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). It is very gratifying for the Government to find that apparently there is such substantial unanimity on both sides of the House as to the desirability of Canada being represented by a contingent of our various military forces on the occasion of the Diamond Jubilee. The Government, I think, will be acting in accord with the general wish, not merely of Parliament but of the country, in taking care that Canada is properly represented on that occasion by a thoroughly representative contingent, and they will see that that is done; and I think I may venture to intimate to the hon. gentlemen that the various bodies composing the Canadian militia, not excluding the Mounted Police, will not be forgotten on that occasion. As to the other matters, I can say that a good deal of correspondence has been going on, and is going on now, with the Imperial authorities with respect to certain details as to the composition of the force; and the House will therefore, I hope, excuse me for not going into details yet. They will remember that those who go over, at any rate a considerable portion of them, will, of necessity, be guests of the Imperial authorities, and we must not intrude ourselves too much upon them. Now, one other point which I was glad to see brought forward by several hon. gentlemen on both sides. I am entirely of their opinion that thorough economy is not parsimony in dealing with our militia; and when we bring down our supplementary Estimates I trust that we will receive the support of hon. gentlemen

opposite, as well as of hon. gentlemen on this side, in making reasonable provision to see that Canada is fairly and properly represented, as Canada ought to be, on an occasion of this importance. I quite agree with what has been said on both sides of the House as to the importance of the occasion, and as to the importance of Canada making it plain to every section of the British Empire that the people of Canada are thoroughly determined to preserve law and order in this part of the continent that has been committed to their charge, and that they are well able to do so. I trust, if not to-morrow, at any rate immediately on the reassembling of the House, to be able to communicate full details to the House; but the House will understand that while these negotiations are pending, it is not desirable to go into minute details as to the number of the contingent, and other matters of that sort.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

INDIAN AGENT CROWE.

Mr. McNEILL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the hon. the Minister of Interior whether his reply is correctly reported in the "Hansard" of yesterday, where he said, in reply to my question as to the dismissal of Mr. Crowe, Indian agent at Saugeen:

> Inspector Macrae's instructions required him to investigate the matter in regard to which Mr. Crowe has been adjudged guilty of irregularity.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). That is correctly reported.

Mr. McNEILL. Will the hon. gentleman lay the instructions and report upon the Table?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have no objections to doing so.

THE FRANCHISE ACT.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fitzpatrick for second reading of Bill (No. 7) to consolidate and amend the law relating to the election of members to the House of Commons; and the motion of Mr. Foster in amendment thereto.

Mr. McMULLEN. In rising to reply to the address delivered by the hon. the ex-Finance Minister on Friday last, upon the franchise question, and in which he wandered over the entire record, I desire to recur to a few points that he attempted to make upon that occasion. First of all, he complained that Parliament had been summoned too late this year. Well, we know that it is desirable, all things being equal, that Parliament should meet as early in the year as possible, but we know that the present Government have met with great difficulties in the way of summoning Parliament at an earlier period of the year. Hon. gentlemen opposite are well aware that the Government intended to summon Parliament at an earlier period, but, unfortunately, a fire in the departmental buildings necessitated a postponement; and then, again, another accident occurred whereby the hon. the Minister of Militia was very seriously injured, and that was the cause of a further postponement of the meeting of Parliament. The ex-Finance Minister has been calling loud and long and pointedly for the delivery of the Budget speech, but I think he has no reason to complain when we look over the history of the past and see at what dates, under the Conservative Government, their Budget speeches were delivered. I have looked at the dates on which those budget speeches were delivered by the hon. Finance Minister, including tariff changes, and found that the first was on May 12, 1887, the next on March 27, 1890, and the other on March 27, 1894. The first budget speech delivered by the hon. gentleman was delivered about one month after the date on which it is now announced that the budget speech would be delivered during the present session, and the others were only some twenty-five days earlier. On those occasions the hon. gentleman had not to contend with a fire, which destroyed two or three important departments, and other difficulties with which the present Government have had to contend. So I do not think there is room for the complaint made by the ex-Finance Minister. The hon. gentleman claims a great deal of credit for delivering his speech in 1894 so short a time after Parliament assembled. We know on that occasion he delivered the speech a few days earlier than was the ordinary rule, but that was the one exception in his political lifetime. We should also remember that prior to the delivery of that speech, considerable reductions in the tariff were promised, and that when it was delivered it was in such a crude and unsatisfactory form that when the hon. gentleman came to explain the alterations, clerical errors almost innumerable were found to exist. Rather than have a repetition of the experience of 1894 by a Finance Minister before this House and the country, it is very much better that a fair portion of time should be given to the Finance Minister to properly and carefully prepare the changes he desires to make in the tariff, so that when they come before the people there will not be unpleasant explanations to offer, such as were necessary on that occasion owing to the mixed and muddled details of the budget speech, which was full of clerical errors, as the then Finance Minister admitted. Then, again, the hon. gentleman has intimated that the country was fairly aware of the line the Government would pursue, that the people were not taken by surprise, that there was always a well understood principle at the bottom of their tariff and

their policy. In connection with that matter we have a very vivid recollection of some incidents that happened which led us to suppose that the public had too much knowledge with respect to what was likely to happen. I would not charge the ex-Finance Minister with having given hints or winks to any particular section or individual, but we know that in 1894, when he added half a cent per pound to the tariff on raw sugar, some of the refineries in Halifax imported more sugar within the three months prior to the delivery of the budget speech than they had ever imported during a previous year. We do not know who gave the hint, or how the refiners got into possession of the fact that an increased duty on sugar was going to be levied. Whether they got it directly or indirectly we have no knowledge, but the fact remains that in some way they obtained an inkling of what was likely to occur, because two hon. members who then sat in this House, Mr. Kenny and Mr. Stairs, who were largely interested in those refineries, reaped a very fine harvest out of profits from the enormous quantity of raw sugar imported by those refineries before the duties were levied. Of course no Government is justified in giving a hint in respect to proposed tariff changes

The ex-Finance Minister also spoke with respect to the necessity of avoiding a long spring and summer session, and he urged that we should get through the work rapidly; that many of the members had very important interests to attend to at home, and it was desirable that they should be relieved from their duties as soon as possible in order that they might attend to important private business. I have gone over the record and ascertained to what extent the hon. gentleman who now makes this plea on the Government and the House, sought to allow members to engage in their regular work during spring and summer, and I ascertained that out of eighteen years, the House was in session during sixteen springs and summers. That is the record of hon. gentlemen opposite, that is his record as a Minister, while now he is seeking to find fault with the present Government on the ground that they did not call Parliament earlier in order that members could get away to attend to their spring and summer business.

The hon. gentleman has also declared that it is not the intention of the Reform party to fulfil their pledges, and he has outlined a number of pledges given by the party which so far have not been carried out. The hon. gentleman evidently expects that a Government that has only been in power a few months should be prepared during practically its first session to implement every promise made. I do not think it was reasonable to expect the Government to do so. The Speech from the Throne foreshadowed certain measures to carry out promises that the Government have made when in Opposition. One of the leading features in the Speech is the tariff. It is fully the intention of the Government to carry out that promise as one of their principal measures. After the tariff is dealt with, the proposed Franchise Act, which unquestionably will meet the wishes of the people, will be taken up; and if the Government get through the measures outlined in the Speech from the Throne, they will accomplish a great deal in the direction of carrying out the promises made to the people of the country.

The ex-Finance Minister also drew attention to the Bill before the House with respect to superannuation, and he said it did not abolish superannuation. I should like to know from the hon. gentleman if he would justify the introduction of a Bill containing more drastic clauses than the one now before the House, and which he has declared himself quite willing to assist in carrying through Parliament. I believe that the Postmaster General, who introduced the Bill on the question of abolishing the superannuation system, no doubt was prepared to go as far as the abolition of the Act as was fair to the civil servants. The civil servants have certain vested rights. They were engaged and entered the service on certain stipulated conditions. Those conditions were that after they had occupied positions in the service for ten years and had contributed to the superannuation fund by reductions made from their salaries, every permanent civil servant had a claim on the Crown for superannuation, and the result is that if the Crown expects loyalty from their public servants, she must deal honestly and honourably with them. I would like to ask the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster), what kind of a Bill he would introduce? Would he deprive those who are now on the superannuation list of the amount they are enabled to draw under the operations of the Act? I do not think he would be so dishonest. Would he deprive those who are now in the service, and who are entitled to superannuation if they become sick and disabled and have served over ten years? That was the bargain and contract with them when they entered the service, and would the hon. gentleman take advantage of a power of Parliament to break that contract? I do not think he would.

Sir, I want to draw attention to the handle that is attempted to be made by the Conservative press of a recent statement of the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) in this House. In reply to the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) the name of every one of those superannuated since the present Government came into power was given to the House, and the Conservative party is trying to prove that the Reform party have superannuated, as well as the Conservative party, when they were in power. Sir, there is no member of this House who has more frequently criticised

the abuses of the Superannuation Act than I have. I claim that I am familiar with every provision of it. Had the superannuation system been rightly used in Canada, it would have been self-sustaining; but owing to the fact that the Conservative Government misused the Act, the system has become obnoxious and the people have declared that it must be abolished. Let me show that the present Government have not abused the superannuation system. They have not added one year, or one month, or one hour, to the time of service of any clerk who has been superannuated, and they have not given one dollar more in the way of superannuation than the official was entitled to under an honest application of the Act. When the present Government dispensed with the services of those clerks, they were bound to recognize their right to superannuation so long as that law is on the Statute-book. But, on the other hand, let me give the House a little idea of the manner in which the Superannuation Act was abused by the late Government. The ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) must have an idea of how the provisions of the Act were applied in the interests of his own relations. No Minister of the Crown on this side of the House has been charged with being guilty of installing his own relations in office by superannuating other officials. I call the attention of the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) to this fact. Mr. R. W. Cruikshanks of St. John had $2,000 a year, and the ex-Finance Minister superannuated him and added to his time of service, so as to give him the full amount, namely, thirty-five-fiftieths of his salary, or $1,400 a year, and he appointed in Mr. Cruikshanks' place, Mr. H. D. McLeod, his own nephew. Mr. Cruikshanks got as full a superannuation allowance as if he had served fifty years. Now, was Mr. Cruikshanks in such bad health that he was incapable of performing the duties of his office? No, Sir. He has since been performing very onerous duties for the local Government and he is to-day as able to discharge those duties as ever he was in his life. But the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) wanted to find a place for his friend and nephew, and in order to get Mr. Cruikshanks quietly out of the way he added to his time of service.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want to take any honours that do not belong to me. Mr. McLeod is not my nephew. I am old enough, but I am not old enough for that.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, perhaps he is his cousin or some relation. The hon. gentleman cannot say that he is not related to him.

An hon. MEMBER. He is his uncle.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is not the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) the uncle of Mr. McLeod?

Mr. FOSTER. If I continue to deny any longer, the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) will have all the degrees of consanguinity exhausted, and he might then find out the relationship.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) wants to escape the charge that Mr. McLeod is his nephew, but he won't deny that he is a relation of his.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) to try and keep a little closer to the amendment before the House.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to point out how hon. gentlemen opposite abused the Superannuation Act.

Mr. FOSTER. I must imitate my hon. friend the leader of the Government and take a point of order. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) is now discussing the Superannuation and Civil Service Act. I am not aware that that is pertinent either to the main motion, which is for the second reading of the Franchise Bill, or to the amendment, which is that the Franchise Bill shall not be proceeded with until the tariff Bill is disposed of.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am simply answering the argument of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster. I admit that he took a very wide range——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Even if the hon. member (Mr. Foster) were out of order when he was addressing the House, now that the point of order is raised and my attention called to it, it would hardly justify me in permitting the hon. gentleman from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) to proceed with remarks which are not pertinent to the question before the House. I may say further, that there is hardly any doubt that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) is anticipating discussion on another order which is on the paper. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) must confine himself to answering the certainly very numerous arguments which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) adduced in support of his motion. I do not remember that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) addressed any argument to the House with reference to the Superannuation Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. I surely gave him chance enough.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. ex-Finance Minister did unquestionably deal with the Superannuation Bill. I hope he is not going away, for I have something more to say to him. But as you have raised the point, Mr. Speaker, that I am dealing with a question that is now on the Notice Paper, I will postpone any further remarks in regard to that question; and I notify the ex-Finance

Minister that when the Bill comes before the House, I will take the opportunity of dealing with the superannuation system, and showing how it has been abused.

The hon. ex-Finance Minister also tried to frighten the manufacturers of this country by saying that we had declared that our tariff would be death to protection. Well, Sir, I believe I am voicing the opinion of the entire Reform party in this Dominion when I say that as a party we have no bitterness or hostile feeling towards any manufacturing institution in this country that can fairly hope to exist. On the contrary, I believe that the Reform party are prepared to encourage any such industry in any way they can. One feature of the National Policy which we have denounced most strongly has been that feature which produced monopolies, which placed manufacturers in a position to combine and to extort from the consumers of this country excessive prices for the commodities which they manufactured; and I believe it is the determination of the Government, as it is the feeling of every Reformer in this Dominion, that that feature of the National Policy should be obliterated, but we have no hostile feelings towards the legitimate manufacturing institutions of this country. Many of these flourished before there was a National Policy, and I believe that they will continue to flourish after the new tariff is introduced, and that they will come to realize that while the National Policy professed to build them up and make them rich, they were bled in other ways to such an extent that when the annual balance sheet came to be made out, they were not in as good a position as they would have been under a reasonable revenue tariff. We do not want a single manufacturing interest in this country that can fairly hope to exist, to get alarmed. It has nothing to be alarmed at, if it is not one of those sucking monopolies that has been existing unfairly and unjustly by extorting excessive prices from the people.

In the next place, the ex-Finance Minister said something with regard to the Reform party having declared themselves in favour of free trade as it is in England. We would rejoice if the financial condition of this country were such that we could follow the example of the mother country in regard to free trade; but, unfortunately, hon. gentlemen opposite, during the sixteen or eighteen years of extravagance, of increased debt and increased expenditure, have placed this country in such a condition that we cannot hope, for many years, to adopt a free-trade policy; but that is the goal. We earnestly hope, however, that Canada's better day has dawned. The economy in public expenditure that has been so well commenced by the present Government is shown in the Estimates which they have brought down; and I hope they will continue in that course until, at some time in the future, we may be able to follow the noble example set by the mother country, and adopt free trade. The policy of hon. gentlemen opposite was a protective policy; every item in the tariff was placed there with the view of protecting the particular commodity it referred to. On the other hand, the policy of the Reform party is first a tariff for revenue, so adjusted as to reach fairly and equitably the entire consuming masses of this country, without doing any violence to any manufacturing institution that can fairly hope to live and prosper in Canada.

The hon. ex-Finance Minister appears to assume to himself the championship of the manufacturing industries of the country; he appears to think that no member of this Government has any sympathy whatever for any of these institutions. Well, Sir, I think he is greatly mistaken. I think he will begin to realize very shortly that he is under a delusion, as no Reformer desires to injure any industry in the country that can hope to exist under a revenue tariff, fairly administered.

Now, the hon. ex-Finance Minister has challenged the prudence, the propriety, the justice of introducing the measure now before the House. He has said that it strikes directly at the Conservative party, that it is intended to deprive them of the rights and privileges they enjoy. I would like to know in what way he can prove that statement. The provincial franchise as it now exists in the province of Ontario is entirely under the control of the municipalities. The reeves and councillors are not all Reformers. Even in townships which are looked on as Reform or as Conservative there is always a considerable body of the opposite party. These men lay the foundation for the provincial franchise, and they are in a much better position to say who, within the limits of the township shall be granted the right to exercise the franchise at municipal and provincial and Dominion elections, than any revising officer or any county judge. They are well acquainted with the neighbourhood in which they live, and they are usually scattered over the township. It is the privilege of every inhabitant of the municipality to appear at the revision and to ask that a name should be put on or taken off, and if the council declined to do what any individual deems to be simple justice, he has the right to appeal from the council to a county judge. Thus the last appeal is to friends of hon. gentlemen opposite. I would like to know how, under these circumstances, hon. gentlemen opposite can claim that the proposed measure is a direct thrust at the Conservative party.

The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) very strongly advocated the continuation of the franchse now in existence. I do not much wonder at that, because it landed him in this House, and if the other system had been in existence, I doubt very much that he would have come here. So I

suppose he thinks he had better stick to the ship that landed him here.

The hon. ex-Finance Minister has been singularly uneasy since this House met. He has been very restless in his seat. He has been very ready to rise to ask questions, to press for certain measures, and to ask for the Budget. I do not know what is the cause of his uneasiness. The fact that his seat is not now cushioned with the $7,000 salary which he formerly received may possibly explain why he is so fidgety. All we have to say is that the verdict of the people of this country on the 23rd of June last landed him in the seat he now occupies. I think it would be very much better for the hon. gentleman to cultivate a little patience beneath the wave of popular indignation which placed him where he is, and allow the Government a fair and reasonable opportunity of showing how they can discharge the duties of the Executive of this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite may possibly feel sore with the Moses of their party (Sir Charles Tupper) who has led them into the political wilderness, where, in my opinion, they are likely to remain for some time. There can be no doubt that these hon. gentlemen have a record which is exceedingly unsavoury, and I look forward to a better condition of things. I look forward to the present Government administering the affairs of this country honestly and sensibly, and feel confident that we have done with such scandals as the Curran Bridge scandal, the Tay Canal scandal, the McGreevy scandal, which disgraced the last Administration. Let me urge hon. gentlemen opposite to cultivate patience and forebearance, and realize that they are in Opposition. We sat on that side for a great many years, and we tried when there to discharge the duties we owed our country, as we shall endeavour to do on this side. We hope that hon. gentlemen opposite will equally discharge their duties, because the Opposition have very onerous duties to perform, and I have no doubt that the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) will prove himself a very efficient member of the Opposition. He has evidently made up his mind to do a great deal of work, whether the hon. gentlemen behind him perform their share or not.

I hope that the Bill now before the House will receive its sanction. We must not forget that the Government have promised a plebiscite on the temperance question. Now, the plebiscite cannot take place before we have revised the franchise, because it would be a gross injustice to submit the question on the present lists. We have had no revision for some two years, nearly three. Would it be fair, I ask, that a question so vital and prominent should be submitted on defective voters' lists, in which many young men who have just come of age are not entered. I venture to say that 10 or 12 per cent of our young men who have a right to vote are not on the lists at all. We require a revision of the voters' lists. You cannot possibly proceed to take a plebiscite, until you have a revision under the proposed Act now before the House.

Mr. SPROULE. Why not take a vote on the provincial lists, and provide in the Plebiscite Act for this way of taking it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think the proper way to take a vote is to take it on the lists adopted by the Dominion for Dominion purposes, and until we have that list, the Government cannot carry out their promise with regard to the plebiscite. We have it hinted that possibly the Franchise Act will receive very severe handling in the Senate, and some say it may possibly be choked up there. If the Senators are prepared to assume the responsibility of doing so, if they are bound to stand in the breach and not allow the Franchise Act to pass, they will have to bear the odium. But before the plebiscite is taken, we should have a thorough revision of the lists of the Dominion. When that is done, we can take a fair and honest plebiscite, but until then we cannot. Until we pass the present Franchise Bill, it will be an utter impossibility to get a verdict by means of a plebiscite.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I must say that I have not given that attention to the Franchise Act which I would like to do, and which I propose to do in order to discuss it thoroughly in the Committee of the Whole House. But there are some primary objections to this measure becoming law, which I wish to point out to the Government, and, which, if my interpretation of the statute itself is correct, renders it almost impossible for a measure of this kind to become law. In the first place, I understand that, under the present law, in the province of Quebec, the principle of one man one vote does not apply, and it does in Ontario. If that be the case, then the result of this law would be that you would give to the electors in the province of Quebec a very much larger representation at the polls than you would give the electors of Ontario and some other provinces, where the principle of one man one vote obtains. This is to my mind what renders it almost impossible for the Government to go on with the measure during the present session. I cannot conceive it possible that an elector living in Montreal, having votes in seven or eight constituencies in that province, would have the right to exercise his franchise in these different constituencies, whilst an elector residing in Toronto would be tied down, by the principle of one man one vote, to the one constituency, though he might own property in several. Do you mean to tell me that, at the present session, in the face of this one fact alone, without any assurance of a change in the laws of Quebec, we, in this Parliament, are

going to enact a measure of that kind? I venture to say, with all deference to the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), who has had in charge the preparation of this measure, that no such law will ever be enacted in this Parliament during the present session at least. Well, Sir, that is only one illustration of the change that has taken place in the history of franchises in Canada. I say "franchises" advisedly, because in this Bill we are dealing with franchises of all kinds, and not the franchise of the Dominion alone The principle upon which the legislation first introduced in this Parliament was based, was not, as some suppose, to obtain uniformity throughout the Dominion. Any one who doubts that I would refer to the speech of the late Sir John A. Macdonald, when he introduced the Franchise Bill in 1885. He stated that it was not on that account, but it was, that, though the provinces might differ in their franchises, nevertheless we in this Parliament had the power to say whether these should be the franchises of this Dominion. That is the great principle involved in the franchise of 1885. We know, Sir, that during the session of 1885 we adopted the franchise then existing in Prince Edward Island, we adopted the franchise then existing in British Columbia, though that franchise was manhood suffrage in each case. Though they differed from the franchise in Quebec or Ontario, they then became the Dominion franchise. It is not alone in the particular I have mentioned as regards the province of Quebec or Ontario, but in every respect we are subjected to any future changes that may be made by any legislature—which may be more advanced, if you like, as to the extension of the franchise. Whatever it may be, under this Bill we are bound to accept it as a matter of course. There are, in many of the provinces, people who believe, and believe honestly, in the principle of minority representation. Much may be said in favour of that principle. I am not prepared to say, so far as my humble opinion is concerned at least, that the day is not so very far distant when the principle may be adopted by provinces in this Dominion. If that day should arrive, we shall have no fault to find with the province adopting it, but it may not meet with the approval of the majority of this House and of this country. Nevertheless, under the principle of the Bill before us, we are bound to adopt it as the Dominion franchise for that province. We are subject, therefore, to all the changes—I will not say whims, because some of the changes may be good, some may be advanced, some may be, perhaps, ahead of the times in the Dominion yet not ahead of the time so far as the particular province is concerned—of the various provinces. But I am not prepared to say that some of the provinces will not act in this same high-minded spirit. We have had experience in the province of Nova Scotia. We know that prior to an election, the men in the employment of the Dominion Government were disfranchised in order that they might not cast their votes at a Dominion election. But something has happened within the last ten days in the Ontario legislature alone which ought to make clear to all members of this House the danger of leaving our franchise at the mercy of hostile legislatures. About two years ago, I think it was, that legislature passed an Act limiting the powers of this Government to appoint junior judges, by fixing a limited population in the counties in this regard. The result was that that power was taken from the Federal Government. Within the last two weeks, in what may be the dying hours of the Ontario legislature, that law was repealed. Does any one suppose that it was repealed for any other purpose than to enable the Federal Government to appoint junior judges again? I merely mention that to show the danger of placing the franchises of this Dominion at the mercy of the provincial legislatures in this country. I could mention other cases than that. Sir, there is a great principle involved. This Franchise Act was not enacted without a very great deal of consideration. Not once, but on seven different occasions, did Sir John Macdonald introduce the Bill which was afterwards passed in 1885, and he did so, as he stated, in order that the measure might be before the country and be properly considered by the electors before it finally became the law of the land. I need not remind those hon. gentlemen who were in the House in 1885 of the full and complete discussion that took place upon the measure. We know that that period of obstruction, the first in the history of this Parliament under our present procedure, was inaugurated at that time by those who now occupy the Government benches in this House. We know that after the fullest possible discussion, lasting over a period of some months, this measure at last became law. No Bill was ever passed in this Parliament that received such criticism as this Bill received. No measure was ever enacted here of which it might be so truly said that it was made as perfect as such legislation could possibly be from a Dominion standpoint. And now shall it be said that we will take a retrograde step, that we will commit political suicide so far as this Parliament is concerned by giving up this right which is crystallized into an Act of Parliament and go back to provincial franchises with all their weaknesses and all their dangers? This is to be regretted not from the federal standpoint alone. I believe that the history of this country has shown that there is such a strong current of provincial thought that it is almost impossible for the Federal Government to resist it. In our provinces we have not the second chambers, as a rule, that they have in the United States; we have not the sys-

tem of checks and counterchecks to hasty legislation. Therefore, so far as the central power is concerned, instead of weakening it, we should strengthen it by all honest and legitimate means in this Parliament.

Have said so much with regard to the Franchise Act itself, I wish to pass on to what the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has said in commenting upon the remarks made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) in this House a few nights ago. He stated that that hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) might not have been here had it not been for the present Franchise Act. The same might be said of dozens of hon. members on the other side of the House. In order to test the correctness of that statement, you would have to examine into the circumstances of every individual election held throughout the country, and you would find, I make no doubt, many of the hon. gentlemen upon that side of the House who, by energy and hard work were able to secure, perhaps, better lists than their opponent. Such has always been the case under the provincial lists, such has always been the case under the Dominion lists, such will be the case even if you come down to manhood suffrage and adopt a system of registration. The hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) a few days ago, hinted that there might possibly be a unanimity of opinion in favour of manhood suffrage. I shall have to change my mind before I agree to that principle, believing, as I do, that many of the evils which are now incident to the legislation not only of the United States but of England and of this country, are referable to the very low standard of property qualification that prevail in all these countries. But that is a matter that can be discussed, as it was in 1885, when the Bill is in committee of the whole House—it is a matter of detail. I have sought only to point out the danger that faces this Parliament when you come to enact legislation of this kind. Provinces will advance, provinces will change their franchises possibly for good, but possibly in directions that we would not approve in this House. But whether for good or evil, we are bound to affirm them ; by this Act they will become the law of the land.

Now, just one word more with regard to what the ex-Finance Minister dwelt upon so long, the fact that this measure was brought forward for a certain purpose, that it was brought forward in advance of the legislation to which the country was earnestly looking forward. Now, Sir, I wish to join my voice with his in expressing my regret that the Government has not been able to bring down their measure of tariff reform, or tariff changes, at an earlier period in the present session. Sir, I sympathize with the Government, and acknowledge that the task they have undertaken is not a light nor an easy one. It is the most difficult work, perhaps, that a Government could undertake. Nevertheless, they have had opportunities, I think, beyond those that were enjoyed by the late Government prior to the legislation of 1894 ; they have had all the opportunities of going about the country and visiting the different industries, which was a right and proper thing to do, although they found much fault with us because a commission, of which I was a member, did the very same thing before bringing down the tariff revision of 1894. I can only say this, that I cannot believe that this measure was of sufficient importance to be interposed before the production of the more important tariff measure. I venture the prediction that this measure will scarcely be made law during the present session of this Parliament ; and I rejoice to know that the circumstances of the country, the exigencies of party, the state of opinion in this Parliament, are not likely to render it necessary that the Government should bring down any such law during the present session.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is refreshing to have one of the leading members of the Opposition side of the House rise and direct his remarks to a discussion of the measure before the House. With the exception of, perhaps, the slightest and most casual reference to this question, we have had nothing from that side of the House with regard to the repeal of the franchise law. The hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) has attempted to show reason why the Parliament of Canada should continue to exercise the functions that it took upon itself in 1885, to provide for this Dominion a voters' list. I think that the verdict of this country will be, I think that the verdict of this House will be, that the Government now occupying the Treasury benches, in deciding to sweep this measure from the Statute-book, is acting in the public interest, and will be entitled to receive, and will receive, the thanks of the public. My hon. friend from Brockville attempts to impress upon the House the idea that the repeal of the franchise law of this Dominion and the substitution in place of it of the franchises of the provinces, will work inequalities of the most striking and pernicious character. He tells us that in the province of Ontario, if the elections are held upon the list of that province, and in accordance with the election laws of that province, we shall have the principle—I may say parenthetically the salutary principle—of one man one vote ; while, on the contrary, in the province of Quebec, and perhaps in other provinces, that principle will not apply ; and for that reason we shall have a law which is not uniform in its application or in its operation with regard to the elections throughout the Dominion. But the very next moment the hon. gentleman goes on to say that when this law was adopted in

1885 we took the franchises of the provinces, in Prince Edward Island manhood suffrage; in British Columbia manhood suffrage; and the incorporation of these franchises in the Bill made them Dominion franchises.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Will the hon. gentleman allow me. The argument was this, that even under manhood suffrage one man would only have one vote. In Ontario we had the principle of one man one vote, and in the province of Quebec we had the principle of one man several votes. So it was not the principle.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have fairly stated the hon. gentleman's position. He cites these two instances to prove that inequalities will exist in the operation of the law in these different provinces. I have fairly stated what the hon. gentleman has put before the House, and I was proceeding to say that the hon. gentleman, the next moment, stated that the Government in 1885, when the Dominion electoral franchise law was passed, did incorporate inequalities in that law. They set out with the assertion that the reason that warranted them in asking Parliament to assume the functions and the duty and the power of establishing a Dominion franchise law, was that it was necessary to have a uniform franchise. The hon. gentleman will not deny that that was one of the reasons assigned.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I hope the hon. gentleman won't charge me with interrupting him. I stated that uniformity was not alone the principle. Then I pointed out the danger there was of inequality. That was my point; it was not the principle of uniformity. Read Sir John A. Macdonald's speech in introducing the measure in 1885, and you will find he distinctly stated that it was not, but that, to use his own words, it was no pedantic idea they wished to follow.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman says it was not exclusively upon the assumption that the Government desired to secure uniformity, that this was not the exclusive principle that actuated the Govment in the passage of this law. I was about to proceed and say that there were other principles that actuated the Government, principles that were not as creditable to the Government as the principle that it was desirable to secure uniformity. But this was one of the assertions made by the Government of the day as a justification of its conduct in introducing into this House the Electoral Franchise Law of 1885, the assertion that it was necessary to secure uniformity of qualification for the exercise of the franchise throughout this Dominion; but having introduced the law based upon that assumption, among others they proceeded themselves to violate, in the most glaring manner, the very principle they had laid down as one of the fundamental principles that governed them in their action. They proceeded to grant universal suffrage in two provinces; they proceeded to give, in the maritime provinces, a suffrage based upon a character of property that did not exist and was not used in other provinces; and they succeeded at last in placing upon the Statute-book a law which gave greater diversity of franchise than existed under the provincial franchises. They thus gave away their whole case, and they showed most conclusively that the assertion made, the assumption upon which they proceeded was a mere assumption, was a mere assertion, that did not actually govern their conduct as the consideration of this Bill proceeded.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman tells us that this Bill that we have under consideration received the most exhaustive consideration and criticism, that the Bill, forsooth, was a perfect Bill when it was placed upon the Statute-book of this Dominion, because it had been subjected to three months of adverse criticism, and gone through the fiery ordeal of a consideration in the committee of the whole in those three months. Sir, the Bill was an infamous Bill when it was introduced, it was only slightly less infamous when it became law. The fight of the Opposition in this House for three long months, was to save the country from the imposition of this outrage, conceived for the purpose of giving to the Government of the day power which they unjustly wrested from the Opposition, power which enabled them to deal corruptly and improperly with the formation of the voters' lists of this country. The then Opposition may claim not that they secured for this country through their long debate on the Bill a good law; but they may claim that they secured by their long and vigorous fight the excision of some of the most objectionable features of this law.

What were the circumstances connected with the introduction of this Bill? What were the reasons that led to its introduction? What was the necessity that existed for bringing in this Bill? Under what provisions had we held our elections from 1867 to 1885? Had the country at large expressed any dissatisfaction with the mode in which our elections were held? Had there been any friction? Had there been any demand for change? Had there been the slightest indication, either on the surface or beneath the surface, that the people of the country required an electoral franchise law for the Dominion, or that the interest of the people would be served by such a law? We had a provision inserted in the British North America Act with respect to the mode of holding our elections, a provision that worked well, a provision the propriety of which was never questioned, nor was any question raised as to the desirability of continuing it. That pro-

vision is found in section 41 of the British North America Act, and it reads as follows :—

Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, all laws in force in the several provinces at the union relative to the following matters, or any of them, namely—the qualifications and disqualifications of persons to be elected or to sit or vote as members of the House of Assembly or legislative assembly in the several provinces, the voters at elections of such members, the oaths to be taken by voters, the returning officers, their powers and duties, the proceedings at elections, the periods during which elections may be continued, the trial of controverted elections and proceedings incident thereto, the vacating of members, and the execution of new writs, in case of seats vacated otherwise than by dissolution—shall respectively apply to elections of members to serve in the House of Commons for the same several provinces.

That is, we were to have as our law governing in these cases the law of the respective provinces relating to the election of members to sit in the legislative assembly. We were to have the voters' lists for use in Dominion elections that were to be used in provincial elections. I re-affirm the assertion I have already made, that there never was during the eighteen years that rule was in practice any evidence of the slightest dissatisfaction with it, the slightest evidence of the necessity of change, and the Government were not impelled by any necessity, apparent or real, to carry out the change they made. Now, of course the Government had a motive. The Government had a motive when it naturalized and introduced that American cutthroat piece of political villany called the gerrymander, and so arranged matters in this province of Ontario that one-half of the electors were able to elect two-thirds of the members to sit in this House. The Government had a motive there. The motive was to strengthen themselves ; and they did it. They had a motive when the Electoral Franchise Act was introduced. The motive was not to do justice, not to meet a public want, not to meet a claim on the part of the public for the redress of a grievance, but the motive was to place upon the Statute-book—a law which would give the Government of the day unjust and illegitimate advantage. That was the motive ; and that motive was in the results and fruits that followed fully secured. The Government attempted at first to give to all Indians of the Dominion a vote. They finally abandoned that proposition. They attempted at first to take power to appoint any man who had five years' experience as a barrister, no matter how disreputable he might be, no matter how pliant a tool of political parties he might be, to the position of revising barrister. The long fight the Opposition made prevented some of these attempted outrages. We secured a limitation of the Indian vote to a few tribes, partly civilized. We secured a provision that judges only where available should act as revising barristers. We minimized to some extent the evils that the Bill was intended and calculated to produce, but we never were able to eliminate its chief and most important features for evil.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the Bill proposed to enfranchise all the Indians; that the Indians of British Columbia, the Indians of Manitoba and the Indians of the North-west Territories were all to be enfranchised ?

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman understood me correctly. The Premier of the day, when asked that question, expressly asserted that such was the case—that "Strike-in-the-Back," "Eagle's Nest," "Pie-a-Pot," and all other Indians of the North-west were to be enfranchised. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman was in earnest or indulging in a piece of facetiousness, but that was his answer, and that was the provision of the Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is not in earnest.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am ; I leave insincerity to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DAVIN. When was this ?

Mr. CHARLTON. In 1885 ; when my hon. friend's parliamentary existence was yet in embryo. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Bill with these provisions became the law.

Now, what were the practical results connected with the operation of the Bill ? The Government appointed the revising barristers. The revising barristers held office during the pleasure of the Government. They might be honourable men, and in the majority of case they were ; they might in some cases not be as strictly honourable as might be desired. These men had in their hands irresponsible power. They were clothed with power to make the lists, to publish the lists, to use such information as they might deign to us in the preparation of the lists. Their decision could not be challenged except on questions of law, and the right of a man to be on the voters' list is always a question of fact. The preparation of the lists was so expensive that the Government shrank from incurring the expenditure of an annual revision, and we had only four revisions from 1885 to 1896. Those lists upon the occasion of the first revision were printed in the printing offices of newspapers supporting the Government. Then the Government changed the plan ; they bought plant for the Government printing office at Ottawa, and printed the lists in their own office. When that point was reached, we had this most remarkable condition of things existing : we had a law that gave the Government of the day power to appoint its own officers to make the lists ; then we had a further provision by which

the Government of the day, if those officers did not make the lists to suit them, could stuff those lists at their own pleasure in their own office, and for the last outrage, if attempted, there was no possible remedy. It has been asserted, and I assert that voters' lists on numerous occasions have been tampered with and names placed on lists in the Government printing office that were not entitled to a place there. I claim that in one polling division in the riding of North Norfolk, twelve names that were struck off by the revising barrister, found their places upon the voters' lists when they were printed at Ottawa. What could we do with a thing of that kind ? We were contending against this trinity of political infamies : the Gerrymander Act, the Franchise Act, and an unlimited amount of boodle.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, shame.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, we were, and it was only by the interposition of Providence that we were enabled to shake these men from the hold they had. The idea of a man standing up to-day to defend a franchise law that provides for the making of lists, for the printing of the lists, and for the manipulation of the lists in every respect by the Government that may desire to profit, and will profit, by any improper conduct with regard to the formation of these lists.

Mr. SPROULE. What do you think of the right of the Manitoba Government to make their lists ?

Mr. CHARLTON. They have the right to make their own lists, and we have nothing to do with it. Now, one of the reasons assigned in justification of the present law was that it was proper and desirable to copy the English example. England had revising barristers, and it was said that England had a system which it was proper for us to imitate. We were told that the lists prepared in England were prepared for the election of members of Parliament, and that we ought to have such a system in Canada. Well, Sir, when we come to examine the English law, and to contrast the working of that law with the working of the Dominion Electoral Franchise Act, we will find that there are no points of resemblance between the two. The English lists are made by municipal officers, the overseers of the poor. I have here the English statute, 48 Vic., chap. 15. This law has been often amended and the last amendments were made in 1885. The statute, first of all, issues instructions to the clerks of the peace of the various counties, and, following the instructions to the clerks of the peace are the forms and the nature of the instructions given by the clerks of the peace to the overseers of the poor. These instructions cover the following subjects—Registration of county voters, general instructions explaining the persons entitled to be registered, the meaning of the expressions used, and the mode of making out and publishing the lists, the publication and inspection of lists, provision for notices and inquiries, for the publication of the lists of voters and the receiving of claims and of objections by these overseers of the poor, the work of forming the lists, of receiving applications to go upon the list, of receiving protests against being upon the lists ; all this work was performed by the overseers of the poor who are municipal officers, and finally, there were the instructions to those overseers of the poor with regard to their attendance upon the revising barristers.

Now, the revising barrister in England was not a creature of the Government. He was not a Government appointee at all. He was appointed by the chief justice ; he held his office for one year, and his functions with regard to the lists were purely and exclusively judicial. He supervised the work of the municipal officers, and upon appeals from their action he gave his decision. This English law was identical almost with the law of Ontario. The township councils there, corresponding in their functions to the overseers of the poor, made the list from the assessment rolls, held courts of revision, hear claims to be put on, hear protests against being on, and having made a perfect list, so far as their functions will permit them to do, the county judge, whose duties correspond with those of the revising barrister in England, is called in to revise their work upon appeals from their decision. I repeat, that we have in the province of Ontario a system with regard to the preparation of the voters' list almost identical with that that prevails in England. Nothing could be more widely divergent from the system prevailing in Great Britain than the Electoral Franchise law of this Dominion.

Mr. SPROULE. What does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) think about the registration system in cities and towns of Ontario, which is done under appointees of the Government ?

Mr. CHARLTON. Well, Sir, I think that in regard to registration, in regard to any course that can be taken for securing the privilege of the franchise at the very earliest day to young men who come of age, is a movement to be approved of. Anything that will avoid such a scandalous condition of things as we had in 1891 when we held an election upon a voters' list two years old, anything that will prevent such a scandalous condition of things as existed in 1896, when we held an election on voters' lists two years old, is a welcome improvement. In neither of these elections could any voter in the Dominion of Canada under twenty-three years of age exercise the franchise. Almost anything that is imaginable is preferable to such an outrage upon the electorate as was perpetrated in these two elec-

tions. It is desirable that our young men should have their names upon the voters' lists as soon as possible after they attain manhood. If a man, otherwise entitled to vote, attains the age of twenty-one, he should be given the right to exercise the franchise as soon as possible, and he should not be deterred for two years afterwards.

Mr. HUGHES. How will you do that if you adopt the provincial lists ?

Mr. CHARLTON. You will do it under the provincial law. Whatever mode is adopted by the province for the exercise of the franchise is the law that will apply for the election of members for the Dominion, and if it is a just law in the one case it is a just law in the other. I do not dispute that this House is properly invested with authority as to the trial of the right of its members to sit here, and as to all things relating to the economy of this House. Nevertheless, it must be borne in mind that we are all of us here the representatives of certain ridings. We come from certain provinces, and these provinces are invested by the constitution of the country with the civil right which enables them to secure representation in this Parliament. We represent our provinces here. We are not relieved from responsibility to these provinces; we are not relieved from the duty of looking after the interests of the provinces and the ridings we represent. I have always held that it pertained to the province to say what should be the method by which it should choose its representatives in this Parliament ; that that was a civil right of the province ; that while we exercised certain functions in the way of determining the qualifications of members of this House, and so forth, yet primarily we are sent here by our ridings, which are different portions of the province, the province being entitled under the British North America Act to be represented in this House, and that Act prescribing the number of representatives which each province should have in this House ; and when we are asked : How will you do this or that, how will you have one man one vote in one province and another system in another province ? I say do as they do in each province—adopt their franchise for the sake of harmony, and do not adopt a hard and fast rule that may conflict with the rule of the province ; do not be guilty of the folly that we perpetrated in 1885 of providing two sets of machinery at enormous cost, perplexing the minds of the people, causing confusion, and in every way working detrimentally to the interests of the country. It may be said : this thing cannot last—you will have to go back to a Dominion franchise.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. "Hear, hear," I hear. Some men are very wise in this matter. They do not take the pain to look at the experience of other countries in the very same road that we are now travelling. That is of no consequence to them. Here is a law that they placed on the Statute-book in 1885 for a political purpose. It has served its purpose, and they are in favour of that law because it has been a good friend to them ; and they say, forsooth, that it cannot be dispensed with. But I know it can be. Our friends have talked of the example of England, and I have pointed out that we have not followed the example of England at all—that the main features of our law are diametrically opposed to the main features of the English law. It is admitted that our federal union here is to some extent a copy of the first great experiment in the formation of a federal union in the history of the world. That experiment was the formation of the federal union of the thirteen colonies that first constituted the United States. That federal union is the example on which we have acted, on which the Australian colonies are about to act, and on which all federated colonies must act. In that example they can copy what is desirable, and avoid what is undesirable. The American people have not passed exactly through our experience, for they have never had what may be termed a national franchise law. They had a national constitutional convention in 1787, after the first Confederation Act had been found ineffectual. One of the first questions to be decided in that convention was, what should be the character of the machinery by which the members of Congress, the President and the Vice-President of the United States should be elected ? How should they ascertain and apply the popular will ? That question was debated for weeks. Four propositions were made. One was that the states should elect members of Congress as they now elect senators. Another was that each state should determine the mode in which they should be elected, what men should vote and what men should not vote. Another was that the United States should have a uniform franchise law to be applied in all United States elections, which was similar to our own law. That was rejected, as were the other propositions, and the simple solution of the difficulty arrived at was that the lowest form of franchise used in each state, the franchise for the election of members to the most lower branch of the legislature in the state, the most widely-extended franchise, should be the franchise used in United States elections. That law went into operation in 1790 ; it has been in operation 107 years ; and there never has been the slightest friction under it or the remotest expression of a desire to have it changed. It has been recognized through all that period to be essentially just and to be the only form of franchise that could be worked easily, harmoniously and without

friction. Imagine that country adopting a set of machinery for a national franchise, with its revising barristers, its revisions, its lists, its printing of these lists and its distribution of these lists among the 70,000,000 inhabitants of that country. Imagine the confusion that would reign between the list of the nation and the lists of the states. We have had such an experience in this country under this absurd law, and common sense and justice require that this Government should sweep it from the Statute-book at the earliest possible moment.

I do not know that it is necessary to enter with very much greater fulness into the discussion of this question ; but I have this to say, that the Dominion franchise law is unique in its character among all the franchise laws in existence.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The proposed one.

Mr. CHARLTON. The one which it is proposed to sweep away. There is no law in England corresponding to this. In no other British colony is there a franchise law that places it in the power of the Government of the day to make the list, to alter the list, to print the list, to stuff the list and trample on the rights of the people. I repeat that Canada in this respect occupies a unique position, a position so unique that the sooner we get out of it and return to the old system the better. We are not recommending a novel or untried system. We are simply proposing to return to the principle that was in operation longer than the existing franchise law—a system which was in operation from 1867 to 1885, and which gave evidence by its fruits that it was an excellent system and that no possible reason existed for the substitution of the one now in vogue. I hold, therefore, that this Government is not only warranted but is in duty bound to repeal this law.

Now, some question may exist on our own side of the House as to why the course proposed to be taken is advisable. Some of our friends may perhaps entertain the impression that somehow or other, and to a limited extent at least, the Dominion should exercise some degree of supervision in this matter. Such a position is entirely at variance with the position occupied by the Liberal party on this question from the time it was fought in this House for three months. From 1885 down to this moment the Liberal party has always squarely and unequivocally held the position that the franchise law of this Dominion should be the franchise laws of the different provinces. I will read one amendment that was offered in the course of that memorable struggle, which expressed the position of the Liberal party at the outset ; and the party has continued to occupy that position down to the present time. The resolution, which was moved on the 3rd of July, 1885, was as follows :—

Moved by Mr. Charlton :

That the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, for the purpose of amending the same, so as to provide for leaving with the people the control of the voters' list by officers of their own selection ; and for avoiding the useless expense of double machinery for preparing voters' lists, the extra expense contingent upon a Dominion Franchise Bill, and the confusion and annoyance to the people resulting from two distinct methods of preparing and revising voters' lists, by providing that each province shall be allowed to judge of the proper requirements for the exercise of franchise within its own limits (inasmuch as the diversities of conditions in different provinces render it difficult, if not impossible, to fix a uniform franchise for the entire Dominion that will fully meet the conditions and wants of each separate province) ; and that a uniform franchise for each province, for both provincial and Dominion elections, shall be secured, by providing that the voters' lists used in each province, in the elections of members of the Dominion House of Commons, shall be voters' lists in each province prepared under the laws of such province, and in use for the election of members of the House of Assembly of each such province.

That was the distinct position taken by the Liberal party in July, 1885, as regards the Dominion franchise law and the Liberal party has never in the slightest degree departed from that position. The position was a sound one then, it is a sound one now, and the country calls loudly to be relieved from the incubus that has rested upon it in connection with the operation of this Bill. But four revisions have cost the country more than a million dollars. The Government did not dare have an annual revision of the lists, and we usually held our elections on the old lists. The two last elections were held on lists two years old. In consequence of this great cost, in consequence of the cumbersome nature of the machinery, in consequence of the great inconvenience placed upon the electorate of the country in getting themselves placed upon the lists, in consequence of the cost to members of Parliament and candidates of revising the lists, averaging $600 or $700 per riding for each revision, in consequence of all this unnecessary trouble and expenditure to secure a result that would be better secured by a list which costs nothing at all, I hold that the Government are justified in sweeping away this measure and substituting for it the provincial franchises.

Mr. BENNETT. The motion of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) is " that the further consideration of this Bill be deferred until the tariff promised by the Government for this session has been disposed of by this House ;" and in rising to support that resolution, almost at the outset I congratulate two hon. gentlemen, the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) on the addresses delivered by them this afternoon. Let me tender, first, my sincere congratulations to

the hon. member for North Wellington. Considering the new element in which he found himself, he did fairly well. The hon. gentleman found himself adrift, so to speak, in this respect that he was not able to indulge in his old-time abuse and vituperation of his political opponents, but the hon. gentleman has sufficient of the old leaven left in him to forget occasionally which side he is on, and indulges in a strain that reminded one of his former efforts, and in the course of his rhetoric he has even drifted into scripture. I must confess that my biblical lore will not compare with that of the hon. gentleman, but he recalled to my recollection the fraud that was perpetrated when Jacob, inspired by the evil to which unfortunately mankind is too prone, attempted to defraud his ancient father by passing himself off as his brother Esau. In like manner while the hon. gentleman this afternoon tried to masquerade as a protectionist and while the mask, though not very thick, perhaps might pass, still the voice of McMullen the free trader was there and that voice could not possibly be forgotten. The hon. gentleman, in his remarks on the Franchise Act, set a pace which excited emulation on the part of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who endeavoured to excel him, and I must certainly congratulate that hon. gentleman on the tone of his remarks this afternoon, characterized, though they were, by that acerbity which usually marks his utterances, and which no doubt is due to the fact that the hon. gentleman's exclusion from the Cabinet has not had the effect of mollifying his feelings. Why he should have been treated in the way he was is more than passing strange. In the first place the hon. gentleman had the financial status to entitle him to a place in the Cabinet, and in the Ontario representation that seems to be taken as the standard and not the question of ability at all, because we all recollect how for years and years the hon. Senator from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), while a member of this House, toiled and slaved in the interests of the party only to be cast aside at the last moment in favour of hon. gentlemen who had not a tittle of the claims on the party which he had, if we leave aside the financial point of view. Considering therefore the reflections in which the hon. member for North Norfolk must be indulging to-day, his remarks are not to be wondered at. As usual, he made an attack on the revising officer in his own particular riding, and I would remind hon. members of this House that upon another occasion the hon. gentleman made just as bitter and acrimonious remarks concerning the revision of the lists in his riding, for which he was at once severely taken to task. He was taken to task then because he made statements of a grossly libellous character, and he has made statements equally libellous this afternoon, on the Superintendent of the Printing Bureau at Ottawa, and the revising barrister of his riding. When the hon. gentleman was taken to task last year for his charges of wrong-doing on the part of these gentlemen, what did he say in reply? He said: I do not know that I am warranted in saying it was done in the printing office or that the authorities at Ottawa are responsible, because I imagine it might have occurred in this way, namely, that the revising barrister completed his investigations and left his clerk to make out the lists, and possibly the clerk might have been tampered with. Therefore the remarks of the hon. gentleman in this connection must fall to the ground. If he was honest enough to withdraw the insinuations he made a year ago, surely he will be honourable enough to-day to withdraw the reflections he has made on the revising barrister or the Superintendent of the Printing Bureau, and no doubt he will again attach the blame, not to the Superintendent of the Printing Bureau or the revising barrister, but to some other person, for tampering with the lists.

In reply to the sweeping denunciations of the hon. gentleman of the characters of some people, let me say that within the walls of this building, are the original lists made up by the judges in the different districts from one end of the Dominion to the other. The hon. gentleman can have access to those lists, he can examine the handwriting and make a comparison to ascertain whether the lists have been tampered with. There rests an excellent opportunity for the hon. gentleman to give free play to that curiosity which so thoroughly possesses him and discover for himself whether any wrong-doing existed.

The hon. gentleman at the outset charged that there was fraud perpetrated in the original making-up of the lists. I would ask the hon. gentleman, who revised the lists for the Dominion elections in the province of Ontario? Are they not the county court judges? Are they not the very men before whom will come the revision of these self-same voters' lists? One would imagine that in the revision of these lists there were employed none but parliamentary hacks, but the hon. gentleman knows well that even in his own constituency the lists are revised by the very same judge in the Dominion elections who revises them for the local elections. Now, what does the hon. gentleman say? He did not go into details. He did not place side by side the local lists and the Dominion lists, as they are prepared, and submit them to the judgment of the House, as they are prepared in the province of Ontario. Now, Sir, what is the system of preparing the local lists in the province of Ontario? After the municipal council is formed each year, it is their duty to appoint an assessor, and early in the year—some time in the month of February, I believe—the assessor,

having received his list, goes about the different municipalities, to do what? In the province of Ontario every man is entitled to have his name on the list of voters for candidates for the local legislature who is of the age of twenty-one years and is a British subject, regardless of whether he has property or not. The assessor's list is made up to include the names of such persons, and is then returned to the clerk. Then there is held in the municipality a court under the control of the municipal council itself, when an appeal can be heard of those who wish to have their names on the list. This is held about June or July. But the matter is not concluded there. The next move is that any party that feels aggrieved with the conduct of the municipality has an appeal to the county court judge; and the county court judge, in turn, holds a court later on in the different municipalities of the county; and it is very often away on in the month of November or December when the list for the year is completed. Now, the hon. gentleman says that in the preparation of the Dominion voters' list, where the same county judge takes the self-same assessment roll and fills it up, after announcement that he will receive applications of parties entitled to be placed upon the list, it is the self-same judge who holds this court. The hon. gentleman would have us believe that when this judge holds court for the Dominion lists he is the villain in the play, and if he is deciding as to the local lists he is quite honest and above-board. What a farcical proposition to place before right-thinking men. One would suppose there was an imaginary line separating the Liberals and Conservatives, and on the Liberal side all holiness and purity, and on the other all wickedness and vileness. I propose to show you—and I am not going to cast reflection upon the Liberal party as a whole—how the revision of the voters' list is carried on in certain cases. I will say that in my own riding, man for man, the Conservatives are as respectable as the Liberals, and in the revision of the list, whether for the local or federal, the Conservatives certainly had more to redound to their credit than had the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, it is argued in the first place, that the cost is enormous and the hon. gentleman figures that a million dollars has been spent in the four revisions of the lists, or an average of a quarter of a million upon each. That that is the case I do not deny, but that the local lists will cost fully as much I am here to affirm and to prove. Why, Sir, one would imagine that these local lists were revised and completed throughout the whole province of Ontario without cost to anybody. The fact is, that while for the Dominion franchise the cost has been borne by the country, yet for the local lists it is borne by the several municipalities. The hon. gentleman says that the cost is all on one side. Let me tell him that, taking the average of ten municipalities to a riding—and that is a low average—after a close investigation and scrutiny, any revision of the local list must be at a cost of at least $100 to each municipality. And I will tell you why. In the first place, certain fees are allowed to the county court judge, who revises the lists. In the second place, while we have an inexpensive manner of summoning men to appear before the court under the Dominion franchise law—merely notifying them by letter to appear—under the provincial law you have to personally serve every man against whom you are appealing. The result is that the cost of a revision in any township runs up, as I know they have done in my own riding, to the sum of $100 or over. And that cost is borne by the municipalities. Now, take ten municipalities to the average riding, and you have a cost to each riding of $1,000. If in each of 213 ridings the same thing happens, there is an aggregate expense cast upon the municipalities of close upon $200,000. Now, the hon. gentleman says that heretofore we have only had this occasionally. But I would remind him that if there is going to be this close scrutiny of the local lists each year in order to meet by-elections and elections that come unexpectedly, that expense would have to be borne every year by the municipality, and not once every four or five years as at present.

Now, for the edification of the hon. gentleman, and in order to convince him—because I believe he is a doubting Thomas—that there can be good on our side of the House and villainy on his side, I have some newspaper references to the revision of the lists in East Simcoe. In the revision of 1894, knowing that the elections were coming on, we on the Conservative side in that riding put forth our best efforts to have a fair and honest voters' list. And, when the revision was over, we found how essential and necessary it was. I will read some references showing how the Liberals in that riding sought to carry on the revision of the voters' lists. The following is from the Orillia "Packet," of September 29th, and the judge is the same judge who revised the Dominion lists:

> Judge Ardagh found a pretty stiff piece of work cut out for him, when he came, last Monday, to hold the voters' list court for the township of Orillia. The net results of His Honour's labours, assisted by representatives of both political parties, is as follows:—The Conservatives had fifty-five names put on and forty-one struck off. This does not make account of two names put on for which both sides had appealed. The net gain for the Conservatives on the day's doings is eighty-seven. Thirty-two cases were adjourned till October 16th. Of these only one is a Liberal appeal. Of the remaining thirty-one, twenty-eight are appeals against the names of men who cannot be found, who are returned by the pathmasters as not having done statute labour.

I fancy how the hon. gentleman shudders

as he thinks of this being done by a good Liberal assessor and of having 126 Liberal names struck off the list or their admission refused; and, at the same time, I can believe that the hon. gentleman will writhe in agony to think that the Grit plot did not go through; because we only carried the riding by 124, so that if we had not been successful in nipping this nefarious plot in the bud the hon. gentleman's friends might have carried the riding. When the assessor was put in the box and placed under oath, he admitted that he had had names handed to him of men he did not know, whose place of residence he did not know, he knew nothing about them, but that prominent Liberals in the riding had handed him the names, and these names had been distributed hap-hazard here and there through the assessment roll. What was the idea? Why, to carry these from the assessment roll to the voters' list and leave to their friends in East Simcoe, if they had succeeded in getting the names on the list, to find on polling day men to fit the names, which is an old trick of theirs.

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

After Recess.

Mr. BENNETT. When the House rose at six o'clock, and before that time, I had been devoting myself to two phases of the Franchise Act; firstly, that the preparation of the list under the Dominion Franchise Act was as free and as fair as any preparation of the voters' lists under the local legislatures and under the municipal councils; and I made this further claim, that it is impossible to have at any time a voters' list that will be perfect in its entirely. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) pointed to the fact that in some of the recent elections the voters' list used were compiled some two years or a year and a half before. Well, all I have to say in answer to that is that naturally it is utterly impossible to have a voters' list revised down to each day, or even down to each month, or down to each year; and if to-day an election should take place in any one of the four diivsions of the city of Toronto, the result would be that they would vote on a list compiled in the year 1894; because in the cities under the local Act, there is a kind of registration in force which bring about the result I have mentioned, and the registration only takes place immediately prior to the election being held. Now, a few words as to the cost. I contend that under a preparation of the local voters' list in view of an approaching Dominion election, great interest would be evinced by both political parties, that the same interest that now attached to a Dominion revision would appear in the event of a local revision, and that being the case, there would be cast an expense of at least $1,000 on each riding, or an aggregate of $213,000 odd for the whole Dominion, which would not come out of the Dominion exchequer, but would come directly out of the municipalities. As I pointed out prior to six o'clock, a great deal more expense is occasioned in revising a local voters' list than is occasioned in revising a Dominion voters' list. Now, I am free to admit that to pay $213,000 for a revision of the Dominion voters' list, is a matter to which every importance should be attached; but at the same time I do not believe that every principle of fair-play should be dependent upon what it would cost; and I may repeat here what I have said before in this House in a discussion of the Franchise Act, that if the local municipalities are not prepared to afford that spirit of fair-play that should be afforded to all classes of the electorate, this Parliament should fight to the bitter end any attempt to take away that right of citizenship, because the right of voting is the dearest right of citizenship to every elector. Now, suppose for instance, that to-day in the province of Nova Scotia there was to be an assumption of the local list rather than the Dominion list; the result would be, and hon. gentlemen opposite know it full well, the deprivation of a large number of electors of the right of recording their votes at a parliamentary election. Take the case of Annapolis county which, I understand, is represented by the Attorney General of Nova Scotia, Mr. Longley. That gentleman was successful in carrying that riding for the local election; and why? Because he was able to deprive a large number of Dominion employees of their votes, but when it came to a federal election and all men had a right to vote in that constituency, the hon. gentleman suffered a defeat at the hands of the hon. member who represents that riding in this House. So you can go from one province to another, and the voters' lists have been and are used to-day, not to afford fair-play but rather to secure at all times and at all hazards a party advantage. Now, Sir, as has been pointed out in the course of the debate on the Franchise Act this session, there is no immediate requirement for the passage of this Act. The First Minister has announced that in all probability there will be no general election for four years to come, at all events; and in that view of the case, is it not better to postpone from the present time until a future session of this Parliament, any interference with the franchise as it exists to-day, and wait and allow the provinces to endeavour to assimilate their franchises and place them one and all on a common basis. Now, Sir, the feeling that the provinces are antagonistic to the Dominion, should be swept away, and it is not going to be swept away until they are shown the full responsibility that rests upon their shoulders. To the local legislatures

the disbursing of a large sum of money by the Dominion in the matter of the preparation of a voters' list, is and must be a matter of serious import; and in view of the fact that the Dominion Parliament and local legislatures have one and a common interest, why should they not endeavour to meet upon a common basis, and say that in all these provinces the franchise shall be alike? If that is done it would be much easier for this House, or for the Federal Government, to embrace an opportuinty that would be afforded by the provinces to meet upon a common basis. Now, Sir, in regard to the resolution that was moved by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) last week, in face of the fact that the Government have made the announcement that next Tuesday, the 22nd instant, they are going to bring down their fiscal policy, there is not perhaps that serious demand that there was at the outset of this debate for the resolution of the member for York. But, still I think, in view of the fact that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have in the past, and whose predecessors have for the past eighteen years, laid down the principle that a protective policy was in the best interest of this Dominion, the intervening days should be seized by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to impress upon the Government the necessity of the maintenance of that policy which has been in force for the past eighteen years. It is true that hon. gentlemen opposite take fits and starts, so to speak, in their announcements about the tariff. One hon. gentleman holds out the bludgeon, while the next comes along in the most entertaining way, and says, in the words of the fable: "Will you walk into my parlour, says the spider to the fly?" This afternoon we heard from the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), and I am sure that to the protected industries of this country his remarks can carry no consolation. That hon. gentleman, speaking of the tariff, said this, and I presume that he speaks with some little authority, because he speaks so often that he should have some authority:

> No hostile feeling lies in the breast of the Government to any business interest that can hope to exist, but the duty of the Government will be to assail all the combined interests of the country.

Now, these hon. gentlemen have been for years before the public, on the platform, through the press, and in this House, declaring their policy. When one individual speaking for himself has made any statement, it may be fair to say that upon himself alone must rest the responsibility; but when the leader of a great party makes statements and makes announcements, it must be expected that he is warranted in making them, and that the party has a right to be bound by the statements that he makes. Sir, the more serious import is when hon. gentlemen do not make these statements at hap-hazard, but coolly and deliberately. Now, only a few years ago there was held in this city of Ottawa a great national convention of the Liberal party, and on that occasion the present First Minister made speeches of a very sweeping nature. Referring to the protected industries of this country, he said:

> Let it be well understood, then, that from this moment we have a distinct issue with the Liberal-Conservative party now in power. Their ideal is protection; our ideal is free trade. Their important object is protection, ours is a tariff for revenue, and for revenue only; and upon this issue we engage in battle.

Sir, later on those hon. gentlemen went before the electorate of this country bound in what is commonly known as campaign literature, and in that literature they make a direct onslaught on certain large protected industries of this country. For instance, speaking of the cotton manufacture, which is a large industry in this country, in a pamphlet published by the Liberal party and issued throughout the province of Ontario, we find this statement:

> Mr. Edgar stated in the House of Commons—and the correctness of his statements has never been challenged—that the raw cotton fell in cost, between 1890 and 1893, one cent and six mills a pound. This, on the enormous quantity imported of about forty millions of pounds, amounted alone to a profit of $660,000. * * * In other words, on the $4,500,000 worth imported a tax of $1.260.000 is paid, which goes into the treasury, and on the $13,000,000 worth of cotton manufactured, an equivalent tax of $3,640,000 is paid, which goes into the coffers of the combines.

The hon. gentleman assailed the cotton industry of this country as a combine, and this afternoon the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) declared that this Government would wage war directly against combines. No wonder that to-day in Cornwall, where there are magnificent cotton factories which every member of the House would do well to visit, those factories which have been running for years, are closed. I was there a few weeks ago, and it would be a matter for regret to every hon. member as it was to me, to see those immense cotton factories standing idle, the looms silent, while in the streets were the men, women and children who were usually employed there. The owners have taken hon. gentlemen opposite at their word; and to-day we have had it announced by leading members of their party that this is one of the combines that is to be attacked. True, the hon. gentleman did not say specifically: we are disposed and propose to assail the cotton industry; but hon. gentlemen have bound themselves in the past, both by speeches in this House and by issuing campaign literature all over the country, that if there is an industry in the country which they intend to strike, not with a gentle hand but with a rude hand, it is the cotton industry. Let me tell hon.

gentlemen opposite that if you go to Cornwall to-day you do not hear any voice of inquiry as to whether the Government are going to pass a Franchise Act, as to what amount is to be spent on public works, but the one and sole inquiry is, when will there be something definite and decisive known on the tariff which so vitally affects the cotton industry in which we are so generally greatly interested ? So hon. gentlemen opposite to-day should be appealed to by hon. members on this side of the House, should be appealed to honestly and fairly as we have appealed to them in the past, and asked to allow the vast cotton industry, which has been threatened, and which has been affected by the threats which hon. gentlemen have made, to stand as in the past, and give to Canada what it requires, large manufacturing interests, whether they may be in Cornwall or in any other part of the Dominion.

But there is another industry which hon. gentlemen have threatened. Throughout Ontario, I care not where the party platform was put forward, and also on the floor of this House, there was the plea made that the agricultural implement industry was one of the vilest combines that ever existed in any country. What did hon. gentlemen promise ? The other evening the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) quoted utterances made by the First Minister here and there, and what were his statements relative to the iron and coal industries ? He pointed out that other articles entered into this industry, and said that we are unable to reduce the price of the manufactured articles by reason of the fact that the raw material is highly taxed, and if we come into power, by sweeping away the duties on raw material, we will be able to give the manufacturers cheaper raw materials and thus the price of the manufactured article will be reduced. How is that promise to be kept ? Hon. gentlemen opposite have already announced that the coal industry of Nova Scotia is not to be affected ; and manufacturers are told in the same breath that instead of obtaining free coal, their coal imported from the United States must be taxed as in the past. Not only is the First Minister responsible for those statements, but every prominent member of the Cabinet is responsible, for they have at all times made those same statements. I recollect well the vigorous language used by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) on one occasion, when rising in the might of his energy to denounce protection, not only did he declare it a system to be disapproved of, but he said that it was accursed by God and man. What is the hon. gentleman proposing to do to-day ? He was one of those who was pleading for cheap farm implements for the farmers of western Ontario, and he wa going to bring that result about by reducing the duties on coal and iron, and he declared that when they had been reduced the farmers would get the benefit ; but to-day the farmers must be told, inferentially, that no favours are to be accorded to them. Well, I could go on and discuss one item and another in the tariff which hon. gentlemen opposite have from time to time assailed, and which to-day they are at issue upon, and so we must wait in expectancy to hear what announcements will be made. But if the protected industries of this country are injuriously affected by the statements made from time to time, the manufacturers may at least obtain a little consolation from the fact that in the Estimates brought down the Finance Minister has provided for equally as large a revenue as was provided in the past year. And not only so, but they have provided for even more, because while to-day their proposed expenditure for the next year is almost on a par with the expenditure of last year, this must not be lost sight of, that the Finance Minister has not brought down what no doubt will be bulky, heavy and vast Supplementary Estimates, which are yet to come. From that fact the industries of the country may take hope and courage, and may believe that hon. gentlemen opposite are yet going to keep up the tariff that has existed in the past, and which I hope will be continued in the years that are to come. Hon. gentlemen opposite have said that the tariff must be and will be simply a tariff for revenue. All I have to say in that regard is this : If they propose to follow out a tariff revenue policy on the line of the English tariff, then recourse must be had, not to a tariff such as exists here to-day, but to direct imposition of taxes on certain articles such as are imposed in England, on coffee, tea, and other articles I might mention. But while the manufacturers and protected industries of Canada are held like Mahommed's coffin between the sky and the earth, while they are held in doubt as to what is to be done respecting them, hon. gentlemen opposite come to the rescue with the announcement made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) this afternoon, that even on such a trivial matter as the Franchise Bill they are not in accord and are not all of one sentiment. This afternoon that hon. gentleman in his position as one of the Liberal Nestors dealt with some of the refractory members and told them that while they might not all agree on certain matters, they should forget the past and endeavour to come in line on one basis. I ask the hon. member for North Norfolk, is he prepared to come in on this tariff Bill that the Government may bring down ? If they are prepared to bring down a tariff Bill practically in agreement with the tariff which has existed for eighteen years, and it is accepted by the hon. gentleman, he must greatly belie his past record. He has not been one of those advocates of free

trade as it is in England; the hon. gentleman in past years has been a free trader, and not only so but he has been something more, and on every occasion and at every opportunity he has endeavoured to voice his sentiments, and when the hon. gentleman's sentiments did not meet with very hearty recognition and support in Ontario or any of the other provinces, he went across the line, where he knew he would meet with a more hearty reception. I ask the hon. gentleman where he stands on the tariff question? Is he in favour of retaining and perpetuating the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party, or the reverse? On 28th January last, the hon. gentleman went to North Tonawanda, as he had a perfect right to do. The hon. gentleman had a perfect right to go any place where he might expect to find an appreciative audience, and so he went there and made a speech on trade relations between the people of the United States and this country. I will not weary the House by reading the whole of his speech. Hon. members have heard the hon. gentleman so often, and I trust they will hear him often again, that I may dispense with the reading of his remarks in full, but I will read the vital and important part as showing the ideas on which the hon. gentleman believes a trade policy should be framed in behalf of Canada. His views were thus briefly expressed:

He then took up the question of annexation. The only way it can be accomplished would be to bring about a closer commercial policy. We feel that it is necessary to obliterate the present tariff, and that a more liberal and extended trade policy will have a most salutary effect on our prosperity. "We are a small country in every respect except territory," concluded Mr. Charlton, "and, as small bodies are attracted to larger ones, so also are we attracted to the larger country south of us."

Mr. CHARLTON. I rise to a correction. I do not know, Sir, from what source the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) quotes the language put in my mouth as being part of my speech at North Tonawanda. I disclaim that report of my language and I pronounce it false. I had occasion to call the attention of the pastor of the church at Tonawanda in which the lecture was delivered, to certain statements made in the Conservative press of Canada with regard to that lecture. The Rev. E. K. Sanborn, pastor of the church, wrote to the Toronto "Globe" and gave an epitome of the lecture which I delivered in Tonawanda. The reverend gentleman gave an explicit denial to the statements that were made concerning that lecture. These statements appeared first in the Toronto "World," and the "World" had the fairness to publish the refutation of the statement which came from the Rev. Mr. Sanborn. My lecture at Tonawanda was devoted to the consideration of Canadian matters; physical, political and historical. I took distinctly the ground that Canada had resources to accommodate a population of one hundred million souls.

Mr. FOSTER. Surely you are not going to give us all that speech again.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am going to give a few lines in order to correct the statement made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett). I took the ground that while Canada wished more intimate commercial relations with the United States, that the people of this country did not desire to part with their autonomy, that their intention was to build up a nationality here, and that while they expected and hoped to live upon terms of amity with their neighbours, yet, they had no intention of adopting any policy that would sever the connection which exists between this country and Great Britain. I said at Tonawanda, that Canadians intended to shape their destiny in such a way as to serve their own interests in building up a nation on the northern half of this continent. That is an outline of my address at Tonawanda, and the statement to which reference has been made by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) is utterly and entirely false—and is maliciously false.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The hon. member (Mr. Charlton) cannot accuse my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) of saying what is maliciously false.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Charlton) cannot accuse another hon. member of making a statement which is maliciously false.

Mr. CHARLTON. I did not attribute it to the member himself, but to the author of the statement as it appeared in the press.

Mr. BENNETT. I wish to say, by way of defence, if any defence is needed, that the clipping I read was from the file of the Toronto "Mail" of about the date of 28th January, and if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) was incorrectly reported by the Toronto "Mail," he has recourse against that newspaper. I have to say, that I never saw any denial, nor apology, either in the "Mail" newspaper, of which I am a fairly close reader, or in the "World."

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) must accept the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton).

Mr. CHARLTON. I will take occasion as a matter of privilege to read the letter of the Rev. E. K. Sanborn upon the first occasion that offers.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) will accept the denial.

Mr. BENNETT. I certainly accept the denial of the hon. gentleman. I thought I was doing the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) a compliment when I gave him the credit for his frankness. I thought I was paying him a high compliment, because surely it

cannot be that he has receded from the position he has taken in this House in the past. Everybody must recollect the attitude of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton), in regard to the lumber duty, when he himself admitted on the floor of this House, that he cast himself adrift from his party, and upon his own responsibility did what he pleased. And, sitting in his place upon that occasion, the present First Minister, said, that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) had that great privilege that is always accorded to every member of the Liberal party, to do exactly what they are doing to-day—each one think and act for himself. Sir, I was about to make an appeal to the hon. gentleman. In view of the fact that that great party that once was heard so much about in the country and had so little votes in this House—the Third party—now, that it is decimated and cut to pieces through over one-third of the whole party being lost at the general elections ; I thought that perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) might cut himself adrift from his own party, and as a political Ishmaelite be embraced with open arms into their camp.

I cannot believe, and I cannot conceive, that hon. gentlemen opposite are going against their own interests on this tariff question, and I hope and trust that when the tariff is brought down, that, in the interests of the great manufacturing industries of Canada, should there be any slashing and cutting of the tariff such as was prophesied by the hon. member from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), that hon. gentlemen opposite, irrespective of party, will join with us in protecting the best interests of the country as a whole. Sir, coming down to my own constituency, and its wants, and requirements—for I believe, secondly, it is the duty of every hon. gentleman in this House to ask for careful consideration in the matter of the tariff in regard to the interests which closely concern his own riding. I have, therefore, an appeal to make to the Government in regard to the carriage industry. In the town of Orillia there is an important carriage industry employing upwards of one hundred men. It has a large pay roll, and the owners of that factory have noticed with alarm that, year after year, the importations in their line from the United States have been increasing. I find from the returns, that while 832 buggies and vehicles were imported in 1895 ; last year, 1896, there were 1,564 imported, or nearly twice as many.

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) be good enough to connect that argument with the motion before the House.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), as I understand it, is that the tariff is of much greater importance than the Franchise Bill, and surely a vital part of the tariff must be the interest of a large carriage industry in this country, and it is from that point of view that I direct the argument. Now, Sir, there is another vast industry in that northern country, which to-day is waiting with bated breath to see the attitude of the Government in respect to it. I refer to the lumber industry. What is the attitude of this Government on that question ? The United States have announced, by what is known as the Dingley Bill, that upon every thousand feet of lumber passing from Canada to the United States, there shall be an import duty of $2. From all I can learn, and from what I believe to be the fact, the imposition of such an enormous import duty will result in practically driving out of the American market our present large lumber trade. The other day the Minister of Finance was waited upon by a large and representative delegation from that northern country. They asked that if the United States persisted in placing that duty on lumber, then that some steps should be taken by this country in a retaliatory way, and that our tariff should be so arranged that in the event of the American Government charging more than $1 a thousand upon Canadian white pine, there should be placed a prohibitory duty on saw logs exported from this country to the United States. I trust that that matter will receive the most careful consideration of the Government, and that it will result in this : that if the United States people are not prepared to deal fairly on the question of lumber duties, then, while it may not be a policy which we may wish to take, by way of reprisal this Government should stand firm and adopt the policy advocated. To-day the tariff is receiving a vast amount of attention from the business people of Canada, and I believe that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House would be prepared to forego their holidays, if the Government would even this week, bring down their tariff policy. That, Sir, I suppose is hardly to be expected. I trust, however, that the Government of the day will carefully consider all the overtures that have been made to them from business men throughout this entire Dominion, that they will consider every argument that has been adduced by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and that they will also listen to the words of wisdom that have fallen from prominent members of the Senate on the Liberal side. In moving the Address last week in the Senate the hon. Mr. Cox said, very judiciously and wisely :

> The importance to this country of the tariff legislation foreshadowed cannot be over-estimated. It is a matter fraught with consequences too serious to be influenced by the campaign speeches made by either political party under circumstances quite different from those that now exist.

Hon. gentlemen opposite will claim, and I think will be entitled to sympathy if they make a great political somersault. But I

can only say that it is better for the vast manufacturing and all other industries of this country that hon. gentlemen opposite, from that sturdy advocate of free trade, the hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) down to to lowliest and humblest member of the party, should take a political somersault rather than that there should be such an interference with the tariff of this country as to undo the good that it has accomplished in the last fifteen years, and destroy our bright expectations for the future so long as that policy is continued.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, as one member who has not occupied much of the time of this House, but who has been an interested listener to the arguments of hon. gentlemen on both sides, I desire to make a few remarks on the question now under consideration. I believe I am expressing the sentiments of my constituents when I say that I am heartily in accord with the principles of the Bill presented to this House by the hon. the Solicitor General. I think I can clearly understand why the late Government forced upon the people of this country an Act which I know did not meet with the approval of a large number of Conservatives. They did so simply because it assisted them in connection with the voters' lists. I have listened with a great deal of pleasure to the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) who has just taken his seat; but there is one point in his remarks to which I take exception. I cannot believe that his estimate of the expense in connection with the voters' lists is exactly correct. My hon. friend says that it costs about $1,000 in each riding. He has correctly stated that after a municipal council is formed, it selects its assessors; that the assessor then goes round and prepares his list; that after that a Court of Revision is held by the council, and that there is an appeal finally from the Court of Revision to the county judge. I have had the honour of representing a municipality in the county of Middlesex for a number of years; and during that time we never had occasion to appeal to the county judge, and I do not know of any municipality that has had to do so except on rare occasions. If it cost $1,000 for the municipal lists in each riding, then why under the sun should we insist on having a dual system, whereby the cost would be doubled? There is not only the cost of about a quarter of a million dollars for each revision under the Dominion Franchise Act, but also the cost to the Liberal candidates and their friends and the cost to the Conservative candidates and their friends, which together would involve a sum equal to if not more than the direct cost. In the constituency of West Middlesex the late revising barrister took the old lists of 1891 as a basis, consequently we were compelled to put on or strike off three or four thousand names; and when you take into consideration the large number of constituencies in the Dominion of Canada, the number of municipalities in those constituencies and the number of subdivisions in those municipalities, you can realize the amount of trouble and expense connected with the preparation of the lists. I saw an estimate that it cost the Liberal party $150,000 to prepare the lists in the last revision, and it must have cost the Conservative party an equal amount; so that you have a cost of $300,000 to the two parties, added to the $250,000 paid out of the Treasury, or over half a million dollars, for the preparation of the lists. As the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has said, we have a list prepared by the municipalities every year. He says that costs over $200,000 each year. I do not think it costs that much; but even assuming that it does, why is it necessary for us to prepare another list? But unless we prepare a list every year, which cannot be done except at enormous expense, we are compelled to vote on a list two years old, as we did in the last election. What does that mean? It means that thousands of young men who came of age from 1894 to 1896 are debarred from casting their vote, although compelled to pay their share of the expenses in connection with this iniquitous Act. Not only that, but thousands of men who sold out and left this country and took up their abode under the Stars and Stripes, are allowed to come back to this country and cast their votes against honest men who are compelled to bear their share of the expense. I need not dwell on that subject. I believe in the principle of one man one vote, which is in operation in the province of Ontario. The hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) asked why we should have the principle of one man one vote in Ontario when in the province of Quebec a man might vote three or four times. I am in favour of the principle of one man one vote. Why should a man, simply because he owns five or six pieces of property, situated in five or six constituencies, cast a vote for five or six candidates, while a man who may own property ten times the value, situated in one constituency, has the right to cast but one vote. I do not think it is right, but if the people of the province of Quebec are prepared to continue that system, I do not see why we in Ontario should find any fault with them. I am in favour of the principle which holds in Ontario. I think a man should vote where he lives, and I do not think he should vote simply because he owns a few pieces of property. If this Bill be passed, as proposed by the Government, we shall be free to vote in Ontario under the Ontario system. It may be necessary to have some amendments made. I do not think it embraces the privilege of manhood suffrage, as we have it in the cities and certain towns of Ontario. If that is not

in the measure, I am very much in favour of having it inserted, because it will save a large amount of yearly expense. It will save the Liberal and Conservative candidates and their frineds a great deal of trouble looking after the young men whom they are anxious to have placed on the lists, as they will have the privilege of having them registered a certain time before the election. It will consequently save the municipalities a large amount of money now expended by them in having these names printed on the lists year after year. I must say that I congratulate the Government on bringing down their measures as expeditiously as they have. They made certain promises to the people and those promises they are rapidly fulfilling. They promised to bring in an alien labour Bill, and such a Bill has been brought in by my hon. friend from South Essex (Mr. Cowan). They promised certain changes in connection with superannuation, and a Bill providing for these changes has been submitted to us. Then, they promised a revision of the tariff and that subject will be shortly engaging the attention of the House.

I may be permitted to extend my congratulations to my hon. leader in connection with the settlement of the school question. I am quite sure that the settlement he has achieved will meet with the approval of every Liberal and of nine-tenths of the Conservatives in the west riding of Middlesex. Sir, the Liberal party have long since learned to recognize in our chieftain the qualities of a great leader, combining the marvellous gift of eloquence with that keen discernment so necessary for the proper consideration of public questions, and with a breadth of view which knows no provincial lines, but embraces this vast Dominion and the glorious Empire of which we form a part. And now, surrounded, as he is, by some of the ablest statesmen from the provinces, whose names are synonymous with integrity, sterling honesty and unfailing championship of the people's rights : I am heartily in accord with the Government on this, as well as other questions, and sincerely trust this measure will be adopted by the House.

Mr. CRAIG. I have no intention of delaying the House long, but merely rise to give some reasons why I support the amendment of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster). I shall not discuss either the present law or the Bill submitted to us. I know that there are a great many objections to the present franchise law, and I am sure that most of the people of this country would be glad to see it improved. I have that feeling myself very strongly, but while I admit that, I am not prepared to admit that the proposed Bill is an improvement on the present Act. There are objections to the present law. There it no doubt it is expensive and difficult to work. There is no doubt it is not only expensive to the country at large but to the candidates as well, but admitting all that, if we are to repeal the present law, we ought to replace it by something better ? Looking over the present Bill, I have come to the conclusion that it is not an improvement. However, I do not propose to discuss that point at present. I do not propose to go into the details of the measure and point out its imperfections, but what I wish to say is this, that in framing a new franchise law, some time should be taken and great care should be shown to have the law as perfect as possible. To my mind, the franchise should not be a party question at all, and I do not think it would be, if we looked upon it in the proper light. A good franchise law is important to every man in this country. What is its object ? It is that every man who has the right to vote should enjoy that right. We know that that is a very difficult object to attain, and I repeat again that, in order to frame a good law, great care is required and considerable time and close study. It seems to me that the Government have not taken very much time to consider the Bill they have presented to us for our approval. Instead of going on and improving on the present law, they have gone back to an old law which we had some eighteen or nineteen years ago. Of course it was very easy and simple to say that this system which was in force some eighteen or twenty years ago, or perhaps eleven or twelve years ago, was a good one, and we will go right back to it. It is a very easy way of getting rid of the difficulty to say : No doubt that old law had its imperfections, but we have been always so opposed to the present franchise law, we have considered it, in the language of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) such an infamous measure that we are willing almost to take anything in its place. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not think, with all deference to the legal authorities in the Cabinet, that that system is the one we should adopt in framing legislation. While I admit that the present franchise law has its imperfections, I desire to see it replaced by a better and not by a worse one. When I look at this Bill, what do I find ? I find that it is very lengthy, that it contains 158 sections, that it makes some very considerable changes, and that considerable time and study must be expended to master its details. If we want to act intelligently in this matter, what should we do ? We ought to study the systems of the various provinces in the Dominion and find out how they work, because we are called on now to pronounce in favour of these systems. And you must remark, Mr. Speaker, that these systems are all different. How then, when we have, as we shall shortly have, such an important subject before us as the tariff, which will occupy of itself all the remaining time of the session, can we be expected to study and intelligently discuss this ques-

tion of the franchise as it ought to be studied and discussed and frame a law which will meet the necessities of the case. Let me point out one or two objections which occur to me at the moment. The first is that this Bill gives the provinces control of the franchise for this Dominion. The hon. member for North Norfolk Mr. Charlton) argued that that was perfectly correct.

He declared that the provinces should control. Why? Because, he said, we come here to represent certain ridings, which ridings are part of the province, and therefore the provinces should make these lists. I think he should have carried the argument a little further. He should have gone on to say that these provinces are part of the Dominion, and therefore the Dominion should prepare the franchise for the provinces, and not the provinces for the Dominion. I think that that is a perfectly legitimate argument from the premises laid down by the hon. gentleman. I think it would be more reasonable that the supreme authority should frame the franchise for the provinces than that the provinces, which have inferior jurisdiction, should frame the franchise for this last court of appeal in the Dominion. It is a very strange objection, to my mind, this taking from the Dominion the control of the franchise and placing it with the provinces.

Another point is made with reference to one man one vote. Personally I should be be very glad to see that principle incorporated in the Franchise Act; but, as was well pointed out to-day, we would not have that all over the Dominion, but we would have it in one province and not in another. But there is one great objection, to my mind, to passing this measure, and that is the temptation that would be offered the provincial governments to use this franchise for party purposes. Now, it has been urged as a very strong objection to this Franchise Act which we have at present, that the Dominion Government used it for party purposes. But I ask, what would be the difference between the Dominion Government using the Franchise Act for party purposes and the provincial governments using it for party purposes? Of course it is said that the provincial governments are too honest to do such a thing, but that the Dominion Government is not honest enough to be depended upon to resist this temptation. I hold that the Dominion Government is as honest as the provincial governments.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CRAIG. I say that regardless of what party is in power. I am willing to grant that the Government in power here is as honest as the provincial governments. Not only that, but while we have one Dominion Government which might be tempted in this way, we have a great many provincial governments, and, I may say without slander, that some of them have not shown themselves above using the franchise for party purposes. I take it that it would not be hard to find cases where that has been done. And the objection is a very strong one, because when this is done we have no redress. Another great objection is that under some of the franchises existing under provincial laws a great number of citizens are disfranchised. They were disfranchised at a time when it was supposed they would vote for the Conservative party. I do not know whether, in committee, any arrangement will be made to give these men votes, but if this were done, it would show clearly how unfairly this Act could be used. Men employed on the Intercolonial Railway in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, men earning, perhaps, a dollar a day, were deprived of their franchise because they were in the employ of the Government, and because, I suppose, it was assumed that if they voted they would vote Conservative.

Mr. MACDONALD. The same in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. CRAIG. Just so, and I think this is a very strong objection. If the franchise were framed in this House no hon. member would stand up and advocate the disfranchisement of men because they earned a dollar or a dollar and a half a day working on Government railways or in any capacity under the Government. These men have as good a right to vote as I have. I have mentioned these cases merely to show that provincial governments would have the opportunity of using the franchise for party purposes, and might deprive men of their votes for the benefit of their party.

My conclusion is that the Government should leave this whole question of the franchise over to next session. I maintain that they have ample work to do this session, and I say, further, that this is not a pressing matter. There is no need for a new Franchise Act just now. We have no hope on this side of the House—at least speaking for myself personally, I have no hope—of putting hon. gentlemen opposite out of office for three or four years, when the next general election comes on. I do not know why there should be such a hurry to have this Bill passed unless gentlemen opposite are afraid that they will not be able to agree and the Government will split to pieces before long. Looking from the outside, it seems to me that they ought to be able to hang together for three or four years. This being so, there is no need for this Franchise Bill. If we take it up next session, we shall have had time to consider it. It was a good thing to introduce it this session, in order that hon. members may have the opportunity of considering the matter. If it is possible to lay aside party feeling and frame a Bill for the bene-

fit of the whole country, I shall be glad to support a measure of that kind. But it has been stated by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that the reason why it is absolutely necessary that we should have this franchise is because of the plebiscite. I think he was well answered by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), who asked why the provincial voters' list could not be used for the plebiscite.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to ask if hon. gentlemen opposite intend to run the business of the House, or if they will leave it to the Government to do that?

Mr. CRAIG. We are going to help the Government to do it. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) if he is part of the Government? I have just been wondering where the Government is: I do not see any of them in their places. I do not suppose they have resigned, but they must have something very important on hand if they have not time to listen to this discussion. I see in their places the two Controllers, and I am very glad to see them. However, I submit that what I have said is a complete answer to the objection raised by the hon. gentleman for North Wellington.

Mr. McMULLEN. No, no.

Mr. CRAIG. The hon. gentleman says "no." But I fancy he does not want to be persuaded. It would seem that he is not satisfied with the provincial lists, for the plebiscite, but would be quite satisfied with the provincial lists for elections for the Dominion.

Mr. McMULLEN. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CRAIG. Certainly.

Mr. McMULLEN. I know that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Craig) is a pronounced temperance man. But, while he is perfectly satisfied with the provincial lists to decide the question of temperance, he is not satisfied with the provincial lists for the elections of members for Parliament.

Mr. CRAIG. The hon. gentleman says that I am a pronounced temperance man. I do not take that as an insult at all. He says, further, that I am quite satisfied to have the plebiscite held on provincial lists, but I am not satisfied to have members of this House elected on provincial lists. Now that is entirely out of the question, and I will tell you why. I object to going on with this Franchise Bill for the reason I have stated, namely, that I want as perfect a measure as possible when we do frame such a Bill, and I hold that the measure submitted to the House is not much of an improvement on the present Franchise Act. Now, I would only consent to take a plebiscite vote on the provincial lists, because the hon. gentlemen opposite say these provincial lists are all right to elect members of the House upon. I take them at their own word, they are satisfied. An hon. gentleman opposite says: I am not satisfied to elect members on it. But I say he is satisfied to elect members on it, and he should not object at all. I am satisfied to take a plebiscite vote on the provincial lists. I do not see what reason he has to object at all, yet he is the very man that says no. So I say to him: You are not satisfied to take a plebiscite on the provincial list, but you are satisfied to elect members of this House on the provincial list. Where is the common-sense argument in that? So, Sir, I will say further that if the tariff was not coming down this session I would be quite willing to go on and discuss this measure, and try to make it a good one. But I hold we will not have time to discuss this Bill; I hold that the tariff is the great question that is coming before the present session of this House. I hold that the country is not crying out at all for a new Franchise Act, but the country is asking the Government to give it a new tariff. I do not say they want a new tariff, but they know they have got to accept a new tariff, and they want to have it settled for good, if they possibly can have it settled. Now, Sir, it has been said by some, and I have seen it stated in some papers, that the Opposition have made up their minds to obstruct business. I deny that altogether. We have no intention of obstructing business. But I hold there is no need of obstructing business in the least. Why, there will be plenty of business to do. I understand an offer has been made that, instead of going on with the second reading of this Bill, the Government should bring down the Estimates and go on with them. That is not obstructing business. We have no desire to obstruct business. We are all anxious to get on with the business; we are all desirous that the House should close in time to allow the First Minister to go to England and represent this country there. The Opposition are just as anxious to assist him in doing that as the members of the Government side of the House are. And we say now to the Government, and we have said to them: If you bring down your Estimates, we are willing to go on with them. But we do think that it is not right to urge us to go on and consider the Franchise Bill, of which there is no need, before the tariff comes down. This is a Bill which there will not be time to consider after the tariff comes down. Then not only the Estimates might be gone on with but there is another Bill which could be taken up, the Superannuation Bill, which we have no objections to go on with. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have said about all I want to say. As I said before, I did not rise to discuss this Bill, or the old Franchise Bill; I rose to give my reason for supporting the amendment of the hon. member for York. I think I have given good reasons why this measure should

not be urged at the present time, and why it should be left until next session. I hold that this Franchise Bill is one of sufficient importance as to deserve more than a small part of the session, it should take almost the whole of one session in order that we might frame a good Bill. I want to see a Bill framed which will be satisfactory to both sides of the House; I want to see a Bill framed that will, if possible, give to every man in this country, who is entitled to it, the privilege of voting. I want to see a Bill framed which shall not be expensive to the Dominion as a whole, and which shall not be too expensive, or not at all expensive, to members who seek election to this House. There are plenty of expenses without the expense of that kind. I may say that I would be very glad if we could have a Bill of that kind to replace the measure now in existence.

Mr. FROST. I have been listening with a good deal of interest to the discussion on the Franchise Act. I have heard a great deal about the tariff, about the Superannuation Bill, about the Alien Labour Bill, and a number of other Bills which are coming down during the present session, but I do not know, apart from the tariff measure, of any Bill that is more important than the Bill for the repeal of the Dominion Franchise Act. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that there is not time during this session to study the present Bill that has been brought in by the Solicitor-General. I can tell hon. gentlemen that the present Bill is practically a renewal of the former system of using the voters' lists of the various provinces, and it does not require so much study as they imagine. We have been studying the present Dominion Franchise Act for the last twelve years, and it has met with the universal condemnation of the people of this country. Every man who knows anything about the Franchise Act, knows that it was framed for the purpose of giving the Conservative party an advantage in the elections, and we know it has worked in that direction in every election since it was framed. The difference between the two Bills is practically this: We want to return again to the old, simple fashion of registering votes in fairness and equity, as against the present Dominion franchise with all its cumbrousness, and all it costliness, and all its many obnoxious features, which we have discovered during those twelve years it has been in existence. We know that the Confederation Act simply gave the privilege of using the provincial voters' lists, and for seventeen or eighteen years these lists were used to the general satisfaction of the whole country. There was no fault found with these lists, and it was not until the present Act was brought in that we heard anything against the old system of taking votes. Now the hon. gentlemen opposite know that the present Franchise Act did give them a decided advantage; and while in their Act, the revision was to take place every year, we know for a fact that owing to its costliness, which surprised the whole country, we have only had four revisions in the twelve years. Consequently we find that in taking a vote at a Dominion election we practically disfranchise thousands of young men throughout the whole country, and not only both political parties but all concerned in taking the vote, have been obliged to go to great expense in bringing thousands of people to the polls from all over the country, as has already been stated this evening by the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Calvert). We have been obliged to see thousands of our neighbours who were entitled to vote, prevented from doing so because their names were not on the list. Again, we know that the Government took the revision of those lists entirely into their own hands; not only the revision of the lists, but their publication and their printing. Formerly the printing of the lists was done in newspaper offices, but after the Government Printing Bureau was established, they were printed here. I know for a fact that there have been scores of men who supposed in all fairness that their names were on the list, but who found to their dismay when they came to vote, that their names were not there at all, although their names had been presented to the revising officer by their associations. Now I have heard it stated to-night that it would require a great deal of time to consider this Bill; and one of the objections to taking it up is that the tariff is in the way, and that the tariff should be brought down first. Well, we have now an announcement that the tariff is coming down very soon, and it is coming down at a period not later in the session than has been the case in other sessions, and earlier than in some previous sessions. But there are some reasons why the tariff should be delayed, and this no one knows better than hon. gentlemen opposite. After the Government came into power in July, how much time have they had to discover the minds of the people with regard to this question? A commission went through the country, and even to this day there are men still anxious to meet that commission, so great is the interest taken in that matter. The Government could not possibly think of bringing down their Budget any sooner than they have done, and I am surprised that they have been able to do so much within so short a period of time. I know that three years ago hon. gentlemen opposite when in power issued a commission respecting the tariff, which travelled over the country for nearly a year. What did the tariff revision amount to? In the end nearly everything which it was proposed to reform was immediately put back before Parliament prorogued. The hon. member for East Simcoe Mr. Bennett) referred to some industries. I do not pro-

pose to touch on any of the different industries, because I deprecate any discussion at this time when we are so near the day when the tariff will be brought down. It might be unfortunate to make statements that might have to be retracted or amended. It was to be regretted that the motion of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) covered so much ground which subsequently required to be travelled over by other hon. members in order to show it was necessary that the present Franchise Act should be set aside.

I am not one of those who has the slightest fear as to the Government satisfying the great mass of the manufacturers of the country. Prior to the time of the National Policy we had a great many industries in Canada. No country exhibiting at the Centennial Exhibition at Philadelphia in 1876 made a better display of implements and the products of her industries than did Canada at that time; and that display was made under a revenue tariff and under the administration of Hon. Mr. Mackenzie several years before any National Policy was introduced here. It may be said that the National Policy was the beginning of the industries of Canada. This I deny, because, as I have already stated, our industries were previously in a flourishing condition, barring a slight depression, which was felt all over the continent, but which was nothing like the depression that has existed here during the last three or four years. We have had a National Policy for eighteen years. Has the National Policy kept away depression? No, we have had four periods of depression in eighteen years, each more severe than any which prevailed before the inauguration of the National Policy. I say to-night, in the presence of this House, that I do not believe the manufacturers of Canada have any reason to fear any action of the Liberal Government. Surely we have hon. gentlemen in the Government to-day who are equal to hon. gentlemen who have been members of any past Government. Surely we have men who have had experience, men who possess the confidence of the country, and whom the country, in the face of a Dominion Franchise Act which was created for the express purpose of keeping hon. gentlemen opposite in power, returned to office. The country will be prepared to sustain these men in their honest desire to preserve the rights of Canada and carry out the honest desires and wishes of our people, and I believe the Budget when brought down, combined with all other features of a true National Policy which hon. gentlemen are seeking to carry out, will redound to the prosperity, to the greatness and to the future growth of this country.

I desire to reply to one or two suggestions made by the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig). He spoke of provincial governments using the new Franchise Act for the purpose of advancing party purposes. I should like to ask, what has the provincial government to do with the present lists in the various municipalities? The provincial government has nothing to do with compiling them. Every list issued in Ontario is made up from the assessment rolls of the various municipalities, prepared by men who are connected with both parties. Again, we have a very easy system of getting a revision, by a court of revision, and as the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Calvert) has already stated, we seldom find an appeal taken to the county judge. Every man who wants to vote has the privilege of getting his name on the list. In what way a provincial government could utilize the list for party purposes is beyond my comprehension. I believe, and I hold it to be the opinion of this House, that the only remedy for the present Franchise Act, which is costly, cumbersome and unfair, and which does not give a free expression of the public mind, is to return to a simple system, which we have in our various provincial lists. That is what the people ask for; and that is the pledge which the Liberal party gave the country. That pledge will have to be redeemed, as all other pledges will have to be redeemed, and they will be redeemed one by one. What is the pledge the Liberal party made to the country? It was as follows: —

That the Franchise Act since its introduction has cost the Dominion Treasury over a million of dollars, besides entailing a heavy expenditure to both political parties;

That each revision involves an additional expenditure of a further quarter of a million;

That this expenditure has prevented an annual revision, as originally intended, in the absence of which young voters entitled to the franchise have, in numerous instances, been prevented from exercising their natural rights;

That it has failed to secure uniformity, which was the principal reason assigned for its introduction;

That it has produced gross abuses by partisan revising barristers appointed by the Government of the day;

That its provisions are less liberal than those already existing in many provinces of the Dominion, and that in the opinion of this convention the Act should be repealed, and we should revert to the provincial franchise.

This is the pledge the present Government when in Opposition gave the people, that immediately on attaining power they would introduce a law to sweep away the present iniquitous Franchise Act. That is what the Government are now doing, and their supporters will sustain them in their action, and the sooner the present Act is swept away the better. It is said that we will not have any elections for three or four years. I would remind the House that we shall have by-elections from time to time, and we do not want to carry them out under a bad law. As soon as the new law comes into force we want every member entering this House to have been elected under it

and to have thus secured a free expression of the people's will in the constituencies; and this can be done by reverting to the provincial lists, with conditions and amendments which may be made to those lists when this Bill reaches committee. I sympathize with the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig) in his desire to have a free and fair expression of the people's will. I know what his fairness means. I know he is a man whose mind is free and open to what is reasonable and right, and I am glad to welcome him into the ranks of those who are willing to uphold what is right and what is true rather than those who will support that which is known to be insincere, unpatriotic and incorrect. I am therefore much pleased to hear the statement, and I hope that when the time comes, he will see that this Bill shall go through without giving it undue obstruction, and without—as we have heard from the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster)—fighting it foot by foot and inch by inch. What we want is to do justice to all. We do not want simply to do justice to ourselves. It might be said that if the Franchise Act worked well for the late Government it would work as well for the present Government. Well, that is not our principle. We are not built that way. We believe in doing justice even to our opponents, and we want all to have the advantage of straightforward and honest legislation. We want further to do away with the heavy expense which this Franchise Act has inflicted, not only upon the public treasury, but upon private individuals as well. I shall therefore not only vote against the amendment of the hon. gentleman from York (Mr. Foster) but I shall do everything in my power to assist the Government in repealing the existing Franchise Act and putting in its place a law immeasurably superior, and which will render justice to all.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer to a few subjects to which hon. gentlemen who have spoken have directed their attention. I hold very strongly the view expressed by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), that in the interest of our lagging industries, and in the interest of the welfare of our people, we should deal with the tariff before dealing with this franchise law. It is the tariff that the people of Canada are anxious about now, and there can be no urgent need for a new franchise enactment, because, at best, it can only be used for the present in isolated cases where there are by-elections. The industries of this country are urgently demanding information regarding what the new tariff shall be. They are anxiously awaiting knowledge, as to the basis on which the commercial interests of this country will settle down in the future, and in view of the stagnation of business all over Canada, it does seem to me that we should deal with the tariff question at once, and leave this Franchise Bill in abeyance. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Frost) has complained that the existing law was not fairly administered and the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), had the same complaint, viz., that it was administered by partisans appointed by the Government. Well, the friends of these hon. gentlemen are now in power, they will have the administration of the law, and cannot these hon. gentlemen trust their Liberal leaders for a fair administration of it? If we who are in Opposition and have no say in the administration of the law, are satisfied to abide by it and to accept it as a fair and free expression of the will of the electors of the country, surely these gentlemen should have sufficient confidence in their own friends to allow them to carry out the provision of the existing Franchise Act. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Frost) asked: What has the provincial government to do with making up the provincial lists? Is he not aware that the provincial government appoint their own officials to make a registration list before each election in the towns and cities of Ontario? and is he not aware that the same thing takes place in Manitoba, and that partisans of the provincial government—if partisans they may be called—are appointed to make up the provincial lists? In my opinion, the complaint about partisanship applies to provincial officers with tenfold greater force, than it applies to the Dominion officials who are now charged with the duty of revising the lists. The provincial lists in Manitoba are made up only once in four years, or at least before the provincial elections are held, and therefore there must be an old list some time in their history, if the Dominion Government holds an election under them. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Frost) did not propose to deal with the question of the tariff for fear he might say something that he would be obliged to take back in a few days when the fiscal policy of the Government is announced. He seems to have as much knowledge in regard to the line of policy the Government intend to take as many others of his friends have. He is, however, prepared to say "Amen" to whatever policy they bring down, whether it be free trade or protection, and so, for fear that he will be obliged to stultify himself and retract later on, he is afraid to say anything now about the tariff policy of his own friends in office. It is a strange position for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Frost) to find himself in. I wonder that he is not possessed of more intelligence, and more independence to express his own views, if he conscientiously believes them to be right. Why does he not do so, and then endeavour to get his party in accord with them and convince them that they are wrong.

Mr. FROST. What I said was that the tariff was not up for discussion just now, and that there was no necessity for referring to it at the present time.

Mr. SPROULE. I am using the hon. gentleman's own language. He said he was afraid to deal with the tariff question, as the Budget speech would be down in a few days, and he might be obliged to withdraw something he said, because he did not know what line the Government would take. The inference from that is, that the hon. gentleman would endorse the Government policy whatever it was.

Mr. FROST. Perhaps you will be obliged to withdraw some things you have said on the other side, when you hear the Budget.

Mr. SPROULE. We are quite willing to take our chances on that, and to say here and now, what we believe to be right. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) objects to the present franchise law because, he says, that if a man comes of age within one week before a federal election, he ought to have a vote. That is the reason he gives for a new Franchise Act. Does the hon. gentleman think for a moment, that if we were depending on the provincial lists, his idea would be carried out in that respect? Why, if a federal election were held in Manitoba two years hence, the provincial lists under which it would be held would be three years old. We cannot compel the provincial governments to make lists for use in the federal elections, and so, we would be obliged to accept that old list, although it was three or, perhaps, four years old. Does the hon. gentleman not remember that the same thing exists in Ontario, and that if we held an election before the provincial elections, which will likely be held within a year from the coming summer, we would hold it on a list that was four years old, because their registration system only obliges them to make out a list once in four years in the cities and towns. If we adopt the provincial franchise, that old provincial list might be the only available list on which to hold a Dominion election. It is the same thing in the province of Manitoba, the same in the North-west Territories, I believe, and the same in some of the maritime provinces. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) complains that the Dominion electoral lists of 1891 were three years old, but if we now adopt the provincial lists, many occasions may arise when they also will be three years old at the time of the federal election. I may say, Sir, that, in my opinion, the Dominion voters' lists are objectionable in some respects. I have always thought that human ingenuity ought to be able to devise a means whereby we could have a Franchise Act under our own control, which was not quite so expensive as the present one. I believe that if the late Sir John Thompson had lived longer, we would have had an amendment to that law which would make it cheap to administer, and would have removed the objections that are to it. The present Dominion franchise law is objectionable, but in drawing a comparison between the cost of making out the lists under that Act, and the cost of preparing the provincial lists as they exist in the province of Ontario, hon. gentlemen opposite are very unfair when they try to figure out that the provincial lists cost nothing. Does it not cost the municipalities something to print the lists which are accepted as the provincial lists. Do hon. gentlemen not know that the municipal councillors have to pay the bill by levying a direct tax on the ratepayers of the municipalities. The revision of that list by the judge is a much more expensive one than the revision of the Dominion lists under the present law. It is no improvement upon the Dominion Franchise Act in that respect. The provincial list costs as much as the Dominion list, if not more, and is not as good a list. The only difference is that while the cost of the provincial list is paid by the municipalities and is raised by taxes upon the ratepayers, the cost of the Dominion list is paid out of the Dominion treasury, so that in this case you can get at the cost in a lump sum, whereas in the other case you cannot get at the cost, because it is spread over all the municipalities.

Hon. gentlemen say that they object to the present law because it is administered by partisan returning officers. That argument has been answered over and over again, and I am almost ashamed to find any man at this day standing up and saying that the Dominion list is not fairly revised, when the very same men who revise it are appointed by the provincial Government to revise the provincial lists. If they are partisans in the revision of one list, would they not be equally so in the revision of the other? For my part, I have never seen any indication of any revising officer in the province of Ontario doing anything but his duty in this respect. I live in a county where there is one revising officer who is not a judge. In most cases the revising officers are county judges, and I think no one will say that they are not fair in their decisions. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) insinuated as much; but I have never known even a hard-shell Reformer to accuse any revising officer of doing other than his duty. One of the revising officers in my county was a barrister of five years' standing, and, therefore, qualified to be appointed a county judge. He did as the other revising officers in the county, viz., explain before he commenced the revision the rules he intended to be guided by. This was explained to both parties before the revision, and I never heard any objections raised to his rulings or any unfairness charged against him.

It is said that under the existing law it is troublesome to candidates to look after the list. I have no doubt it is, and it is also troublesome to look after the provincial list, and if we are to be confined to the provincial list, then the trouble will be transferred

to that list, because more attention will be paid to it. If any means could be devised whereby the candidate would be relieved from that onerous task, I candidly confess that I would like it very well; but I do not think that is possible.

Now, I have serious objections to the Bill submitted to us. We have been told that one of the planks in the platform of the Reform party bound them to repeal this law, and that they are now only hastening to give effect to that pledge. I only wish they were as earnest and willing to redeem their other pledges. If they were, the country would not be labouring under the uncertainty which is to-day paralyzing trade, stopping the legitimate pursuits of the people, and keeping everything at a standstill. In the first place, this Bill is objectionable on account of its being a mixture of a franchise Act and an election law. The number of Acts repealed by it is 11 or 12. It is therefore very difficult to understand. I object to it because it deprives the Dominion Parliament of the right conferred upon it by the fathers of confederation in the British North America Act to make its own franchise law, and to say on what basis members should be elected to this House. In their wisdom the fathers of confederation thought we should have a Dominion franchise law, foreshadowing what has since taken place. Seeing how difficult it would be for people to understand the franchises of the various provinces, they thought it would be wise to have as far as possible a uniform law for the Dominion. I take for granted that no clause of the British North America Act was inserted except for a definite purpose, or except to be brought into operation. I take up that Act, and what does it say? It says:

Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides,——

This is done because at the beginning, before the Parliament of Canada had any power to make a law, some method had to be used to elect members to this House, but it was not contemplated that that should be continued:

Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, all laws in force in the several provinces at the union relative to the following matters, or any of them, namely:—The qualifications and disqualification of persons to be elected or to sit or vote as members of the House of Assembly or Legislative Assembly in the several provinces, the voters at elections of such members, the oaths to be taken by voters, the returning officers, their powers and duties, the proceedings at elections, the periods during which elections may be continued, the trial of controverted elections, and proceedings incident thereto, the vacating of seats of members, and the execution of new writs in case of seats vacated otherwise than by dissolution,—shall respectively apply to elections of members to serve in the House of Commons for the same several provinces.

"Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides." Of course, it was contemplated then that as soon as the Dominion Parliament commenced operations it would make a franchise law of its own that would be as near as possible uniform, and would provide how members should be elected to this House. It further says:

Provided that, until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, at any election for a member of the House of Commons for the district of Algoma, in addition to persons qualified by the law of the province of Canada to vote, every male British subject, aged twenty-one years or upwards, being a householder, shall have a vote.

This is the commencement of a Dominion franchise law, because it goes beyond the provincial law. It is as clear as anything can be that it was contemplated that this Parliament should have a franchise law of its own. In my opinion, what the present Government should have done to enable the members of this House to fully comprehend the law they were proposing, was to put before us an epitome of the various provincial franchises, so that we could see what they are when we came to adopt them. We have not got them, and, therefore, we are not in a position fairly to judge what the provisions of this Bill are.

Now, the present law contemplates the abandonment of that right. That, it seems to me, is a retrograde step. If the law is defective by way of being too expensive, let us mend it and make it simpler, as I respectfully submit it can be, and let us retain our right to control the Dominion franchise. I object to this Bill because it leaves the provinces to decide what shall be the Dominion franchise, and allows them to so amend the franchise, from time to time, as to make it prejudicial to the interests of the party in power in the Dominion or the reverse. No doubt our hon. friend's opposite feel no apprehension in this respect, because their friends are in power in most of the provinces, but that is no reason for our giving away the control of our own franchise. In the past, provincial governments have amended their franchise laws in such directions as to fairly lead to the conclusion that they intended giving their friends an undue advantage in the Dominion elections, and it was to remedy this state of affairs that the Dominion franchise law was introduced. We know that Manitoba amended her franchise law so as to prejudicially affect the Goverument that held office in the Dominion. We know that some of the maritime provinces have done the same thing and that the province of Ontario likewise set the same example. There can be no question of that whatever. Take, for instance, the territory of Algoma and Muskoka. The law there practically gave manhood suffrage without registration, and under its operation, timber inspectors, road jobbers, and other Government employees and hangers on, in large numbers flooded that territory during election times. We have heard the objection

from the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to the Franchise Act of 1885, that it gave some of the bands of Indians the right to vote. But in Algoma and Muskoka, the Indians, both men and women were driven, almost like herds of cattle to the polls, and after the men had voted, they went to a separate room and exchanged garments with the squaws who then went to the polls, in their turn, and cast their votes, and this they did, under the control of the agents of the provincial government. Yet we are asked to hand over the control of our franchise to local governments, which could tolerate such proceedings.

There can be no question as to the truth of what I have stated, because it is a matter of record which nobody disputes. I could give the names of the gentlemen engaged in the work and of the employees of the provincial government who interested themselves in this matter. What we want is a fair and honest expression of the people's will, and in that view we should hesitate before adopting any system which is likely to give us the opposite. We should have uniformity in our franchise law, as far as possible. Pedantic uniformity we cannot, of course, always obtain, but at least there is a fair measure of uniformity in our present Dominion franchise law. What is proposed to be given us by the Bill before the House? We are asked to adopt a system, which will be conspicuous for its want of uniformity, and that alone, it seems to me, is sufficient to condemn it. Then as to the plea that elections are held upon old lists, under our present law, let me say in reply that in each province the lists are closed at a different period of the year. In Nova Scotia the assessments begin in November and are finished in July. In Ontario, they begin in April and May and are finished in December. In British Columbia, the provincial lists are made up just before the provincial election, and they are finally revised about the 30th of June. In Prince Edward Island the assessments are made out in December and finished about the 1st of May, and no Dominion officials are allowed to vote. In Manitoba the lists are made just before the provincial elections are held. In every province the lists close at different times. It will be seen, therefore, that it will be simply impossible to hold a Dominion election on lists on which everybody is inscribed who has the right to vote. The result would be that there would not be a single Dominion election which could be held on new lists. If the lists were new in Ontario, they would be old in some of the other provinces, so that it would be utterly impossible to have either general or by-elections on new lists throughout the Dominion. Let me quote from a very admirable work of Dr. Bourinot which gives us a little insight into the different franchises of the provinces. Any one looking over this work, must be struck with the differences in the franchises of the different provinces. Dr. Bourinot points out:

> In the provinces every native-born Canadian or subject of Her Majesty, by birth or naturalization, who is a male person of the age of twenty-one years, not insane, not convicted of any crime, nor otherwise disqualified by any law, and who is duly entered on the official list of voters, can vote at legislative elections within their respective provinces, on the following conditions:—
>
> In British Columbia.—For residents in the province for twelve months, and in an electoral district for two months of that time. Chinese and Indians have no votes. The system is, consequently, manhood suffrage.
>
> In Manitoba.—Residents in the province for six months, and in the electoral division for one month before the issue of proclamation appointing the registration clerk therein. The system here is also manhood suffrage. Indians and persons of Indian blood, receiving an annuity or treaty money from the Crown, and all persons receiving salaries or fees from the Dominion or provincial governments to amount of $350 and upwards, have no vote.
>
> In Ontario.—Residents in the province for nine months before the time fixed by law for beginning to make the assessment roll in which they should be entered as qualified to vote, providing they are at the time actually residing in the municipal district in which they vote.

By the Ontario law to-day, lots of men who own large amounts of property cannot vote under the lists at present. Why? Because no matter how much property a man may own, he will have his name put down where his property is, but at the time of election he may be living in another polling subdivision and not be able to vote at all, because he must vote in the polling subdivision where he is living at the time the election is held. That is not fair to the electorate of Canada nor to the property-holders of Canada. Now, the Dominion franchise law is objected to on the principle of one man one vote. No doubt that principle has its advantages, and I candidly confess that I have often felt it was a disadvantage that we should be obliged to bring in the outside voter. I think, however, we could amend the law and still give a man a right to vote if he had property in the country, somewhere, so that he would not be deprived of that right when the elections came on.

> In Quebec.—Owners or occupants of real estate valued in cities at $300, or $200 in other municipalities, or which yields a value of $20 a year. Tenants paying an annual rental for real estate of at least $30 in a city, and $20 in any other municipal division. Also teachers under the control of school commissioners or trustees, rentières, or retired farmers, with a rental of at least $100 yearly.

These all have the right to vote but they vote on a different principle from that laid down in Manitoba or Ontario or British Columbia.

> In Nova Scotia.—Persons assessed on real property valued at $150, or personal and real property together valued at $300. Persons exempted

from taxation, when in possession of the property just stated. Tenants, yearly, of similar property. Sons of foregoing persons, or of widows, in possession of enough property to qualify as stated above, and actually residing on such property.

If these persons are not actually residing on the property at the time, they would not have the right to vote.

In Prince Edward Island.—Residents in an electoral division who have performed statute labour for twelve months before an election.

If they do not happen to do statute labour, they would have no right to vote in the election for members for this House. Now, I find that the variety of franchise in the different provinces is very great. Is it to be said that the wisdom of the House of Commons or this Parliament of Canada cannot devise a simpler, plainer, and more uniform franchise for the election of members to this House than by accepting the various franchises of the province, an epitome of which I have given? I think it can be done, and done without a great deal of trouble. Now, I object to the Bill for the reasons I have given. I objected to the old Dominion law, because I thought it was too expensive. I have only this to say regarding the Bill now before us, that there is no reason for pressing it through and bringing it into operation now unless hon. gentlemen opposite are so disloyal that they intend to abandon their leader and wreck the Government, and if I were to insinuate that they would feel insulted. There is no urgency in this matter. But there is urgency for making known the changes the Government intend to make in the tariff. The new tariff should be brought down. The leader of hon. gentlemen opposite has announced that they intend to continue the discussion of the Budget from day to day until it is finished, and the Budget is to be brought down next week. That is a step in the right direction. There is a frankness about that that we admire very much. But we say that there is no reason for delaying the tariff and taking up the franchise law. We hope that hon. gentlemen opposite will give us their Budget at as early a day as possible. There is no hurry so far as the franchise is concerned. If they delay they may be able to give us a better Bill than the one before us. Objectionable as the old Franchise Bill was, in many directions this is more objectionable. It involves the abandonment of a principle which I think should be held as sound. I hold that we should not abandon our rights or give them over to the provincial governments. It has been found in the case of the United States that the great trouble of their system is the weakness of the central authority. We here are drifting in the same direction when we are giving away our rights and allowing them to be exercised by the various provinces. We are weakening the hands of the central authority, and the day will come when it will be absolutely essential to ask to enlarge our constitution, if this continues very long, and strengthen the hands of the central authority rather than weaken it, as it is proposed we should do in the Bill before us.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. The Dominion Franchise Act, I have no doubt, was conceived with the ostensible desire of giving the people of this country a perfect piece of electoral mechanism. It was to be perfect in all its parts; it was to satisfy the longings of politicians who claimed that the Act was for the good of the country. These same politicians, however, were keen enough to remember that the good of the country meant the good of their own party. The Act was to bring with it a harvest of blessings, but both sides of the electorate have heartily cursed it. I am satisfied that I am not mistaken when I claim the Dominion Franchise Act has altogether failed to fulfil the promises of its creators. It was in name an Act for the enfranchisement of Canadians, but in nature and its operation it was an Act for the disfranchisement of Canadians. It was a scandal.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. Yes; it was a disgrace, and well do I know it; in the last Dominion election Canadians of full voting age had no place on the lists, which were stuffed with the names of thousands of Canadians who were either dead—or worse still, in the United States. The elections of last June and the by-elections were held on lists that were three years old, and, in these contested constituencies the doors were slammed in the faces of Canadians of 22, 23 and 24 years of age, and freely opened to excursionists from the other side of the line, who, having fulfilled their purpose, having return tickets, took the first train out of the country. I have long been against an Act which enfranchises the grave-yard and disfranchises the home. The Act, as the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) puts it, and I do not think he exhausted the English language in his explanation—proved too costly, not only for the taxpayers of the Dominion but for parliamentary candidates. Any measure that makes our politics expensive adds to the influence of money; and it is not a good thing that members of Parliament should enter this House a debtor to the rich men who have paid for the revision of their lists. These rich men will have a claim upon the Government which that member may support, and, sooner or later, all Governments are apt to honour the claims of wealth. I had hoped that the genius of this Government would have been equal to the preparation of an Act upon which honest men of all political parties could have agreed. There is no room for wrangling over the simple process of enfranchising every qualified Canadian.

There ought to be no wrangling. But, much as I hate the old Franchise Act with all its evils, I can see no good reason for falling in love with this substitute which the Government has offered us. The country expected an Act from the Government that would utilize to the utmost extent, or as far as possible, the municipal machinery in the making of a voters' list. There might be grave difficulty in the way of the Government working out such an ideal; but because it is hard for a Government to do the best, is that Government justified in doing its worst? The old Franchise Act had the one virtue of embodying the ideal of national unity in a law which made the basis of the federal franchise the same thing in every province of the Dominion. This Bill discards the one virtue of the old Act and retains all the evils which that law brought into our politics. Our old friend the revising officer will bob up serenely and disport himself in Manitoba; in Montreal a man will vote wherever he has property: in Ontario he will be able to vote only where he sleeps. Now I did not know anything of the qualifications in the maritime provinces until my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) referred to the franchises in those provinces. But I object to any franchise Act which makes property the qualification in Quebec; manhood suffrage the qualification in Ontario, and manhood and the favour of a partisan revising barrister the qualification in Manitoba. And, in this connection, I think a good point was made by my hon. friend from West Huron (Mr. Cameron) on the first day of the debate and to-night by my hon. friend from West Middlesex (Mr. Calvert) with regard to one man one vote. I favour also the idea so well put by my hon. friend the member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) this afternoon. I think these suggestions are all essentials in the framing of a Franchise Act. Is this Act the Liberal Government's answer to the expectations of the people? Because, if it is, I can tell the Government that the people will be greatly disappointed. I can tell them further, that the independent voters of this country, a force that is rapidly increasing in number, expected something very much better. I hold that the basis of a Dominion Franchise Act should be the same in every province of the Dominion, and for the sake of that principle, I will vote against this Bill, at least in its present form. I admit that the motion of my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) is rather an ignoble way of putting this Bill temporarily out of the way. I would sooner have had a resolution squarely assailing the principal features of the Bill; but as I want to see the Bill either amended or killed, I am prepared to use any tools within my reach even if they are not silver-plated. If it were a question between retaining the old Act or adopting this as a substitute, I might hesitate. I suppose that even this proposal is less objectionable than the iniquity which it would displace. Surely this Government is going to offer this Parliament something better than a choice between evils. Surely this Government underrates its own power when it thus confesses its inability to devise some simple easily-worked-out system which will provide an honest voters' list at a small expense in every province of the Dominion. This Bill, to my mind, does not ensure an honest voters' list; it certainly leaves my Conservative friends with a good excuse for saying that the Government, in the preparation of this Act, were thinking more of advantages to its own party than to the general good of the whole country. I hope that this Act will fail in passing, and thus clear the way for legislation that will be just to all, and for ever leave the making of a voters' list above the strife of partisans. I do not know what the constitutional difficulties are, but it seems to me that it ought not to be impossible for Parliament to agree upon some system that would adopt the municipal or provincial lists so far as these lists comply with the Dominion law. This would clear the way for some simple plan by which a non-partisan authority could add to or take from the municipal or provincial qualifications, so as to make a complete list and comply with the law, which should be the same in every province of the Dominion.

Mr. MORRISON. I regret that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross Robertson) who has just taken his seat has not given us some slight idea of the reasons for which he hopes that this Bill will be defeated. On the several occasions upon which I have had the pleasure hitherto of hearing that hon. gentleman address the House, he has very succinctly and explicitly stated his grounds for the votes which he gave. On this occasion he has attacked not only the present Bill, but the old Franchise Act, and he has not, in one instance, specified upon what he bases his objections. Now, the hon. gentleman is as well aware as any one in this House, that epigram is not argument. I take it that when the hon. Solicitor General introduced this Bill he did it for the purpose of having a full and intelligent discussion of the measure; and I may say that I coincide with the hon. gentleman in the regret that the Solicitor General in introducing this Bill, did not consider it necessary to dilate a little more upon the principles underlying it. I think if the Solicitor General had taken that trouble a great deal of the discussion which we have heard would have been obviated, because then hon. gentlemen opposite would not have had the slightest pretext for indulging in what they no doubt are pleased to call argument, during the day or two that they have spent in discussing this Bill. I have heard every hon. gentleman opposite who has taken part in this debate, but I have failed to hear any of them give it that intelligent and logical treat-

ment which it deserves. With the exception of the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) I have not heard one hon. gentleman on the other side give a single valid reason why this Bill should not be passed; while even the hon. member for Brockville, in his argument, I submit with all due deference, indulged in fallacies and sophistries. His argument is entirely specious, and did not effectually assail any of the fundamental principles of the Bill. Now, I submit that the section in the Bill which is the crux of the whole disapprobation on the point of hon. gentlemen opposite, is section 7, which reads as follows:—

> Subject to the provisions hereinafter contained, the qualifications and conditions necessary to entitle a person to vote at a Dominion election shall be those entitling a person at the time of such election to vote at a provincial election in the electoral district for which the Dominion election is being held, or in some part thereof.

Now, that I conceive to be, in their eyes, the objectionable section of this Bill. But it is the section which contains the principle underlying this Bill, and the principle which I submit ought to underly any Franchise Bill, a principle which has been evaded and ignored by gentlemen on the other side in the various Acts of legislation respecting the franchise of this Dominion. In that short section lies the principle clearly enunciated which ought to be supported by every hon. gentleman in this House, and that is a principle leading to manhood suffrage. I am more than surprised at hearing the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) characterize the Bill in the terms in which he did. The hon. gentleman must surely have forgotten that under the common law, elections were in the hands of the people; that the principle, or quality, of manhood suffrage was invaded by the party which is the prototype of hon. gentlemen opposite, when they made their encroachment upon the liberties of the people of England in the year 1429, before which date manhood suffrage was the franchise in England. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been taking the cue, apparently, from that party, and upon every opportunity they have enlarged upon the invasion of that principle of manhood suffrage. That principle, which is admitted, was invaded owing to the aristocratic tendencies of the Government of the day in England, tendencies which are being perpetuated by hon. gentlemen opposite, and in this connection I must again say I was very much surprised to see the hon. member for Toronto rising in his place and attack this Bill, which contains the principle as set forth in paragraph 7. He is inconsistent, and I am waiting for some explanation of his extraordinary statement, that the Bill, including the principle contained in it, is perfidious and iniquitous

I contend that at the present stage of the political existence of this Dominion an enlargement of the franchise ought to be given and ought to be recognized; that owing to the inter-communication between the various provinces, the increase in wealth, population and business, greater local power should be given to the different constituent parts of this Dominion. This cannot be done in a better way than by enlarging the franchise. This Bill gives to each province control over its own franchise. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) quoted from the British North America Act, our constitution, and I must say I was surprised, as he apparently knows of the existence of our constitution, that he appeared to be utterly ignorant of this principle enunciated in that Act, that the franchise ought to be controlled by the different provinces. That is the cardinal principle, enunciated and recognized in the British North America Act, and that is the principle which this Bill is following out in section No. 7. Hon. gentlemen opposite apparently are labouring under the mistake that the scope of this Parliament is paramount to that of the legislatures of the different provinces. I contend that in regard to matters of local import the scope of this Parliament is not paramount to that of the local legislatures. Why should it be so? Take the franchise itself. Who are in a better position to decide who shall vote or not, or even how often they shall vote or at how many places they shall vote, than are the people of the respective provinces? I have heard no hon. gentleman controvert that position, or indeed refer to it. We will take British Columbia—and I speak for that province, and I hope to hear hon. gentlemen from the various provinces refer to the franchise question in their respective provinces—in that province, should this Bill pass, the franchise would be very free and full indeed, and open, if at all, in my opinion to very few objections. The franchise in that province at present is exceedingly liberal, and so far as our province is concerned there is no possible objection to this Bill becoming law, and I venture to say that hon. gentlemen sitting on this side of the House, if not hon. gentlemen sitting opposite, will find, if this Bill passes, their respective provinces will raise no objection to it. In British Columbia, according to the Elections Act, every male of the full age of twenty-one years, not being disqualified by that Act or by any other law in force in the province, being entitled to the privileges of a natural born British subject, having resided in the province twelve months, and in the electoral district in which he claims to vote for two months immediately previous to the time he claims to vote, and being duly registered under the Act, shall be entitled to vote. No Indians or Chinamen are permitted to vote. So far as this franchise is concerned, there cannot be any objection raised to it. Another point which strikes me very forcibly, and perhaps hon. gentle-

men are not aware of the fact, is that the foundation of the voters' lists is the assessment rolls of the different constituencies. What is the assessment roll, and who has jurisdiction over it? It is a roll prepared under a provincial Act and the provincial legislature enacts concerning it. The very foundation of the franchise, then reverts back to the provincial legislature, and to provincial legislation. In order to make myself clear, I will repeat. It is that the provincial legislature enacts the law in regard to the assessment roll. The revising barrister under the old Act, in order to make his list complete and trustworthy, was of necessity obliged to refer to the assessment roll, a matter under provincial enactment. Therefore, having referred to a piece of legislation over which the provincial legislature has control, clearly the provincial legislature had some sort of control or influence over the franchise of the Dominion. The point I wish to make of that is this: that on that ground alone the Dominion Parliament had not full control over the whole of the franchise of the country, and, therefore, it must be conceded that the local legislature has some right to interfere and deal with the franchise. If that is conceded, I contend that the stand taken up by hon. gentlemen opposite, that the local legislature should not interfere in regard to the franchise or electoral lists fails. I contend that one of the cardinal principles enunciated by the British North America Act is that the franchise should be under the control of the local legislature of the provinces. That is one of the reasons I support this Bill. I contend that the principle enunciated in paragraph 7 is the cardinal principle, an invasion of which will work great harm. There is an abundance of precedents for the Government introducing a Bill of this kind. These precedents must be known and cannot have been forgotten by hon. gentlemen opposite, some of whom must have been members of this House during the introduction and passage of legislative enactments to which I now refer. The precedents for this Bill are as follows: Section 31 of the Imperial Act granting a constitution to Upper and Lower Canada. In that Act one of the grounds for disqualification was that a voter was within the description of a person disqualified by Acts passed by local legislatures. Undoubtedly there was a recognition of the principle that the provincial legislatures should have control of the franchise of the provinces. The next precedent for the introduction and passing of this Bill is the Act of Union between Upper and Lower Canada, 3 and 4, Vic. 1, chap 35, to which reference has already been made; 3 and 4 Vic., states:—

> That until otherwise provided by the Legislature of the United Kingdom, the laws of Upper Canada, and the laws in force in Lower Canada in 1838 relating to the qualification and disqualification of voters, should be continued.

Mr. MORRISON.

There is the second recognition of this principle.

Mr. DAVIN. Does not my hon. friend (Mr. Morrison) see that that enunciates a directly opposite principle to that which he contends for.

Mr. MORRISON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) does not follow the trend of my argument, and that I regret very much, because it is his misfortune. I was very careful in giving the hon. gentleman the citation, so as to afford him an opportunity of consulting it which he has not evidently heretofore done. The third precedent for the passage of this Bill is in the British North America Act, section 41 of which states:

> Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, all laws in force in the several provinces at the union, relative to the following matters, or any of them, namely:—the qualifications and disqualifications of persons to be elected or to sit or vote as members of the House of Assembly or Legislative Assembly in the several provinces, the voters at elections of such members, the oaths to be taken by voters, * * * shall respectively apply to election of members to serve in the House of Commons for the several provinces.

There is another precedent which is laid down in the British North America Act, section 51. The fourth precedent is, that in 1871 the Acts adopting the provincial franchise for the Dominion elections were passed. The fifth precedent is laid down in 34 Vic., chap. 20; the sixth precedent is laid down in 36 Vic., chap. 27, passed in 1873; and in 1874 the Dominion Parliament adopted the various provincial franchises. I contend, Sir, that these are ample precedents for the action taken by the Government now. I think we can pin it down to one reason which I will repeat. The voters' list as at present when finally completed by the revising barrister is the foundation for the franchise, and against it there is no appeal. That voters' list, when finally revised and passed by the revising barrister cannot be attacked, even on the trial of an election petition before a judge of the Supreme Court. It is incontrovertible evidence over which you cannot get. What is the fact in regard to that? The list may have been prepared by an official who may have acted in the most dishonourable way—I do not mean to suggest that any revising barrister that we have to-day has resorted to these methods, but I wish to point out that such a thing may happen, and there are gentlemen in this House who have said that it has happened. It has not been done to my knowledge and I am simply speaking for myself. However, what I say is, that even should that list be prepared in the most dishonourable way, there is no recourse against it. Whether the voter on that list be de jure a voter or not, on the day of election he can demand to have his vote

taken no matter how wrongfully he may have got on that list. On the other hand, no matter how much entitled a man may have been to be on that list, if through the machinations of some of the officers his name is left off, there is no remedy to which he can resort. If this Bill, speaking for the British Columbia franchise, should become law, the voter finds that his name is not on the list, then he may appeal to the county court judge, and from the county court judge he has a further recourse to a Judge of the Supreme Court. That gives him the fullest and most ample remedy if his name has been left off the list, either intentionally or otherwise. The fact that under the old law there was such arbitrary power placed in the hands of any official—whether he used that power arbitrarily or not—is sufficient to condemn the law. I say that any Act, I care not by what name you call it or by what party it is introduced, which includes provisions so pernicious as the provisions of the existing law are admitted to be by both sides, should not be tolerated in a constitutionally governed country. To the extent even that the present Bill eliminates those pernicious provisions, it is infinitely better than the existing law. I simply rose to refer to section 7 which I consider to be the main point in reference to this Bill, and for my own part I should like to have heard of hon. gentlemen on the other side who have attacked the measure state their reasons against the principles involved in it. If this Bill is so objectionable as gentlemen opposite contend—and I have no doubt they are honourable and intelligent men and actuated by the best motives—surely they should have given some reasons for their objections. I am free to admit, that I am open to conviction, and I would be the very last man to vote for this Bill if it is all that hon. gentlemen opposite have said that it is. However, I shall not take their ipsi dixit for that. I expected that men who have the confidence of their respective constituencies, sufficiently to send them to this House, would have discused a matter of such great importance as this, in an intelligent manner, and given the reasons for their opposition. With one exception, not a single member on the other side of the House has given us his grounds for his objection to this Bill. To that extent they are culpable and reprehensible for uselessly taking up the time of this House and of the country. I believe that the country, and the Government, and the House want an intelligent discussion on this question. I am a new member of this House, and it is inexplicable to me how an hon. gentleman like the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), could rise ostensibly to discuss the Franchise Act, and then direct all his remarks to extraneous matters, the discussion of which is entirely premature. It is inexplicable to me, how an hon. gentleman like the ex-Finance Minister, should resort to what I deem an anomalous practice in the rules of debate in this House, and avail himself of the artifices which are at the disposal of any hon. member who chooses to use them. If hon. gentlemen opposite are in earnest in condemning this Bill, they should give us some reasons why it should be condemned. I am afraid, however, that if the debate continues in the same line as it has since it opened, we shall have a discussion on extraneous matters, such as the tariff, and the Superannuation Bill, measures not now before the House, and that no light will be thrown upon the principles of this Franchise Bill.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 14th April, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 34) to incorporate the Canadian Securities Company of Montreal.—(Mr. Madore.)

Bill (No. 35) respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Bill (No. 36) respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. McGregor.)

Bill (No. 37) respecting the Niagara and Grand Island Bridge Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, before you proceed to the next order of business, I rise pursuant to a statement that I made last night that to-day I would make a personal explanation in reply to a certain charge that was alluded to by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) last evening.

If necessary to keep myself in order, I will conclude my statement with a motion. The statement referred to by the hon. gentleman last evening, as I understood him, was con-

tained in a despatch to the Toronto "World" from Niagara Falls, dated February 11th. It is headed: "Annexationist J. Charlton has been causing a sensation at Tonawanda. The Yankees praise him, and people on the Canadian side are filled with indignation." The despatch reads as follows:—

Niagara Falls, Ont., Feb. 11.—(Special.)—John Charlton, the annexationist, is creating a sensation in the vicinity of Tonawanda and Niagara Falls. Mr. Charlton has interests in Tonawanda, and a short time ago delivered a lecture on Canada and its resources, intimating that the average Canadian citizen would favour continental annexation, which he himself did. The local American newspapers have taken up the cry; they praise Mr. Charlton and the Liberal party, who, they claim, are desirous of annexation, and honour the Conservatives by calling them loyalists. They publish alleged facts that the Canadians residing on the frontier would join them to-morrow, if it were possible. Great indignation is felt on this side of the river at the Yankees' presumption. Nowhere in Canada would annexation be more strongly opposed than on the Niagara frontier. As far as business transactions are concerned, the Canadians are on the best of terms with their cousins across the border, but apart from that, they are not of them. John Charlton may have made friends across the river, but he certainly has not on this side.

This despatch is of the same character as many others regarding myself which were published in Conservative papers from time to time, and in this, as in all other instances, the despatch was destitute of foundation and truth. I called the attention of the pastor of the church in North Tonawanda, where I delivered this lecture, to the character of the statements that were being made with regard to it by the Conservative press in Canada, and I requested that gentleman to furnish a statement as to what the actual character of the lecture was. The lecture was given at his solicitation, and was one of a series delivered in that church last winter.

Mr. DAVIN. Where is Tonawanda, may I ask my hon. friend?

Mr. CHARLTON. I may inform my hon. friend that Tonawanda is the second lumber centre of the United States, and the third lumber centre of the world. It is a place of very great commercial importance, and if the hon. gentleman will examine the map he will find that it is situated on the Niagara River, in the western part of New York. It was some time before my request was complied with, but on the 3rd of March, the Rev. Mr. Sanborne, pastor of the North Presbyterian Church in Tonawanda, addressed the following letter to the Toronto "Globe":—

To the Editor of the "Globe":

Sir,—My attention has been called to certain statements made in some Canadian newspapers regarding Mr. Charlton's lecture in this place on the evening of January 28 last, and I beg that you will permit me to refer to the matter in the columns of the "Globe."

Mr. CHARLTON.

The managers of the North Presbyterian Church, of North Tonawanda, N.Y., decided last autumn to arrange for a course of lectures. Mr. Charlton, who has relatives among the members of the congregation, was asked to give one of these lectures, and consented to do so. He expressed a desire to contribute his quota to the enlightenment of Americans about Canadian matters, and he announced as his subject, "Canada, Physical, Historical and Political." His lecture upon the subject chosen was distinctively Canadian in tone and sentiment. The statement that he expressed himself as favourable to the annexation of Canada to the United States is untrue. He did refer to the question, and said that in Canada it was neither a political issue nor a live question, and that while the present tariff conditions between the two countries continued, it could not even be said to be a remote possibility.

He spoke with some asperity of the narrow policy pursued by the United States towards Canada, and declared that the latter country, under its new Liberal Government, desired to adopt a friendly policy and to secure modifications of trade restrictions that would be mutually beneficial. While this, however, was the case, Canada had no desire to surrender her autonomy, but wished to work out her own destiny, ever maintaining relations of the utmost friendliness with her great neighbour. Mr. Charlton dwelt with evident pride upon the extent of the arable area and of the material resources of Canada, and surprised his hearers by declaring that the Dominion could sustain a population of 75,000,000 souls. He sketched briefly the romantic colonial history of the country and the growth of its institutions since the conquest. The outline he gave of the character of those institutions as at present existing, was an attractive one, though he admitted that possibly some modifications might be made with advantage. His remarks upon Canadian politics and parties were exceedingly instructive and interesting to an American audience.

It is true that Mr. Charlton's lecture was well received in Tonawanda. The spirit of friendliness and good-will that characterized it throughout was all that could be desired; but the ground was distinctly taken that Canada wished to become a nation and work out the problems of her future side by side with, but separate from, the United States, and that the traditional policy of the Liberal party was to seek to dwell together in concord and amity and to secure an extensive mitigation of the restraints upon the trade of the two countries with each other, based upon fair and mutually advantageous conditions.

HENRY K. SANBORNE.
Pastor North Presbyterian Church.

North Tonawanda, N.Y., March 3.

Mr. DAVIN. Hear, hear.

That letter, so far as my memory serves me, gives a correct outline of the leading features of my lecture, and the statement which the writer makes denying the utterance of any annexationist sentiment by myself is absolutely true.

COMPLAINT AGAINST JAMES H. THORNE.

Mr. MILLS asked:

1. Was there a complaint made against James H. Thorne, postmaster of the office called Kars-

dale, in the county of Annapolis? If so, what was the complaint? Who made it? Was there any investigation held? If so, what was proven?

2. Has the said James H. Thorne been dismissed from the said postmastership? If so, why?

3. Did one Daniel J. Riordan make a complaint against said Thorne?

4. Is the said Daniel J. Riordan now the postmaster of Karsdale?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). 1. A charge of offensive political partisanship was made by the Honourable J. W. Longley and Daniel J. Riordan against J. H. Thorne, postmaster of Karsdale. An investigation was held before C. J. Macdonald, post office inspector, the charge was attested by D. J. Riordan under oath. 2. The office was closed 1st of April, 1897. 3. There was a complaint of Daniel J. Riordan dated 12th of December, 1896. 4. No, the office was closed.

DISMISSALS OF DAVID COVERT AND D. J. RIORDAN.

Mr. MILLS asked:

1. Has David Covert, of Annapolis county, been dismissed from the office of postmaster of Thorneville?

2. If so, was there a complaint made against him, what was the nature of such complaint, who made the complaint?

3. Was there an investigation held, before whom, what was proven at such investigation, who were the witnesses?

4. Was one Daniel J. Riordan the complainant, was he a witness?

5. Who is now the postmaster of Thorneville Post Office?

6. Is Daniel J. Riordan a postmaster in Annapolis county? If so, in what office? When was he appointed? Who are his bondsmen?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). 1. The office was closed 1st of April, 1897. 2. A charge of offensive political partisanship was made by the Hon. J. W. Longley and Daniel J. Riordan. 3. An investigation was held before C. J. Macdonald, post office inspector; charges were made by D. J. Riordan, under oath. The witnesses were Riordan, the postmaster and the postmaster's son. 4. There was a complaint by Daniel J. Riordan under date of 12th October, 1896. 5. The office is closed. 6. Yes, he was appointed to postmastership of a new office established at Thorne Cove, midway between Thorneville and Karsdale, on 1st of April, 1897. Postmaster's bond has not yet been received.

APPOINTMENT OF MR. WILFRID MERCIER.

Mr. LaRIVIERE (for Mr. Bergeron) asked:

1. By whom was Mr. Wilfrid Mercier, barrister, of Montreal, appointed a commissioner to hold an inquiry respecting the post office at Valleyfield, province of Quebec?

2. How much does he receive per day as remuneration and for travelling expenses?

3. Has he power to swear the witnesses and (4) to pay them?

5. Can he act as barrister, clerk and judge?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Under the authority of an Order in Council dated the 27th of November, 1896, issued under the provisions of chapter 115 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, Wilfrid Mercier was appointed a commissioner to hold inquiry respecting the conduct of the postmaster at Valleyfield, his allowance being three dollars a day for living expenses, his actual travelling expenses, and ten dollars a day for his services, with such powers as are, by the said Act, conferred upon commissioners appointed thereunder.

BELLE RIVER BREAKWATER.

Mr. MARTIN asked:

Is it the intention of the Government to place a sum in the Supplementary Estimates for the extension of Belle River breakwater, in Prince Edward Island?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). The question is under consideration.

MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked:

Who was acting for the Government in the negotiations of a settlement of the school question with the Government of the province of Manitoba, and what were his instructions? Has he made a report, and if so, will the same be submitted to this House?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The negotiations for the settlement of the Manitoba school question were conducted by the Government themselves. No authority was delegated to any one.

POSTAL DELIVERY OF CONSERVATIVE NEWSPAPERS.

Mr. BERGERON asked:

Is the hon. the Postmaster General aware that the postmaster of St. Timothy, in the county of Beauharnois, who, by the way, is absent, the office being held by his wife, refuses to deliver the Conservative newspapers which are addressed to bona fide subscribers? Will the Postmaster General take means to prevent such abuse?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The Postmaster General is not aware that the postmaster at St. Timothy, in the county of Beauharnois, refuses to deliver Conservative newspapers addressed to bona fide subscribers. If such abuse exists and the Postmaster General is notified thereof, he will deem it his duty to take prompt measures to put an end to it.

QUEBEC ORIENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. BELCOURT (for Mr. Choquette) asked:

Is it the intention of the Government to grant, this year, subsidies to the Quebec Oriental Railway Company?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I shall have to answer that question precisely as I have answered previous questions of the same character. The question of which railways are to be granted subsidies, if any, is under consideration.

GROSSE ISLE WHARF.

Mr. BELCOURT (for Mr. Choquette) asked:

Is it the intention of the Government to place in the Supplementary Estimates, this year, a sufficient amount for the extension of the Grosse Isle wharf, as recommended by the report of Dr. Montizambert?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I can only say that this question will be answered when the supplementary Estimates, if any, come down.

WESTERN BLOCK FIRE.

Mr. BELCOURT (for Mr. Choquette) asked:

What public documents were destroyed by the fire in the Western Block? To what department did these documents belong? Over what period did they extend?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). The Department of Public Works has lost the correspondence received from 1880 to 1892, with the exception of the correspondence relating to matters still pending and which being kept in another part of the building was saved. None of the books of reference were lost. All contracts, deeds, &c., were saved. The vouchers in the Accountant's office up to the year 1890 were destroyed, these, with the correspondence above referred to, being kept in the attic where the fire originated. All the plans in the Chief Engineer's and Chief Architect's offices were saved.

Marine and Fisheries.—The Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries states as follows:—

Files of this department, Marine Branch, containing letters and reports received from 1867 to 1879, inclusive, and also register books of correspondence received from 1867 to 1882, were consumed in the late fire. Some volumes of the "Canada Gazette" and a supply of forms used in connection with the various services of the department were also destroyed, and also a quantity of printed reports of the department, dating from confederation to the present time. Most of the letters received by the Fisheries Branch from 1867 to 1888, inclusive, were lost.

The North-west Mounted Police branch having its office wholly in the attic of the Western Block naturally suffered most from the fire. The same may be said of the records of the Departments of Marine and Fisheries and Public Works, which were destroyed and which were also filed in that attic. The Departments of Militia, Trade and Commerce, and Customs, being on the ground floor of the building, where the fire did not reach, did not lose any documents on that account.

Customs.—The Commissioner states as follows:—

I have to state that, so far as I am aware, there were not any public documents belonging to the Customs Department destroyed by the fire in question.

North-west Mounted Police.—The Controller of the North-west Mounted Police reports that the following documents in connection with his office were destroyed by the fire:—

1. Files of correspondence, 1877 to 1887, inclusive, and a few files of 1891.
2. Registers of correspondence, 1892 to 1895, inclusive, and one register of 1881.
3. Letter-books, 1873 to 1883, and six letter-books covering broken periods between 1887 and 1892.
4. All vouchers, financial statements, &c., 1879-80 to 1892-93, both inclusive.
5. Q. M. ledgers, returns, &c., all years prior to 1893-94.

Trade and Commerce.—The Commissioner states:

So far as this department is concerned, I am not aware that any documents were absolutely destroyed. Many that have been missing have turned up from time to time from other departments, and the probability is that there have been none of importance either lost or destroyed.

Militia and Defence.—That department reports that they did not lose anything by the fire, but that some of their books and vouchers were damaged by water. It is thought, however, that none of the damage will prove a serious loss.

MISS KELLY, WINDSOR POST OFFICE.

Mr. TAYLOR (for Mr. Hughes) asked:

Is Miss Kelly employed in the Windsor, Ontario, Post Office? Have her services been dispensed with? If they have, for what reason? Was there an investigation? What was the ground of complaint?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Miss Kelly was brought from West Huron and appointed temporary clerk in the Windsor Post Office after the by-election between Hon. J. C. Patterson and Mr. M. C. Cameron, but there was no public need of her services in the Windsor Post Office at any time, the strength of the staff of that office being much beyond the needs of the service, and the total amount of the salaries excessive. Accordingly, her services, being wholly unnecessary, will be dispensed with on the 1st of May next. This is the sole reason for her removal, and no person will be appointed to fill the position in question.

DISMISSAL OF JACQUES FOURNIER.

Mr. TAYLOR (for Mr. Morin) asked:

Will the hon. the Postmaster General say why he has dismissed Jacques Fournier, postmaster of Magenta, in the county of Rouville?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The answer to the question is "Yes."

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. Postmaster General has not answered the question.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Read it.

Mr. TAYLOR. The question is:

Will the hon. the Postmaster General say why he has dismissed Jacques Fournier, postmaster of Magenta, in the county of Rouville?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. That is very smart, that is.

PUBLIC WHARF, IONA, VICTORIA, B.C.

Mr. SPROULE (for Mr. Bethune) asked:

On whose authority, and by whom were the repairs made to the public wharf at Iona, Victoria county, in 1896, examined, and on whose report was the amount asked for for said repairs not paid? Who were consulted by those making the examination as to the extent of said repairs? Was the person authorized to repair the wharf consulted before reporting to the Government? Was the cost of obtaining a pile-driver, removing portions of the old wharf, debris, &c., taken into consideration?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). In answer to the first part of the question, I would say that on the authority of the department the repairs were examined by Mr. C. A. Hutchins, inspector of lighthouses and marine works for Nova Scotia, and on his report the sum of $148.72, which he considered a liberal estimate allowed, instead of $259.85 claimed. A report has also been received by the department from Mr. Daniel M. McDonald, wharf builder and contractor, of Baddeck, in which he estimates the value at $166.62. The department is not aware of any person being specially consulted as to the extent of repairs by those examining, nor did such consultation appear necessary as the work spoke for itself. The department is not aware that the person authorized to make the repairs was consulted before a report as to cost of repairs was made to the Government. The cost of obtaining a pile-driver and removal of portions of old wharf, &c., was taken into consideration.

REGISTRATION OF PINPLATS.

Mr. McMULLEN asked:

Whether the Government has received a copy of the following resolution, passed in Buffalo, at a meeting of the Board of Marine Inspectors, 12th March, 1897:—

"At a meeting held at Buffalo by the Lake Underwriters to take joint action with all the Canadian underwriters, insuring grain cargoes from the Upper Lakes to Montreal; to have all barges known as pinplats, as their construction and material and model do not qualify them to carry grain on the Upper St. Lawrence River, as the results have shown it has been disastrous to all insurance companies insuring cargoes on board them, therefore, as a special request to the managers of the Canadian Inland Lloyds, we wish to have pinplats which have been engaged in carrying grain from Kingston, Prescott and Ogdensburg on what is known as the Upper St. Lawrence River to Montreal, not to class as standard barges in the Canadian Hull Register."

Do the Government intend to take any action on said resolution?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The Department of Finance has received a copy of the resolution referred to, and the Department of Marine and Fisheries has an amount of correspondence in connection with the same matter. The whole subject is now receiving the very careful consideration of the Government.

REPORT OF HON. T. M. DALY.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

Has the report of the Hon. T. M. Daly on immigration from Europe been received by the Government? If so, will it be laid on the Table of this House?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The Government has received this report, and I beg now to lay it on the Table of the House.

THE QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE—COLONIAL TROOPS.

Mr. FLINT (for Mr. Domville) asked:

In view of the fact of the celebration of Her Majesty's Jubilee, on the 22nd June, and the invitation extended to the colonies to send troops to London to take part in the ceremonies, that other colonies have already sent forward corps, the Australian contingent of cavalry having embarked on the 17th ultimo;

That the active militia of Canada consider they should be represented, and that all arms of the service—cavalry, field artillery, and infantry should send a quota in the shape of a small column, to be composed of one squadron cavalry, one battery field artillery and one battalion infantry, with the necessary staff of Canadian officers;

That the move made to send a subscription regiment is viewed with disfavour by many commanding officers, inasmuch as it is not representative, and subversive to discipline and the best interests of the service;

That in order to make the best selection of men and horses no time is to be lost;

That Canadian cavalry would be the means of showing to the best advantage the horses of Canada, and opening up a market for cavalry chargers; and as the militia of Canada are anxiously awaiting the action of the Government, it is necessary to know at an early date:

1. What action the Government propose to take in the matter.
2. If active militia are to be sent over to London, what the force will be, and how selected.
3. And how soon will orders be issued.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). These matters are all at present earnestly engaging our consideration. I am not prepared to make a statement just now.

DISMISSALS—LACHINE CANAL EMPLOYEES.

Mr. TAYLOR (for Mr. Quinn) asked :

1. Is it true that John Tynan, an employee at Montreal on the Lachine Canal, has been dismissed?
2. On whose complaint was he dismissed?
3. For what reason was he dismissed?
4. How long had he been employed on the canal?
5. What was his salary?
6. Has his successor been named, and if so, what is his name?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1, 2, 3 and 6. No, it is not true that John Tynan has been dismissed, but as usual, at the close of navigation, the services of a portion of the staff are dispensed with, and a re-organization takes place at the opening of navigation. This re-organization is now under consideration, but is not complete. 4. He has been employed since the 1st of June, 1866. 5. His wages are $38 per month for season of navigation only.

Mr. TAYLOR (for Mr. Quinn) asked :

1. Is it true that a man named Shields, an employee at Montreal on the Lachine Canal, has been dismissed?
2. On whose complaint was he so dismissed?
3. For what reason was he so dismissed?
4. What was his salary?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. 1, 2 and 3. No, it is not true that James Shields has been dismissed, but as usual, upon the close of navigation, the services of a portion of the staff are dispensed with, and a re-organization takes place at the opening of navigation. This re-organization is now under consideration, but is not complete. 4. His wages are $38 per month for season of navigation only.

Mr. TAYLOR (for Mr. Quinn) asked :

1. Is it true that a man named Hickey, an employee at Montreal on the Lachine Canal, has been dismissed?
2. On whose complaint was he so dismissed?
3. For what reason was he so dismissed?
4. How long had he been employed on the canal previous to his dismissal?
5. What was his salary?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. 1, 2, 3 and 4. No, it is not true that James Hickey has been dismissed, but as usual upon the close of navigation, the services of a portion of the staff are dispensed with, and a re-organization takes place at the opening of navigation. This re-organization is now under consideration, but is not complete. 5. His wages are $38 per month for season of navigation only.

Mr. TAYLOR (for Mr. Quinn) asked :

1. Is it true that a man named Gallagher, an employee on the Lachine Canal at Montreal, has been dismissed?
2. On whose complaint has he been dismissed?
3. For what reason was he dismissed?
4. How long had he been employed on the canal previous to his dismissal?
5. What was his salary?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. 1, 2 and 3. No, it is not true that John Gallagher has been dismissed, but as usual upon the close of navigation, the services of a portion of the staff are dispensed with, and a re-organization takes place at the opening of navigation. This re-organization is now under consideration, but is not complete. 4. He has been employed since the 1st of May, 1892. 5. His salary is $38 per month for the season of navigation only.

Mr. TAYLOR (for Mr. Quinn) asked :

1. Is it true that a man named Hatch, an employee on the Lachine Canal at Montreal, has been dismissed?
2. On whose complaint was he dismissed?
3. For what reason was he dismissed?
4. How long had he been employed on the canal previous to his dismissal?
5. What was his salary?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. 1, 2 and 3. No, it is not true that Patrick Hatch has been dismissed, but as usual upon the close of navigation, the services of a portion of the staff are dispensed with, and a re-organization takes place at the opening of navigation. This re-organization is now under consideration, but is not complete. 4. He has been employed since May 1st, 1876. 5. His wages are $38 per month during season of navigation only.

Mr. TAYLOR (for Mr. Quinn) asked :

1. Is it true that a man named Gahan, an employee at Montreal on the Lachine Canal, has been dismissed?
2. On whose complaint was he so dismissed?
3. For what reason was he so dismissed?
4. How long had he been employed on the canal previous to dismissal?
5. What was his salary?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. 1, 2 and 3. No, it is not true that Mr. Gahan has been dismissed, but as usual upon the close of navigation, the services of a portion of the staff are dispensed with, and a re-organization takes place at the opening of navigation. This re-organization is now under consideration, but is not complete. 4. He has been employed since the 1st of August, 1887. 5. His wages

are $38 per month for season of navigation only.

Mr. TAYLOR (for Mr. Quinn) asked:

1. How many employees of the Government, on the Lachine Canal at Montreal, have been dismissed since 1st September, 1896?
2. What complaints, if any, were made against men so dismissed?
3. What investigations held in each case?
4. Were such men dismissed on recommendation of friends of the Government, and if so, who recommended such dismissals?
5. How long had such men been employed on the canal previous to their dismissals?
6. What were the respective salaries of the men dismissed?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. 1. The services of one employee of the Lachine Canal have been dispensed with since September 1st, 1896. 2. No complaint made. 3. No investigation held. 3. His services were dispensed with on recommendation of Mr. Madore, M.P. 5. He had been employed since 15th June, 1895. 6. He was paid $1.50 per day.

COLLECTOR DANIS, BEAUHARNOIS CANAL.

Mr. LaRIVIERE (for Mr. Bergeron) asked:

When was Mr. A. D. Danis appointed collector of tolls on the Beauharnois Canal? When was he appointed as paymaster of said canal? When did he cease to act as paymaster, and why? What is the yearly salary Mr. Danis received as collector of tolls? What fees as paymaster did he receive? Has he paid to the pension fund for eighteen years, and how much has he paid thus? Was he dismissed as collector of tolls, and when, and why? Upon whose complaint was he dismissed? Did he ask for an investigation, and was it promised to him? Why was not the investigation, as asked and promised, granted?

Was Mr. J. Bte. Laplante, advocate, of Valleyfield, appointed in the place of Mr. Danis as collector? Why was the nomination rescinded? How many solicitors are asking for Mr. Danis' position?

Has the position been offered to Mr. S. A. Brodeur, N.P., of Vaudreuil, on his promising to edit the Liberal paper of the place, "Le Progrès de Valleyfield"?

Is it true that Mr. Brodeur is ready to accept the conditions above referred to, if he gets the other position held by Mr. Danis?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Mr. A. D. Danis was appointed collector of tolls on the Beauharnois Canal, October 1st, 1879. He was appointed paymaster of the Beauharnois Canal October 9th, 1879. He ceased acting as paymaster on the 30th June, 1886, in order to bring all the Quebec canals under one paymaster and that the office of collector and paymaster should be separate and distinct. The yearly salary Mr. Danis received as collector of tolls was $850, and he received as paymaster $50 per annum. He contributed to the superannuation fund from his appointment as collector from October 1st, 1879, to January 31st, 1897, and paid into the fund $311.16. His services were dispensed with as collector, January 25th, 1897, for taking an active and offensive part in the elections in June last, on the representation made on the personal knowledge of the Hon. Israel Tarte. He asked for an investigation, but none was promised him because it was not considered necessary. Mr. J. B. Laplante was not appointed in the place of Mr. Danis, nor was the position, so far as the department knows, offered to Mr. S. A. Brodeur upon his promising to undertake anything. The department is not aware whether Mr. Brodeur is ready to accept the position, nor does the department know that there were any other persons desiring the position that Mr. Danis had held.

Mr. LaRIVIERE (for Mr. Bergeron) asked:

Who is the collector of customs at Valleyfield? When was he appointed, and at what salary? What is the amount of money collected at the Valleyfield port since Mr. Danis' appointment? Is Mr. Danis the excise officer at Valleyfield? When appointed? What fees? How much money collected since appointment? Is Mr. Danis the present collector of customs and excise officer at Valleyfield the same Mr. Danis who was dismissed, after eighteen years of faithful service and contribution to the pension fund as collector of tolls, on the 25th January, 1897, and who is not yet replaced as such?

Is it the intention of the Government to increase the salary of Mr. Danis as collector of customs at Valleyfield?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). There are some statements of fact in the question, and I would ask the hon. member to leave it on the Table until he has changed it and put it in order.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. What change?

Mr. SPEAKER. I suppose the hon. member refers to a statement of fact in the latter part of the question, alleging that Mr. Danis had been for eighteen years performing faithful services and contributing to the pension fund. The hon. gentleman might ask whether that was a fact; but he sees the difficulty in answering such a statement of fact. I think the question had better be recast.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I will let the question stand until the hon. gentleman who put it on the Order paper is here.

Mr. FOSTER. Just drop those three words.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the Minister is ready to answer the question with those words dropped out, it can be gone on with; otherwise it had better be put into proper shape.

DISMISSAL OF MR. MARTIN, POSTMASTER OF BELFAST.

Mr. MARTIN asked:

What is the date of the dismissal of Martin Martin as postmaster at Belfast, in Prince Ed-

ward Island? What was the nature of the charges preferred against him, if any? Has he been furnished with a copy of those charges? Has he been given an opportunity to defend himself against those charges? Has his case been examined by Mr. Palmer, the investigating commissioner? If not, why not?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). At the request of a number of the residents, the post office which had formerly been conducted in Mr. Martin's house, was removed to what was indicated to be a more convenient site, which occasioned a change of postmasters.

DISMISSAL OF DR. GEO. MITCHELL.

Mr. CLANCY asked:

1. Was Dr. George Mitchell dismissed from the position of physician to the Indians of Walpole Island, on charges of political partisanship?
2. If so, by whom were such charges made?
3. Was the said Dr. George Mitchell given an opportunity to answer such charges?
4. If not, why not?
5. Have the Government any rule to guide them in dismissing officials on charges of political partisanship with and without investigation into such charges?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). 1. He was dismissed for political partisanship. 2. No formal charges of political partisanship were made against Dr. George Mitchell, but evidence was afforded the department that Dr. Mitchell was vice-president of the Liberal-Conservative Association, and as such took an active part in political affairs. 3 and 4. The facts were so notorious that it was not considered necessary to call upon Dr. Mitchell for a defence. 5. Where the partisanship is notorious and undeniable it is not deemed necessary to waste time and public money in holding investigations.

TUG "SILVER SPRAY" AND SCHOONER "MARY GROVER."

Mr. WOOD (Brockville) asked:

1. Were the tug "Silver Spray" and the schooner "Mary Grover," or either of them, seized for infraction of the revenue laws of the Dominion during the year 1883 or 1884, or either of said years?
2. If said vessels or either of them were so seized, what was the nature of the offence for which they, or either of them was so seized?
3. What was the name of the officer who seized said vessels or either of them?
4. Were said vessels or either of them released? If so, upon what terms?
5. Was an investigation subsequently held? If so, what was the name of the officer who conducted said investigation? Where was it held? What was the names of the witnesses examined at said investigation? Was their evidence reduced to writing and returned to the department, and is the same now on the files of the department?
6. Was final disposition made of the matter?
7. What was the name of the owner or owners of said vessels?
8. By whom were the sworn entries made at Port Arthur or Michipicoten (or wherever the same were made) of the cargoes of said vessels?
9. Were the original entries and the invoices accompanying same returned to the Department of Customs, and are the same now on file in said department?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The department have been making all diligence to secure the information for the hon. gentleman, but he will understand that it is an old matter, and requires a good deal of search. If he will be kind enough to let it stand until the next occasion for putting the question, I will be ready to answer him.

FAST ATLANTIC STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before taking up the notices of motion, I should like to draw the attention of the House to a very important matter, and in order to put myself right, I will conclude with a motion. The matter to which I wish to draw attention is the condition of the proposed fast Atlantic service. The Minister of Trade and Commerce stated to this House a day or two ago that a contract had been made, I think the hon. gentleman said, with Messrs. Peterson, Tate & Company for the performance of that service. I think, Mr. Speaker, we have again reason to complain that this House and the people of this country should be obliged to obtain information with respect to matters of great and pressing importance from parties outside of this House, and in this as well as in other cases, from the other side of the Atlantic. The Parliament of the United Kingdom it appears is first to be informed of contracts made by this Government in relation to matters affecting this country. I do not raise this question at all in any factious spirit or with a view of calling the attention specially of the House to the discourtesy, I may almost call it, with which the Government treats the House as regards these questions. The late Minister of Agriculture asked the hon. Finance Minister the other day if an Order in Council had been passed granting a large sum of public money to the Grand Trunk Railway Company in connection with services to be rendered at Montreal. The Finance Minister promptly informed my hon. friend that he could not tell him whether that was the case or not. But I find on looking at the London "Times" of April 1st a communication from the correspondent of that paper stating that an Order in Council had been passed granting a large sum of public money to that company. I think it is of very great importance that the Government should take the House into their confidence in relation to matters that are of great public interest, and the people of the country should not be compelled to learn what has been done in relation to important pub-

lic matters either from the London "Times" or from announcements made in the Imperial Parliament. I may say that this question of a fast Atlantic service, as the hon. First Minister knows, has never been treated as a party question in this House. My hon. friend knows that the late Government after great deliberation arrived at the conclusion that it was of great importance to this country that we should obtain or realize the advantages that our geographical position presents for the purpose of a fast mail, passenger and freight communication of certain classes between Great Britain and Canada. The Government having arrived at the conclusion that great and important interests were to be subserved by the establishment of a fast service between Great Britain and Canada, which would have the effect of bringing a vast tide of travel of a very important character to Canada which otherwise we would not receive, that it would have the effect of carrying to a large extent the mails between Europe and America through Canada and across it, that it would have the effect of establishing a fast line of steam communication which, provided with ample cold storage, would give to our farmers enormous advantages in placing in prime condition within a few days agricultural products, especially perishable products, such as poultry, butter, eggs, meat, fruit and other articles, in the markets of Great Britain in the best condition—the Government having arrived after careful consideration at the determination that it was of great importance to this country to establish that line of fast communication, asked Parliament to vote £100,000 a year for ten years for the purpose of securing that object. Negotiations were undertaken with parties in Great Britain, and I was instructed, as High Commissioner for Canada, to give to persons interested in this matter all the support that possibly could be given in order to promote and secure a satisfactory settlement of this great question. I received an intimation from His Grace the Duke of Devonshire, who was president of the Naval Construction Armament Company—at that time negotiations were being carried on with the Government of Canada by the representative of that company, who came to Canada for the purpose, and I believe a provisional contract was entered into—that it was not possible to raise the capital required for that service unless the subsidy was increased from £100,000 to £150,000. I cabled at once to the late lamented Sir John Macdonald to say that the appropriation of £100,000 was found insufficient, and I stated the source from which I had received an intimation that the capital could not be raised unless £150,000 were provided. I was instructed in reply to say that if the service such as Canada demanded and required was accomplished, Parliament would be applied to and asked to extend the grant from £100,000 to £150,000 per annum for ten years. The gentleman who was engaged in carrying on the negotiations, whose name at present escapes me, the manager of the Naval Construction Armament Company, was taken suddenly ill and died; and those efforts that were then being made were interrupted. Subsequently, as the House is aware, the Government made a provisional contract with Mr. Huddart, under which they engaged to give that gentleman £150,000 a year for ten years for the purpose of securing this fast Atlantic service. Mr. Huddart was a gentleman of great energy and enterprise, connected with Australia and London, and who was greatly interested in carrying this measure to completion, because being one of the principal proprietors of the service between Vancouver and Australia, which would be immensely benefited by the fast Atlantic service, no effort was spared by him in bringing to bear all the influence he could exercise on the London market, connected as he was with great shipping firms and steamship lines that were likely to be interested in the project, every possible effort was made, but made in vain, by Mr. Huddart to successfully accomplish the work he had undertaken. Under these circumstances I was instructed to approach Her Majesty's Government to endeavour to obtain additional assistance, and the time which the Government of Canada allowed Mr. Huddart to arrange his organization was extended, in order that he might ascertain if we were to get assistance from the Imperial Government. In company with all the representatives of Australasia, I went to the Colonial Office and impressed upon the Colonial Minister, then the Marquis of Ripon, the great importance that Canada and Australasia attached to this fast service, which we believed to be of Imperial concern as well, in the light of drawing Canada and the mother country much more closely together. I need not stop to remind the House that, at present, we are not only unable to bring that great tide of travel and mail communication between Europe and this country through Canada; but I presume that a very large proportion of Canadians who visit Europe go by way of New York, in consequence of the greater facilities and the greater saving of time they accomplish by so doing. This matter was pressed upon the Liberal Government in England when they were in power, and I am bound to say that it was received with hearty approval by the Marquis of Ripon, and by the members of the Administration generally, so far as I was able to ascertain. The Liberal party in England had not then the support of a very large majority in the House of Commons, and they did not make that rapid progress with the measure that we thought desirable. They did, however, appoint a very influential departmental committee, representing the Treasury, the

Post Office, the Admiralty and the Colonial Office, for the purpose of investigating this question thoroughly and reporting upon it for the consideration of the Government. The general election ensued and, as this House knows, the Conservative party in England were brought into power with a very large majority. I at once renewed my efforts with the new Government, and I addressed to the Colonial Minister, the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain, a letter pointing out the great importance that Canada attached to this project. I also drew his attention to the fact that it was a measure that had obtained the support of both political parties in Canada. I referred to the fact that, at the conference which took place in Ottawa at which the Australasian and South African colonies were represented in conjunction with the Imperial and Canadian Governments, a unanimous resolution was passed expressing approval of this fast Atlantic service. Mr. Chamberlain promised to give the subject his careful consideration, and, having had an opportunity of discussing the matter on more than one occasion with that right hon. gentleman, he arrived at the conclusion that the measure was entitled to the support of Her Majesty's Government, and said that he was prepared to ask the Imperial Parliament for such support as might be considered appropriate. What was asked for from Mr. Chamberlain was, that the £150,000 voted by the Government of Canada should be supplemented by Her Majesty's Government by an additional amount of £75,000. Mr. Chamberlain practically adopted this proportion, but he said that inasmuch as it had not been ascertained whether the service could be obtained for a lower amount than these two sums added together, it would be absolutely necessary that tenders should be asked for. It was pointed out to Mr. Chamberlain that Mr. Huddart had devoted a great deal of time and attention to this matter under an arrangement with the Canadian Government, but Mr. Chamberlain took the ground that it would be impossible for him to ask Parliament for a large sum of money unless new tenders were called for. That policy was, of course, adopted.

After the resolution was passed by the conference at Ottawa, my hon. friend the First Minister will remember that a motion was offered in this House asking for a grant of £150,000 a year for ten years for this service. I was able to say to the authorities in England that that motion had been passed by this House without division. I may incidentally call the attention of the House to the fact that from the inception of this important scheme it had not been treated as a party measure, but had received the support of gentlemen on both sides of the House, and ultimately was adopted with practical unanimity. I need not remind the House that at a time when the Opposition decided to take such a course as to render the Conservative Government then in power practically powerless to carry any measure; owing to the good offices of the present First Minister who was then leader of the Opposition, we were enabled to pass a Bill through the House amending the law which, up to that time, made it a condition that this fast service should connect with France as well as with Great Britain. Finding that such a thing was impracticable by the same line of steamers, the First Minister was good enough to aid the late Government in passing a Bill to change that, but making it a condition, and a very proper condition, that any contract entered into for this service should be subject to the approval of this House. That amendment was passed for the purpose of avoiding loss of time, and in order that we might ask for tenders, and the House whatever its complexion and whoever might be in power, would thus have reserved to it the right of approving of any contract made. Under that authority obtained by the support of both sides of this House, the Government invited tenders, and as hon. gentlemen opposite know, the result was that no tender was received for a less sum than the £225,000 sterling.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). You might possibly say that no tender at all was obtained.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend will, I think, have to qualify that a little. I do not think it presents quite an accurate view of the case.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We differ in the interpretation of what constitutes a tender.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Technically my hon. friend is right. Any variation in a tender from the terms in which the tender is invited of course technically prevents that from being absolutely a tender. But, as the hon. gentleman knows, what took place was this. Certain questions were raised which became a subject of discussion between the Government here and the Colonial Office through the agency of the present High Commissioner. There were two tenders—one from Mr. Huddart and one from the Messrs. Allan. The Messrs. Allan's tender was a little lower, because it gave the amount in pounds sterling, whereas the other gave the amount in dollars. Much as the Government regretted that Mr. Huddart, with whom they had entered into a provisional arrangement, and who had spent a great deal of time and money in prosecuting the undertaking, was not in a position to undertake the work when placed in competition with the Messrs. Allan, they felt bound to give the precedence to the tender of the Messrs. Allan, because it was a little lower than that of Mr. Huddart, and because of the much more substantial and important

reason, that we knew that the Messrs. Allan, in connection with the Glasgow firm who joined in making the tenders, presented an amount of capital and resources that would enable them at once to carry the work to vigorous completion. Under these circumstances, negotiations were entered into with the Messrs. Allan and the Colonial Office, and we arrived at a point which enabled us to agree upon a provisional contract; and all that was necessary, so far as the Government of Canada was concerned, was the signature of His Excellency the Governor General. Hon. gentlemen opposite know that an Order in Council was prepared authorizing the Government to make this provisional contract with the Messrs. Allan, subject to the approval of the House when it should meet, and so much importance did I attach to this work being carried rapidly and promptly to completion, that I took the liberty, when leaving office, of writing a letter to the hon. gentleman who succeeded me, suggesting that if the assent of the Governor General to this provisional contract were obtained, a year would probably be saved. It requires something like two years to construct, with due regard to economy, ships suitable for so great and important a service; and as soon as the assent of His Excellency was obtained to the proposal, it could be submitted for the approval of Her Majesty's Government. I had no doubt as to what the result of that application would be, because the matter had practically been settled between the Colonial Minister and myself, and the inviting of the new tenders had disposed of the only difficulty that stood in the way of the Colonial Minister applying to Parliament for the aid we required. I am sorry to say that this matter was not promptly carried out. Every person knows that the Messrs. Allan were the pioneers of the Atlantic service between Great Britain and this country; and, in addition to the fast ships, capable of maintaining an average speed of 20 knots at sea, which would require to be built under admiralty supervision, they had a great freight service at their disposal, with which they could implement the fast service in such a way as to make it most advantageous to Canada. The hope I entertained that this matter would be carried to a successful completion did not apparently meet with the concurrence of hon. gentlemen opposite. I cannot forget that when I made a statement on this subject to the House last session, my hon. friend the First Minister followed me with a hearty endorsement of the proposal. He stated that he had arrived at the same conclusion, that it was absolutely necessary that Canada should possess a fast Atlantic service, and his only doubt or hesitation in connection with the matter was as to the desirability of endeavouring to ascertain whether it would be practicable to obtain greater freight facilities in connection with that service. We cannot forget that in taking that position the hon. gentleman met with unexpected opposition on the part of some of his supporters, although I am inclined to believe that the great body of the gentlemen on that side of the House will be prepared to give a hearty and enthusiastic support to this measure—a measure which I say has been dealt with, not from a party standpoint, but which has commended itself to the approval and support of gentlemen on both sides of this House. I have heard it insinuated in various quarters that it would be impossible for us, even with a 20-knot service from Quebec in summer and Halifax in winter, to expect to draw a large amount of travel from the western states as well as from the various portions of Canada. I made some inquiry on that subject, and I found, on reference to the books of the Messrs Allan, containing an account of their passenger service, that at a time when their service from Canada could compete with that from New York, they booked passengers from the United States to the extent of $27,000 per month. I mention this in passing in order to show the House how important it would be for this country to enjoy the advantage of having the great tide of travel of that description brought to this country, one of the advantages of which would be that capitalists who would thus travel through Canada would naturally have their attention drawn to the great field for the investment of capital which this country presents.

I am only too glad to learn from any source that the Government are disposed to press this matter to a conclusion, but I confess that I am greatly disappointed when I find that the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) is entrusted with the negotiations in this matter. I am surprised and disappointed that these negotiations should have been entrusted to a gentleman who, in addressing the Board of Trade in Quebec, and afterwards from his seat in this House, used strong arguments in opposition to the establishment of a fast Atlantic service, and whose arguments were therefore calculated, so far as the hon. gentleman's statements could have any effect, to discredit this service, not only in the estimation of this House, but of the Imperial Government or of any person who might attach importance to them. I do not question at all the good faith of the hon. gentleman nor do I propose to discuss his statements here, but it seems to me that if the Government were anxious to secure this great boon they would have done better to entrust the negotiations to some person who really heartily believed in the importance and value of the scheme. I think they would have done better to have placed the negotiations with the Imperial Government—with whom, I have no hesitation in saying, the whole question as to amount

and everything else was practically settled —in the hands of some one more in sympathy with the project.

Curiously enough it seems that a new proposal has been made, which has been given in the "Globe" newspaper in minute detail. By this scheme, it is proposed to change the points of communications and select Milford Haven in Great Britain—which is a local question to be settled between the Government of Canada and Her Majesty's Government and the directors whoever they might be—and a port near the Strait of Canso. The "Globe," in publishing this proposal, said :

If the British syndicate which has been organized to carry out these proposals is a substantial one, and it is understood that it has all the money required, then the Government will probably make an examination of the proposal and the feasibility of this scheme.

The hon. First Minister disposed of this when he said that, under the Act which the House had passed in relation to this matter, it would not be practicable to take up this route, but I find that another paper, generally well informed as to the views of the Government—the Montreal "Daily Witness,"—in its issue of 13th of April, has an article on the question which ends with the following statement :—

The proposals submitted by the Milford syndicate are under the consideration of the Government.

The hon. First Minister shakes his head, and I accept at once the statement which he made before that the Government could not, under present legislation, consider this new scheme at all. I do not mean to say that there may not be something in the proposal, and what I fear is anything being brought up that may be calculated to delay what I regard as a very important measure and to prevent its being properly concluded. I draw the attention of the hon. First Minister to the condition under which, according to the "Globe," this syndicate line would be warranted in obtaining the consideration of the Government for its proposal, and that condition is that it should be shown to be a syndicate sufficiently powerful and possessing sufficient money resources to enable it to carry to completion any project it undertook. I should be very much surprised to learn that the hon. Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Chamberlain), having made it a sine qua non to the Imperial Government contributing for this service, that new tenders should be asked for, to learn that he is prepared to ask the Imperial Parliament to ratify a contract with any persons upon terms which he absolutely refused to consider or entertain on a former occasion, after the service has been tendered for by the Messrs. Allan, with whom satisfactory negotiations had taken place by the late Government who asked the authority of the Governor General to sign the contract subject to the approval of this House.

Apart from that, unless this matter is to be treated from the standpoint of how not to do it, it is of the greatest importance that the gentlemen who undertake this contract should be persons possessing resources and standing and position sufficient to enable them to carry it to a successful conclusion. The hon. gentlemen opposite will agree in that opinion, and I am sure, alive as they must be, to the vital importance of any company undertaking so great a service being competent in every respect to satisfactorily carry out, their attention must have been drawn to the very clear and strong article over the signature of "Bona Fides" in the Montreal "Star" of April 3rd, in which elaborate proof is given, assuming it to be authentic, that Messrs. Peterson & Tate are parties utterly unable to carry out any service of the kind. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but the very fact that one of the leading papers in the country has given place in its columns to a laboured and clear statement of the financial position which these gentlemen occupy in England, supported by quotations from the best authority, is deserving the attention of the Government before committing this House to placing this important service in the hands of parties who might be found to be utterly inadequate to carry it to completion. I received by the last mail from England, I do not know from whose hand, a periodical called "The Syren." It appears to be a periodical of very good standing. It has an article on page 83 of the issue of March 31st, 1897, as follows :—

Poor Canada ! A "Times" telegram from Ottawa says : "In official circles here, it is stated that Messrs. Peterson & Co., steamship owners, Newcastle-on-Tyne, have entered into a provisional contract with the Dominion Government for a fast steamship service between Canada and England. The firm have undertaken to perform a 20-knot service for a subsidy much less than that for which the late Government were prepared to close with Messrs. Allan last year." We comment upon this subject at length in another column.

And in another column they point out the fact that Messrs. Peterson & Tate are not in a position to build the class of ships that are required, and that they would have to obtain a large amount of new plant and incur a very great outlay in order to turn out ships that would perform this service at all. This shows that this firm have not the exceptional facilities possessed by the Naval Armament Company and the White Star builders, the name of whose company I have forgotten for the moment, that turn out such ships as the "Teutonic" and the "Majestic" and that would be in a position to do the work infinitely more cheaply than a ship-building company that have never constructed such vessels. I do

not know whether the Government will take us into their confidence sufficiently to tell us the terms of this contract which they admit that they have signed. Down to the present hour, in connection with this fast Atlantic service, everything that the Government has done has been proclaimed in and out of Parliament. This is a subject in which the whole country was so deeply interested that we felt we should fail in our duty to Parliament and to the country if we did not give the fullest publicity to every step in relation to it. I think, therefore, that this House has a right to expect that, as the Government have admitted that they have made a contract, they will lay a copy of that contract on the Table of the House, that we may be able to judge of it, and know our position in relation to a question of such vital importance to the country. I have no hesitation in saying that, anxious as I was to see Mr. Huddart obtain the reward of his energy and enterprise and of his large expenditure in prosecuting this work, yet, when, as High Commissioner, I was called upon to come over and confer on this subject with Sir Mackenzie Bowell and his Government, I said to Mr. Huddart frankly: The Colonial Minister makes it a sine qua non that there shall be new tenders, and I am bound to say to you in the spirit of friendship that the Government of Canada will not entertain any tender unless it is backed by such an amount of capital as to show that the parties are absolutely prepared, not to take the contract and endeavour to raise the capital upon it, but to carry it on to completion. So, Sir, I feel that nothing could more completely damn this enterprise than to enter into a contract with parties which have not all the resources to enable them to carry it to completion. But the fact that Mr. Huddart, with a contract from this Government for £150,000 a year could do nothing in the money market of the world to obtain the necessary capital, but that, after the most complete investigation, it was found absolutely necessary for the Imperial Government to supplement that with £75.000 a year, is the best proof that to undertake this service for a sum materially less than £225,000 a year must involve placing it in the hands of people who will not be able to carry it to a successful completion. Deploring, as I do, any delay—because it will take two years after the contract is made to construct the steamers—I felt it my duty to call the attention of hon. gentlemen to what I regard as the great importance of this question and to give a brief and general résumé of the facts already before the House, that they may take such steps as will secure not a contract but the early and successful carrying out of the work by parties who possess the necessary resources, knowledge and enterprise. I regret taking up the time of the House but I felt it my duty to draw the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to this point. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). For all practical purposes, I suppose, the House might as well adjourn, because the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) has pretty well destroyed the chance of doing anything to-day.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And this matter is of no value or consequence, I suppose.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I will not say that, but the method the hon. gentleman has taken to bring up this question renders his remarks of much less consequence than they otherwise would be. Now, the hon. gentleman was good enough to accuse the Government of discourtesy, saying that they did not deal fairly with the House in not bringing down all the steps of an uncompleted negotiation. I think that most of my parliamentary friends will agree with me that for an hon. gentleman of his experience to bring this question up on a motion for adjournment, without giving the slightest notice to the Government of his intention to do so, was a most excellent mode of wasting the time of the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I thought the question asked was sufficient notice that the matter was to be taken up.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This is the first time I have ever heard this doctrine of implication advanced by a gentleman in the position of the leader of the Opposition. The hon. gentleman knows that the custom has been, when gentlemen availed themselves of this special mode of calling attention to a question, to give the Government notice of it, if they want a detailed reply. I think a good deal of the pith of the hon. gentleman's remarks was contained in a sentence which dropped from him, perhaps, unawares, a few minutes ago, in which he protested against the people of Canada being allowed to get this contract for anything less than the million and a quarter, or so, which he was prepared to pay for it. If I am to judge by the hon. gentleman's expression, he would regard it as a high crime and misdemeanour for the present Liberal Government to succeed in getting done for two-thirds of the sum what he was prepared to pay for, on an extremely doubtful class of tenders, at a rate of $750,000 a year. I took occasion when this matter was up before the House, without desiring to reflect upon either the Messrs. Huddart or the Messrs. Allan, to intimate to the hon. gentleman what I now repeat—that I, for one, do not consider the tenders given by Mr. Huddart or by the Messrs. Allan as tenders in any proper sense at all. And for two reasons: Both one and the other of these firms, as the hon. leader of the Oppo-

sition well knows, chose to annex to its tender certain conditions. In one case they were to have four months, and in the other six months, at the end of which time either one or the other of them might say to the people of Canada: We do not choose to go on; we do not find it convenient to go on. He recollects those terms occurring in their proposition. But in the case of the Messrs. Allan, he knows very well there were a number of other statements made which would have had the effect of putting it very completely at their option and not at ours, as to whether we got a 20-knot service, or a 19-knot service, or an 18-knot service, or a 17-knot service, or a 15-knot service, for the matter of that. Then changes were imported, and a lot of qualifications and a lot of conditions were inserted which, in my humble opinion, rendered their tender a wholly one-sided affair, so far as they are concerned, at any rate. Sir, the hon. gentleman and his friends are in a most desperate hurry now. I recollect some seven, or it may be eight, years elapsed since the date when the hon. ex-Finance Minister declared that his Government were a 20-knot Government, and therefore required a 20-knot service, before they ever called for tenders; and I recollect more, that when they did call for tenders they gave just five weeks' notice to enable all the world to compete. I think the tender under which the hon. gentleman proposed to give away, for ten years, $750,000 a year, was issued somewhere about the first week of May, and the tenders were to be accepted somewhere in the second week of June. Now, I must say to him that I think that tenders under those conditions were very little calculated to bring out anything like the number of tenderers that might have been expected for a service of this kind.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend will allow me to say that that was represented as absolutely necessary, if the service was to be ready to commence two years from May.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Then all I can say is that the Government had come to that knowledge very late in the day. Now, the hon. gentleman knows perfectly well, everybody knows well, that if tenders for a service of that kind are to be of the slightest value, they must be for a sufficient length of time to enable plans to be prepared, to enable careful calculations to be made, to enable financial arrangements to be made; in other words, that a very much longer time than five or six weeks would have been necessary to enable persons without very special knowledge in that very difficult question, to come in at all; so that I regard tenders given under those conditions, and for that length of time, as not at all likely to afford to the people of Canada any sufficient or adequate protection or assurance that they would get a fair tender for the service. Now, what is the actual fact of the case? The actual fact of the case is this—and as regards the question of discourtesy, it is important—that, as the hon. gentleman perfectly well knows, this is a matter in which the British Government have a great deal to say as well as ours. As this contract, before anything can be done with it, must be submitted to this House for its approval, we certainly exercise no discourtesy towards this House in waiting until we know what the English Government are going to do before we proceed to lay on the Table the full details of a negotiation of this kind. I am quite certain the hon. gentleman, in our place, would have waited until he knew exactly what the English Government were going to do. What we did do was this: we found that a very advantageous proposition indeed for the people of Canada, at any rate, was being submitted, a proposition which, if it were carried out correctly, would have given us a better service, and would have given us better boats, would have given us far more accommodation, and would have got it for two-thirds of the money. Was it our duty or was it not, to confer with the English Government, the other parties to the matter, and ascertain whether they were willing to unite with us under those circumstances? Now, Sir, it is perfectly clear that Mr. Chamberlain and the British Government had the right, and always had the right, under such circumstances, to require new tenders; and I submit that it was a totally proper thing, under the circumstances which subsisted a matter of a year ago, for Mr. Chamberlain to say: Rather than commit my Government to the expenditure of $375,000 a year, and your Government to the expenditure of $750,000 for a term of ten years, I will ask for tenders. Then it would be for Mr. Chamberlain or any one else to say: After our tenders only succeeded in eliciting a proposal to do this service for something like $1,125,000 a year, after we find that that was the best we could do, when a vastly better offer was made, we must still continue tendering. Now, what is the object of tendering at all? The object of tendering is to get these things at a fair and reasonable price, and if you once get a tender, you may do just as in the case of an ordinary transaction, when you have put property up at auction; if you cannot obtain a certain sum for your own reserve bid, everybody knows it is a constant thing to accept a fair offer, when a fair offer is made; and that will be precisely our position. As to the position of Messrs. Peterson & Tate, they did not propose to construct these ships in their own yards at all, they knew perfectly well that they were not in a position to do it. So far as the information given us shows, they were persons who were to be relied upon, who were willing to make a reasonable de-

posit, and of whose solvency we had received assurances from parties of high standing; and they have made provision with proper ship-building companies, and they have made provision with parties of high financial standing to enable them to carry out this undertaking, always provided that we and the British Government consent to the moderate terms which they propose. That and nothing else is the position of the matter as it now stands. Of course, the hon. gentleman does not expect, has no business to expect, that I should proceed to follow him over the elaborate history which he gave us with respect to these same contracts. I dare say the hon. gentleman may have done his best, sincerely and honestly, to obtain this service for the people of Canada at a reasonable sum, although I do not altogether approve of all the steps he took with respect to it. But I do submit to him, and I submit to the House, that it is not at all the best way, if he is desirous, as he tells us he is, of promoting this service, to interpose a discussion at this stage without asking for papers, and before any papers can be brought down to him, and when he knows that Mr. Chamberlain has stated that the British Government has this thing under consideration. Does he suppose it will help to obtain this contract at a reasonable figure, that it should be telegraphed across that he objects to all these proceedings? Does he suppose it is going to help Mr. Chamberlain in his negotiations for him virtually to declare that he does not believe that the thing can be done for less than £250,000, because he was not able to obtain a better offer than that? Unless that is his view, I cannot conceive for what purpose he should have got up this discussion at the present moment, and without any notice. Now, it is quite true that numerous suggestions have been made to us at various times as to other routes, such as he referred to; but he knows very well the understanding with the House, which we did not feel justified in departing from, the understanding which his Government had and which is virtually the understanding on both sides, was that this service was to be from Quebec in summer, and from Halifax in winter. These other matters he has alluded to, we cannot consider, I do not think we ought to consider, at all until the question of the Quebec and Halifax service has been definitely disposed of. We will probably be in a position very shortly to intimate to the House what decision the Imperial authorities have arrived at. But I submit to him, and I submit to the House, that no possible good can arise from our discussing a matter which is actually being negotiated with the Imperial authorities—unless, as I said, the hon. gentleman, finding that we have obtained a considerably better offer than was made to him, wishes in advance to discredit all chance of our obtaining a large saving, to make a saving which, over the term of ten years that these contracts are proposed to extend, would amount to something like two or three millions to the people of Canada. That would be the result, and that is the only result that he can obtain from interposing in these negotiations at the present time. Had he given me notice of that, I should have been prepared with certain papers and documents to reply to him; and if he chooses to move for these papers, this matter can be brought up in a legitimate way and with some reasonable advantage, possibly, to the public service, at a later date; but at the present time, I must tell him that in my mind and judgment he is doing no service to the country at all by springing such a discussion on the House.

Mr. HAGGART. The House will notice that the hon. the Minister has not replied in any way whatever to the first complaint made by the leader of the Opposition. My hon. friend stated that as regards nearly every matter of importance, instead of the act of the Government being first communicated to Parliament, the information came indirectly through other channels, through an unimportant paper in Chicago, like the Chicago "Record," or by statements made by the President of the Grand Trunk Railway Company in England, or by correspondence in a London paper setting out that an Order in Council had been passed respecting a fast Atlantic service, or by a communication made to the British House of Commons by the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain, stating that a contract had been entered into by the Canadian Government, which was then under the consideration of the Imperial Government. The only reply made by the hon. the Minister is that when we were in power and occupied the Treasury benches the Government entered into a contract for this service without giving sufficient notification to tenderers, that only five weeks were given, during which time it was impossible to go into the necessary details and prepare tenders which would be of such a character as would bear inquiry. What are the facts in regard to this matter? No application was made by hon. gentlemen opposite for tenders; no statement was made by the Government that they had changed their minds as to the manner in which those vessels should be built. What was required was very simple information, upon which any shipbuilder could at once submit a tender, namely: the number of tons per vessel, the number of knots of speed, and the carrying capacity as regards passengers and cold storage. Five weeks was ample time to give tenderers. Why did not hon. gentlemen opposite give the same length of time to intending competitors? No, they entered into a contract forthwith. We do not know the class of vessels arranged for, or the tonnage. A representative of a company came over here from the old country and returned

with a contract, and at the same time stated that if the Canadian Government, which was primarily interested, was satisfied to grant a large sum of money for the proposed service, why should not the Imperial Government supplement that grant with a subsidy? What the people of this country required was a service equal to the best that crosses the Atlantic. It was for such a service that they were prepared to pay $750,000 a year for ten years, and which led them to induce the Imperial Government to supplement that sum by a further grant of $375,000 a year for a like period. What do we know about the proposed service, or even about the parties? Whoever heard of Peterson, Tate & Co., before they entered into this contract? Whoever heard about the system of turret ships, which it is said is being foisted on this Government? The people of the country have had no time to consider this subject; the contract was entered into without tenders being asked and without Parliament being notified. These facts form the basis of our complaint. The justification put forward by hon. gentlemen opposite is that the contract will not amount to anything unless it is supplemented by the action and approval of the Imperial Parliament. How do we know what the form of contract will be, or what means are being urged on the Imperial authorities to lead them to modify their views as to the class of vessels required. Have we had any intimation from the Imperial authorities, or has there been any change in their opinions, since the time when they were unwilling to ratify our contract without calling for further tenders. No such information has been laid before the House, or at all events hon. gentlemen opposite do not deign to give hon. members information. If there has been a change in the opinion as to the requirements of the Imperial authorities regarding the proposed fast line, the announcement should be made to this House, and the people of the country should be given a chance to consider it. Tenders should have been openly asked for and inquired into and publicly accepted, and this course of entering into contracts secretly with persons unknown should not have been adopted, and five weeks' notice should have been given to intending contractors. These are the complaints put before by the leader of the Opposition, that instead of this House being informed by the Government as to what contracts have been entered into, some weeks elapse before the Government deign to give information to the House; further, we find that the parties with whom this contract has been entered into are unknown, that the character of the service and tonnage of the vessels is not known; and our contention is that the House should be taken into the confidence of the Government as to whether the class, speed and equipment of the vessels will be such as will prove satisfactory to the country.

Mr. HAGGART.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). If any proof were required of the inutility of a debate taking place at present on the fast line service, that proof has been afforded by the speech of the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat. The hon. member is in utter ignorance of the facts connected with the letting of this contract, which he himself holds must be in the possession of hon. members before they can discuss it in a satisfactory manner. I only rise for the purpose of recalling the hon. gentleman's attention to what was stated by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and to which he apparently did not listen. The contract which the Government has signed is a provisional contract essentially. The contract which the Government has signed is one that must be submitted to and approved of in all its details by the Imperial Government before it comes into force; and over and above all, the contract, if approved by the Imperial Government in all its details, does not have the slightest effect or force until it is laid before this House together with the specifications, and contract and specification receive the approval of the representatives of the people in this Parliament. That being the case, what more does the hon. gentleman want? If he had listened to the speech of his leader, he would have learned the great and pressing importance of not losing any time in this matter, and I will not waste time by pointing out what was so effectively shown by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, that when we did receive a proposition such as we received from eminent and responsible shipbuilders such as Peterson, Tate & Co., to carry out the Fast Atlantic Mail Service for a sum of money infinitely below that to which the hon. gentleman and his colleagues were lately prepared to commit the country, there was but one duty laid on the Government, and it was that of submitting the proposition in the speediest and most effective way to the Imperial Government and afterwards to the representatives of the people in this country. That course has been taken. The people will not have any mine sprung on them, they will be satisfied that everything has been done and every measure taken to safeguard their interests and the interests of the travelling public. I can only regret the ignorance which the hon. gentleman stated he was possessed of when he told this House that nobody knew anything of the standing of the Messrs. Peterson & Tate. Sir, when the hon. gentleman comes to inquire, he will learn, that not only are they most distinguished shipbuilders, but that their record as financial men is one which he himself, when he learns the facts, will implicitly accept.

Mr. HAGGART. I got the record from the papers, the Montreal "Star." If you read that you will see the record.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The Montreal "Herald."

Mr. HAGGART. The Montreal "Herald."

Mr. McNEILL. I do not intend to continue this debate, but I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to another matter.

Mr. SPEAKER. You cannot speak on any other matter than the fast line.

Mr. FOSTER. Cannot you hitch it on to the fast line?

Mr. McNEILL. I suppose I could, if necessary. I should like, with the indulgence of the House, to call attention to the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER. I cannot allow the rules of the House to be so often broken.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I would suggest to the hon. gentlemen opposite, that for the convenience of some private members, we might by mutual consent take up private Bills and advance them a stage. It is obvious at this moment that we cannot do anything else, and then I suppose the House will adjourn at six o'clock.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It would conduce to the convenience of the House to adopt the suggestion of the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. SPEAKER. Then, with the unanimous consent of the House, we shall proceed to call the order for Private Bills.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 28) respecting the Ontario Pacific Railway Company, and to change the name of the company to the Ottawa and New York Railway Company.—(Mr. Snetsinger.)

Bill (No. 30) respecting the Central Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Bill (No. 31) respecting the Trail Creek and Columbia Railway Company.—(Mr. Gibson.)

Bill (No. 32) respecting the Columbia and Kootenay Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Gibson.)

CALGARY AND EDMONTON RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. SPROULE (for Mr. Osler) moved second reading of Bill (No. 33) respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.

Mr. OLIVER. I wish to call attention to the fact, that this Bill has not been distributed. As this Bill entirely affects the constituency which I represent, and as a number of petitions have been presented in regard to it, I would ask to have it thoroughly understood, that by my agreeing to the second reading, there shall be no prejudice to amendments in the Railway Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER. According to the orders before us, this Bill seems to have been printed in English and distributed, but probably the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) has not obtained his copy from the post office. There is no reason that I know of, why the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) is not free to move any amendment he wishes in committee. This Bill will have to be posted over vacation, and it will be eight days at least before it can be considered in committee. The only objection the hon. gentleman can take is, that it has not been printed in French, but I suppose he will not press that.

Mr. OLIVER. If the mover of the Bill were here, I would ask for explanations, but as he is not here, I do not want to block the second reading of the Bill, and I do not want to prejudice my case in committee.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

ADJOURNMENT—THE QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I suppose under the circumstances the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) will consent to the adjournment now.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no objection to it.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. McNEILL. Before the House adjourns, I may perhaps be allowed to refer to the matter which I desired to mention a moment ago. I desire to call to the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who is now acting as Minister of Militia, this paragraph which appeared in the Ottawa "Citizen" this morning:

> The War and the Colonial Offices are considering General Gascoigne's request for leave to send a Canadian regiment, 600 strong, to the Queen's Jubilee. The officials speak most appreciatively of the request as an evidence of Canada's desire to do the highest possible honour to the occasion; but they feel that the difficulties for such a number are insuperable, among them being, that the acceptance of Canada's offer would upset all the proportions allotted to the other colonies.

Of course, we do not know what the proportions allotted to other colonies may be; but, taking 75 men for each of the seven colonies of Australasia, we would have 600 men as just the right proportion for Canada. I have observed for some time past that there is a tendency among Imperial officials in

the mother country, when reckoning the colonies, to count in this way: Canada, one; New South Wales, one; Victoria, one: Queensland, one. Now, this is not doing Canada justice at all. I desire to call the attention of the House to this matter because it is one of great importance and which will be of increasing importance to Canada as time goes on. The computation should not be in that line, but in this line: Canada, eight; New South Wales, one; Victoria, one; and so forth. It is surely too absurd to assume that because the British North American colonies have confederated, because they have advanced further on the path towards Imperial unity, than any other group of British colonies, the individual colonies composing that confederation are not to count for as much as the other colonies which have not advanced so far as we have. This group of colonies is the highest product, if I may so express it, of the forces which make for Imperial unity—the highest evolution produced by those forces; and it would be surely absurd to count the individual colonies composing this confederation, as less than those colonies which are not so highly developed.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would like to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that it is not in order to make a speech when the adjournment of the House is moved for the purpose of concluding the business. The hon. gentleman should confine his remarks to the smallest possible limit.

Mr. McNEILL. I am not going to make a speech. I was just about concluding what I had to say. I was about to call attention to this, that when this reckoning was adopted in connection with the Colonial Conference held here a few years ago on the question of preferential trade within the Empire, a Minister of the Crown stated in the Imperial House of Commons that there had been a very considerable difference of opinion among the colonies on that question—that there was far from a unanimous feeling on the question; and why? Because, he said, the division was five to three. How did he arrive at that conclusion? By counting Canada one, New South Wales one, Tasmania one, and so forth. That is to say, the whole Dominion of Canada was held as of only equal value with the little colony of Tasmania. I think it cannot be too strongly pressed upon the attention of this House, that it is absolutely necessary in the interests of the Dominion that we should have it recognized in England that we are not to be counted as merely equal in value to one of the unfederated colonies, but that each of the colonies of this confederation is to be held as having a value of its own equal to that of each of the other separate colonies in those groups of colonies that have not been federated. I hope that when my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) comes to deal with this question, if we are to have an outburst of Imperial sentiment and of loyalty strangled by red tape, he will see, at all events, that the execution is performed in an orderly and decent manner.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). All I would say to my hon. friend is this: that the paragraph he alludes to I have not yet had an opportunity of seeing. In fact, at present, I am unable to find time to read many newspapers at all. I think he and the House will agree with me that we must really wait until we are officially communicated with by the Imperial Government through some other medium than the Ottawa "Citizen," before I can be expected to refer to the subject. I will lose no time in giving the fullest information to the press and to all parties concerned when the British Government's answer arrives, and is made known to us. With respect to the other point which my hon. friend has alluded to, I am and have always been disposed to insist on the superiority of Canada, and the officials of Canada over every other colony. There I am heartily in accord with him. As to the relative proportion of guests or military contingents that the British Government may choose to invite on this occasion, I must remind him that we are after all guests, and we cannot prescribe to the British Government how many guests they will have. That is for them to say. I have observed that in one respect, at any rate, they are perfectly willing to admit the greater population and resources of Canada. When it comes to the question of contributing to any purpose such as a Pacific cable, they are always willing to recognize our supremacy, and to give us the proud privilege of paying four times as much as any of the other colonies.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. While concurring with the observations made by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, I would like to ask him whether the statement which I see current in the press that Major General Gascoigne has offered the Imperial Government to send 600 men, is a correct statement?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No, it is not a correct statement.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is a very ludicrous one, I must say.

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

Mr. MARTIN. I am sorry the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) is not in his place, as I would like, before this motion is carried, to ask him in regard to a statement which was ordered by this House last session, in reference to the expenditure on railways by the Dominion, all over the Domin-

ion, and in each of the provinces. I have called his attention to the matter several times this session. I am sorry that statement has not yet been laid on the Table of this House, as it is very important to the province from which I come that it should be forthcoming. I find that many of the members of this House and I learn that some members of the Government are under a misapprehension as to the amount of the railway expenditure in the province from which I come, and I think the statement I ask for, when brought down, will put this matter right. I am anxious, before the discussion takes place in this House on the motion for papers and correspondence relating to the proposed railway construction in Prince Edward Island, that that statement should be laid on the Table, as I believe it is very necessary in order to disabuse the minds of hon. members in regard to the railway expenditure by the Dominion Government in that province.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). When the hon. gentleman mentioned the matter before, I called the special attention of the Minister of Railways to it, and the Minister gave instructions to have the return pushed on. I hope he will have it at an early day.

TEMPORARY GOVERNMENT LOANS.

Mr. FOSTER. Might I ask the hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) whether he can answer the question which I put at the beginning of this day's sitting with regard to temporary loans, and which I now repeat:

What temporary loans are now current? What is the date on which they began to run respectively, and when do they end? With whom have they been contracted, and at what rates?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). My hon. colleague the Minister of Finance is not present, but I take the liberty, in his absence, of giving the hon. gentleman the information, which I find on my hon. colleague's desk:—

1. £1,000,000 sterling, being £400,000 contracted by the late Government and renewed, and £600,000 contracted by the present Government.
2. 1st January, 1897, and 1st July, 1897.
3. £600,000 with Bank of Montreal at 3½ per cent per annum, and £400,000 with National Provincial Bank of England at 3 per cent per annum.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 5.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 20th April, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, a certificate of the election and return of François Arthur Marcotte, Esquire, for the electoral district of Champlain.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 38) respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.—(Mr. Casey, for Mr. Britton.)

Bill (No. 39) respecting the Canadian General Electric Company (Limited).—(Mr. Casey, for Mr. Lount.)

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

François Arthur Marcotte, Esq., member for the electoral district of Champlain, introduced by Sir Charles Tupper and Sir Adolphe Caron.

THE ELECTION IN SASKATCHEWAN.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to direct the attention of the House to a state of things in one of the constituencies of the North-west Territories which is, I hope, unparalleled in Canada. It is a state of things alarming and disgraceful and in which, it is to be feared, more than one prominent member of the Government is implicated; and it is, therefore, of the first importance that the attention of Parliament should be called to the state of things that exists at the present time, and has existed, in the constituency of Saskatchewan. And it is therefore of the first importance that the attention of Parliament should be called to the state of things that exists at present and has existed for some time in the constituency of Saskatchewan.

Mr. SPEAKER. Does the hon. member propose to make a motion?

Mr. DAVIN. I do. In June last we had an election, and the hon. First Minister ran in the constituency of Saskatchewan, and was elected. He was elected by a small majority, and not merely was there ground for protesting the election—my hon. friend was in no way, I believe, personally concerned in that—but we could have claimed the seat. Nevertheless, in response to urgent appeals from leading Liberals in Prince Albert, the answer came from the leaders of the Conservative party that they did

not wish to disturb the hon. First Minister in his seat. I do not know whether this was the right course to adopt or not, but at any rate it was the one which was taken. The hon. First Minister then elected to sit for Saskatchewan, and there was anxiety to have the new Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson) sit for the constituency of Saskatchewan. It was felt desirable that he should have a seat in the North-west Territories, and suggestions were made to the Liberals in Prince Albert and other parts of Saskatchewan that he should be nominated and run for that constituency. Many people thought he would run, but the feeling was so strong, a certain under-current that I need not further particularize, was so effective, that the prospect of having the Controller of Customs run for the Saskatchewan division became dimmer and dimmer until it entirely disappeared. Then the condition of the Liberal party in that constituency was such that a brother of the present Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) had to be brought from Calgary to act as peacemaker, and he filled that role with such success that he left the Prince Albert Liberals in a worse state of internecine war than that in which he found them. Well, if we are to trust to circumstantial evidence as well as openly-stated telegrams, the hon. First Minister then entrusted the mission of peace to a mutual friend of his and of mine, a leading official in the Indian Department, whom he sent to Prince Albert to arrange for the candidature of Mr. Newlands. This official, under the impression that he was calling on the present member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis), called on a brother of that hon. gentleman, and it so happened that this brother, although close to the hon. gentleman in kin, is less than kind, at all events from a political standpoint. In fact, of all the Liberals in Saskatchewan, he was the most opposed to the nomination of his near relative, the present member for that constituency. It was a very interesting story at the time; and from the high and lofty view taken by the First Minister when we bring before this House the dismissal of public servants for interference in elections and active partisanship, I am greatly surprised that the hon. gentleman did not punish this official, who, by his own orders, had been guilty of what certainly the hon. gentleman himself would pronounce gross misconduct. Anyway this leading official, one of the leading officials of the North-west Territories, went to the Saskatchewan on a political mission, and so determined was he to keep his mission secret, that he did not take any of the other Liberals into his confidence, but went at once, as he thought, to the hon. member for the Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis). By mistake, however, he went to his brother instead, and was told by the brother, after he had heard the whole story, that he was entirely of different views. Then the whole thing was given away and got into the papers. On the 29th of September, the Saskatchewan "Times" gave an account of this matter which nobody has ever dared to contradict. After quoting a telegram that was sent from Prince Albert to the Winnipeg "Free Press," the Saskatchewan "Times" went on to say:

> The above despatch from the "Free Press" correspondent here is correct in every detail, but the correspondent might have extended his report with all the particulars, as the whole transaction is now public property. The story leaked out in the following rather amusing manner. The Indian official mentioned in the despatch arrived in Prince Albert, and, wishing to keep his mission as quiet as possible, called on but very few Liberals. He had known Mr. J. O. Davis in the old days in the police force, and was not aware there was any other Davis a merchant and politician in Prince Albert. So, early on the morrow after his arrival, Mr. Indian Official called into Mr. J. O. Davis's store and imparted to that gentleman the information that he was Mr. Laurier's emissary to try, if possible, and unite the opposing factions of the Liberal party in Saskatchewan.

This high official, taking this prominent political part, and he a Reformer—why, Sir, it is incredible. There must be something wrong. This certainly cannot be believed.

> He, of course, produced credentials from his chief, and proceeded to discuss matters political, and finally, after doing all the talking, intimated that, if Mr. Davis would not recede from his position and allow Newlands to get the nomination, they would have to do something for Newlands; and, as Mr. Barker, inspector of registry offices, was growing old, it was proposed to get rid of him and give the position to Mr. Newlands, and if this was agreeable, Mr. Davis could count on the support of the Government.

Here is another feature of the policy of the Government emphasized. Not merely are they to give positions to men because of political action, but they are to knife officials in order to make room for them.

> The chagrin of Mr. Laurier's emissary may be better imagined than described, when he was told that he had given the whole thing away to a man whose greatest living desire was to see T. O. Davis and H. W. Newlands defeated. These are the facts, which are well known to the public, but have not hitherto appeared in print.

Well, time passed on, and still the Liberals of Prince Albert could not agree. The soothing hand of Mr. Sifton, of Calgary, had been irritating, and the irritation had gone on increasing, and the result was that month after month, week after week, day after day, the happy family of Liberals in Prince Albert and the Saskatchewan grew more and more irritated and determined to fight among themselves, and the irritation culminated in a contest between Mr. McPhail and the present member for Saskatchewan. What happened? The present member was elected, and it is notorious that there was good ground and good evidence to support the personal charges made against him and which would have disqualified him. What

then took place? Mr. McPhail filed his petition, and Mr. Davis came down to Ottawa, and the hon. Finance Minister, it is said, telegraphed for Mr. Macarthur, and then Mr. Sifton took a hand, and the result was a corrupt bargain, under which Mr. McPhail returned, and with lightning speed got his petition withdrawn. And the result is now that the Liberals, the respectable Liberals in Prince Albert and in the Saskatchewan—I am not now speaking only for the Conservatives, but I can say that I am speaking for the respectable Liberals——

Mr. GUAY. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. Though my hon. friend (Mr. Guay) seems surprised at that, I can tell him that there are respectable Liberals in the Saskatchewan; and not merely in the Saskatchewan, for I have been recently reading in some of the papers of the province from which my hon. friend comes, language expressing of their shame at the state of things they find here at Ottawa.

Mr. GUAY. State it.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend need not be a bit afraid; I am going to lay this whole matter before the House. And I had hoped, considering the view we have frequently had of such things from my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who is now about to leave the House, I really had hoped that he would remain and second my motion.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Great is your faith.

Mr. DAVIN. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan "Times" of March 23rd, 1897, contained an article headed "The Protest Settlement Reviewed," which article is as follows:—

An interesting and highly important document now lies snugly ensconced among many other important papers, the property of Mr. J. R. McPhail, late Liberal candidate in opposition to Mr. T. O. Davis. The brief notice given out last week, that the protest proceedings in connection with the election of Pushful Thomas to the Commons has been dropped, was a decided surprise to a very large number of people of all shades of political belief. Mr. McPhail's solemn protestation, that he had ample evidence on hand to unseat and disqualify his late opponent, was taken seriously by all his friends, and much more seriously by his enemies, Davis's party, and, as a matter of fact, which can be ascertained on unimpeachable authority, we are in a position to state that he did possess evidence of the most damaging description, which, had it been disclosed in court, would have shown Grit methods of conducting elections to be the most corrupt on record, and without doubt would have relegated T. O. Davis to political obscurity. That in the face of the gross corruption collected by Mr. McPhail, and sworn to by him and others in the petition he lodged, the protest should now be dropped, came, we repeat, as a surprise. The distress of mind which the protest caused Mr. Davis, his frantic efforts to get even with his persecutors by instituting criminal proceedings against several of McPhail's supporters, and the untiring manner in which the member and his friends, actively assisted by the Liberal Government at Ottawa, worked to secure the withdrawal of the protest, could not be regarded otherwise than as an open and unqualified confession of guilt, and being so understood by the general public, there was very general surprise and indignation when the matter was allowed to drop. Mr. McPhail himself, there is no doubt, was willing to proceed, but one by one his Grit followers forsook him. He was wired from Ottawa to meet and talk over the matter with the Finance Minister. He obeyed the summons, and appeared from that day to see things in a different light. Meanwhile, Mr. James Macarthur received notice from Hon. Clifford Sifton that the actions of himself and McPhail were a stab at the Government, and seeing any schemes he might have had for a senatorship swiftly fading, with T. O. Davis as member, devised the plan of writing out several propositions. These were submitted, first to A. L. Sifton, the Calgary peace-maker, and then sent to Brother Clifford at Ottawa. The document comprising these resolutions is that alluded to above; and, by the courtesy of two gentlemen who were accorded the privilege of seeing it, we are in a position to publish its contents.

Now, Sir, this is the document:

The Dominion Government agrees to accept J. R. McPhail as Government candidate at the next general elections, pledging themselves to do all in their power to secure his nomination and election.

Thos. O. Davis agrees to, and does, sign a promissory note in favour of J. R. McPhail for the sum of $..... (The blank was filled in by a comparatively large sum of money.)

The following gentlemen are hereby constituted an advisory committee to act with the present member for Saskatchewan:—J. R. McPhail, Jas. Macarthur, Alexander Selkirk Stewart, Graham Neilson, William Knox.

And it is further agreed, that no appointments to office, letting of tenders and other matters connected with the representation of Saskatchewan in Parliament, shall be made or performed unless sanctioned by at least four members of the advisory committee.

The article goes on:

This is enough of the agreement to show the wondering public why the protest was dropped. It is, we believe, sufficient to convince the electors that they are represented at Ottawa by a man who, to all intents and purposes, is not only tied body and soul to support the Government, whether right or wrong, but has also allowed himself to be securely gagged and handcuffed to a half a dozen Liberals of the town of Prince Albert, who are, as will be seen by this agreement, really the member for this district.

So far as the patronage is concerned, I think, Sir, this is an agreement which strikes at the independence of a member of this House; and it is a matter, therefore, that this House should take cognizance of. I hold that the Government ought to have an inquiry, examine witnesses, whose names I shall give them, witnesses who are ready to come here and be examined——

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that when an hon. member makes what, so far as I can

judge, are charges against another hon. member affecting that hon. member's independence and so on, that it is only proper to give notice of a motion——

Mr. DAVIN. I gave the hon. gentleman notice.

Mr. SPEAKER. I mean the regular notice. The Orders of the Day show no notice of motion to have been given. I thought, until the hon. gentleman came to what seemed to be personal charges that he was indulging in a general discussion of——

Mr. DAVIN. I will content myself with calling attention to——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I thought the hon. gentleman was indulging in a general discussion of the condition of affairs in Saskatchewan, and would conclude with a motion to adjourn. But I think he will see that if he makes a charge, as he seems to be doing, that that is a subject for notice of motion, and that a motion on that subject should follow.

Mr. DAVIN. I will content myself with calling the attention of the Government and the House to what is going on in Saskatchewan, and will personally make no charge whatever.

Mr. SPEAKER. But if the hon. gentleman allows a newspaper or any one else to make a charge through him, that will be the same thing. The hon. gentleman must not be the mouthpiece of any one in making a charge any more than he must make a charge himself without notice. He must assume the responsibility as the——

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) cannot interrupt.

Mr. DAVIN Of course, I have no desire whatever to disobey or to attempt to disobey in any way any ruling of yours, and, if I speak, it is solely as to the point of order. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that it is necessary to give notice if an hon. member seeks to call attention, for the behoof of the Government, for the behoof of this House, at the first moment when a serious state of things comes under his notice. It would be necessary, of course, to give notice if I was going to conclude with a motion to refer this matter to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. But I apprehend, Mr. Speaker, with great respect for your ruling, that it is not necessary to give notice, but that it is a matter of duty without notice at all, when a serious state of things like this comes to my notice, to rise at the very first moment in the House and call the attention of the House and the Government to it. Suppose, for instance—and I may argue the point of order—that some wrong is done to the Prime Minister in this matter, is it not of the utmost importance to the country and to a man occupying his position that the earliest opportunity should be given him to deal with it and disavow it? For instance, here is a statement which I meet that a corrupt bargain has been made between the Government and certain persons in Saskatchewan. If there is no truth in that, if the Prime Minister is in a position to disavow it——

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not object at all to the hon. gentleman saying that a corrupt bargain has been made by the Government. That is not a personal matter exactly; it does not affect the independence of any hon. member of this House. But I still feel that the hon. gentleman is rather confusing the right that any hon. member has to get up and raise a question of privilege which affects himself with the raising of a question of privilege against an hon. member without notice, which, I think, cannot be allowed, at any rate, unless a case of great urgency has been shown to exist.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The point that is now under your consideration, Mr. Speaker, is a very grave one indeed, and I should like to have the opportunity of stating that so far as my acquaintance with parliamentary practice goes, I think it has been the invariable practice in this House, when a grave charge affecting either an hon. member of the House or a member of the Government of this country has arisen, for an hon. member to draw the attention of the Government and of the House at the earliest possible moment to the matter, and the opportunity is given—which is most desirable in the interest of the character of the House and the Government—the hon. member who may be affected by that statement to make such explanations as perhaps may entirely dispose of the whole question. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is a very serious matter indeed to interpose when an hon. member is bringing forward a matter of such grave moment as is the matter now under consideration of the House, affecting so seriously the position of an hon. member on a very grave question, and the hon. member thus affected be prevented by closing a discussion from having an opportunity of making his explanation. I have very great respect for your ruling, Mr. Speaker, on any question; but I think the present question is one that requires to be very carefully considered before the House adopts the course indicated, that does not strike me to be either in the interest of the Government or of this House or especially of any member affected by statements so confidently made.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Charges made against an hon. member of this House unfortunately have not been made for the first time, but the practice when we occupied seats on the other side of the House was, not to make such charges

under colour of a motion to adjourn, but such charges were made on the personal responsibility of an hon. member. I did not propose to take notice of the charges when I heard that the hon. member intended to conclude with a motion to adjourn the House. But if any hon. gentleman wishes to make a charge against any member of the Government or any member of this House, there is a proper way to do so, and conform to the rules of the House, viz. : to make a personal statement on his responsibility as a member of the House, conclude his statement with a charge, and that charge must then be investigated. That practice has been followed time and again ; but I never heard an hon. gentleman make a statement out of scurrilous newspapers, and attach so much importance to them, and yet dare not say from his place, I make that charge personally. The hon. gentleman would have the Government and the House act on idle gossip. The Government will not act on any idle newspaper gossip, but if the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) makes charges on the floor of the House from his place as a member of this House against any hon. member of this House they will receive the attention of this Government.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid the rule laid down by the Prime Minister would unfortunately prevent discussion from this side of the House of any act of the Government or of any members supporting the Government, no matter how well known it was and how much it was being commented on in the newspaper press and by the public. He in fact says that no charge of misconduct against the Government or any supporter of the Government shall be ventilated in this House unless the charge is made on the personal responsibility of a member.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). He did not make any such statement.

Mr. FOSTER. And that he, as a member of the House, prefers a distinct charge. I have been a member of this House since 1882 and I never have seen such a rule invoked, and I hope there never will be such a rule invoked in the interest of good government. It is one thing if I with my knowledge of certain things, having looked carefully into them, have come to the conclusion that there is a case of malfeasance on the part of a member of the Government, and I determine that it is my duty as a member of this House to prefer that charge and have it tried. But, Mr. Speaker, you know and every hon. member knows that not a day passes when in the recrimination and in the criticism of party politics there are not cases occurring on the part of the Government which have obtained notoriety in the newspapers, which go from mouth to mouth throughout the country, upon which we have no certain knowledge but that they are being bandied from mouth to mouth, and from party to party, and when it is not in the interest of good government, and especially in the interest of the Government for the time being, that it should have an opportunity to clear its skirts of complicity or of any fault in that matter. It is a kindness to the Government to call these matters to its attention and give members of the Government a chance to deny them, if it can be done, or to palliate them, if they can be palliated ; and if I were sitting on the other side of the House behind the Government, and a charge of this kind was being ventilated in the newspapers and talked over by brother members, I should consider it a kindness to me if it was so brought up that I could meet it with a square denial, if such were within my power. We are now told by the hon. Prime Minister,—and I hope, Mr. Speaker, your judgment will not carry so far,—that we cannot rise and say that it is a matter of common repute that the Government entered into a bargain to "saw-off" the protest in Saskatchewan, and that there is prima facie evidence that this had been done, for here is correspondence published in the public press, which has become current in this country. Forsooth, it is argued, that we cannot call that to the attention of the Government, and if it casts reflections on the member sitting for that constituency, as it must, we cannot call it to his attention so that he may rise and show it is altogether unfounded, if it is unfounded. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I think you will have to look very carefully into your judgment on this question, or parliamentary government comes to an end if our mouths are closed, because this Government is not by any means immaculate. It has made many mistakes already and will make many more, and we propose as an Opposition to call the attention of Parliament and the country to those mistakes, and surely the Prime Minister will not say that before we make any such charges we must put them into form, make them on the honour of a member and ask for a committee.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is not the statement made by the Prime Minister.

Mr. FOSTER. The Postmaster General will have some cases. When he sat on this side of the House he was a great stickler for the freedom of Parliament, he did not want the Opposition to be gagged, and no gag seems to have been able to stop his mouth The hon. gentleman no doubt would have been very glad if his mouth had been gagged to some extent. He would then have been not left to the imputation which he carries upon his brow to-day, and will carry all the years that he sits there as a Minister ; that he made protestations of principle——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FOSTER. Let us hear what the point of order is.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The point of order is this. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is assumed to be addressing the House on the point of order raised, as to whether the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) was right in proceeding as he did. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is not addressing the House upon that point of order, but is dealing with an irrelevant matter.

Mr. FOSTER. I am presenting my case, Mr. Speaker, and I am addressing the House on what was your assumed ruling, but which you have not authoritatively given.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has taken up a question relating to the hon. the Postmaster General which has no bearing upon the point of order that has been raised on the motion before the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, Mr. Speaker, will you allow me to put my argument, and to point out that your ruling, as I understand it, was this: that you would not allow a member on this side of the House—that is a member of Parliament, we will say——

Mr. SPEAKER. A member on either side.

Mr. FOSTER. On either side; that is quite right. Your ruling, as I understand it, was, that you would not allow a member of Parliament to bring anything to the attention of Parliament which implicated the Government, or any member on the other side of the House, in a proceeding which had not been right.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Foster) has entirely misapprehended me. I stated particularly, that I did not see any cause whatever for interfering with the charge of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) against the Government. But, I said: that when a special and particular charge was made against the independence of an hon. member of this House, I thought notice should be given to him, and that a motion should be made in support of that charge by any member who wished to bring it forward. My ruling had nothing whatever to do with the charge against the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. But, in a charge made against the Government, the foundation of that charge may have reference to an action which concerns a certain member's seat. It seems to me to be impossible to make a charge against the Government—that is, to ventilate a grievance as against the Government—without bringing in the name of the member whose seat, and the preservation of whose seat, if the documents are correct, seems to have been the only motive for the action that the Government took. Therefore, by implication, the member's position is to a certain extent attacked. But, there is a wide difference between that, and between making any charge against a member of malfeasance in office or of doing a thing which he should not have done as a member, thereby affecting his seat in the House. In a great many cases, none of these charges could be made without to a certain extent implicating members of the House in an inferential way. I understand that there is a large difference between that, and between making a distinct charge against the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davies). That is not, as I understand it, the object of my hon. friend (Mr. Davin). He wants an explanation. He does not want to believe this thing himself, and he simply puts it before the House so that the Prime Minister, and the member who by implication is concerned in this matter, may have the opportunity of explaining to the House. It is in my opinion a very grave matter, and one which cannot be allowed to rest here.

Mr. CASEY. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. DAVIN. Would you allow me to cite what we find in Bourinot, page 415.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) has spoken, but I would be glad if the hon. member (Mr. Casey) would allow me the benefit of his discussion of whatever may throw light upon the point of order.

Mr. DAVIN. Bourinot says this:

> In 1878, a member brought to the notice of the House, on such a motion (a motion to adjourn the House), that certain Dominion officials were taking part in the provincial elections of Quebec. In 1891, Mr. Laurier initiated in this way a long debate on the formation and policy of the new Administration, formed on the death of Sir John Macdonald, Premier of the Ministry consequently dissolved ipso facto.

You yourself, Mr. Speaker, will probably remember, that grave charges were made against Sir Adolphe Caron by a member of this House and a long discussion ensued thereon. The member making the charges refused to take the responsibility of pledging his honour, and I believe, that hon. member sits in the Chair of this House today.

Mr. CASEY. There is, as the hon. member (Mr. Davin) has said, a great difference between making a charge against the Government which necessarily involves a personal charge against the member, and the procedure of making a direct charge against an individual member on the honour of a brother member. There is exactly the difference between a cowardly attack and a straightforward attack.

Mr. DAVIN. Is this to the point of order, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) who has brought this matter up, has chosen to lay before the House, a number

of newspaper assertions directly attacking the honour of a fellow-member and his fitness to sit in this House. I understood you to rule, Sir, and your ruling was certainly in consonance with all the rulings I have ever heard in this House—and I have sat here more years than the leader of the Opposition, or his first lieutenant, who spoke of their long experience in the House. Sir, your ruling was, that any such statements attacking the honour of a fellow-member, should be made as a question of privilege to secure an investigation into these statements, and that notice of such motion should be given to the House and to the member concerned. I do not think there is any room for dispute as to the correctness of that ruling. That has been always the practice of this House. We all know, that the quotation of newspaper gossip at great length, attacking an individual member's character, has never been allowed in this House, unless it were to be followed up by a motion for inquiry, and that it never has been allowed without notice to the House and to the member attacked. The attempt to make it appear as a kindness to the Government, does not affect the point of order. Those hon. gentlemen who have been discussing the point of order have been taking advantage of it to make speeches against the Government on general questions, and I do not propose to follow them in that respect, nor even to defend the Government. I will further call attention to the precedent quoted by my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). He said, that a debate had been brought up, on a motion of adjournment, on the conduct of certain Dominion officials and the general policy of the Government, and so on. Those were certainly matters which this House had a right to inquire into, and they did not affect the personal character or standing of any member in this House. There is a vast difference between the cases. I am sure, Sir, that the House will agree with me, that when we talk of the privileges of Parliament, the privileges of each individual member constitute the privileges of Parliament. This is not a question especially concerning either the Government or the Opposition. No individual member who respects himself should allow these vague and unfounded attacks—as we must presume them to be until they are proven—until some member takes the responsibility of making them. No individual member who respects himself can allow this kind of discussion to go on, without protesting, and without, Mr. Speaker, sustaining you heartily in the ruling you have made.

Mr. DAVIN. I apprehend that now I can go on, and for the behoof of the Government, proceed to call attention to the state of things in the Saskatchewan.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) is not going on with the personal charge.

Mr. DAVIN. No, Mr. Speaker. Now, Sir, an affidavit has been filed in the Saskatchewan by two respectable citizens, W. R. Fish and S. J. Donaldson, and that affidavit is as follows :—

In the matter of the petition lodged by Jno. R. McPhail against the election of Thos. O. Davis as member of the House of Commons for the district of Saskatchewan, and the agreement entered into between Jno. R. McPhail and Thos. O. Davis, M.P., and the Dominion Government, which caused further proceedings before the courts to cease, we, W. R. Fish and S. J. Donaldson, of the town of Prince Albert, in the judicial district of Saskatchewan, do solemnly declare, that on or about the 18th day of March, A.D. 1897, we called upon J. R. McPhail at his office in the town of Prince Albert, and were shown by him a document, which he informed us was an agreement between Thos. O. Davis, M.P., Jno. R. McPhail and the Government of Hon. Wilfrid Laurier; that we were permitted by Mr. McPhail to read the document ; that we did read it, and noted very carefully its provisions, which were as follows :—

(1.) That the Dominion Government accepts Jno. R. McPhail as Government candidate at the next general election.

(2.) That Thos. O. Davis, M.P., agrees and promises to pay to Jno. R. McPhail the amount of expenses incurred in connection with the protest.

(3.) That Wm. Knox Graham Neilson, Alexander Selkirk Stewart, Jas. Macarthur and Jno. R. McPhail are hereby constituted an advisory committee to act with Thomas O. Davis, M.P., in all matters pertaining to the representation of Saskatchewan in the House of Commons and with the Dominion Government.

(4.) That no appointments to offices, &c., &c., are to be made by the Dominion Government, unless sanctioned and recommended by at least four members of the above committee.

That the signature of Jno. R. McPhail and Thos. O. Davis to this document were attested by Jas. Macarthur as witness.

That the Dominion Government and Thos. O. Davis, M.P., agree to conform to above conditions, provided Jno. R. McPhail does not proceed with the protest against the election of Thos. O. Davis, M.P.

And we make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of "The Canada Evidence Act, 1893."

W. R. FISH.
S. J. DONALDSON.

Declared before me at Prince Albert, in the North-west Territories, this second day of April, A.D. 1897.

A. McNABB, J.P.

The paper says :

As the "Times" anticipated and predicted would be the case, the "Advocate"——

That is, the organ of the Liberal party there——

—made an effort to overcome the bad effects produced by the publication of the details of the now notorious McPhail-Davis-Laurier Government protest settlement. The intent to deceive its readers into the belief that no agreement exists or was entered into, was a most absurd one. The "Advocate's" article, entitled "The 'Times' Fake," was no reply at all to the straight, plain and truthful statements made by the "Times"

concerning the reasons why the protest proceedings were stayed. Our contemporary's assertions that "It has interviewed leading Liberals, who say no agreement was made," and "We are assured by gentlemen who are in a position to know, that there never was any agreement between Messrs. J. R. McPhail, T. O. Davis and the Laurier Government," is silly in the extreme.

The paper asserts that those gentlemen have been kept in the dark, and re-asserts all its previous statements, which the affidavit supports.

Now, Mr. Speaker, very great misconduct on the part of the Government is charged by this newspaper, supported by this agreement and by the affidavit of those who have seen this agreement; and hon. gentlemen may be perfectly assured of this, that we have come to a time in this country when you cannot burk or bamboozle public opinion for any length of time. It is futile to say, "Oh, we will not regard this, because an hon. member does not rise in his place and move to have the matter referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections." Why, Sir, who is the first man who should rise in this House and move to have the matter referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections? The Prime Minister himself should be the first man to ask for an inquiry, in order that his own Government, if innocent, should have an opportunity of clearing its skirts. But I know—because I had the means of observing what took place—that the gentlemen mentioned here came to Ottawa and had their interviews here; it was arranged in Ottawa that this protest should be dropped; and though they hurried back to Prince Albert, they must have worked by telegraph, because by the time they arrived there, the motion had already been made to take the protest off the files, and the $1,000 deposit had been withdrawn.

Sir, it is for the honour of the country that I should bring this matter forward; and I find, on looking at May and at Bourinot—and if necessary I could fortify myself with precedents from our own "Hansard"—that the course I have taken is the parliamentary course as well as the course of common sense, and the proper course in the interest of the dignity of this Parliament and of the good government of this country. I move, seconded by Mr. Taylor, the adjournment of the House.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to go into any very long details in connection with this matter. I may say, in the first place, that I did not know that it was going to be brought up by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). I had no intimation of his intention until I met the hon. gentleman in the corridor to-day, when he told me that he was going to bring it up. I told him I was unwell, and did not intend to be in the House to-day. The hon. gentleman seems to be greatly bothered about protests; however, I do not think I should be held responsible for all the newspaper gossip in the country. I have seen this newspaper notice that he has been quoting from, but I do not see that I should be held responsible for anything of that kind. The facts of the case are these: There was a protest against my election; I had a summons to have the preliminary objections disposed of: and Mr. McPhail, the petitioner, was notified. The case came up before Judge McGuire, a judge of the Supreme Court of the North-west Territories, and it was thrown out for want of evidence. These are all the facts of the matter. I had the pleasure, shortly afterwards of reading a letter which the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) sent in connection with this matter to a gentleman named Mr. Gunn, who showed it to me. The hon. member, I believe, offered to furnish the necessary money to proceed with the protest. I suppose the hon. gentleman, having a protest against his own election, would like to have some way of sawing-off. I have no doubt that is what is the matter with him. The gentleman to whom the letter was sent would take no action in the way proposed. I know nothing more about the matter than that. I was not present when the hon. gentleman brought it up to-day, and I only heard a few of his last remarks. If I had been notified, I might have gone more fully into it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I trust that this motion will not be put until the Government take the opportunity of giving some answer to the very grave statement that has been put before this House. I call your attention, Mr. Speaker, and the attention of this House to the fact that the hon. gentleman who sits in this House as the representative of the constituency referred to has taken his seat without venturing to challenge the statement that he is not the representative in this House of that constituency.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, the statement has been made, and an affidavit has been read, of parties who, I am informed, are respectable residents of that district, and who swear that they have seen statements made by which that hon. gentleman has surrendered his position as a representative of this House, and confided the duties and responsibilities——

Mr. CASEY. I rise to a point of order. The hon. leader of the Opposition is taking exactly the line for which you, Mr. Speaker, ruled the hon. member for Assiniboia out of order. He is declaring that the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) is not the member for Saskatchewan, but has surrendered his seat in the House by the course of action he has taken. I think these

are the very same words as were uttered by the hon. member for Assiniboia and which you ruled out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not hear how the hon. gentleman made out that the hon. member for Saskatchewan had resigned his position.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). He said he was not a member.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. Postmaster General is mistaken. I did not say he was not a member, but I said that he had taken his seat without challenging the accuracy of the statement made upon affidavit by respectable persons who had seen the document signed by that hon. gentleman, by which he surrendered his right to sit in this House as the representative of the constituency, and remitted to a commission the discharge of those duties which the constituency elected the hon. gentleman to perform. I say that that is one of the gravest charges that can be made, and if the hon. gentleman thought fit to take his seat without challenging its accuracy, he must be held in the estimation of every hon. gentleman in this House as having surrendered his right to a seat in it. I draw attention to this, as a matter of grave significance, that the hon. gentleman who leads this House should have permitted a statement of this kind to obtain currency and credence for a single moment without disclaiming all lot and part in any such transaction, either on behalf of himself or any member of his Government. The hon. First Minister owes it to the House, to himself, and to the great party he represents in this country, to take the earliest opportunity of removing any such imputation made against him, not merely by newspaper report but sworn to in the most solemn manner.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I do not know what are the feelings of the hon. gentleman in these matters, but so far as I am concerned, I tell him frankly and within the hearing of everybody in this House that I am too long in political life to take any stock in newspaper reports, and I will not be driven from any position I take in this House by anything stated in the newspapers. Whenever an hon. gentleman chooses to attack my position or the position of those who support the Government, upon his honour and responsibility, then every attention will be given to the charges made. With regard to the statements made by the hon. member from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), I take no stock in them, for this very good reason. On the face of them, and as I well know, they are false. He stated that a gentleman in the civil service had gone as an emissary of mine to Prince Albert in order to induce Mr. Newlands, who was a possible candidate for the Saskatchewan district, to withdraw in favour of Mr. Davis.

Mr. DAVIN. What I said was that he went to get Mr. Davis to withdraw in the interests of Mr. Newlands.

The PRIME MINISTER. It does not matter much which way you put it. The hon. gentleman said that this high official was sent in order to get Mr. Davis to be accepted in place of Mr. Newlands, or, in other words, that Mr. Newlands should withdraw, and that the price which should be given him for withdrawing was that he was to be put in the place of Mr. Barker, the registrar, who was to be superannuated. Sir, Mr. Newlands, for reasons of his own, did not run, and Mr. Davis was accepted and ran and got elected. Mr. Barker has not yet been superannuated but is still registrar, and Mr. Newlands is still as he was before. That disposes, therefore, of the imputation that Mr. Newlands had withdrawn for a consideration. The hon. gentleman later said that there had been a compromise or agreement between Mr. Davis, Mr. McPhail and the Government, and that Mr. McPhail and Mr. Davis had come to Ottawa and had seen me in the month of April. I state here, on my honour as a member of this House, that I never saw Mr. McPhail in Ottawa, that I have not seen him since 1894 when I was in Prince Albert. This shows what credence is to be given newspaper reports. The House of Commons could not carry on its business if newspaper reports were to be accepted. The most nonsensical reports and rumours are published in the papers. There are some published to-day, and there are always people found gullible enough to swallow them.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. leader of the Opposition grows extremely virtuous and indignant in Opposition, but when he was a subordinate member of the Government, he did not feel quite so strict on some of those points. It appears, after all, that his charge that the hon. member for Saskatchewan is not the member for Saskatchewan rests on an assertion which even the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) does not undertake to endorse personally, namely, that the hon. member for Saskatchewan exercises his patronage through a committee of his supporters in his riding. I am not discussing the truth or falsity of the statement—but what does it amount to, if true? The loud-voiced gentleman who leads the Opposition states in his most pompous tones that such conduct on the part of an hon. member is tantamount to a surrender of his position as a member of this House—that no man who exercises patronage through a committee of his supporters is worthy to be called a representative. I would like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite how many of them, when they had the disposal of patronage, did ask a local committee to advise them on such questions?

Mr. HUGHES. I venture to say that no hon. gentleman on this side ever signed a document giving up his rights.

Mr. CASEY. Perhaps not, nor have we the slightest tittle of evidence to show that any hon. member on this side did. We have not even the assertion of any hon. gentleman in this House, made on his personal responsibility, that any hon. member on this side, signed such an agreement to give up his rights. But we have had it proven that an hon. gentleman who was and is still a member of this House, but who then supported the Government and is now in Opposition—the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) was guided in the disposition of the patronage in his county by an executive committee of his supporters, and that this executive committee not only exercised the patronage for that county, but, on their on confession, sold the patronage. Did the hon. leader of the Opposition then declare that his supporter had so conducted himself as not to be worthy of a seat in this House ? That was one of those frequent occasions when the hon. gentleman was more profitably occupied than being a member of this House or a member of the Government, but he must have been aware of the facts, and he should be a little more careful, when he tries to throw clubs at gentlemen on this side, that he is not throwing boomerangs.

Mr. QUINN. I cannot boast of having had a seat in this House for the length of time the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) has enjoyed the honour, and perhaps it is on this account that I do not look at the facts put on record by the hon. gentleman who has brought up this charge, in the same light as the hon. member for West Elgin does. No doubt it is because I have not the same experience of the manner in which affairs of this kind are conducted, but as one of the younger members of this House, listening to the language of the hon. member for West Assiniboia and taking communication of the affidavit which has been read before this House, it is certainly a startling proposition to me, when a charge, involving not only the honesty of a member but the honesty of the Government, is placed before this House supported by the affidavit of two respectable, or presumably respectable, citizens, the original affidavit, it is true, not being here, but having been published in the public press of the district in which the occurrence is said to have taken place, the Government and the member of this House incriminated, or attempted to be incriminated by this charge, shall fold their arms, and say : Because the hon. member will not choose to make this charge on his honour believing it to be true, it is not necessary for us to answer. Now, what are the charges that have been made ? The charge is directly made here that the Government of this country entered into an agreement with one of the members of this House that he should be the figure-head before the country as representative of that constituency but that he should surrender into the hands of other persons, the power, the dignity and all the privileges of the position. The Government of the country is charged with having recognized an agreement of this kind. A member of this House is charged with having handed over to a committee the right to represent that constituency in any place except in this House, and yet he has not one word to say in defence of himself as against this charge. The affidavit is not directed against the individual alone, but, as I say, involves the Government because it says :

(1.) That the Dominion Government accepts Jno. R. McPhail as Government candidate at the next general election.

(2.) That Thos. O. Davis, M.P., agrees and promises to pay to Jno. R. McPhail the amount of expenses incurred in connection with the protest.

(3.) That Wm. Knox Graham Neilson, Alexander Selkirk Stewart, Jas. Macarthur and Jno. R. McPhail are hereby constiuted an advisory committee to act with Thomas O. Davis, M.P., in all matters pertaining to the representation of Saskatchewan in the House of Commons and with the Dominion Government.

So that, as a matter of fact, by this agreement, the committee are the representatives of this division instead of the hon. member who sits in this House, and that not alone with the consent of the member himself, but with the consent of the Government, to act as a committee with the Government in all matters appertaining to the representation of Saskatchewan in the House and with the Dominion Government.

(4.) That no appointments to offices, &c., &c., are to be made by the Dominion Government, unless sanctioned and recommended by at least four members of the above committee.

That the signature of Jno. R. McPhail and Thos. O. Davis to this document were attested by Jas. Macarthur as witness.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a most serious charge, and the fact of that committee having been named or appointed in this district, probably throws light on the actions of the Government in discharging persons who have been employed under the Government heretofore and have enjoyed their positions for many years until the present Government came into power. Is it not possible that many of the employees of the Government who have been dismissed from office have been the subject of investigation, not of committees appointed by this House, but by committees formed in the manner indicated in this affidavit ? Is it not possible that not merely one member sits here not by virtue of the votes that have been given, but by virtue of his subjection to a committee appointed in his own district whose behests he is bound to obey no matter what the consequences may be to himself or to the country ? Is this state of affairs to be allowed to continue with simply the answer : We will not pay attention to it unless the charge is made by a member of this House. If so, it will be a revelation to many new members of this House who are

listening for the first time to what they must regard as the law of parliamentary government in this country. It is a most extraordinary interpretation, and I, as a humble member and a new member, protest and ask for a proper answer to be given by the Government, that they either assume the responsibility, or deny that any such agreement exists or that they recognize it in any way.

Mr. FLINT. I think that nothing more clearly shows the wisdom of the rule which was invoked from the Chair than the course of the discussion as far as it has gone. The object and purpose of that rule is not to prevent discussion of grave matters of this nature by the House at proper times, but to enforce upon those who bring these matters to the attention of the House and the country that they should take such fair and reasonable steps as shall give those who are charged with any violation of constitutional usage, or of the rules of Parliament, or of the rights or privileges of members of this House, notice of the nature of the charge and of the specific lines of evidence upon which the charge will be pressed. We have here the statement of the hon. member whose name was more particularly associated with this so-called charge, that, until the moment of the meeting of this House he had no notice that it would be brought forward, that he had no intention of being present in the House today, being unwell; but, owing to the fact that others solicited his presence, he was in a few minutes before the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) took his seat, and we have, consequently, the statement of the hon. member (Mr. Davis, Saskatchewan) in the House that these so-called charges had not even been heard by him, and he has had no fair or reasonable opportunity to either accept them or deny them, or to accept them in part or deny them in part. Consequently, I think, it will be accepted by gentlemen on both sides of this House, that, however ingeniously the matter has been brought within the rules of the House upon the motion to adjourn, there is an unfairness to the other hon. members of the House in the way the matter has been brought forward. But, assuming for the sake of argument, that the so-called charges have been fairly brought forward, let us see what they amount to as put—no doubt in the strongest light—by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) who has just taken his seat. We have the affidavit of parties unknown—unknown, that is, to the members of this House as to their character or standing—alleged to have been taken before some official in the distant constituency of Saskatchewan, alleging the contents of a document a copy of which they do not pretend to give in their affidavit or declaration, and which, taken upon the face of it even assuming that it is correctly reported, simply gives the substance of an agreement between two individuals, one of whom happens to be a member of this House. If this agreement is supported by evidence, there is nothing in it which ought to be a subject of inquiry at this stage by this House. It is simply an agreement, or appears to be, from the second-hand testimony that we have in regard to it, between an hon. member of this House and other parties outside of this House with whom he proposes to consult in regard to the distribution of patronage. Whether that is an offence against parliamentary law or constitutional law still remains to be adjudicated upon. It may be a matter of unwisdom, or it may be a matter of good judgment on the part of the hon. member to consult with certain parties in his constituency as to the disposal of patronage. But I call the attention of the hon. member who has brought this matter forward that there is not one scintilla of evidence that the Government or any member of the Government or representative of the Government is in any way identified with this so-called agreement. Consequently the only party that could be attacked in this House under the form of a resolution to adjourn, namely, the Government, who are open to attack in a question of this kind—the Government are not at all identified or connected with this so-called agreement. Therefore, I think that the rule which was framed with the object of protecting members of this House should be adhered to, and that those who allege that something wrong has been done, and those who allege that any hon. member of this House has been connected with wrong-doing should bring forward their charge in such a manner that it could be properly inquired into by a committee of this House. As the charge stands at present, it is unsupported by any evidence whatever worthy of the name, it is entirely a second-hand report, coming through partisan newspapers. I sincerely trust that if hon. gentlemen opposite take the grave and serious view which they profess to take of this question, some of them will make such an inquiry into this matter from independent sources and bring it forward in a shape in which it can be dealt with by the hon. member for Saskatchewan, and by other hon. members of this House.

Mr. DAVIN. Before you put this motion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words in reply. Now, what is the character of the defence? It is: We won't go into it. A part of the defence of my hon. friend, who is a distinguished luminary of the long robe, is a plea of confession and avoidance. The hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) made a speech. If any man was in a position to exonerate the Government, he was: he was in a much better position to exonerate the Government than the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister could honourably and truthfully get up and make the statement he has made, which, of course, I

entirely believe. He can make that statement, and yet members of his Government may have made a corrupt bargain. There is very little patronage connected with the office that the Prime Minister holds; but one of the members of the Government that are charged in this article and are mentioned in the agreement referred to in the affidavit—one of those members exercises a very large patronage in the North-west Territories; and that is the Minister of Interior; and he should be here to deny what is attributed to him. But in default of the presence of the Minister of Interior, we should have the Finance Minister to deny the statement that he is implicated; and in default of the Finance Minister or the Minister of Interior repudiating the charge, then we should have had a direct statement from the member for Saskatchewan that no such agreement was made. The member for Saskatchewan got up, and what did he do? Why, he told us that he was elected, that there was a protest against him, and that that protest had been dismissed. Because why? For want of evidence? No, because it did not go to trial; but because the petitioner withdrew from the position of petitioner. Then the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) got up. He started out with an attempt to bend the bow of Ulysses; he attempted to wield the club of Hercules, he attempted to imitate the manner of my hon. friend who leads the Opposition. Well, Sir, he was hardly heavy enough to do it. He was like a super in a cast for Othello wanting to play the principal part, and he was hardly equal to it. He spoke of his long experience in the House. Well, Sir, his experience is longer than that of any other hon. member, but I observe of the hon. gentleman that the older he grows and the more experience he gets the more ineffective he becomes every session. Those gentlemen who have defended the Government have only referred to the allegation in the affidavit that the hon. member for Saskatchewan had made an agreement to give away his patronage; they did not refer at all to the allegation that an arrangement had been made whereby the Government was to place the giving away of the contracts into the hands of this committee. Is that incredible? Is it not on record that the Minister of Public Works was hardly fresh in his office when a supporter of his was giving away a contract through a friend, and then we had the hon. Minister of Public Works indulging in proverbial philosophy, and the immortal line, "business is business" is for ever connected with his name. Well, Sir, business, evidently, up to the hilt and up to the chin in this agreement: business is business so completely that there is no attempt on the part of the Government to deny it. Sir, I cannot for one minute accept the proposition that some hon. gentlemen lay down on that side of the House. If an hon. member brings a charge before the House, as it is his duty to do at the earliest possible moment, it is an advantage to the Government if the Government is free; if the Government's skirts are clean, what I have done here to-day is an advantage to the Government. They could get up and they could clear themselves of this charge that I have made against them. I have frequently admired the ability of the tactics of the leader of the Government, but there is one thing that I do not think he executes well, and that is a precipitate retreat. I must say that he does not shine as brightly as usual when he executes a retreat. I cannot compliment him on the way he has retreated from facing the music on this occasion; indeed, he never attempted to show fight. There was plenty of room for it, however. There are the charges, and there they remain, and there they will remain, and they will sink into the minds of the people, not merely in the North-west, but all over this country. If those charges remain unanswered, then when the Government comes to face the constituencies, come it early, or come it late, they will find, if they do not answer these charges that they will be as mill-stones around their necks.

Motion to adjourn, negatived.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Prime Minister—because I see the Minister of Finance is not here—if he is not going to give us the supplementary Estimates for the current year before he makes his Budget speech. We ought to have the supplementaries both for the current year and for the next year. I have not much hope for the latter, but I think we ought to have the supplementaries for the current year.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). So far as my memory serves me, it is altogether unprecedented; I never saw the Supplementary Estimates brought down before the Budget Speech.

Mr. FOSTER. I am very sorry my hon. friend has so bad a memory. If he will take five minutes to look over the records of the "Hansard" last year and the preceding year, he will find they were brought down.

The PRIME MINISTER. Perhaps so.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Let me remind my hon. friend opposite that I have petitioned, most earnestly, but unsuccessfully, my hon. friend to give us the supplementary Estimates before his Budget speeches.

Mr. FOSTER. Those were the supplementary Estimates for the succeeding year. I remember when I told him that I could not give them to him, that it had not been the practice to do so, and my hon. friend said: It is a very bad practice.

THE QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE.—MILITIA CONTINGENT.

Mr. HUGHES. I desire to ask the acting Minister of Militia what conclusion has been arrived at in regard to sending a detachment of Canadian troops to the old country to take part in the Queen's Jubilee. Has there been a plan agreed upon for volunteer regiments or corps from Toronto and Montreal to go to the Jubilee, in addition to the 200 troops which I understand are to be sent by the Government?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Her Majesty's Government were exceedingly pleased and gratified by the evidence given of the patriotic feeling which actuated those gentlemen who desired to send a volunteer battalion or two to the Queen's Jubilee, but they much regretted that it was impossible to receive them on the present occasion. Our representation, therefore, must be confined to the contingent of 200 men, which will be made as representative as possible of the various branches of the service.

FRANCHISE ACT AMENDMENT.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fitzpatrick for second reading of Bill (No. 7) to consolidate and amend the law relating to the election of members of the House of Commons; and the motion of Mr. Foster in amendment thereto.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, when a few days ago I made a suggestion to my hon. friend the mover of the amendment now before the House that it should be withdrawn, I did so under the impression that an understanding had been arrived at by which the Bill was not to be further proceeded with, but other business was to be put before the House. In that, it appears, I was mistaken, and consequently the motion made by my hon. friend is still the motion which is under consideration. But I may say that the point of that amendment which was supported by a strong pressure on the Government that they should give precedence to the Budget, has lost much of its force from the fact that the announcement has already been made that the Budget will be brought down on Thursday. I will not, therefore, offer to the House any argument in support of the motion made by my hon. friend for the reason stated, but I will proceed to take this opportunity of directing the attention of the House to the measure which is now submitted for its consideration. I do not intend again to press the unreasonableness at the present session of pressing this measure upon our attention, because I still hope that my hon. friend the First Minister will find it convenient, after we have entered upon the important business of the session, the granting of supplies and dealing with those branches of the public service that are pressing for consideration, and demand immediate attention, to allow this measure, in regard to which no hon. member has presented a single ground for forcing it through the House at the present session, to remain for further consideration. I also venture to express the hope that my hon. friend in giving that careful consideration, in the light of the discussion that has already taken place, and in the light of the general expression of public sentiment given through the press, will take the opportunity before the measure is submitted for our serious consideration and with the object of passing it into law, will fully weigh whether it is not possible yet to devise a measure of a much more practicable character than this, one that will accomplish all the good that is claimed from this measure by its promoters, but will also be unattended with a great many of the objections that have been so forcibly stated in this House and out of it. We have been told by hon. gentlemen that there is nothing new in this measure, that this principle of having the franchise of the various provinces used for the election of members of this Parliament is one that has been long in operation—that this was the law of 1867. Every member of this House knows that, ex necessitate rei, we had to adopt the franchises of the various provinces for the election of members to the first Parliament of this Dominion. The House is also aware that under the Confederation Act provision was made that the franchises of the various provinces, obviously necessary to be used in the first instance, could be superseded by the adoption of a franchise law for this Parliament. The House is further aware that a measure was introduced, but not pushed to a conclusion, under which the election of 1872 took place in the same manner as the first election of members to this House; and that in 1874 a Bill was introduced which materially changed the position of this question, for while still adopting the franchises in operation in the various provinces, provision was made to give this House and the Government a large amount of control in the administration of the Act. I do not intend to detain the House by considering at length the subsequent Act of 1885. I was not then a member of the House; but I believe that Act received a very long and protracted discussion and was subjected to very exhaustive criticism on the part of hon. members. I may say, however, that that Act secured the great object sought to be obtained by a Franchise Act for this Dominion and for the election of members to the House of Commons, and that was uniformity. With the exception of Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, affecting a comparatively small number of voters and the return of a

comparatively small number of members to this House, it was a uniform Act. It was an Act under which the representation was made equal in all the various portions of the Dominion, and members of Parliament felt that, with the exception of those two small provinces, all members of this Parliament met on a common ground, were elected under a common franchise, and sat in conformity with a uniform principle. There was another very important matter, and it was that the revising officers who were appointed under that Act were men of standing and of character. The Government was responsible to this House for the selection of men of standing and of character to discharge the responsible duties of revising officers. But, there was a still more important feature in the franchise law of 1885, and that was, that there was an appeal from the action of the revisers to a judge, and no voter could be struck off the list, and no voter could be put on the list by any of the revisers without a final adjudication before a judge. That security I consider of the very greatest possible importance, because we all recognize in relation to all the provinces, that we have a judiciary of which the country may be, and is, justly proud. I frankly admit that there is one objection to the existing franchise law, and that is, the great expense which has attended its operation. That expense led to the want of frequent revision, which was a very objectionable thing in itself, and I am quite prepared to say that it is the duty of this House to deal with the question of a franchise for this Dominion in such a way as to obtain a plain and simple workable law, equitable in all its bearings in the various provinces, and unattended by that expense which I regard as the main, if not the only objection to the present law.

Now, Sir, as to the Bill introduced by the Solicitor General. We all know that there is no uniformity in it, and that under its operation the very reverse of a uniform franchise will be introduced. The federal members from Prince Edward Island and Manitoba will occupy relatively the same standing, because the franchise in these provinces is practically the same; but the members from other provinces will be elected on an entirely different franchise. There is no uniformity, I say, and the members of this House under this Bill will be elected by half a dozen different laws, all bearing upon elections for this House and all differing in character one from the other. The members of this Federal Parliament will no longer occupy that independent position which they now occupy, of being elected upon a uniform franchise. But there is worse still. Under the proposed Bill this Parliament parts with its right—a right which I hold to lie at the very foundation of the independence of this Parliament—this Parliament parts with the right of declaring under what franchise its members shall be elected. Is it desirable, Sir, that the members of the Parliament of this great Dominion shall be selected under laws over which they have no control whatever? Sir, it does not require a laboured argument to prove that the adoption of such a principle is highly objectionable. For this Parliament to part with the control of its franchise is, in my judgment, a fatal objection to this Bill, and one which the more it is considered the more it will be regarded as striking at the first principles on which the representation in the legislature of a great country should be based. In future, if this Bill should pass, we will have seven laws, each differing from the other, under which members are sent to this House. We will not only have all these different franchises, but we will have these provincial laws changed from time to time by parties over whom we have no control, and who will not be obliged to consult the wishes or interests of this Federal Parliament. I wish to again refer to the incident which occurred in the province of Nova Scotia as an illustration of the danger of our parting with control over our own franchise. At the time when we were subject to the provincial franchises, an incident occurred in Nova Scotia which ought to be sufficient to prevent this Parliament from ever considering for a single moment the question of remitting this power to a local legislature. After the provincial elections in Nova Scotia were over, they passed a law intended to affect the election of members to this House, and which they did not intend should operate in regard to their own elections. My hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) evidently feels that the local legislatures will not pass Acts which will not be regarded as wise and judicious, because these Franchise Acts will bear upon their own elections. But what does the hon. gentleman say of what was done by the Nova Scotia legislature? We had the scandal there exhibited, of the law being changed after the local elections so as to affect the Dominion elections, and without any intention of using that franchise in their own elections. In fact, they repealed that law before the provincial elections were held. That such a thing has ever occurred ought to be sufficient to deter any party in this House from placing the franchise under which members of this House are elected in the hands of a legislature which would do such a thing. But, Sir, that is not all. As I say, these laws are liable to be changed from day to day, and they will be changed. Every person knows that there is no guarantee that the existing Franchise Acts of the various provinces will continue to be the law after this Bill comes into operation. Every person who follows these questions knows that independent of any desire to do wrong, independent of any desire to take such an unfair party advantage as was done in the Nova Scotia case, the very fact that the opinions of members of the various legislatures differ so radically on this question

of the franchise, is the best evidence that from day to day we will have very serious changes in the provincial law bearing upon this matter. An hon. member, in the course of this discussion, has referred to the fact that a great deal has been said in the British House of Commons, and in other places, as to the question of minority representation. So distinguished a man as Mr. Courtney has urged with great force and great ability in the Imperial House of Commons the adoption of minority representation which, if adopted by any of the provinces of Canada, would be a complete and radical change, under which a minority in every constituency could, by a certain means, secure a certain amount of representation in Parliament.

Now, I put it to my hon. friend the introducer of this Bill, what the position would be supposing the province of Ontario or the province of Quebec should become converted to that doctrine, and should adopt minority representation. The hon. gentleman knows that such an action on their part would upset the whole theory upon which the franchise and the constitution of this country are based, that is, to a large extent, the principle of representation by population. It would introduce a great amount of confusion into the whole system. I will not elaborate that point; I have only to mention it, and pass on.

But I will take another point. We know that a resolution in favour of enfranchising women, moved in the Imperial House of Commons the other day by the member for Glasgow, obtained the support of a majority of the House of Commons. Now, I ask my hon. friend the First Minister whether he thinks it would be right or fair for the province of Quebec, the province of Nova Scotia, or any other province to enfranchise women, and all the other provinces to be left without that advantage, if it may be so called? The very fact that you have a resolution passed in the Imperial House of Commons by a substantial majority, affirming the desirability of enfranchising women, is the best evidence that it is not at all unlikely that in some of these provinces at an early day, the law under which this Parliament is to be elected will enfranchise women. Then you will have a portion of the members of this House in the position of being elected under a franchise which includes women, and the rest of the members deprived of the benefit of having the weaker sex included among their constituents.

I mention these as insuperable difficulties against the Bill proposed, which sweeps away the uniformity that now exists and gives us an absence of uniformity which must lead to a great deal of confusion. Why should a person who lives in one province where he enjoys the franchise for a representative of the House of Commons, find himself disfranchised on removing to another province? He is the same man, and he has the same ability, the same right, and the same desire to exercise the franchise; and yet he finds that he has ceased to be an elector when he has crossed the boundary line separating one province from another.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). That is the case under the present law.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think not to the extent that it would be under the law now proposed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Not that it will be, but that there is a possibility of it. The hon. gentleman is only arguing against a possibility.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, I say absolutely. I say that the man who enjoys the franchise in one province and moves to another will cease to be an elector in a great many cases. At present we have practically manhood suffrage in Ontario, Prince Edward Island, British Columbia and Manitoba, and we have a property franchise in Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. This shows that a very large number of electors enjoy advantages in one province which they will cease to enjoy in another.

But my hon. friend from Brockville (Mr. Wood) brought up a most serious and important objection, I think an insuperable objection, to which I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick). He pointed out that under this law a man in the province of Ontario would have but one vote, while a man of the same character, standing and wealth in the province of Quebec would have six votes or perhaps more. So that you are not only going to destroy uniformity, but you are going to give the province of Quebec a very much larger number of individual votes. For instance, in the city of Montreal, where there are a great many men of wealth, who have votes in half a dozen different places, and where it is perfectly practicable for them to poll all their votes in one day, these men will have under this Bill six times greater power than men of the same character, standing and means in the province of Ontario. I think my hon. friend will see at once that this is a most fundamental objection to the enactment of such a law.

Now, I do not intend to occupy any more of the time of the House than is absolutely necessary to glance at certain objections to this Bill. What is wanted is a simple law, a plain law, which the great body of the electors of this country can understand and follow. But any person who reads this Bill with the care with which I have read it, will come to the conclusion that instead of simplifying matters, it has confused everything, and that it would take a long time for any ordinary elector to so study its provisions as to be in a position to carry

it out with that clearness and readiness which are essential in a matter like the franchise.

The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) said that one of the greatest objections to the existing law was its fraudulent character, and that it was desirable to adopt measures that would prevent anything like fraud or dishonesty in the conduct of our elections. There is not a member of this House who does not realize the vital importance of having an honest election law, and one that will be fairly and honestly administered. I was very much astonished on a former occasion, when this question was under the consideration of the House, to hear the hon. First Minister refer to ballot stuffing. There is something worse in my judgment than even ballot stuffing, and that is stuffing the voters' lists, but I may tell the hon. gentleman that I think he can hardly have been following what has taken place in connection with the charges of ballot stuffing in the province of Manitoba when he ventured to speak of ballot stuffing with regard to that province. The hon. gentleman, I presume, does not require to be told that having expended some $5,000 of public money in the prosecution of that charge, having put the law in motion in that province, and the Attorney General having arrested some twenty or more parties accused of that charge, the result was that only one single conviction was obtained out of the whole twenty cases. Instead of its being proved that any such general violation of the law had taken place, the very reverse was proven. One man was convicted on his own testimony, and it is believed that that testimony was due to the fact that the Conservative party had refused to allow him to blackmail them. He then went to the other side, and on the evidence of this one man, a blackmailer, they succeeded in obtaining one conviction out of twenty or more cases, in which people had been treated with the greatest harshness and cruelty possible, through the law being put in force against them without cause. One after another of those accused was acquitted and only one conviction obtained, and that, under most questionable circumstances, and after an expenditure of $5,000 by hon. gentlemen opposite.

I may say that I hold in my hand the report of a speech of the leader of the Opposition in the Manitoba House, Mr. Roblin:

> Mr. Roblin said before proceeding to the orders of the day there was a matter of importance to the province and to himself, as a loyal citizen, which he would like to bring before the House. He referred to the rights of citizenship. The speaker then read from a speech made in the House of Commons on Friday last by the Hon. Mr. Laurier, regarding the elections held in this province last summer. This statement should be taken in connection with what was put into the mouth of His Excellency the Governor General in the Speech from the Throne. This, the speaker thought, fully justified him in bringing this question to the attention of the House. With the knowledge which he possessed regarding the infamy that has followed in the tracks of our provincial Election Act, he could only qualify this Act as an infamy.

There we have a description of this Manitoba Act which the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) invites us to make the law of this Dominion for the election of members of this House:

> By it, not only are the people of this province deprived of their rights, but the very law shields the men who are guilty. Mr. Laurier's intention is to substitute the present Dominion Elections Act with the Act which is a standing disgrace to this province.

And I invite the attention of hon. gentlemen who want an honest law, one that will prevent fraud, to this statement:

> By it, at the last provincial election, above 100,000 men have been robbed of their franchise, and now Mr. Laurier, seeing how much it has helped his friends in this province, now proposes to give it wider scope and adopt it for the Dominion.

And when it is remembered how small is the number of votes in the province of Manitoba, the House can readily grasp the statement made by a responsible member of the local legislature that it has defrauded 100,000 electors in that province of their votes. What has been the result of all these prosecutions for alleged ballot stuffing:

> What has been the result of all these prosecutions for alleged ballot stuffing? Only one man is convicted, and that upon his own evidence. If the Attorney General has obtained from his protege, Frecborn, all the evidence that has been revealed before the courts, he should communicate it to the House, so that we might be in a position to refute the vile slander of Laurier's on this province. Is Laurier aware that, after his Government had granted $5,000 to this government to prosecute those suspected of ballot stuffing, only one man has been convicted?

Mr. Roblin gives us in graphic detail what the real character of this Manitoba Act is, and I would not trouble the House with it were it not that we are invited to make this Manitoba Act the law of this Parliament for the election of members to this House. Mr. Roblin states from his place in the House:

> What does Laurier propose doing? He intends, if he can, to have the provincial and infamous law imposed on the whole Dominion. This Act was as introduced in 1890 or 1892. He had fought this Bill at every stage because he knew that the government intended by it to legislate away the rights of a large number of voters. As it was first introduced, it would give power to an agent to prepare the voters' list without any one knowing who was on it. He had, however, succeeded in having this clause struck out. As it now reads, the Lieutenant-Governor can appoint a registration clerk, who is not bound by time, so that a court of revision can, and often is, appointed and sitting before the list is completed. It can be easily seen what an opportunity this

affords to a man who is blinded by party ties or interests.

There is a case which is well known, where a clerk so appointed admitted that he had prepared his list from that of a Liberal scrutineer used at previous election, and this is the Act which Mr. Laurier intends foisting upon the Dominion. Another thing that has been done is to place bogus names on the list after it was declared completed. This was done to his friend from Emerson, who, when he heard of it, had subpœnas issued and given to a constable to serve, but the constable made a return that he could not find these men, for the very good reason that they never existed. Yet some of these names were retained on the list.

And why do you suppose did they decide that these names should be retained on the lists? Because the revising officer declared that unless it was proved that the subpœnas were served he would not strike the names from the list, and as these people never had any existence, it was not very easy to prove that the subpœnas had been served:

The Act say the clerk shall post up, thirty days before the court of revision is held, the list of voters. Is this ever done? No, it is not. The speaker then read a correspondence between Mr. McDonald, president of the Conservative Association, and the registrar of Brandon, Mr. Maclean, to show that in the case of the election held at Brandon, the court of revision was held before the list was completed. Mr. McDonald asked that the court should adjourn until the list was completed, but this Mr. Maclean refused. It is to avoid a repetition of such infamous conduct as this that he is now addressing the House. His friends opposite are opposed to the Dominion Act on account of its cost, but more particularly because it works out against them. Under the provincial Act there is no appeal from the revising barrister, while under the Dominion Act there is an appeal to a judge.

He had in his possession the names of 200 voters which were given to Albert Monkman to place on the voters' list for Dauphin, yet this Monkman refused to say whether he would or would not place them on the list. From this it can be seen that all that was required were seven Albert Monkmans, and where would be the votes opposed to the present government? This was no hearsay story, for he had in his hand a sworn statement to this effect. In the little town of Morris, in 1892, there were 108 names of French Canadians kept off the lists, but fortunately they were righted by the court of revision, yet it was through no fault of Dr. McTavish that these Frenchmen were not disfranchised. Again, this McTavish, in a small settlement, left off the list 55 names of men well known to him. Later on, however, thanks to the returning officer, Mr. Dawson, these names were added. The same state of affairs obtained in many other districts, such as Hamiota. It is only in constituencies where it is known that the Conservative vote will not affect the result, that this is not tampered with.

Right here in Winnipeg, in 1896, 800 names were omitted from the voters' list so as to ensure the election of a supporter of the government. The Greenway Government owes its return to power more to revising officers than to the votes of the people.

* * * * * * * *

In North Winnipeg, 400 names were left off the list at the last provincial election. When Mr. Laurier made such a slanderous statement as he is reported to have done, he should be informed of this. The registration clerk in Winnipeg has been charged by Mr. Haggard with perjury. When we have a law which permits, which in fact encourages, such deeds of infamy, it is high time to ask that such a law should be repealed or amended. It was for an honest franchise that he was to-day contending. Should Mr. Laurier's intention be to submit this Act for the Dominion Act, it would be a lasting disgrace to the country at large.

Now, Sir, I do not require to say another word in order to prove to the House that nothing could be more unjust, nothing could be more calculated to destroy the character of this House in the estimation of the country than to provide that the members of this House shall be elected under such an infamous Act as this is described to be. But, Sir, this is not all. I have under my hand a statutory declaration by D. H. McFadden which also, I think it my duty to read to the House:

Dominion of Canada.
Province of Manitoba.
To wit:

In the matter of the Emerson Voters' List.

I, David Henry McFadden, of the town of Emerson, in the province of Manitoba, veterinary surgeon, do solemnly declare, that—

1. I was first elected to the provincial legislature of Manitoba in the year 1892, by a majority of fourteen votes, as representative for the electoral division of Emerson.

2. The aforesaid constituency of Emerson was represented by one James Thompson from 1888 to 1892, and who, in 1888, was elected by a majority of fourteen.

3. The aforesaid Thompson was my opponent in 1892.

4. Donald Forrester, barrister, of Winnipeg, was appointed registration clerk and W. E. Perdue, barrister, Winnipeg, revising barrister for the Emerson division, to revise the voters' list previous to the last provincial election.

5. The said registration clerk opened an office at Emerson according to the terms of the Election Act of this province. Every night I had a clerk go to this office and make an exact copy of the list as it was from day to day altered or added to, and continued this rule up to the last day for receiving applications to be put on the list. Late in the evening of that day, I had the said list completed as it was made out by the registration clerk.

6. When the list was printed and distributed, according to the provisions of said Act, I found 13 names on the printed list which were not on my copy of the list, the names being as follows:

Poll No. 10.

No. on List.	
13	Campbell, Arch.
48	Leith, Alex.
49	May, Chas.
62	McEwan, M. W.
88	White, Wm.

Poll No. 11.

14	Hargrave, P.
22	Munro, Alex.
34	Pullar, James.
47	Singer, Joseph.

Poll No. 12.

42 Lister, Frederick R.
46 McDonald, J. C.
47 McKievor, D. W.
57 Turner, Joseph.

as appears by the revised list of electors of said electoral division of Emerson, now produced and shown to me, and marked as Exhibit "A."

7. I at once made diligent inquiries as to these particular voters and as to their right to be placed upon the said electoral list, but could find no evidence that the said voters, or any of them, ever resided within the electoral division of Emerson. I then made application to the registration clerk to have these names struck off the said list of voters.

8. As to the description of residence of these individual voters, it was limited to townships, no section or other particulars being given in the list as to where these parties, or any of them, resided. I had summonses issued by the revising officer and placed them in the hands of responsible parties, actual residents and familiar with all other actual residents in the several townships quoted in the lists, with instructions to make every endeavour to serve these individual voters.

9. At the court of revision the parties whom I had so instructed to serve said summonses, appeared and stated that they could not find any of the said voters to effect service of said orders: and further stated that they could get no information that the said parties, or any of them, resided in the township set opposite their respective names in said list of voters. None of the parties sought for attended the court of revision, and, when application was made to strike their names off the said list, the revising barrister, the said W. E. Perdue, ruled that he would not strike them off the list until it was shown they had been individually served with a summons to attend the said court, and he allowed all the said names to remain on the list as finally revised, and the said names still remain on the said list as bona fide electors of said division, although they are not now, and never have resided in said electoral division.

10. Amongst the names struck off the said list of electors was the name of Donald Forrester, the registration clerk. As he resided and practised his profession as barrister in the city of Winnipeg, application was made to strike his name off. When challenged, he admitted his ineligibility, and the revising barrister had, therefore, no alternative but to strike his name off, which was done.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of "The Canada Evidence Act, 1893."

D. H. McFADDEN.

Declared before me at the town of Emerson, in the province of Manitoba, this first day of April, A.D. 1897.

W. W. UNSWORTH,
A Notary Public in and for the prov. of Man.

Here is a registration clerk entrusted with the construction of the lists, and he actually, without having a shadow of a claim to vote, puts his name on the list with thirteen other names manufactured, names of people who had never lived in the district and did not live there then; and when the gentleman who was to be defeated by these manufactured votes asked to have them struck off, and produced the men who had been instructed to serve the summons to prove that this could not be done because no such persons existed, the revising barrister refused to strike off the names on the ground that these people had never been served. That one fact shows the monstrous, the frightful character of this law and the desperate methods practised under this Act, which methods will be practised in the elections for this House of Commons if this Bill becomes a law, as proposed by the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick). This same statement that I have just read has been repeated in substance by Mr. McFadden on the floor of the legislature of Manitoba, and without any attempt, so far as I am aware on the part of any person to contradict him. Mr. McFadden is reported as follows:—

Mr. McFadden said the Conservatives had not been very successful at the last election. Mr. Greenway can well afford to make little of the gentlemen of the Opposition. This Election Act is all right, if they can get honest revising officers. But they cannot get them. The Emerson list was copied day after day, and the clerk was asked if it were complete, and he said, yes. After the list was printed, however, a lot of names were put on, and because he, the speaker, could not swear that he had subpœnaed these names objected to, and of course he could not do that, because they never existed, they were allowed to remain on the list.

There is Mr. McFadden's testimony. Now, Sir, it requires no argument to show the frightful position we will be in if we adopt the Manitoba law. The hon. gentleman knows that a very striking evidence of the character of this Act is furnished by the character of the legislature of Manitoba. Why, Sir, I think that in the whole of that legislature there are only five or seven Conservatives.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I think it larger than the proportion of Conservatives in this House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But I want to draw my hon. friend's attention to this fact, that when we ran the Dominion elections we divided the province of Manitoba.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You have fallen from grace since then.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman knows that, notwithstanding the most desperate and stringent efforts in that province, where the difficulties were naturally and necessarily greater than in any other portion of this Dominion, we divided the province in the Dominion elections; and yet out of the whole legislature there are only five or seven Conservatives returned in the provincial elections. I think no better evidence could be given of the fraudulent character of this Act under which the local elections are run, and the necessity of hav-

ing a Dominion Act in order to insure something like justice and fairness. Now, Sir, I can find nothing in this Act—and I have read it through with a great desire to discover all that was good in it—I can find nothing in this Act to recommend it. I will make one exception; there is one clause, and it is the only thing in the whole Act that I can find to recommend it, and that is the clause that provides that when there are two or more by-elections they shall all be held on the same day. I admit that is a good clause; but the hon. gentleman who compiled this law must have felt that in putting in that clause he was casting the greatest censure possible upon this Government. Why, Sir, has this Government done what this Bill requires, in providing that the by-elections shall be held on the same day? No, Sir. There never was a more scandalous manipulation of by-elections than has taken place recently. Look at what is taking place to-day in the county of Colchester. How long has that seat in Colchester been vacant? The hon. gentleman knows that the seat for Colchester has been vacant for between three and four months—though I do not remember the exact date. I ask the hon. gentleman why is it that the county of Colchester, in that small province of Nova Scotia, which requires all its representatives in this House to obtain fair consideration—why is it that that important constituency, one of the finest constituencies in the province of Nova Scotia, has been disfranchised by the Government? Can the hon. gentleman give me any reason except a desire to obtain some unfair, some unjust, some improper influence in the control of that election? The election in Colchester is held back until the local elections are suddenly sprung upon the province, and it is now held upon the same day as the local elections. What does the hon. gentleman say with reference to my hon. friend from Champlain (Mr. Marcotte)? Does not this Bill brand the Government with being guilty of an act of gross impropriety in providing that, in justice to the rights of the people of this country, the by-elections should be held on the same day? The hon. gentleman knows that months after that seat was vacant in the province of Quebec, he was afraid, as I have not hesitated to say on a former occasion—he was afraid to challenge the independent opinion of the province of Quebec; but he was ready to rush an election down in Gaspé, in a remote part of the province, where exceptional influences of a powerful character could be brought to bear. Before the late member was scarcely cold in his grave a writ was issued and sent down there, while the independent electors of Champlain were denied the sacred privilege of putting their verdict on record, because the First Minister was afraid to give them the opportunity of expressing their opinion. Why, Sir, have Colchester and Champlain remained vacant since the 25th of March, while the House has been nearly a month in session? I say that these important constituencies have been disfranchised for nearly a month. Is that just? Is it right? If so, why does the Government not propose to continue that practice? As I suggested the other day, the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) was obliged to bring in a Bill to protect the Government from the temptation to which the First Minister admitted they were subjected in regard to the civil service; and so I say to-day that the Solicitor General is obliged to bring in a Bill to prevent this Government from acting unjustly to this House and to the people of this country, and to compel them to hold by-elections on the same day. Sir, I hope this Bill will never become law, and I do not think it ever will. In saying so, I pay a great compliment to the First Minister, because I believe that after sober second-thought he will come to the conclusion that a wiser and better Bill can be brought down, one that will reflect more credit upon the Government, and be more beneficial to the country than this one; and it is on that ground that I say I do not think this Bill will ever become law. But if it should become law, I would suggest to my hon. friend that he should protect the Government once more against themselves, and provide not only that they should hold all the by-elections on one day, but within a certain limited period from the time the seats become vacant. I must say that, judging from the past, they ought to be only too thankful to be again protected from themselves, and protected from the position they occupy here to-day of being challenged and condemned for keeping two important constituencies unrepresented in this House for a month after this session began, although the seats were open months before.

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

After Recess.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I will now deal with a very important branch of this Bill. The desire constantly expressed by hon. members who are now on the other side of the House has been that every possible effort should be made to render any corrupt practice in regard to elections as impossible as legislation could make it. That is a sentiment I think, Sir, that will receive the ready assent of hon. gentlemen in all parts of this House, and I am quite sure anything in the form of relaxation of the measures that have been found necessary to secure purity in elections will be readily admitted to be very desirable, and that any movement in the other direction will be found to be very objectionable. I find that in several respects this Bill makes a new departure and

adopts a line that has never been adopted by hon. members in this House, namely, that it proposes to relax the clauses of the Election Act to secure the purity of elections and to open the door to a great deal of corruption. I will draw the attention of the House for a moment to clause 72 of the present Bill, which makes a very important and radical change in the law as it is at present. The clause reads :

72. Where there is no voters' list, if a deputy returning officer rejects the vote of a person entitled to vote and does so in good faith and believing upon reasonable grounds that such person is not entitled to vote, the deputy returning officer shall not therefor be liable to any penalty.

Under the law as it stands there is no room for the judge to interpret the intentions of the officers. If he violates the law he is held responsible and he suffers punishment under the law. Under this clause, however, in cases where there is no voters' list, it makes the deputy returning officer the absolute judge, and he can say to any person, I will not accept your vote ; if he declares that he did so in good faith, believing upon reasonable grounds that the person is not entitled to vote, he is relieved from the penalty that now attaches. I can scarcely imagine any more dangerous innovation so far as purity of election is concerned. The law lays down the circumstances under which a person is entitled to vote. The returning officer has no option in regard to accepting the vote, provided the person is willing to take the necessary oath which the law imposes, and the question as to whether it is a good or bad vote depends upon judicial proceedings taken afterwards. But in this Bill it is proposed to throw on the judge trying the case the responsibility of deciding, not whether the act is a legal or illegal act but what was the intention of the returning officer. I am sure it is only necessary to call attention to this clause and the effect of it to show that it can only operate so as to relax the security which every candidate now possesses, in that the acceptance or rejection of votes does not rest on the will and disposition of the returning officer.

Then we come to a matter which I think is still more important and is involved in clauses 126 and 130. Clause 126 is as follows :—

126. If, on the trial of an election petition, it appears to the court that an act constituting in law a corrupt practice was committed by a candidate, or with his knowledge and consent, but without any corrupt intent, and in an ignorance which was involuntary and excusable, and that the evidence showed the candidate to have honestly desired, and in good faith endeavoured as far as he could, to have the election conducted according to law, the candidate shall not be subject to the penalties and disabilities which he would but for this section incur.

Under the law as it now stands, if a candidate is found guilty of personally being engaged in a corrupt practice, he has to take the consequences of it ; but this clause is another modification of the Act as it now stands on the Statute-book under which the party pleading that although corrupt practice was committed by a candidate, or with his knowledge and consent, if he had not a corrupt intent, he shall go free. Who is to judge of the intent ? If the candidate commits the corrupt practice he must take the consequences, and under the present law he is obliged to bear the penalty, severe as it is ; but with this relaxation of the law all the candidate has to plead is that he had no corrupt intent, that it was involuntary and excusable. I contend that this clause again opens the door to great relaxation in the present law, and every one knows how difficult it is to frame laws that provide complete security against corrupt practices either on the part of candidates or of persons conducting elections. Then in clause 129 we have another novelty introduced. It is copied from the present Act, and is as follows :—

129. Every person other than a candidate found guilty of any corrupt practice in any proceeding in which, after notice of the charge, he has had an opportunity of being heard, shall, during the eight years next after the time at which he is found guilty, be incapable of being elected to and of sitting in the House of Commons, and of voting at any election of a member of the House of Commons, or of holding any office in the nomination of the Crown or of the Governor General of Canada.

That law, hon. members will see at once, is rendered practically nugatory by the additional clause, which for the first time makes its appearance in an Act for the election of members to this House—clause 130, which reads :

130. No person shall be subject to the disabilities set forth in the next preceding section by reason of a merely technical breach of the law, or by reason of any act which is not an intentional violation of the law and does not involve moral culpability or affect the result of the election.

This is throwing a very serious and new duty upon the judge who tries an election case. He has not only to decide what the law is and enforce the penalties which the law provides, but he has to take into account the moral culpability of the party, which involves, I say, a complete relaxation of the clause as it now stands on the Statute-book so as to a large extent render it nugatory.

I do not intend to go more at length into this Bill. I have drawn the attention of the House to what I regard as very great defects in it, and in fact I am at a loss to find anything in this Bill, from cover to cover, that is calculated to recommend it to this House. I direct the attention of hon. members to another point, and that is, that this Bill, so far as I am able to judge, has found no support anywhere. I may be wrong ;

but I consider it to be a duty which devolves on me to read the Government papers as well as the Conservative papers, and I fail to find a single paper that approves of this Bill. I have failed to find any portion of the press to which this Bill apparently commends itself. In the Montreal "Gazette" and in the "Mail and Empire" I find the strongest possible objections raised to it not only on the grounds which I have presented to the House, but on the grounds of relaxing the penalties for offences against the law and threatening the purity of elections. Then I take the "Globe," which generally is able to give a tolerably hearty support to anything that emanates from hon. gentlemen opposite; but I find in that newspaper this statement:

The Confederation Act provided that the provincial franchises should be used until otherwise ordered.

Then it speaks of the change, and says:

The argument, that if we return to the provincial franchise, the law will be subject to the caprice of the provincial legislatures, is worthy of a little more consideration. The provincial legislation on the franchise has doubtless contained some faults, but none worse than the Franchise Act of 1885.

The best the "Globe" can say of this Bill, is that is does not contain anything worse than the present Act, which has been denounced in such round terms by hon. gentlemen opposite as being entirely indefensible. Then the "Globe" says:

Really, however, one of the gravest objections to the Franchise Act of 1885 was the unfair use to which it might be put by the Government and its friends, of whatever party they might be composed. Another was its expense.

I think I have proven to the House, that however open the Act of 1885 is to be made use of by the Government and its friends, this Bill would be a thousand times more open to that charge, because legislatures over which we have no control would be able to do in the Dominion elections, what I have already shown they have done in regard to the local elections. The "Globe," after having spoken in the most forcible manner in favour of manhood suffrage says:

The basis of the federal franchise certainly ought to be: one man one vote.

So, Sir, I find that even a paper so strongly supporting the Liberal Government as the "Globe" does is anything but satisfied with the character of this measure. Then, the Montreal "Star," an independent paper, under an article which is headed "It satisfies no one," denounces this measure which we are now considering and points out its grave defects. It says:

The "Globe" makes the boast that by the new law three-fifths of the people of the Dominion will elect their members of Parliament under manhood franchise and one man one vote, and prophesies that before the next general election the remaining two-fifths will probably have fallen into line, and that we shall have a law that will give absolute equality in all the provinces.

I think, Sir, there is a great deal in that. At the present time a very large portion of the members in the province are elected under manhood suffrage practically. In the province of Ontario it is now practically manhood suffrage; in British Columbia, Prince Edward Island and Manitoba, it is the same, and with the exception of Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, you have manhood suffrage throughout. The tendency of all the local legislatures being to broaden the franchise, the probability is, as is indicated by the "Globe," that at a comparatively early date, within five years, we shall have practically manhood suffrage in the various provinces of the Dominion. If that be the case, it becomes worthy the consideration of hon. gentlemen opposite, as to whether they should not endeavour to obtain an easy worked and inexpensive law by which a franchise Bill shall be obtained that will be common to every part of this Dominion. In speaking of the expense of the Franchise Act, I may draw the attention of the House for a moment to the fact, that the operation of the franchise law in Manitoba is anything but inexpensive. The total cost to the province of Manitoba was as follows: Registry clerks' fees, $6,284. Expenses for final revision, $1,717. Cost of printing, $6,227; making a total cost for that small province of $14,228, or a little over $355 for each constituency. In the courts of revision there were 1,955 names added, and 944 struck off, making the total vote 49,199, at a cost of $14,288, or about 29 cents for each name. Printing the lists and a number of other expenses would devolve upon the Government here. Then, Sir, I find in the St. John "News" the following statement:—

But the proposed new Act, instead of being a simple measure, turns out to be a bulky Bill of 156 clauses, making 68 printed pages, and in many respects it is quite as complicated as the present law. More than this, the general principle of the Bill, which is the adoption of the various and divergent provincial franchises, is not to be commended. A man living in one province will be a voter who would not under similar conditions be a voter in an adjacent province. The principle that it shall be left to the local legislatures to say who shall and who shall not vote for members of the Federal Parliament, is decidedly wrong, and may lead to abuses and injustice. A Bill based on the principle of simple manhood suffrage, with certain necessary restrictions, would have been better and much more in consonance with the spirit of the age.

I find also that the Manitoba newspapers object to this Bill in the strongest possible language. They point out the extremely corrupt character of the franchise law in Manitoba and they object to having that applied to the Dominion. The Manitoba

"Free Press," a paper supporting the present Government, has the following statement with regard to this measure:—

"The new franchise law," says the Toronto "Globe," "means that we are done with stuffed voters' lists." On the contrary, it means that in Manitoba, at least, we are to have, for the first time, stuffed voters' lists for use in Dominion elections. The "Free Press" does not presume to speak of the lists elsewhere than in this province; the laws under which they are made may be the best, and they may be honestly compiled. The "Globe" may speak for Ontario, and other papers for other provinces; for the present we do not presume to go outside of Manitoba. Here, too, they may be honestly compiled, but that is in spite of the law, which distinctly permits dishonesty. It is some years now since the "Globe" took the trouble to learn enough about the Manitoba Election Act to declare that it was bad, and that it would hinder the reform of the Dominion law by putting a weapon of defence in the hands of the Tories. These were not its exact words, but they convey its exact meaning. It may have forgotten in the intervening years what it then knew, and we shall take the liberty briefly to recall to its recollection the salient features of the Manitoba law.

It provides that lists shall be compiled by registration clerks appointed by the government. These are not barristers of repute in their profession or of standing in the community, as provided by the Dominion Act which is now being repealed because it is thought to be so objectionable. They may be any persons whom the government choose to appoint, and as a matter of fact, have been for the most part active workers of the party to whom the pay of a registration clerk is a consideration. They have no public or professional reputation to sustain, and are, therefore, all the freer, in earning their money, to earn also the gratitude of their employers. We need not go beyond this to convict the law of all the badness charged against it. It has long been a Liberal principle that the making of the voters' lists should be free of government control, and an excellent principle it is. In passing the Dominion franchise law, the Conservatives, no doubt, calculated to reap party advantage by means of the control exercised through the revising barristers, and, holding the view they did, the Liberals were quite right in denouncing the Act. But the control was insignificant in comparison with the control reserved by the Government of Manitoba. As a matter of fact, there were few complaints made against the revising barristers, which shows their work was fairly well performed. Perhaps this has been largely due to the checks provided by courts of revision and appeals to judges. Here the registration clerks are at liberty to compile the lists in any manner they choose, free of restraint or constraint. The "Globe" may form a shrewd conception of the results produced, if it will carefully bear in mind the general character of those registration clerks.

I invite the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to that as coming from one of their own newspapers, the Winnipeg "Free Press," which is not likely to overstate the case; and that confirms in the fullest and clearest manner the authentic statements which I have read as having been made in the legislature of Manitoba.

Now, I have already said that manhood suffrage is enjoyed in a large portion of the Dominion, and I think it is well worthy of the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite, even at this late period, whether it would not be infinitely better to adopt the principle of manhood suffrage throughout the Dominion. I am sure there is no person who wishes to see our elections carried on in a proper and suitable manner, and the members of a great parliament like this elected on a common principle and placed on a common footing relatively to each other, who would not a thousand times prefer a Bill providing for manhood suffrage to the measure now before us—a measure open to such serious objections that it renders confusion worse confounded. I believe that if the public sentiment of this country were taken, it would be found greatly to prefer a simple manhood suffrage, guarded by residence and a proper system of registration. I may say that in 1859 manhood suffrage was the law in Nova Scotia. I will read the principal clauses of that law as they are very short:

All natural-born and naturalized subjects of the Crown of Great Britain, having been, and being, domiciled as hereinafter limited, and being males over the age of twenty-one years, shall be entitled to vote for members to serve in general assembly, that is to say, provided they shall at the time of voting have had their usual place of abode for at least year next before voting in the counties for which they shall vote for county members, and in the townships for which they shall vote for township members; and provided also, that such naturalized subjects so voting, and such natural-born subjects as were not born in Nova Scotia, shall, in addition, have resided in the province for at least five years next before voting; and provided also, that persons voting on residence shall only be entitled to vote in the electoral districts in which they reside at the time of voting, and which district must be in the counties and townships respectively for representing which the candidates are to be elected at that election; and no person who shall have received aid as a pauper under any poor law in this province, or aid as poor persons from any public grant of government money within one year before the day of polling, nor any Indian, shall be entitled to vote on residence.

It will be seen that there was not only manhood suffrage, but one man one vote; and I think I may say that the legislature of Nova Scotia at that time held as high a character for the ability and independence of its members as it has ever done in any period of its history. As I said on a former occasion, there is no country in the world to which, in my judgment, manhood suffrage could be entrusted with greater propriety than to Canada. Every gentleman who is acquainted with the mass of the people of this Dominion knows perfectly well that for intelligence and independence, no electorate could be found anywhere that would surpass that of Canada. I have said on a former occasion that manhood suffrage in the Dominion of Canada would be a much higher franchise than the franchise that exists to-day in the United Kingdom

of Great Britain and Ireland, where many thousands of the electors have not the slightest idea of many of the questions before the country nor any knowledge of the relations of the political parties. Everybody knows that from the frequent electoral contests that take place in Canada, the great mass of the people are not only thoroughly intelligent, but thoroughly well informed on political questions, and in a position to give an intelligent expression of their opinion upon them. I therefore do hope that before this measure is pressed to a conclusion, the Government will give careful attention to the advisability of adopting a simple franchise, adapted to the whole country—one that will be inexpensive, and that, with a proper registration, will remove almost every objection that has been urged against this measure.

Now, Sir, I am at a loss to understand why hon. gentlemen opposite should denounce so fiercely the present law. I look upon it is an act of base ingratitude on their part. Why, Sir, what has the present law done for them? We had the local franchises in this country in 1867; the Liberal party were badly beaten. We had them in 1872; again they were badly beaten. We had them in 1874, when, as hon. gentlemen opposite know, they got a snap verdict from the country before the country understood the question that was under consideration. But that was the only occasion down to 1891 on which they succeeded. Out of seven elections, they were beaten every time but one under the very provincial franchises they now propose to bring into operation. Now, since this law has been on the Statute-book, we have had three elections. And in the last of these they succeeded, going to the country without a policy, without a principle, without anything except the prestige of my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Laurier) which, I confess, was a very great source of strength, and I look upon it as an act of great ingratitude to the present law that they should denounce the very means by which they succeeded in obtaining office. I am quite sure that the more hon. gentlemen opposite think of this question, the more they will find that the adoption of such a Bill as this will be fraught with great injury to the country, will give great dissatisfaction, and be attended by none of the advantages which we all agree an election law should possess, and they will find, I believe, sufficient talent and ability among themselves to devise a cheap and inoffensive measure that would apply to the whole of Canada and that we need not be ashamed of, and under which all members elected to this House would stand on the same footing.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I ventured at a public meeting which was held a short time ago, to express my opinion that the hon. gentleman would receive one of the surprises of his life after Parliament met and he found the Liberal party redeeming the pledges they had made previous to the elections, and I am vindicated to-night in the speech he has just made in which he expressed his unqualified surprise that the Liberal party, who, for some ten or twelve years past have pledged themselves in and out of the House to the introduction of just such a Bill as we have before us now, should have redeemed that pledge on this occasion. The Liberal party are mindful of their pledge and not unmindful of the handsome majorities they have received, and in redeeming that pledge they are carrying out the wishes of the large majority of those who voted for them at the last general election. The hon. gentleman is to be congratulated on the mild and quiet way in which he to-night addressed himself to the subject under discussion. He commenced in the afternoon with his usual vigour, but as time went on he became milder, and after dinner we found him resuming the discussion in a still milder tone. For some unaccountable reason we found the hon. gentleman evincing a mildness altogether foreign to his character, and which only can be accounted for by some extraordinary influence? What is the cause? How is it he is not thundering to-night as usual on the delinquencies of the present Government? How is it that he has not been charging hon. members on this side with having lost the confidence of the electorate? How is it he does not tell us that the remarkably intelligent province from which he has the honour to come has listened to the weary diatribes which he and his friend and lieutenant beside him (Mr. Foster) have uttered since the session began and has shown that it saw some strength in their arguments. Sir, the whole secret of the mildness and quietness with which the hon. gentleman addressed the House can be found in the telegraphic despatches which have just reached us from the province of Nova Scotia. Sir, to the three weeks of wasted time for which the hon. gentleman was accountable he has just got his answer from his native province. He sent perhaps the most brilliant and able of his lieutenants down there to take charge of the campaign. He resorted, I have no doubt, to those devices than whom no one knows better how to use, to carry the elections, and although the Liberal party in that province were deprived of the assistance of my hon. colleague, the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), who has been compelled to remain in this House, yet, under the leadership of the Hon. Mr. Murray, that province has returned to its local House, out of thirty-eight members, thirty-two to support Liberalism and five to support the Tory party. Sir, I think the hon. gentleman is to be commiserated.

Mr. CRAIG. From the sea alone.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Slowly but surely, not from

the sea alone, but from all parts of the Dominion comes in the answer that the people have lost confidence in him and his policy. Unequivocally and unreservedly they pronounce their faith in the Liberal party. Unequivocally the people of the province of Nova Scotia have pronounced their continued faith in that party which has ruled that province for the last fourteen or fifteen years.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a case of misplaced confidence.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Thirty-two to five is the best answer I can give. If I were to argue here for a week, I could not give a better one, or make it stronger. That great city in which the hon. gentleman's voice has been heard so often records a majority of 600 in favour of the three Liberal candidates, and the whole province has gone with a sweep and declared emphatically, beyond contravention or doubt, that Toryism and Tupperism, as my hon. friend beside me has said, is dead in the province of Nova Scotia. But how about the great county of Colchester, and how about the historic county, which, almost since confederation, has returned, constantly, members to support the party to which the hon. gentleman belongs? Where is that county to-day? Even it has turned its back upon him. Cumberland has gone, Colchester has gone. The hon. gentleman was deploring that Colchester was not represented in this House, and I am pleased to be able to inform him that hereafter during this session and Parliament, Colchester will be well represented by a member supporting my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Laurier). Well, the hon. gentleman is to be commiserated. He has fought long and talked loud, and he would do well now, with his mature years, to recognize the handwriting upon the wall. He would do well to recognize the fact that in this great Dominion the young men are declaring themselves Liberals, that Canada is saturated with Liberal principles, and that from the Atlantic to the Pacific there is to-day one universal feeling, that Toryism is dead and buried. I offer my commiserations to the hon. gentleman. I feel somewhat sorry for him. His ranks are being decimated slowly but surely. Standing behind him is a small phalanx of the old guard, but day by day we find their numbers diminishing and others taking their places on the opposite side. I can only hope for the hon. gentleman that those who are nearer and behind him will remain true, for if they do not he will not be left with even a corporal's guard when the session is over.

I congratulate the hon. gentleman sincerely on one fact, that he has shown an example to his lieutenants and followers in this debate by endeavouring to discuss the merits of the Bill, and because he has done so, I propose to say a few words in reply. Towards the close of his speech he spoke of it as being an extremely bulky measure. No one knows better than the hon. gentleman himself that, although the Bill is somewhat bulky, it is a necessary consolidation of a large number of existing statutes, and that unless these statutes had been consolidated in the Bill, it would be almost impossible for the ordinary man to understand the election law at all. In this bulky Bill of sixty pages there are only very few sections which are new or which introduce a new principle. The other sections merely consolidate the existing diverse statutes on the election law. So that we have to confine ourselves, not to a discussion of the consolidation part of the Bill, but simply to a discussion of those new principles which the Bill introduces. Now, the hon. gentleman took some time just before dinner to show the iniquity of the present provincial franchises. He took as an instance the province of Manitoba, and he argued at some length basing his argument upon statements of the leader of the Opposition in that province and another member of the Opposition named McFadden, to prove that there was no earthly good to be found in the Manitoba election law at all. It was, to use his own language, a most infamous Act. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have had occasion to look through that Act; I have examined it somewhat critically, and I find that, taken as a whole, this Act of the legislature of the province of Manitoba, is, on the face of it, about as good an Act as could well be conceived of. I find, Sir, that it confers the franchise upon those of the male sex:

> Who are of the age of twenty-one years and are British subjects by birth or naturalization, and who, at time of the proclamation of the appointment of a registration clerk, have been three months resident and domiciled within the electoral division, and have been one year resident and domiciled within the province.

And my surprise was intensified when after I had heard the hon. gentleman, for nearly half an hour, denouncing this Act as an infamous Act, to hear him wind up his lengthy speech by calling upon this House to adopt the very principle of manhood suffrage that was embodied in the Manitoba Act. How does the hon. gentleman reconcile these things?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend (Mr. Davies) surely is not serious. I was not objecting to manhood suffrage being embodied in the Act, it was the administration of the Act, the corrupt administration of the Act, which I proved up to the hilt, and which the Manitoba "Free Press," supporting the hon. gentleman denounces as loudly as I do.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Then, I am glad to receive the confession of the hon. gentleman that it is not the Act itself that he denounces.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Act contains this corrupt organization and administration.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Manitoba Act is all right, it appears.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, it is all wrong, except the principle of manhood suffrage.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It embodies the very principle that the hon. gentleman, in his closing words, contended for, the principle of manhood suffrage.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It does.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. And because we ask that this principle should be adopted, so far as Manitoba is concerned, for elections to this House, he denounces this Bill as an infamous Bill. The hon. gentleman said that he did not give his own evidence but quoted the opinion of the leader of the Opposition in the legislature of Manitoba. And I do not wonder the hon. gentleman quoted that language; when I heard it read, I thought it suited him exactly. I will not accuse the hon. gentleman of exaggeration, but I will call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the quotation which he read with so much gusto. What was that quotation which he seriously asked this House to adopt as correct? The criticism which he read as coming from Mr. Roblin, the leader of the Opposition, was that under this "infamous" Act, 100,000 electors had been disfranchised during the last election in Manitoba. What will this House say when I tell them that the whole population of Manitoba is about 200,000 or about 40,000 families. Yet it seems 100,000 electors have been disfranchised in the province.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Allow me to say that I presume that is a clerical error in the report which I read, and that 10,000 was the number intended.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will take the hon. gentleman's explanation. He admits that it was a clerical error. But when he was quoting it, when he was rolling it with such intense gusto under his tongue, did he suggest that there was a clerical error? The thing contains its own refutation; its absurdity stands out upon its face. But, as the hon. gentleman has withdrawn it, I will say nothing more to the House, except that I hope that those who quote his speech, including the statement he now corrects, will also quote his correction. His argument based upon this 100,000 falls to the ground in the proportion that 100,000 bears to 10,000; and, so far as the 10,000 is concerned, I think the House will not ask me to trouble it by continuing the argument. Further, the hon. gentleman quoted an ex-parte declaration of a gentleman named McFadden as showing that the Franchise Act was, as he termed it, an infamous Act. What did Mr. McFadden say? And I would ask the hon. gentleman in this connection, if he thinks it becomes a distinguished statesman of his standing, a man of far more than ordinary calibre, as he is, when addressing his followers and this House upon a Bill that goes to the foundation of representative institutions in this country, to content himself with reading ex-parte declarations of some member of the provincial legislature as to the existing state of facts. The thing is beneath him. He should relegate it to some of those gentlemen behind him who seem to think that they fulfil their duties here when they occupy an hour or two of the time of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not saying anything against many of the hon. gentlemen behind the leader of the Opposition, among whom are many personal friends of my own. But those who have sat here for the past few weeks cannot shut their eyes to the fact that there has been a kind of contest among some hon. gentlemen opposite to see which could occupy the longest time of the House, irrespective of the force of the arguments they presented. Now, what was the gist of the statement made by Mr. McFadden, after all said and done? It was that the election Act was all right, but the only trouble was with the administration of the Act. Well, Sir, we are not adopting the present administration of the Act; that may change from day to day. I will not concede there were any improprieties in the administration of the Act in Manitoba. We know very well the extent to which members of the Opposition will go, when they are beaten in a general election, in order to account for their defeat. They will give all manner of reasons as accounting for their defeat except the fact that the people did not vote for them, which generally is the real reason. But they avoid that and talk about the way the law is administered. But I wish to address myself seriously to some serious arguments of the hon. gentleman which seemed to have some weight. I do not think anybody pretends that the Bill presented by the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) is a perfect Bill. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) is quite willing to accept any suggestions as to details which come from gentlemen opposite to improve the Bill. All we do say is that the principle of adopting the provincial franchises as the basis of the Dominion franchise is a principle for which the Liberal party has fought for the last ten or twelve years, and a principle to which, after five years of ceaseless agitation, our opponents, the Conservative party gave in their adhesion, and to which they publicly declared their conversion. Why, Sir, what are we arguing about? I

say unreservedly that upon this point as to the principle upon which the basis of the Dominion franchise should be built, that principle it was contended by the Liberal party should be the provincial franchises, and for five years that principle was conceded by our opponents, and they admitted that it was the proper principle. There was no difference between the parties. It was not a contentious principle until faction made it so; it has not been a contentious principle for the last five or six years. When the hon. gentleman argued, therefore, that the principle we have adopted was a vicious principle and a wrong principle, he was opposing the declarations of the party which he now leads, declarations made in this House from time to time, and most notably by the late leader, Sir John Thompson, to whose remarks I will refer in a moment or two.

Now, he says the Act of 1885 was a good Act in several respects, he says it gave practical uniformity. He instanced the exceptions, evry properly and very justly, of Prince Edward Island and of British Columbia; but he failed to go further, as he ought to have gone. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman this question, when he is thinking this out, as he ought to think it out, and as I have no doubt he does try to think it out in the seclusion of his study—I would like to ask him this question: Is there uniformity in the Act of 1885, leaving Prince Edward Island and British Columbia to one side? Were the franchises for the city and the county the same? Did not a man who possessed the right to vote in the city, pass into the county and lose that right to vote? Certainly he did. The same qualifications did not exist. The hon. gentleman knows well, no one, from his large experience, knows better, that in all British representative institutions it has not been sought to obtain pedantic or absolute uniformity, that it is not thought desirable to have pedantic or absolute uniformity; but that the franchises change with the changing conditions of the people, as they ought to change. In the city you have a franchise, one amount, one fixed franchise; in the country districts, an entirely different one. In one province we have one franchise, in another province another franchise—just to suit what was thought to be the conditions of the people, and to offer an opportunity to give expression to the mature wish of the people in each province. That has been the case with us, and that is the case, not only in the mother country, but in all countries possessing British representative institutions. I ask the attention of the hon. gentleman for a moment to the state of the franchise in Great Britain and Ireland. Is the franchise the same in England as it is in Scotland? Is it the same in Scotland that it is in Ireland? Is it the same in the city as it is in the boroughs? Why, the hon. gentleman knows there is no such thing as uniformity known, or recognized, or legislated for in the great country from which we take our cue. Such a thing as uniformity is not known, and such a thing as uniformity would be unjust, because the conditions of the people in cities and boroughs, in Ireland and in England, and in Scotland, are entirely different, and you must legislate in conformity with the actual conditions of the people.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman put a point which was a very strong one, if it was correct. He says: I call the attention of Parliament to the serious fact that we are legislating to-day to part with our right of declaring how its members should be elected. Sir, we are doing nothing of the kind. The hon. gentleman surely is wrong. The House is legislating with the full knowledge of what the franchise will be in each province of this Dominion. The hon. gentleman says this may happen, and the other thing may happen. Sir, it has been the boast of our elastic British constitution that as conditions change, we will change the legislation necessary to meet them; and if conditions change in this Dominion of Canada, if any of the horrible things happen which my hon. friend predicts, if the great province of Ontario confers the franchise upon a class of people that we do not approve of, surely it is open to this Parliament to change the Act. We do not part with the power. We adopt the franchise as it is to-day, we adopt the provincial franchise as long as we think it suitable for our interests, but we do not deprive ourselves of the power of regulating our franchise if we choose. What was the fact before? When this confederation was first brought into existence, we had a scheme, a system, very similar to the one which we are now asked to adopt; we had the provincial franchises as the basis of the Dominion franchise. That system worked for eighteen long years, and I venture the assertion that it worked with hardly a hostile criticism from any part of the Dominion. Who revoked that system, and why was it revoked? Was there a call from the people to revoke it? Dare anybody stand up and say that during the first eighteen years of this Dominion that franchise was an infamous one, or proved a curse, or was not a blessing? Why, we know that the voice of the people was obtained through that system better than it has even been obtained after the Bill of 1885 was introduced. We propose, not something entirely novel or new, but we propose, after having had some twelve years experience of that Franchise Bill of 1885, that we should return to the system that worked so admirably from 1867 up to 1885. But the hon. gentlemen says: Suppose a minority representation was introduced in the great province of Ontario, where would you be then? Well, supposing it was, I cannot see how that is going to affect us. The principle of having a minority representative

would not apply to us. It is only the franchise vote which would be polled in accordance with the electoral law of the Dominion to elect one man for each electoral district, and not put a minority man here. That argument does not apply, and cannot apply. And the same answer may be given to his suggestion that possibly the province of Ontario, singled out here again as perhaps the most advanced province of the Dominion, might confer the franchise upon females. Well, Sir, supposing it did. This Parliament might be perfectly well satisfied to adopt that, perfectly well satisfied to let it be. But if Parliament was not satisfied, the remedy would be in their own hands. The argument which the hon. gentleman suggests, that we are parting with our powers in this matter, is altogether inaccurate, because we are simply adopting the franchise as it at present exists, we claim the fullest and amplest power to alter, revoke, or modify it from time to time, as the circumstances of the case may call for.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend will probably allow me to ask him a question, because I do not read the Bill as he does. I understand him to say that this Bill proposes that we should take the franchises as they exist now in the various provinces, and make them the basis of the Dominion franchise. But that is not the Bill. The Bill reads :

> Subject to the provisions hereinafter contained, the qualifications and conditions necessary to entitle a person to vote at a Dominion election, shall be those entitling a person, at the time of such election, to vote at a provincial election in the electoral district for which the Dominion election is being held, or any part thereof.

So that whatever the law may be in the province at the time the Dominion election is held, shall be the law for the Dominion.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Precisely, the hon. gentleman is perfectly correct. He has read the Bill just as it is, and just as I read it. But I was addressing myself to his argument that Parliament was parting with its right of declaring how its members should be elected, and I was showing him that while we are adopting this system of provincial franchises which are to apply to the Dominion for the time being, we do not part with our powers ; we can retain and recover those powers at any moment we like to exercise our privilege.

The hon. gentleman quoted with approval a speech delivered by the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) the other day. That hon. gentleman presented a well-reasoned argument against the principle of this Bill. He argued that one vital defect in it was, that while in Ontario there was the principle adopted of one man one vote, that principle did not apply to the province of Quebec, and one man there if he possessed half a dozen qualifications for votes in different electoral districts could deliver as many votes as he could visit different electoral districts on election day. The hon. gentleman seemed to think that that was an extraordinary position and might result in an extraordinary state of facts; indeed, he more than broadly hinted that underlying it was the awful question of French domination, and he told this House that the province of Ontario would never submit to anything of the kind. One would suppose from the hon. gentleman's argument that some special advantage was being conceded by this provision to the province of Quebec. No one knows better than the hon. gentleman that the province of Quebec sends to this House a fixed number of representatives. It does not matter whether one man votes in two or half a dozen places ; it does not alter the representation in the House, and if the province of Quebec in its wisdom seems to think the better plan is to give property the right to vote through its owner in every place which he can visit on election day, it is the business of the province itself : it does not alter the representation in this House, nor does it give the province of Quebec a scintilla of advantage over Ontario.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Yet the "Globe" hopes that the province of Quebec will change its present system to one man one vote.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not surprised that the "Globe" should advocate the one man one vote principle, and that it would like to see it extended to the province of Quebec. But the "Globe" does not pretend to dictate to Quebec. The "Globe" knows very well that in the matter of provincial franchise the people of the province of Quebec are supreme, and if they choose to retain the principle they now have, the "Globe" will not complain, much as it may argue that the plan of one man one vote is a better one. But my hon. friend is a veritable Rip Van Winkle. The hon. gentleman was a member or leading supporter of a Government which distinctly admitted its adhesion to the principle he now condemns. Does the hon. gentleman remember when he sat on this side of the House what Sir John Thompson, his leader, stated ? Did he not say that in order to achieve simplicity and avoid the enormous expense of a Dominion franchise, the Conservative party had solemnly agreed to accept as the basis of a Dominion franchise the provincial franchise of the Dominion ?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Sir John Thompson never at any moment declared or expressed the opinion that this Parliament should depart from the principle of governing its own franchise. Once you depart from that principle, it is no longer a Dominion but a provincial franchise.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is confounding two things. I am talking about the justice of taking the provincial franchise as the basis for a Dominion franchise. I am arguing whether it is proper or right to adopt as a basis for a Dominion franchise the franchises of the several provinces. That is a separate and distinct question in itself. Is it right or wrong ?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). You propose to make some changes in this Parliament ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman says that is wrong. Why ? He says it is wrong because in the province of Quebec a man may have five or six votes, whereas in Ontario a man has only one vote. But you have conceded that point already ; you have declared that that principle was the only one you would adopt.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). We never declared that. The Bill never came before this House, and never was voted on.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not saying it was voted on. But I say that the hon. gentleman's leader used the following language, which has already been quoted by the Solicitor General, but which under the circumstances, I may be pardoned for quoting again. At page 3367 in the "Hansard" of 1894, in reply to Mr. Laurier, Sir John Thompson said :

> We propose important changes in the Franchise Act, and, without making a speech upon them or giving reasons, I would briefly state that we propose to adopt, as the basis of the franchise, the franchises of the various franchises of Canada.

That was the proposition. No one cheered more heartily than the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) on that occasion. He was here supporting Sir John Thompson through thick and thin ; that was his own declaration made through the mouth of his leader. He now comes forward and warns us—about what he says : If you attempt to give six votes to a man in the province of Quebec, as you would do if you adopt the Quebec franchise, and only one vote to a man in Ontario, the great province of Ontario will not submit to it. But the hon. gentleman has been asleep for six years ; he is, as I have said, a veritable Rip Van Winkle. The hon. gentleman accepted through the mouth of his leader five or six years ago the declaration I have read.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I never accepted it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. gentleman did not accept it, he took mighty good care to hold his tongue, and he took a position in the Government without making any explanation in regard to it.

Mr. HUGHES. I desire to ask a question. Are not the franchises of the provinces the basis of the present list ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. HUGHES. They are.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No. The basis of the present list has been the fiat of the revising officer. Upon this point, and keeping as close as possible to my hon. friend, for I do not want him to escape, I may say that Sir John Thompson introduced a Bill based on the principle which he enunciated in answer to the question put by Mr. Laurier. What did Sir John Thompson say ? For I will give my hon. friend the benefit of all the qualifications applied by Sir John in introducing the Bill. He said :

> The change is also proposed in this Bill which I indicated a few days ago, that the questions upon which so much difference has arisen in the past as to the basis of the franchise, shall be adjusted by adopting the franchise of the several provinces. While I admit that this is a new departure, I deny what has been so widely asserted, that it is in any important or practical degree a surrender of any principle that we have contended for in times past. The number of differences which exist between the provincial franchise and the Dominion franchise as established by our own Act, are so few as not to be worth the contest and the expense which are involved in keeping them up, and the adoption of a general system which will apply both to the local and Dominion legislatures, has recommendations as regards simplicity and facilities for economy, which cannot exist under a dual system, such as we have been keeping up for the past few years.

Can anything be more clear ? The only thing Sir John Thompson claimed to retain was the right to administer those franchises through Dominion officers ; but the principle that the franchises of the provinces should constitute the franchise of the Dominion was unreservedly enunciated and unreservedly accepted. So I say, Mr. Speaker, that I was more than surprised, after we had heard this and for years had heard no repudiation of it, to find that this Bill, based upon the very principle they accepted, and on which Sir John Thompson announced his desire to frame a measure is called a contentious Bill to which they cannot agree. I can understand that if an hon. gentleman took up the position adopted by Sir John Thompson, namely, that Dominion officers should be appointed to make up separate lists from the provincial franchises, then he would have a point. Whether we should incur that expense or not is a point I am willing to debate. If the hon. gentleman thinks it worth while to have two sets of revising officers, two sets of lists based on one franchise, involving a cost of hundreds of thousands of dollars for their revision, we are prepared to discuss the matter, grapple with it and take issue on it. But do not let my hon.

friend escape from the dilemma in which he is by intimating, when he sat in silence behind Sir John Thompson, cheering his words——

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I never cheered his words.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Then the hon. gentleman gave a silent assent, and a mere assent from him is sometimes better than the most vigorous cheering on the part of some other members who sits behind.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The Bill was introduced. I was not a member of the Government at the time, and I had the right then, as every private member has a right, to take whatever position I pleased on a Bill introduced by the Government of which I was a supporter. I never supported the Bill. Sir John Thompson never wanted to introduce provincial franchises over a Dominion franchise. And further, that in adopting the provincial franchise we never made for uniformity alone, and uniformity alone was not the sole principle. We allowed manhood suffrage in Prince Edward Island and British Columbia under the Act of 1885. We held to the right of this Parliament to say just what this franchise should be. My point was, that you cannot, and I do not believe you will say: that one man in the city of Toronto having six votes in the adjoining constituencies can only vote once, while an elector in Montreal can exercise his right to vote seven or eight times in the adjoining electoral districts.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am bound to accept the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wood) that he was not in accord with the leader at that time, and that he reserved to himself the right to differ from that Bill if it had been brought to the vote. I accept unreservedly the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wood) to that effect; but, what of all the rest of the party? Were they like him, sitting there giving an apparent assent, while in their hearts they dissented? Was the Government of the day not bound by the leader's statement? Were the gentlemen with whom he (Mr. Wood) was afterward associated, and who are now sitting on the front Opposition benches, not bound by the statement of their leader? What did the organs of the Conservative party say outside the House in addition to what the members of the party said inside? Why, the "Mail" and the "Gazette" were out with flying colours declaring that in this the party had made an advance towards the Liberal line, that all was peace and harmony, and that they were prepared to accept the great principle for which the Liberal party had so long contended. And, after the announcement by the leader of the House unquestioned, after the announcement of the leading party organs, after the absence of a whimper of dissent from even the rear rank of the party, we now hear my hon. friend (Mr. Wood) announce: Although I did not say anything then, I was entirely opposed to it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wood) is entitled to that, but all I can say is that he stands alone. I do not believe he will find another man who stood behind the leader of the Government at that time who will have the courage to make an announcement similar to his. It was stated the other night that this Bill was a contentious one, and I said then, and I repeat now, that I was surprised at the statement, because I thought that all contention on this subject had been buried when the leader of a great party solemnly and constitutionally announced from his place in the House that the party had come to the conclusion to adopt the provincial franchises as the basis of the Dominion franchise. I believed that under British constitutional usage, I might accept that statement of the Prime Minister as conclusive. But it appears that I was mistaken, and we have now to deal with a state of affairs that I venture to say cannot be paralleled in any other representative institution.

We have had another gentleman (Mr. Foster), a leading member of the Administration of Sir John Macdonald, a Finance Minister for many years, now the lieutenant of the leader of the Opposition; we have had him deliver a speech for three mortal hours, not upon the Bill, for he did not speak upon the Bill for ten minutes, but upon all manner of conceivable subjects which he could drag in, and weary and take up the time of the House with. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) did do the House the honour, during the last five minutes of his speech, to refer to the question before the Chair. And, Sir, with that supreme indifference to accuracy which distinguishes the hon. gentleman, and that calm superiority to facts when they stand in the way of his argument, which has made him a past master in this kind of debate, and with that faculty he possesses of half stating the truth and keeping back the other half; the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) tried to lead this House to believe that this Bill was a perfect enormity. He would have you believe that he had never assented to the principle that I read from Sir John Thompson's speech; and his (Mr. Foster's) followers listened to the latter part of his argument, feeling assured that he would be prepared to advance some solid arguments against the Bill itself. Well, I have often admired the skill and ingenuity with which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) applies himself to an argument he understands, the way he will skate over thin ice, the way he will half state a fact, the way he will twist and turn facts in order to make black white and white black. Some-

times he merits my admiration and astonishment.

Mr. HUGHES. And sometimes you are surprised.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am surprised, but I do submit to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) that in discussing a Bill of the importance of this, he might at least possess himself of an elementary knowledge of the Bill itself. I am not asking too much when I ask that. I do not ask for a lawyer's acquaintance with the different details of the Bill; I simply ask that he would possess himself of some little elementary knowledge of what the Bill is about. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) called upon his followers to fight this Bill line by line and section by section; and why? Because he said: It is a contentious Bill, and being a contentious Bill, it should not be introduced this session, and may not be required for four or five years. And the hon. gentleman, with that superior wave of the hand which he sometimes adopts, gave as his reason that it is a contentious Bill, and stated in the most solemn tones: It proposes to hand over to some other power the delimitation or the fixing of the boundaries of the electoral districts. Now, did every anybody hear anything so ridiculous or absurd. There is not a line, not a phrase in this Bill which would justify any such statement. He evoked it from his own inner consciousness; he built up this bogey for the pure purpose of frightening his followers into line. I do not believe that the hon. gentleman could have read the Bill. But somebody may say to me: you cannot be representing him correctly. Well, Sir, when I heard him at first I thought it was a 'lapsus linguae,' but when he enforced the argument through sentence after sentence, I thought the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was in the position he very often is, of not knowing what he was talking about, and covering his argument up in a great cloud of words. What did the hon. gentleman say?

> The principles of that Bill, if I understand it rightly, propose to take our constituencies and the power of forming these constituencies from the gentlemen who sit here as a Dominion legislature, and hand it over to the provincial legislatures.

Did ever anybody hear anything so ridiculous? There is not a line in the Bill which would justify such a statement. It is pure imagination, wild and reckless imagination, absolute and utter disregard of facts, and indifference to accuracy which the hon. gentleman, as I say, is a past master in. He says further:

> It also gives to a power entirely out of our own control the right to say what shall be the boundaries of the constituencies of gentlemen who sit in this House.

Mr. DAVIES.

Mr. CASEY. Did he say that?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, he did. There is the "Hansard," page 776, and the hon. gentleman is as agile and as slippery at getting out of a key-hole as anybody in the world, but out of that he cannot get; it is there in the "Hansard."

I ask hon. gentlemen sitting behind my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), who have been accustomed to take their political gospel from him, and who have been used to form their opinions upon serious statements made by him in debate, how can any one of them follow him after the exposure that has been made of the ridiculous reasons he gave as to why this Bill was contentious. When one shows that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was entirely mistaken, when one shows that not only one of the dire predictions he made could be fulfilled, because they have no basis in fact, where is the hon. gentleman's argument gone, that this is a contentious Bill. I have shown that this principle is the principle accepted by both political parties. I have shown that the only real and tangible reason which the hon. gentleman put forward why this Bill should be opposed has no existence except in his own fertile imagination; and, having done so, I think I may fairly appeal to the House that, so far as the arguments of the hon. gentleman stand, there is no reason why it should not receive its second reading. I acknowledge that if this Bill were a gerrymander, as the hon. gentleman wanted his followers to believe—if it gave an outside party power to tamper with the boundaries of our constituencies, every man on both sides of the House should rise up in rebellion against it. We have had enough gerrymander Bills in this House. The Liberal party in the great province of Ontario have suffered for eighteen years, aye, nearly twenty years, from the curse of an infamous gerrymander; and a repetition of that gerrymander was introduced here a year or two ago with the hope of legislating me out of this chamber, but it miserably failed, I am glad to say. The Liberal party do not propose to follow in those steps. The Liberal party present a Bill to this House which, though it has its defects, I acknowledge, is based on a principle which has been accepted by both parties, and accepted in a way which, when crystallized in a Bill, ought to insure the passage of that Bill through the House without any factious or contentious opposition.

Now, the argument was used against the Government of the day that we are seeking by this Bill to gain political advantages. How absurd that argument is. Why, we gain no political advantages from this Bill. It takes away from the party in power the political advantages which the present law gives them. To-day, Sir, we could appoint a revising officer of our own in every one of the 215 electoral districts of this Domin-

ion, and have the law administered, if we were bad enough to do it, according to the rule by which hon. gentlemen opposite administered it when in power, that is, for their own purposes.

Mr. WALLACE. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the present Government could appoint 215 revising officers? I think the law is that they cannot dismiss one, any more than they can a judge.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Do you mean to say that they hold office during good behaviour?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Then, the law as it stands, is ten times as infamous as I ever thought it. If it is true—I do not think it is—that hon. gentlemen opposite have passed a law making these revising officers permanent officers, holding their positions during good behaviour, and if it is the fact, which I think will not be challenged, that they have appointed party heelers in most of the electoral districts to carry out their purposes—

Some hon. MEMBERS. No. Name.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will not go beyond my own province. For years and years the law was administered in the province of Prince Edward Island by the county court judges; yet, because they administered it fairly, you dismissed them from their positions, and appointed the president and the secretary of Liberal-Conservative associations. Men who came from the committee rooms of the Tory party sat upon the bench to determine what men should vote for them.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he is aware that nine out of every ten of the revising officers in Ontario are county court judges.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not aware of it: and, so far as they are county court judges, no unfair criticism can be passed upon them. I am speaking of those I know of.

Mr. SPROULE. How can the hon. gentleman say a large majority of them?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Because I believe the majority were so. I was not aware that the majority of the revising officers in Ontario were county court judges. I am told that in the province of Quebec it is not so. But I am speaking of the part of the Dominion I know of.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman spoke of them as a whole, and said the large majority of them.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Well, the hon. gentleman can give his explanation so far as the province of Ontario is concerned. I can make my statement so far as the province of Prince Edward Island is concerned, and I know of what I speak, and the same rule applies to many parts of Nova Scotia.

Mr. POWELL. Will the hon. gentleman state what constituencies in Prince Edward Island his statement applies to?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. East and West Queen's, West Prince, and King's—every one of them. There was not a county court judge in any one of these ridings in the province of Prince Edward Island who was not dismissed, and there was not a revising officer appointed whom they did not take right out of the committee rooms—some of them the secretaries and presidents of the Tory associations in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) Is the hon. gentleman aware of any wrong action having been done by any one of those officers?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not talking about wrong actions.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) They are just as honourable as you are, Sir.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not talking about the class of men they appointed. I am talking about what they hoped to do—what their intentions were when they appointed them; and I say that when they gerrymandered the Island and appointed these revising officers, they had only one object in view——

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) To give you a good, safe constituency, wasn't it?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. But they did not accomplish their object, owing to the independence of the people.

Mr. MARTIN. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? Will he please tell the House what president and what secretary of a Liberal-Conservative association were appointed revising officers?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Smallwood was the secretary of a Liberal-Conservative Association for the past ten years.

Mr. MARTIN. Where was he revising officer?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Either in East Prince or in West Prince—Mr. Charles R. Smallwood.

Mr. MARTIN. Who was the president?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. McQuarrie and Mr. Stewart.

Mr. MARTIN. Neither statement is true.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Well, there is no use of bandying a lie across the House.

Mr. MARTIN. Neither Mr. Stewart nor Mr. Smallwood was a secretary or president of a Liberal-Conservative Association.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I know whereof I am talking. Mr. McQuarrie was the president of the Prince County Association, and Mr. Smallwood has been the secretary for the last ten years.

Mr. MARTIN. So far as East Queen's, the district I represent is concerned, the hon. gentleman is mistaken.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not mistaken. I ran in West Queen's myself, and Messrs. Smallwood and Stewart were the two revising officers—one for the east and one for the west. But we need not get down to parish politics.

An hon. MEMBER. Come out of them.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I was not in them, but I was trying to pull those out who got themselves in. I was arguing that the Government were not trying to gain any political advantage by adopting the provincial franchise. The provinces of the Dominion are not all under the control of the Dominion Government, though no doubt, with the growing intelligence of the people, they soon will be. But at present they are not. The great province of Quebec has been for years under Tory rule, British Columbia is under Conservative rule, and New Brunswick, I believe, has a composite government, neither Liberal nor Tory but a mixture of both, so that the Liberal party are not the ruling party in the different provinces, nor have they the control of the lists in those provinces. I say that the introduction and carriage of this Bill would involve the surrender of powers which the Government of the day now possess under the Dominion Franchise Act, with respect to the appointment of revising officers and all the other extraordinary and indefensible powers confered upon the Government of the day. There are many good reasons for our adopting the provincial franchise. In the first place, because of its simplicity. The lists are made up by a class of officials who live in and understand the country and know the people. They are made up with little expense, and there is no danger of confusing the electors by having two different kinds of franchise. Everybody will admit that it is for the benefit of the electorate that the mode of voting and the means of ascertaining whether a man has a vote or not, should be made more simple, and if you have the one list which entitles a man to vote under the provincial franchise and under the Dominion franchise, you simplify the matter so that it comes within the knowledge of the meanest and poorest elector. He is not confused by being told: you are on the provincial franchise but not on the Dominion franchise. Again it is desirable to adopt this measure because it is a much more inexpensive plan. Hon. gentlemen opposite concede that. Our present law has cost this country for the imperfect revisions we have had during the past few years—not a revision every year but every two or three years—over a million dollars of public money, and that does not begin to represent what the revision has cost the people. I am speaking within bounds when I say that it cost from $200 to $500 to the individual candidate himself for each revision besides the million dollars spoken of as a cost to the country. The burden had become intolerable, and it was largely on that account, that the Liberal party advocated the adoption of the provincial franchise. This measure should be adopted because experience, the best test in the world, has shown that the principle of adopting the provincial franchise is a good one. From 1867, when confederation was first called to existence, up to 1885, that system was in vogue and it worked without complaint. If experience has proved it a good system, if it is inexpensive, and simple and easily understood, it has three qualifications which ought to recommend it to the people. Under these circumstances I had the honour in this House, some years ago, of moving that if the provincial lists were not adopted as the basis of a Dominion franchise list, if the House was determined to retain the making-up of those lists and the appointment of officers, I said that I for one was in favour of manhood suffrage as the franchise which should be adopted, and I adhere to that view now; but inasmuch as the great province of Quebec is wedded to its own system and will not accept manhood suffrage, I cast my vote in favour of the adoption of the provincial franchises. We will thus save a million dollars squandered in this attempt to build up a separate list, and will introduce a simple, plain, easily understood system, under which the electors, as a whole, can record their votes in favour of the candidates of their choice.

Mr. ROCHE. We have heard a good many hon. gentlemen opposite accuse members on this side of occupying a great deal of time in talking on almost every subject but the one before the House, but if the hon. gentleman can point to a speech delivered during this debate so utterly foreign to the question under discussion as was the first part of his own remarks. I should like very much to see it. A goodly portion of the balance of the hon. gentleman's speech consisted of braggadocio, and rather loud voiced bravado, of which he seems to be a master, and taking the cue which is likely to be followed in the near future by his own

supporters, he accused hon. gentlemen on this side of taking a somersault on this question, and thus sought to prepare the House for the great somersault which he expects his own followers to take in the next few days.

It is not my intention to devote many minutes in replying to the hon. gentleman, because possibly the hon. gentleman would disdain a reply from an humble member like myself and also because there was not much to reply to in the hon. gentleman's remarks. Coming, however, as I do, from the province of Manitoba, that province whose legislation has created a good deal of acrimonious discussion in this House and throughout the country in the past few years, I desire to enter my protest against the adoption of this Franchise Bill, first, because I object to the principle involved of having the control of the franchise surrendered by this Parliament and delegated to the provinces, and secondly, because the Manitoba Franchise Act, which is intended to substitute for this law, so far as the election of members from that province is concerned, is a most iniquitous Act and rightly termed so by the hon. leader of the Opposition. It is an act which is administered in a most hostile spirit to the Conservative opposition in that province. It certainly brings disgrace and discredit on those who were instrumental in placing it upon the Statute-book of the province. That Franchise Act is one, which, when we look at the manner in which the lists have been compiled through its operation, is certainly deserving of our severest condemnation. Any person living in that province and being aware of the character of the lists that have been prepared and of the character of many of those registration clerks, appointees of the Liberal Government, some of whom have had to flee their country for their country's good, may be pardoned if he uses rather strong expressions in condemnation of the same. Now, it is only necessary for me to tell you that at the time that Act was under discussion in the Manitoba legislature, that old time Liberal, Mr. Fisher, formerly president of the Provincial Liberal Association and for many years past holding a seat in the legislature, condemned it in unmeasured terms. He declared this Act to be, to use the time-honoured phrase of his, a monstrosity of monstrosities, and said that if everything were true that had been said against the present Dominion Franchise Act, it was still a king compared to the Greenway Act. When I also bring to your memory the fact that the Toronto "Globe," the mouthpiece and family bible of hon. gentlemen opposite, also condemned the Act, and warned the provincial Liberals that in enacting such legislation they were but placing a stumbling-block in the way of the Liberals in this Dominion Parliament who were agitating against the Dominion Franchise Act, you can form some idea of the iniquitous character of that Act when it met with such condemnation from those particular sources. Now, in the few remarks it is my intention to address to this House, I do not intend to discuss the question as affecting any other province, but purely from a Manitoba standpoint. In doing so it will be necessary for me to briefly review the history of the present Manitoba Franchise Act. In the days of the Norquay Administration, the Act provided that the lists should be compiled by officers termed enumerators, who were to be, as far as possible, municipal clerks. Let me read a clause of the Act:

> An enumerator appointed under this Act shall be a clerk of a municipality lying wholly within the limits of the electoral division in which he is to act, or, in case of refusal, neglect, inability or other reason, such other person as the Lieutenant-Governor in council may select.

The Liberal Opposition, led by Mr. Greenway, opposed that Act and especially that clause, taking the ground that in all cases the lists should be prepared by municipal clerks, and the municipal lists should be the proper lists used in the election. Mr. Greenway, in opposing the Act, said:

> He (Mr. Greenway) was in favour of having the voters' lists prepared by municipal clerks, and maintained that this could be easily done, as the greater part of the work was complete when the lists for municipal elections were prepared. * * * He objected to the government taking in themselves the appointment of enumerators. They might appoint partisans, who might put obstacles in the way in order to exclude from the lists names to which they objected. The greatest freedom should be allowed, and there should not be any taint of suspicion as to the manner in which the lists were prepared. * * * If a partisan enumerator were appointed, how easy it would be for him to ignore certain information which he might obtain in reference to certain individuals whom he might wish to exclude.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am free to admit that there was a certain amount of force in the objections offered to that clause by Mr. Greenway. But with how much greater force does that objection apply to his own Act of the present day? He objected to the appointment of enumerators. But these are the officers he has to-day, only he calls them registration clerks. To show what was the opinion of the Liberals in that province, I will read a resolution moved by Mr. Martin, a gentleman whom members of this House have heard of, a gentleman to whom, whatever may be said concerning him, gentlemen opposite owe their positions to-day, though they have treated him very cavalierly and used him very ungratefully, tossing him aside like an old glove, after having used him for their own purposes, and now he is being looked after by his old opponents, the Canadian Pacific Railway, that he fought for so many years. Mr. Martin, on the third reading of the Bill, moved:

> That the said Bill be not read a third time, but that it be recommitted to a Committee of the

Whole House, with instructions to amend the Bill by striking out clause No. 14, which provides for the appointment of enumerators, and substituting therefor a clause providing for clerks of municipalities making up the voters' lists.

This, then, was the policy of the Liberals in 1886. They voted for it in the legislature to a man. In the elections which were held in December of that year, every Liberal candidate and the Liberal leaders from every hustings in the province declared that, if returned to power, the Liberal party would wipe out the Norquay Act, and make provision for the municipal clerks to compile the lists and the judges of the land to revise them. In January, 1888, Mr. Greenway was called upon to form an Administration. And in the session of the following year, I think, in a moment of honesty, he attempted to redeem his pledges. He did pass an Act embodying these principles of having the voters' lists compiled by municipal clerks and revised by the judges of the land. That Act was a very fair Act, and received the endorsation of every member of the legislature irrespective of party. It was an Act that had stood the test of experience in other provinces. It provided that the lists should be compiled by municipal clerks who were directly responsible to the people, and who, if they attempted any unfair dealings, the subject of their dismissal would be a live issue in the next municipal election, so that self-interest alone would prevent them from following crooked methods. But did Mr. Greenway allow that Act to grace the Statute-book of Manitoba very long? Not at all. It was too fair an Act to suit his purpose. He wished to barricade himself behind a partisan Election Act, and one year afterwards, without giving an opportunity for the feasibility of this Act to be tested in a general election, he wiped it off the Statute-book and enacted another embodying every feature condemned by himself in the Norquay Act and in the present Dominion Franchise Act. Nay, more, embodying features much more iniquitous than were to be found in either. Instead of lists being compiled by municipal clerks they were to be compiled by registration clerks, the nominees of the Liberal candidates, whose only qualifications for the position were that they were political partisans, and now in every riding, the lists are compiled under the direct supervision of the Liberal candidates. The Acts of the registration clerks have been notorious. Where judges have acted as revising officers, which is by no means as frequent as it should be, these registration clerks have been reprimanded and condemned. Judge Ardagh in Winnipeg and Judge Ryan in Portage la Prairie, may be named in this connection. The latter, holding a revision for the riding of Beautiful Plains, reprimanded the registration clerk in open court, declared that he had never had such trouble in a court, and that had he known the difficulties he had to face, he would never have accepted the commission of revising officer. The action of these clerks has been such that hundreds, nay thousands, of Conservatives have been disfranchised. The leader of the Opposition has enumerated several instances, notably that of North Winnipeg, where 400 electors were left off the list. The whole Hebrew vote, amounting to 250, were left off because it was expected that they would vote in a body for the Conservative candidate, whereas the Icelandic voters were put on without applications because they generally vote Liberal. Twenty-seven Conservative employees of the Ogilvie Milling Company were left off simply because they were Conservatives, and every Liberal employee was put on without application on their part. And when the registration clerk was asked how these men were put on without application, he had to admit that their names were taken off an old scrutineer's book. As a matter of fact, it was an old canvass book. These men had been marked as having voted for the Liberal candidate, and their names were put on without any application, while the names of Conservatives in the same milling company were left off. In the local constituency adjoining my own, I sent in 35 names that were left off. The hon. gentleman knows what that means, when you take into consideration the sparsely-settled nature of that country. Over 100 other names in that constituency were left off in like manner. In the local constituency where I reside dozens of names were left off the list of men who had voted for ten, twelve or fourteen years previously. It seemed almost an impossibility, even at the court of revision, to get those names on the list without a personal attendance, which necessitated time and labour, and travelling eight or ten miles, and sometimes even thirty or forty miles. In this case the court of revision was held at the extreme eastern end of a county fifty miles long, and in the town where the Liberal candidate resided, to suit his own convenience. In the previous election three courts of revision were held in the same county. In the constituency of Dauphin 200 names were left off the list. In one instance an engagement was made with a registration clerk to put the Conservatives upon the list. A man was to appear at a certain hour with their names, and the registration clerk was to be there to receive the names. But it turned out that he could not be found, and it leaked out afterwards, and they thought it was a sharp trick, the gentleman's own son gave him away by stating that his father had been hiding in a hayloft all the afternoon. In the riding of South Brandon the election was run upon an unrevised list, no time was allowed to have the list printed and to have a court of revision; and therefore the list was not revised at all. In the city of Brandon, on the other

hand, a court of revision was held before the lists were printed and distributed, much against the protestations of the Conservative candidate who desired that the court of revision should be postponed in order that the electors might see if their names were on the list. This was refused, and the court of revision was actually held before the lists were printed and distributed. These, Sir, are a few of the instances which prevailed throughout the length and breadth of Manitoba. Is it any wonder that Conservatives hailing from the province of Manitoba should view with alarm the substitution of such an Act as that in place of the present Dominion Franchise Act? The franchise is the whole basis of constitutional freedom. If we have cooked lists prepared by partisan officials the liberty of the people is gone. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have heard a good deal about hon. gentlemen opposite fighting for civil and religious liberties. They say they want to make this a great issue Now I ask those hon. gentlemen: Are these the kind of weapons they desire to fight their opponents with? You might as well tie a man's hands behind his back and then wade into him a la Corbett. Which is the greater evil, to threaten a man that unless he votes for such and such a candidate, pains and penalties will be inflicted upon him, or to refuse him the right to vote at all in this free country, although he may be fully qualified? I think the latter is much the greater evil, for in the cases I have cited the registration clerks do as they please, while in the former case, in spite of all threats, a man may vote as he pleases and no one can know how he voted. I am but voicing the sentiments of every Conservative elector of Manitoba, yes, and of the independent and fair-minded Liberals of that province, who are certainly disgusted with the methods followed by those registration clerks at the last two provincial elections, methods which are also condemned by the independent press. If hon. gentlemen opposite are bound to push this Act through and make it the law of the land, let them at least exempt the province of Manitoba from its operation until such time as the leader of the Government can use some of his powers of conciliation and sunny methods on the leader of the Government of Manitoba, so that the latter may give it an Act that will allow a Conservative resident of that province to have an equal say in provincial elections with a Liberal elector. Before taking my seat I wish to revise the figures given to-night by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries with reference to the Colchester election:

9.50 p.m. Latest corrected returns give Muir, Conserative, a majority in Colchester, N.S.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It is not my intention to reply at any length to the remarks of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche). I fancy the House will be disposed to agree with me that if he had confined his speech to the announcement he made at the close, he probably would have accomplished all for which he rose. Now it has been the custom in the province of Manitoba for Conservatives to denounce the Franchise Act. The reason for that is that the Conservatives of that province have had some such reason as the Conservatives of Nova Scotia have to-day, to find an explanation for the reception they have met at the polls, when they went before the electorate. That explanation is found in the fact that the Conservative party of Manitoba does not stand well with the people of the province; it is because we find in the legislature, composed of 40 members, there are only five or six Conservatives. It is in consequence of facts of this nature that Conservatives find it necessary to denounce the Franchise Act of Manitoba. That Act has been criticised adversely from time to time, but it provides for one man one vote; and I am free to say, because I have observed it for years, that any person who desires to have his name recorded on the list, can have it so recorded. One reason why they find so much fault is because they have been so badly defeated for a number of years past that many of them do not care to have their names placed upon the voters' list at all, and have practically allowed the preparation of the list to go by default. The manner of preparing those lists, as I say, is perfectly fair, and all residents of Manitoba who are entitled to vote, can have their names placed on the list if they so desire. In regard to the insinuation about registration clerks having left the country for the country's good, I may say that I am not aware of any cases of that kind. There was one young man appointed as registration clerk who left the country for another cause altogether. It was not because he had done anything wrong in connection with the preparation of the voters' list, and no insinuation has ever been made against him on that account. The history of the preparation of the voters' lists may be searched, and I am satisfied that in every case it will be found that they have been fairly well prepared, and I think the Manitoba Franchise Act will stand a fair comparison with the Franchise Act of any other province in the Dominion. Suppose we compare the Franchise Act of Manitoba with the Dominion Franchise Act. We have, as I say, in Manitoba the principle of one man one vote. In the city of Winnipeg, Judge Ardagh, who revised the Dominion list, denounced it as one of the worst lists he had ever had anything to do with; he said it was almost impossible to prepare a correct list with the material before him. Why, there is scarcely a man who has died in that country for the last ten or fifteen years, and whose name was on that list, whose vote was not polled in the election when the election day came

round. As I said, I do not intend to offer any extended remarks on this question, but I merely wanted to point out that if the Manitoba Act does not work as well as our opponents desire, it is because they do not take advantage of the provision of the Act to see that their names are recorded at the proper time.

Mr. HUGHES. I notice that a kind of holy calm has fallen upon the other side of the House; I notice, also, that the froth has all vanished from the top of the cask. When the Minister of Marine and Fisheries arose, he had worked himself up into a suitable effervescence, carried away with the telegram that Colchester had gone in favour of the Liberal party. I notice that the hon. gentleman's head is not now half as high as it was before.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is all right, we carried it. The majority is a little smaller, that is all.

Mr. HUGHES. We have been wondering why this Franchise Bill was placed on the orders before the tariff question. I have been quietly sizing up the situation, and I can give a few reasons why it has been so placed. In the first place, I think the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) stated that the Prime Minister was going away early in June, but that there were at least twenty hon. members on that side of the House who were capable of leading the Government. They all think they are capable of doing so. I notice that to-day they have been practicing, and truly the hand of the master has been shown to be wanting. We have seen hon. gentlemen from the back benches come down to the front seats, and junior members of the Government, who were formerly characterized by hon. gentlemen when in opposition as those hanging around the Privy Council door waiting for lunch to come in, seeking to get their little experience in leading the House. There was another object sought to be attained in bringing in the Franchise Bill before the tariff measure. It was the desire to hold off the tariff measure until certain provincial elections had been decided and certain by-elections were under way, so that people might be influenced by promises made by the Finance Minister publicly in some instances, as has been asserted by friends of the Government in order to influence certain people in connection with the elections. There is another reason, and I believe this is the most potent cause. We have seen dissensions among hon. gentlemen opposite. Talk of dissensions in the Liberal-Conservative party before last June! I believe all the dissensions in the ranks of the Liberal-Conservatives would not rival the dissensions in the ranks of hon. gentlemen opposite. We find them torn apart on the tariff. Free traders and protectionists are wrangling over the question at the Council board, and rumours are abroad that the Cabinet is being disrupted. We see in the newspapers a rumour that three members of the Cabinet have withdrawn; but I notice two hon. members stick fast to their post.

An hon. MEMBER. They will not give up the salary.

Mr. HUGHES. No, nor the position.

An hon. MEMBER. It is a novelty.

Mr. HUGHES. May it remain a novelty. We find them torn asunder and driven apart on the policy in regard to Crow's Nest Pass Railway. We observed how long the face of the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron) became when the Solicitor General made his famous address in regard to the Manitoba school question.

Mr. GIBSON. What did you think of it?

Mr. HUGHES. Of his address?

Mr. GIBSON. No, of the school question.

Mr. HUGHES. I have already expressed my opinion.

Mr. GIBSON. You spoke one way and voted another.

Mr. HUGHES. If the hon. gentleman will come down to the front benches so as to be heard and practice, he will perhaps become one of those described as hanging around the Privy Council door, and may become a Minister either without portfolio or without salary.

Mr. GIBSON. I am not a hanger-on like you.

Mr. HUGHES. This infamous gerrymander to which hon. gentlemen opposite have been referring in connection with the Liberal-Conservative party is responsible for a great deal; had it not been for this infamous gerrymander we would have had a staunch Liberal-Conservative representing Lincoln, and the hon. gentleman would have been at home.

Mr. GIBSON. I want to correct the hon. gentleman, and to make this statement, that the Tories sent 400 marked ballots against me from the city of Toronto, and I could trace them; and except for them I would have come here not with a majority of 429. but with a majority of nearly 1,000.

Mr. HUGHES. All I have to say is this: if the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) knows whereof he speaks and has evidence of the fact, he is unfit to occupy a seat in this House unless he follows up and exposes the men.

Mr. GIBSON. Give us time.

Mr. HUGHES. No man with any principle, knowing the facts of the case, should allow such a matter to pass or should dare to stand here without bringing to jus-

tice the men who have been guilty of such an act. I do not propose taking up much of the time of the House in discussing this Bill. The object of the discussion has been served because the tariff has been promised for Thursday, and this debate the only point on which the Government are nearly united has taken up the spare time. But the difference in the two parties in regard to the Franchise Bill—I am speaking now of the leaders of the two parties—is not as marked as one would suppose. The policy of the Government seems to be this: they want to let control of the Dominion franchise rest with seven different subordinate bodies, taking the lists of the provinces as the lists for the Dominion. The policy of the Liberal-Conservative party is this: that while we are now ready to accept and have always accepted the election lists of the provinces as a basis of the Dominion franchise, we are not willing to surrender to the provinces the control of the Dominion franchise. Our policy is this: we wish to retain the control, to define who shall vote and what the qualification shall be. We want to conform as nearly as possible with the election lists of the various provinces, and that I well know was the policy of Sir John Thompson at the time he introduced the Bill two years ago in this House. It could very easily be arranged that the Dominion should retain control of the machinery of the election lists and still use the local courts and local lists as a basis. It must be remembered that in many parts of Ontario to-day there is a system of registration in force, especially in cities such as Toronto and Ottawa. In the preparation of the lists in those places there must be expense which will not be involved in connection with new municipal lists. Now, in the ordinary county municipalities, it would be a very easy matter to use the courts for the present provincial lists, as the Dominion courts. But as was said by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, why not accept one broad franchise for the Dominion—let it be manhood suffrage if you will, but under Dominion control. In Ontario, although possibly not to such an extent as in Manitoba, in the preparation of the provincial lists and the Dominion lists as well, we have to contend against the whole machinery of the local Government; license commissioners, division court clerks, license inspectors, all this array of officials are at the beck and nod of the provincial Government, and it is part of their official duty to look after the preparation of the lists. The Liberal-Conservative party on the other hand, through its associations, has to depend on its own exertions, and in that manner the cost is enormous to them. I was much surprised to hear the Minister of Marine refer to the gerrymander in the province of Ontario, for I can tell him, that in that province, in the general election of 1886 and in the general elections of 1890, Wm. Ralph Meredith, leader of the Liberal-Conservative party, polled 2,500 votes at one time, and at another time 5,000 more of the popular vote, than did the Reform party, and yet, the Reform party was strengthened in its position in the legislature by reason of their infamous gerrymander. I can also inform the hon. gentleman from Manitoba (Mr. Richardson), that in the last general election in that province, the Liberal-Conservative party, despite the fact that all those names referred to by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) were left off by the registration officer, only elected seven members to the House, although they polled 2,500 votes more than did Mr. Greenway's supporters. That, however, shows that the Liberal-Conservative party is not dead yet. It also shows that others than Liberal-Conservatives understand how to gerrymander. Reference has been made to the fact that the province of Nova Scotia has remained true to the Liberal party. I find, Sir, that when the Reform party took office in that province, there was a surplus to the credit of the people of $300,000, but after ten or twelve years of Liberal rule, the people are burdened with a provincial debt of $2,000,000. Taking the area of Nova Scotia, that represents an expenditure added to the provincial debt of about $100 to the square mile. I believe verily, that the greatest failure as a politician and the weakest government in Christendom could maintain office, by dragging a small province like that with a population of 500,000 into debt in ten years, to the tune of $100 for every square mile, or $5 per head for every man, woman and child in Nova Scotia. If the policy of the Liberal party in the Dominion is to be pursued along similar lines they may retain office for a time, but so soon as the people are aroused to the true position of affairs they will not hesitate to turn them out of office. The hon. the Minister of Marine told us that an attempt was made to gerrymander him out of this House. Well, we all remember that when that statement was made in the House before, the hon. member for King's (Mr. Macdonald), in one of the best speeches it has ever been our privilege to listen to, pointed out, that the Minister of Marine was wide of the mark, and that in place of standing up like a man and placing his case before the House, he had gone around privately and sought to instil the idea that he was being unfairly dealt with. The facts proved by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Macdonald) were, that in redistributing Prince Edward Island they had given the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) an easy riding, and one in which he was sure of election. As to British constitutional usage, the hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that while in England and Scotland and Ireland the franchise differs, yet the general tenor of the franchise in Great Britain

is the same for similar conditions, and the Central Government in England absolutely controls its franchise, and does not leave it to the dictates of any body in Scotland or in Ireland. The Imperial Parliament itself determines its franchise, and that is the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party in Canada. We admit that the present franchise Act can be reformed, and we were prepared to have reformed it had we remained in power. Sir John Thompson's Bill would have reformed it in many important directions, and if our friends opposite will bring in a proper measure retaining the control of the franchise in this Parliament, I am satisfied they will meet with a generous support from this side of the House. If on the other hand, they propose to hand over control of our franchise to the provinces, then I for one will say, that I am prepared to meet it at every step with the most determined opposition.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House for a moment to a statement made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as regards Prince Edward Island. I do not suppose that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) intended intentionally to misrepresent the facts in Prince Edward Island, but he evidently was so eager to make a point in favour of the Bill which he supported, that he went down to the province of Prince Edward Island for arguments, and perhaps unintentionally misrepresented the facts. He told the House that the presidents and the secretaries of the Liberal-Conservative associations were pitchforked into the positions of revising barristers in that province, and he instanced the name of Charles R. Smallwood. Now, would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) be surprised to know that Mr. Charles R. Smallwood was not a revising barrister at all. I think the hon. gentleman, in his eagerness to make out a case fell into a mistake, and I would advise him to be a little more careful. I have the report of the Auditor General, and I will read to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and to the House a list of the revising barristers in Prince Edward Island, and if he can reconcile that list with the supposed names of gentlemen which he led the House to believe were revising officers in that province, I shall leave it for him to do so. For King's, the name of the revising officer is John S. Macdonald. Was he either the president or the secretary of a Liberal-Conservative association in Prince Edward Island ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I believe he was.

Mr. MARTIN. I leave it to the hon. member for King's (Mr. Macdonald) to answer that question, but my information is that he was not. In East Prince Judge Macleod is the revising officer. Was he a president or a secretary of a Conservative association ? For West Prince, N. McQuarrie is the revising officer. The hon. gentleman may say something about him—I do not know, but at least in four points out of five he is wrong——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He was the president.

Mr. MARTIN. For East Queen's, A. A. McLean is the revising officer. Was he either a president or a secretary ? For West Queen's, W. S. Stewart ; was he a president or a secretary ? So there is not one case in Prince Edward Island, with the possible exception of Mr. McQuarrie, that justifies the hon. gentleman in making the sweeping statement he has made to the House. I would not have made any reference to this matter only I think it is unfair that the hon. gentleman should always go to Prince Edward Island in order to bolster up a weak argument. If the hon. gentleman thinks he can misrepresent the facts in regard to Prince Edward Island, so long as I have the honour to hold a seat here, I will try to set him right. Now, the hon. gentleman has referred to the gerrymander of Prince Edward Island. With all due deference to him, I say that the Liberal party in Prince Edward Island are the last party who should refer to a gerrymander, because they are guilty of the most iniquitous gerrymander in Prince Edward Island that has ever been perpetrated in any province of the Dominion, and the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows it. The hon. gentleman also knows very well that some years ago the Liberal party in Prince Edward Island disfranchised most of the Dominion officials in that province in order to obtain a temporary victory ; and what do we see to-day ? We see in the local legislature, where the Liberal party is in power, that the very act which they placed on the Statute-book a few years ago to disfranchise the Dominion officials, they are now going to repeal. Why ? Because they have turned out the Conservative officials and are replacing them with their own supporters, and they need those votes at the local elections in Prince Edward Island, which is near at hand. I am very sorry I have to correct the hon. gentleman, but I could not do much less than I have done, as I could not sit silently in this House whilst any imputations were made against the revising barristers in Prince Edward Island, who performed their duties honestly and well. With regard to this Bill generally, I did expect, after all we heard from the Liberal party while in Opposition about the National Policy and what an incubus it was upon this country, that it would be the first Act they would repeal. The first session of this Parliament is passed. Last session we were told that we would have a session early in the year, when a new tariff would be submitted to Parliament ; but, strange to say, the meeting of Parliament was postponed from time to time. I

think it was first called for the 4th of March; and then it was postponed to the 25th of March. Probably there was more than a scintilla of superstition in their minds with regard to the ides of March. Now we are expected to see in the passing of this Franchise Bill the fulfilment of all their promises. We are told that the law is fulfilled in the one word love; but this Government expect to fulfil the law and to carry out all their promises in regard to the tariff and every other measure advocated by them for the past eighteen years, by passing this Franchise Bill. If any improvement can be made in the existing Franchise Act, by all means let it be done; but there is time enough for that. There are a couple of years before the Government in which they can attend to it. But if the Government had a proper appreciation of the business interests of this country, the first thing they would do would be to try to put in practice the theories in regard to the tariff which they have preached into the ears of the country for the last eighteen years. To say the least of it, I think it is rather bad for them to jeopardize the best interests of the country by not submitting a tariff Bill at an earlier period. It is nearly a year since they attained power. One session is past; another session they are wasting away, and still the tariff is kept in the background. I think the business interests of this country should be attended to before the political exigencies of any party; but the political exigencies of the Liberal party, especially in Nova Scotia, have been made to do duty on this occasion. I did not rise for the purpose of making a speech, but merely for the purpose of correcting my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I know that he only made the statements he did in his eagerness to bolster up a cause that he feels is weak.

Mr. McMILLAN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.55 p m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 21st April, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MAIL CONTRACTS IN NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. MILLS asked:

What are the different mail routes and mail contracts now existing between the town of Annapolis Royal and the town of Liverpool, in the counties of Annapolis and Queen's respectively? What is the name of each contractor and his bondsmen? What is the length of each route? What is each contract price, and whether daily, semi-weekly or tri-weekly?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I must ask the hon. gentleman to put a motion on the paper for that. It is rather a voluminous return.

DEPOSITS FOR CANAL TENDERS.

Mr. CLANCY asked:

1. What are the different amounts of deposits asked for with the different tenders for the Iroquois section of the Galops Canal, the enlargement of Farran's Point Canal, the Cardinal section of the Galops Canal, and the North Channel between Galops and Prescott?
2. Are the amounts of these deposits larger than the amounts asked by the department formerly to be deposited with tenders on works of similar magnitude?
3. Has the department adopted a new course in asking for larger deposits on the above sections of the St. Lawrence Canals?
4. Is it the intention of the Department of Railways and Canals in calling for tenders for all future work to insist on such proportionately large deposits?
5. Has there been any Order in Council passed determining the amounts of the deposits to be made with tenders for the enlargement of the St. Lawrence Canals?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. The amount of deposit asked for the Iroquois section of the Galops Canal is $50,000; for the enlargement of Farran's Point Canal, $27,500; for the Cardinal section, $75,000; for the North Channel, $37,500. 2. No. 3. No. 4. For work under $250,000 the amount of deposit required will be 10 per cent; over that sum, 5 per cent. 5. I may say that tenders were asked during the late Administration requiring 10 per cent deposit with tenders, and having been so adopted as the usage in the department, it was continued until, on complaints being made and the matter being inquired into, it was concluded desirable to recur to the former system of requiring only 5 per cent deposit on tenders over $250,000. We now require only 5 per cent deposit where the amount involved in the contract does not fall under $250,000.

ISLANDS IN THE ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville) asked:

Is it the intention of the Government to dispose by sale of any of the islands in the Upper St. Lawrence during the present year? If so, will such islands be sold by private sale or public auction?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). It is not the intention of the Government to dispose, by sale, of any of the islands in the Upper St. Lawrence during the present year. The whole subject is under the consideration of the Government.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville) asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to introduce the metrical system of weights and measures into this country?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). It is not the present intention of the Government.

WINTER MAIL SERVICE, MAGDALEN ISLANDS.

Mr. GUAY (for Mr. Lemieux) asked :

What sum does the Honourable Postmaster General intend to place in the Estimates, for the winter mail service between the mainland and the Magdalen Islands?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The sum of $300 is included in the main Estimates for the service in question.

POSTMASTER OF CAPLIN RIVER.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON asked :

1. Has Théophile Poirier, of Caplin River, been dismissed from the office of postmaster of that place?
2. If so, was there any complaint against him? What was the nature of the complaint, and who made the complaint?
3. Was there an investigation held? If so, before whom? What was proven in the investigation, and who were the witnesses?
4. Was the inspector of the postal division sent to investigate the matter?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The postmaster in question has not been dismissed.

POSTMASTER OF DABLON.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON asked :

1. Has Guillaume Larouche, of Dablon, been dismissed from the office of postmaster of that place?
2. If so, was there any complaint against him? What was the nature of the complaint, and who made the complaint?
3. Was there an investigation held? If so, before whom? What was proven in the investigation? Who were the witnesses?
4. Was the inspector of the postal division sent to investigate the matter?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The postmaster in question was dismissed because of political partisanship, on a charge made by Mr. Savard, M.P. The evidence being conclusive, no investigation was necessary.

SUNNY BRAE AND MELROSE MAIL SERVICE.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER asked :

How many tenders were received for the conveyance of the mails between Sunny Brae and Melrose, and the name of each tenderer, and the amounts respectively tendered for? To whom was the contract awarded?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I would ask the hon. gentleman to be good enough to put a motion on the paper for that. It involves the preparation of returns of some length.

POST OFFICE AT PIRATE HARBOUR.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER asked :

Will the Government lay immediately upon the Table of this House the petition and correspondence with reference to the closing and re-opening of the post office at Pirate Harbour, in Guysboro' county?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). There is no objection to the return being laid upon the Table ; but an order of the House will be necessary.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Can they not be laid upon the Table without a motion ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There will have to be a motion.

MILITARY SCHOOL, ST. JOHN'S, P.Q.

Mr. MORIN asked :

For what reason did the Government cancel the contract with Wright & Co., of St. John's, P.Q., for drugs, medicines, &c., for the requirements of the military school at that point, and award it to Doctor Sabourin ; and on whose recommendation was it done?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I am informed there was no contract between the Government and Messrs, Wright & Co., of St. John's, P.Q., for the supplies mentioned.

CULVERT—CHAMBLY CANAL.

Mr. MORIN asked :

What amount has the Government expended up to this date in the construction of a culvert of the Chambly Canal at St. John's, P.Q., and how much will the cost exceed the grant voted?

How much has been paid to Messrs. Jacques and Henri Cartier, of St. John's, in connection with this work, and what is the work they have to do?

Is this Mr. Jacques Cartier the same person who is a member of the town council of St. John's?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The amount expended up to this date in the construction of a culvert on the Chambly Canal at St. John's, P.Q., is $9,828.36 ; the cost will exceed the present grant by about $7,000 ; the amount paid to Jacques Cartier, foreman, is $152.50; the amount paid to Henri Cartier, as night watchman and night foreman, is $116.20. I am informed that Mr. Jacques Cartier is a member of the town council of St. John's.

CHAMBLY CANAL—TENDERS FOR STONE.

Mr. MORIN asked :

Who are the parties who sent in tenders to the Government, last fall, for the stone required for

the Chambly Canal; to whom was the contract awarded, and at what price?

Was the contract given to the lowest tenderer, and if not, why not?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The following are the parties who sent in tenders last fall for stone required for the Chambly Canal:—Gervais Brothers, J. Tanguay. Contract was awarded as follows:—Gervais Brothers, for stones (field) about 1 cubic foot, at 80 cents; J. Tanguay, stones (field), large pieces broken by explosives, average size one-half cubic yard, $1; Gervais Brothers, stones (field), small size, 75 cents; Gervais Brothers, stones (quarry), average size one-half cubic yard, rough, $1.10; J. Tanguay, stones (quarry), medium size, $1. The contracts were given to the lowest tenderer in each case.

MILITARY SCHOOL, ST. JOHN'S, P.Q.

Mr. MORIN asked:

Who are the parties who tendered, last fall, for the supply of coal and wood for the military school at St. John's, P.Q.; did the Government give the contract to the lowest tenderer, as was the invariable practice under the Conservative regime, and if not, why not; and is it the president of the Liberal Club at St. John's who has secured the contract?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I am afraid I must ask the hon. gentleman to amend his question. He appears to have introduced statements which may not be entirely correct. If he will amend it in that respect, I shall be happy to answer it.

BUOY SERVICE, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) for Mr. Martin, asked:

1. On what date does the contract between the Government and Edward McKay for buoy service at Murray Harbour, in Prince Edward Island, expire?
2. Has the contract been cancelled? If so, when?
4. If contract is cancelled, have the contractor and his securities been notified?
4. Have new tenders for the service been called for, or a new contract entered into?
5. If a new contract has been entered into, who is the contractor? For what sum is the contract let, and is it let by tender?
6. Have any charges or complaints been made against Edward McKay for neglect of duty, and have they been investigated?
7. Has Edward McKay been paid for his past service according to contract? If not, why not?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). 1. The contract is for three years, to terminate on the 3rd of June, 1898. 2, 3, 4 and 5. The contract has not been cancelled, and new tenders have not been called for. 6. Charges and complaints for neglect of duty have been made against Edward McKay, and an investigation was authorized, but no report has been received from the commissioner. 7. He has been paid $75 on account. Balance of $25 is withheld, pending an investigation.

SUBSIDY OF THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. DAVIN moved for:

Copies of all letters, petitions, memorials and suggestions received by the Government, or any member thereof, since the 23rd June, 1896, to amend the North-west Territories Act with a view of enlarging the powers of the executive of the North-west Territories and to increase the subsidy of the North-west Territories.

He said: This is a motion of a character such as I have from year to year brought before the House, sometimes with successful results and sometimes without anything being accomplished. Last session, my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver), brought forward a motion of a similar kind and nothing resulted from it. Subsequently, a session of the North-west Assembly was held and a memorial was passed which was forwarded to the Dominion Government. That memorial asked for several things, that there is no sign so far that the Government intends to grant. During last session, in regard to one part of the question that that memorial deals with, a member of the executive of the North-west Territories came down to Ottawa, and one of the papers in the Territories had an article on the subject, in which it said:

Mr. Ross's first visit furnishes the Government a fair occasion to prove that the new-born confidence of the people in the Territories has not been misplaced. The attitude of the late Government towards our legislative assembly was of late years most unfriendly. Year after year, the chairman of the executive journeyed to Ottawa to lay the fair and just claims of the North-west Territories before the Government, and year after year these just claims were contemptuously disregarded. The assembly appealed time and again for some definite subsidy, to do away with the hand-to-mouth system, and allow the framing and institution of a progressive policy for the administration of local affairs. A deaf ear was turned to these appeals. Mr. Laurier has thus an early opportunity to demonstrate that he intends to deal justly and generously by the Territories.

Well, Sir, nothing was done last session by the Government of the Prime Minister who was thus appealed to by name, and there does not appear any evidence, from the Queen's Speech or from the Estimates now before us, that there is an intention of doing anything. There is, however, plenty of time for the Government to reconsider its position, and to decide to do something to show itself, as we are told by that paper, more generous than the previous Government. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, in justice to that previous Government, that everything that was done for the North-west

Territories was done by them. They have done a great deal in the Territories, and from time to time, at my instance, they did advance the bounds of the powers of the North-west Territories, and they did other things for us, not merely at my instance in regard to these other things, but at the instance of myself and my colleagues, and those of us who went to wait on the Government as petitioners. But, Mr. Speaker, it was on the floor of this House that we accomplished the giving to the North-west Territories of what was properly described in this House last session by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), and as described in this memorial passed by the legislative assembly: as practically responsible government. In 1887 the Lieutenant-Governor of these Territories was a Czar, and the assembly had practically no power whatever; but in 1887 the Territories were represented in this House, and from that moment the members of this Parliament moved in the direction of giving responsible government to the Territories. One of these members from the North-west Territories had a Bill on the paper providing that full responsible government be given to the Territories, and thereupon, Sir John Macdonald brought down a Bill under which he gave us what was called an advisory council. That advisory council was found not to work well, nor did it give such power as should have been given to the Territories, and so we subsequently got what was called an executive committee. That executive committee had most of the powers of the government of a province, but the means of getting it into existence is awkward, and the means of continuing it, if one of its members should be destroyed by death or resign, is also awkward. You have not, properly speaking, a responsible government there, although you have all the powers, with two or three exceptions, that are given to the provinces. For instance, under the present system I do not think you could possibly have party government. I do not think you could raise party issues under the present conditions, if it were found desirable to do so; because these four men are not a government chosen by one man who is asked to construct a government for the Lieutenant-Governor, but they are chosen by the assembly, and although there is one first among them called the chairman of the executive committee, nevertheless, he has not at all the power of a Prime Minister. I may tell you that the memorial passed unanimously in the assembly, and I wish to call the attention of the Government here to what it says:

The assembly is of the opinion that to remedy this undesirable state of things——

Which I have just now described.

—it is not necessary to have recourse to granting a full provincial status.

You will observe, Mr. Speaker, that the assembly does not want to have the full provincial status given to them. I am not going to discuss that. Probably I do not know why they do not want it; perhaps I cannot gather from the debates why they do not want it. I myself now hold the same opinion which I held in 1887: that the best thing that could be done for these Territories would be to give them full responsible government. That is my opinion, but when you have the whole assembly of the North-west Territories stating that they do not want full responsible government, it would be very improper on the part of a member of this House, and very improper even if this whole House were unanimous, to force full responsible government upon them. Therefore, although I have not changed my own opinion, I am not here to-day to ask for anything more than the people of the Territories have themselves asked for. I shall point out later on the very important consequences that follow from their not asking for full responsible government. When the change was made by the late Government shortly before it went out of power, whereby the amount of money placed at the disposal of the North-west Territories Assembly was given en bloc, and not voted as a specific vote, a course should then have been taken by legislation to devise a safeguard which no longer exists in consequence of that change. It is, of course, necessary to have certain safeguards—for instance, over the expenditure of money; because the Goverument of the North-west Territories has its pupil-like character of which it has no wish to divest itself; and we, in voting the money, must be in a position to ask this Government to show us how every farthing of the money has been spent, and whether it has been properly and judiciously expended; that is, of course, speaking broadly.

Now, they want two things—they want a change in the powers they exercise, and they want a larger subsidy.

They are of opinion that the time has come that their executive government should be put on a firmer basis, by substituting for the executive committee an executive council.

I have described what they have at present, and of that the memorial says:

It is evident that the assembly, having the power to vote money for distinct services, should have the right to control the proper carrying out of its intentions.

As in the present more developed state of the country, which has as much or more need for an intelligent and permanent administration and supervision of its resources and requirements as any other part of Canada, it is impossible for the assembly to act as an executive council; they have been obliged to make provision in their several ordinances to entrust the administering of their laws to the Lieutenant-Governor, acting by and with the advice and consent of the committee created by federal law for the purpose of advising with relation to expenditure only. They cannot, however, be sure that in taking the only

possible steps within their power to meet the necessity, they have not exceeded their powers.

That is a very important thing. There is to my mind, as there is evidently to the minds of the whole assembly, a clear doubt whether, in adopting ordinances providing a modus vivendi, so to speak, they have not exceeded their powers; because they are to some extent in the position of an inferior assembly amending the legislation of this supreme Dominion Parliament. Besides, the memorial points out:

The present machinery does not admit of development, as for instance, in the direction of division into departments with responsible heads. The executive committee also has not the right to advise the Lieutenant-Governor in matters not contained in the ordinances, notably the appointment of justices of the peace, and the convening and dissolving of an assembly.

Now, what they suggest is, that the Parliament should amend the section of the North-west Territories Act of 1891 (54 and 55 Victoria) which is substituted for section 13 of the North-west Territories Act, chapter 50 of the Revised Statutes. That is the section which defines the powers of the assembly, and enumerates the various subjects on which it may legislate. They suggest that in that section this change should be made:

The legislative assembly shall exclusively have power to make ordinances for the government of the organized Territories in relation to the classes of subjects next hereinafter mentioned, that is to say.

While Parliament cannot divest itself of its paramount right of legislation in the Territories, it is desirable that it should not, as it often has done, unintentionally perhaps, by legislation partly or wholly repeal the powers given to the Territories under that section 13, as may easily be done under the law as it is at present.

Then they suggest that we should add a clause to the North-west Territories Act giving power to the assembly, notwithstanding anything in this Act or any other Act of the Parliament of Canada, to repeal the Territories Real Property Act. The object of that is this. You have given them the right over property and civil rights. They can legislate on subjects dealt with by this Real Property Act. They have already made ordinances on those subjects. I am not sure that you have not on your Table at the present moment a Bill dealing with matters of this kind. But it is palpable that, if their ordinances varies in the least from the legislation of this Parliament on that subject, it is ultra vires. So that what they ask for there is, I think, reasonable, and what the Government can hardly refuse, if it intends that the powers given them shall not be illusory.

Then, they suggest the repeal of section 17 of the North-west Territories Act of 1894, and to insert:

There shall be a council to aid and advise in the government of the Territories, to be styled the executive council of the Territories, and such council shall be composed of such persons and under such designations as the Lieutenant-Governor shall from time to time think fit.

It is palpable that this is a demand for responsible government pure and simple; and if you grant that request, the only difference between the Territories and the provinces would be that under clause 13 the assembly of the Territories would be deprived of the authority to legislate on one or two subjects, and one or two other powers which a provincial legislature has—for instance, the power to borrow money; but maugre these two or three subjects, you would give them responsible government if this third request were granted.

Then, they wish to have sub-clause C of subsection 7 of section 13 repealed—that which relates to insurance companies. They very properly say that there is no reason for depriving an assembly of men who are just as intelligent, enlightened and experienced as the men in any assembly of any province, of the power of giving a charter to an insurance company. It is palpable that that very elementary right of a civilized community should be within their power.

Then they wish to have inserted a clause in the North-west Territories Act giving to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council the power to appoint sheriffs, and so on. That is a mere detail, and I do not attach much importance to it. If the Government go as far as the Act, they will probably give them these powers.

Then, they suggest that, subject to conditions, the following subsection should be inserted:—

The establishment, maintenance and management of hospitals, charities and eleemosynary institutions in and for the Territories, and repeal sections 103, 104 and 105 of chapter 50, R.S.C., in so far as they are inconsistent with the powers asked for.

Now, you will see that in the Estimates brought down, on page 67, under the head of "Government of the North-west Territories," you have "Insane patients, Manitoba, $30,000." What happens at present is this, that any insane patients we have are sent to Manitoba, and there is no reason whatever why we should not take charge of our own insane. Lunatics from the Territories are, under an agreement between the federal authorities and the province of Manitoba, which expires in 1898, sent to the asylums of that province, and at present there are in such asylums 74 persons costing one dollar per day. Surely the assembly is only rational in contending that they could perform such service as well and more cheaply than Manitoba. An insane man is found in some part of the Territories, and instead of sending him to an asylum in

Calgary, or Regina or Moose Jaw, or Medicine Hat—wherever the asylum might be—he is sent 300 or 400 miles further into Manitoba, and the clumsy expedient is used of charging the Territories with the cost, under the agreement by which the Manitoba institution takes charge.

As regards hospitals, the assembly already provides, as far as its means will allow, for the assistance of a hospital built and kept by private charity, and we have at Medicine Hat and at Calgary a magnificent hospital in each place. We have a hospital at Medicine Hat due to the enterprise and philanthropy, in the main, of John Niblock—a hospital which, I have no doubt, some of my friends on both sides of the House have visited and which all who have visited it must admit is not merely a credit to Mr. Niblock's energy and philanthropy, but to the philanthropy of the North-west Territories also and the passenger public, because there are wards in it that illustrate the benevolence of those who have visited it from time to time. And let me say, in passing, that I greatly regret, when I bring forward a subject of this kind, that we have not the Minister of the Interior in his place. There is a just claim on the part of this hospital, outstanding now for some years, against the Department of the Interior, and I have strong hopes that the Minister of the Interior will do it the justice of seeing that this claim is paid.

The assembly also wants the repeal of section 21 of the North-west Territories Act of 1894 and that an Act should be introduced respecting roads and road allowance of the North-west Territories, with similar provisions to those contained in chapter 49 of the Revised Statutes of Canada respecting roads and road allowance in Manitoba. The object of this is to do away with the uncertanties and difficulties connected with the laying out, improving and acquiring roads by expropriation and to give to the assembly the right to delegate such powers to municipalities.

Then they desire that a clause should be added giving the assembly the power to repeal, alter, vary or re-enact the provisions for the appointment of justices of the peace and their qualifications. That question, however, is one of detail which I am not going to discuss, because if the Government decide to do the large things asked for, that will follow, no doubt, as a matter of course.

The other large subject dealt with by this memorial of the assembly is the subject of finance. That has been from time to time placed before this House. It was ably placed before us last session by my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver), and nothing new has since taken place that would add to the arguments which he put before this House. I shall just call attention to what the memorial contains on that subject. At present, if you look at the Estimates, you will find that the main grant is for schools, clerical assistance, printing, &c.; and as the hon. member for Alberta pointed out last session, the chief thing to be provided, out of that $242,000 is schools. This is what the memorial says on that point:

> Owing to the vast area of the Territories and the widely scattered nature of the settlement, all the business of the local government is rendered more expensive and proportionately to the population than in any province. As regards roads this is apparent, but with respect to schools it will be found equally true. By considering that, under the most favourable circumstances, less than half the area in each township is available for homesteading, and that, as a rule, only a small amount is taken up, it will not create surprise to see that in 1895 it took 341 schools, with 401 teachers, to educate 11,972 enrolled pupils, with a daily average attendance of 6,600, and that, out of these schools, 223 were only open during the summer months, with a daily average attendance of 11.

Let me call the special attention of the Government now to this argument on behalf of our claim for a larger subsidy:

> In 1891, the population was 66,769; the number of schools in operation was 224. In 1892, the number of schools in operation was 237, and the parliamentary grant was $208,700. In 1895, the number of schools was 341, being an increase in four years of over 52 per cent. In 1896, the population was 104,221, or 10 per cent per year added to the census of 1894, being the ratio of increase between 1891 and 1894, and the grant from Parliament was $242,879, not including $25,000 supplementary vote to recoup the assembly for relief expenditure undertaken for and on account of the Dominion Government, being an increase in five years in population of 56 per cent, and in annual grant during the last four years of 16 per cent.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). What was the amount of the supplementary vote?

Mr. DAVIN. $25,000. Thus while the population increased 56 per cent, the increase of the annual grant was only a little over one-quarter of that.

Now, in the Territories the conditions of the Government are somewhat analogous to those of Manitoba; and, therefore, a comparison between Manitoba and the Territories is a natural one. Nothing could be more natural than that we should ask, as we asked in 1887, as we asked in 1888, and in 1889, and in 1890, and in 1891, and every year including last year through my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver), that we should be treated on precisely the same footing as Manitoba. Now, if we were so treated what would be the result? The population of the Territories in 1891 according to the census of that year, was 66,799. According to the census taken by the North-west Mounted Police in 1894, the population was 86,851. According to that ratio of increase, namely, 30 per cent, the population in 1897 is 112,906. Now, if we were treated on the same basis as Manitoba, according

to subsection B of section 5, of chapter 46, of the Revised Statutes of Canada, the per capita grant would be calculated on an approximate estimate of the population two and one-half years from 1897, which, at the rate of increase that I mentioned in an earlier part of my remarks, namely, 10 per cent a year, would be 141,132. Now, the per capita grant of 80 cents a head for 141,132 would give you the sum of $112,905. Then on the debt account, on a presumably actual population in 1887 of 141,132, the amount would be 5 per cent on $32.44 per head, making $183,133. An amount for the support of government and legislation is given to Manitoba of $50,000 a year. Is there any reason why we should not get $50,000 also for the same purpose? No reason whatever. Then, Manitoba has been held to be entitled to an indemnity of $100,000 a year, because the administration of its lands it withheld from it. But what are the lands of Manitoba compared with the lands of the North-west Territories? What are the claims, therefore, of Manitoba as compared with the claims of the North-west Territories in this particular? The Territories, of course, have a much stronger claim to compensation, inasmuch as besides the land grants to railways in and for the Territories, what has been done with our lands? Why, Sir, we have been a quarry to which they have come from every quarter to get land grants. If a railway seeks a land grant, it always looks to the North-west Territories. Land grants have been given for the general benefit of Canada, and for the special benefit of the eastern provinces and British Columbia; land grants have been given within the Territories for railways constructed for and in Manitoba for which no sufficient land grant could be found in that province. The province of Manitoba has been given all lands designated as swamp lands. Now, if you come to consider what should be given us, we should get a far larger grant than $100,000 on this account. It really ought to be $300,000. But suppose you only add $50,000 to what is given to Manitoba, and you get a land grant that should be given us of $150,000. So the amounts we should get would be:

Provincial subsidy	$112,903
Debt account	183,133
Support of government and legislation	50,000
On account of lands	150,000
Making a total of	$496,038

And what do we get here in these Estimates after this matter has been——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). What do I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) to be reading from? From what does he get these figures?

Mr. DAVIN. I am giving the hon. gentleman a calculation that is not now given in this House for the first time. It was given here last session, it was given even before that. I am referring to the same calculation made in the memorial that has been transmitted to the Government after having been passed unanimously in the North-west assembly.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That was what I wished to know. I understand the hon. gentleman is reading from the memorial.

Mr. DAVIN. These are the figures in the memorial.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman referred to the speech made by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), and I was not sure whether he was reading from that speech or from the memorial.

Mr. DAVIN. I referred to the fact that my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) had brought this matter before the House, as had been done every year. But I wish to point out that $150,000, the sum I have last mentioned, was not mentioned in the memorial. The memorial points out that Manitoba gets $100,000 and says that we are entitled to more, but does not mention a sum. To reach an aggregate, I supposed that it should be made $150,000. So, instead of $242,000, we should get $496,000. I pointed this out, two years ago, I think, when the present Government was not in power, and when my hon. friend was sitting in Opposition—and at that time I got help from hon. gentlemen who are now sitting, as the Prime Minister says, enthroned like the Olympian gods, in a place where they used not to sit. I used to get help from them. I do not know whether he (Mr. Davies) gave me help, but there were gentlemen on that side who used to give me help in contending for what I did contend for from year to year. And, in fact, two years ago, we had more than a million dollars due us by the Dominion Government. If we had a commission such as sat the other day in regard to taxation in Ireland, it would be found that the North-west Territories, like Ireland, had been paying a large amount of taxation that we ought not to have had to pay.

Mr. COCHRANE. Do not suggest a commission, or we shall have one.

Mr. DAVIN. This would not be a very expensive commission, and its work would not take very long. The calculation is easily made, because we have all the facts. And if my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will only make the calculation, he will easily reach the result. Let him for a moment fancy that he has taken a brief for the Territories. I am told by the chairman of the executive of the North-west Territories that something like this memorial has been sent to every member

of the Government and that they are in possession of it. Let the hon. gentleman read that. I know he is an able lawyer,—let him fancy that we have given him a brief and put a large fee in his pocket and that he is to make out a case for us. Let him read it in that light and he will be perfectly astonished what a case he can make out for the Territories and against the lethargy of his own Government, because this is the second session, and, apparently, up to the present, they have done nothing.

An hon. MEMBER. Carried.

Mr. DAVIN. It will be carried in a short time. By the way, what mavis singing-bird was that I heard? Now, I have something to suggest that I think will be welcomed by every territorial statesman, I mean the members of the provincial assembly, and it will be welcomed by every man who has the interests of the Territories at heart. I doubt, Sir, if there is any arrangement that has been made by this Parliament that has worked more successfully and to better advantage than the arrangement that was made by the Parliament of Canada that we should have an Auditor General perfectly independent of the Government of the day. I think it has been a great advantage to the people, it has been in the interests of economy, and I believe it has been of advantage to the Government in the past, and is an advantage to the Government to-day, so far as they desire to act economically. Now, let us suppose that the Government intends to accede to the prayer of this memorial, and to give the North-west Territories the kind of government they demand; but even if they do not do that, what I am now about to suggest that they should do is to provide an auditor that will be appointed by the Government of Canada, and will be perfectly independent of the Government of the Territories. Of course, when the time comes that a full provincial government would be given to the Territories, that arrangement would cease, and we would expect that the Territorial Assembly, when it would take up its full manhood, would re-appoint that auditor, or at all events, appoint somebody in his place, and continue that very useful official; and also appoint him under an ordinance such as our Audit Act, that would make him independent of the executive of the day. I think that would be in the interests of the Territories. But at the present moment, we are bound, here in this Parliament, to see that such an auditor exists. We have no means at present of knowing how the money is spent that we vote to the Territories. That executive and that assembly are only a function of the Dominion Government as long as they do not get full provincial autonomy. At present they do not want full provincial autonomy, as I have already pointed out to my hon. friend when I quoted the memorial.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). A fuller measure of economy might involve the right and the duty of raising money by taxation; and they do not want that.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not think there will be any necessity for it, because they do raise money for taxation at present, that is, they raise a local fund of $30,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. How?

Mr. DAVIN. By licenses; they have a local revenue of $30,000—I think it is about that sum. But I would like to point out to my hon. friend that they say they do not wish to get full responsible government. This is their language:

> The assembly is of opinion, that to remedy this undesirable state of affairs, it is not necessary to have recourse to granting the full provincial status.

They do not ask for it, and this memorial passed unanimously. The money they spend is money voted by this Parliament, and therefore it is logical that this Parliament should know how that money is spent. Some years ago we voted a specific sum for all the work that was done in these Territories, and the sums used to lapse. I was one of the persons, with Mr. Haultain and others, who went to the Government to get that done away with, and we got a system adopted whereby you now vote a block sum, such as we have here—a grant for schools, clerical assistance, printing, &c., to be paid half-yearly in advance, $242,000. Now, I want to see a far larger sum voted, I want to see this House do justice to the Territories, and vote them a sum of $500,000, which sum is the very least that will enable them to manage these Territories effectively. But whether we vote them that much or not, as we are voting money, we ought to have an audit independent of the executive, and an independent audit will be welcomed by the executive. If they do not welcome it, there is the more necessity for it; if they welcome it, then there is necessity for it, and it should be given at once. What we should have is a Dominion auditor, an officer up there paid out of the territorial fund, paid by the executive, but whose appointment would be independent of the executive. That would give us an account of how the moneys are spent that we now vote en bloc, and we have no account of how they are spent; whereas when we voted them in the manner I desired to see abolished, and which I was contributory to abolishing, we did know how the money was spent. As long as we vote the money, we ought to know how that money is spent. Now, it is well known that contracts for large sums have been given, and I believe that it has been done elsewhere also, within recent months—but contracts for considerable sums have been

given without tenders being called for. Well, if that is so, a part of this money that we are voting is spent in that way. It may be spent well, but we ought to know that it is spent well, and we ought to have an auditor to overhaul that. I am not sure that we should go beyond our function if we were to insist that contracts for any considerable amount should be invariably based upon tenders. I hope the Government will go into this question, I hope the Government will listen to the prayer of this memorial, I hope the Government will give an adequate sum, I hope the Government will alter the character of the executive and make it of a responsible character, to the extent that they demand. But in doing that let the Government make a constitution that will be consistent. If you make a constitution short of perfect provincial autonomy, such as these gentlemen desire, and still keep them in 'statu tutelari,' then you are bound as long as they are spending money that we vote here, to have an officer who will give us an account of how that money is spent.

Mr. OLIVER. I am sure the people of the North-west Territories will be very glad to know that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) who has just sat down, is advocating their interests so strongly, and I have no doubt they will accord him almost that measure of appreciation that he received at the late election, in the coming election that is likely to take place in his constituency. I do not wish to argue all the different points he has raised; I will only say that on the general question the hon. gentleman and myself are at one, namely, that the Territories are entitled to a greater measure of consideration at the hands of this Government. I can only hope that the hon. member will be able, by his arguments, so to influence those who sit on the same side of the House as himself, that, what they were able to do when they had the power and did not do, that is, grant the fuller measure of justice to the Territories that the people of those Territories desire and expect, they will support the new Government in doing when the opportunity arises. This question was brought before the House on a previous occasion. It is before the Government again. Gentlemen representing the Government of the North-west Territories are here now. It is quite within the knowledge of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) that members of that Government are here for the purpose of claiming additional subsidy and additional powers. I should like to point out to the House that while the hon. gentleman made a lengthy appeal on behalf of the memorial which those hon. gentlemen are advocating, he also made an insinuation against the gentlemen themselves, and thereby attempted to weaken their case with the Government of the day, for he insinuated that the Government of which they are the head was not spending the money in its hands in a manner that was for the best interest of the country and the people, and that they had to be watched; in fact, it was absolutely necessary they should be watched by a special auditor appointed by this Government. I say that while the hon. gentleman was, on the one hand, declaring that their wishes should be granted, on the other hand he was trying to make light of the position of those gentlemen and to weaken confidence in them so that their representations would not be agreed to. In this case, as in others, the hon. gentleman has been blowing hot and cold; one reason that we have not been able to get what we desired in the past.

I submit that the position of the North-west Territories at the present time, in so far as the control of the funds voted to them by Parliament is concerned, should be, if it is not, exactly the same as that of a province. Certain money is voted to responsible representatives of the people of the Territories for expenditure, under the control of responsible advisers, and there is no reason why that Government should not have full control of the funds, as has the legislature of a province. When the hon. gentleman says that the North-west Government do not ask for full provincial powers, and advances reasons why they should not be given control of money, which only they can properly control, he shows a desire to weaken and not strengthen their case. They are the only people who can know to what purposes this money should be applied, and how it should be applied. When this Parliament votes money to be expended by the Territories, the control ceases, or should cease, as regards this Government as to how the money should be expended. It is now expended by the North-west Government, and with all respect to the hon. gentleman, I believe it will continue to be expended on the responsibility of the executive of the North-west Territories, and solely on that responsibility. As to the provincial powers not asked for: Allow me to say that there are certain powers now exercised by the Government of the North-west exactly to the same extent as they are exercised by a province. This has been done with the consent of the Government here, with the consent of Parliament, and by reason of the necessities of the case, and this is likely to continue. The first of these is the expenditure of money that comes properly within the control of the assembly. The other matters are in relation to education, in regard to which the Government of the Territories has as full powers as the legislature of any province: in regard to legislation with respect to property and civil rights, as to which the Territories have the same rights as a province, and also in regard to municipal organization, in respect to which also the Territories have the same powers as a province. The points in which they lack the power of a province are points

of detail rather than of principle; except this one, that the Territories have not a fixed subsidy, and have not power to pledge the credit of the country for a loan. These are rights belonging to a province, and they are not asked by the representatives of the North-west Government. The reason why they do not ask for a fixed subsidy is no doubt owing to the fact that the extent of the country and its progress would act against their interests rather than in their favour if there were a fixed subsidy granted; that is to say, the country would outgrow the subsidy so quickly that if there were a fixed subsidy, instead of proving advantageous it would be distinctly disadvantageous. That is the reason why they do not want a fixed subsidy which would be the equivalent of a provincial subsidy, and that is the only important power they do not ask as compared with the province of Manitoba, which occupies the same position as the Territories as regards the control of lands. I will not occupy the time of the House at any greater length, but in conclusion I will say that the gentlemen representing the North-west Territories, who are here now, are entitled personally to the full confidence of the Government in any negotiations that may take place their representations are entitled to full consideration, and I have every confidence that they will receive that consideration at the hands of the Government.

Mr. DAVIN. I think we have had a somewhat extraordinary exhibition by an hon. gentleman who seemed to be tearing mad because he could not agree with me. The hon. gentleman was ready to rip himself up because he had to agree with the propositions I laid down. It was certainly a most extraordinary position, that the hon. gentleman on being obliged to agree with me should have got mad. It would seem that the only kind of speaking to which he is accustomed is scoiding, and as he had not an opponent, he had to scold a friend, and some one who advocated propositions with which he agreed. I hope the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) for the credit of the North-west, will reconsider his parliamentary demeanour, and not treat the country to such an exhibition as we have just had.

Mr. OLIVER. I rise to reiterate what I stated. I agree with the general propositions of the hon. gentleman, but I resent, and resent strongly, the mean insinuations he conveyed against gentlemen who represent the North-west in negotiations now going on.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman has not improved his position by his explanation. He resented something that was not in my remarks. He became as mad as a March hare, although this is April, because he could not find anything in my remarks to find fault with, and then he insinuated something that was not in my remarks. I referred with the greatest respect to my friend the chairman of the executive. I know those two gentlemen from the North-west are here. I have never in the past, here or elsewhere, been blinded by that extraordinary sentiment that I have seen some persons blinded with, that they must claim credit for this, that and the other. I have never entertained any such feelings as that. Anything proposed for the good of the country or for the North-west Territories, I have been ready to help forward; so that when the hon. gentleman, last session—although I think his behaviour in a certain way then was extraordinary for a young member—made a motion. I rose and supported him. I did not manifest the miserable, wretched, insect spirit he has manifested here, and that ranks him not on a level with hon. legislators in this chamber——

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid both hon. gentlemen in their last few remarks have not been quite in order. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) spoke of mean insinuations in regard to the speech of an hon. gentleman, and the hon. gentleman who is now addressing the House is going pretty far in the use of language which should not be used by one hon. member to another.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very much obliged to you for calling me to order at any time that I in any way transgress the rules of this House. But, Mr. Speaker, with great respect for you——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Chair. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) must accept the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. DAVIN. Ruling about what?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That you are out of order.

Mr. DAVIN. Pray, in what way out of order.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Speaker has explained that to you.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to know from you, Mr. Speaker, how I was out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) went beyond what I think is parliamentary decorum. Perhaps I should have pointed out before that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver), who spoke before him, transgressed in the same way. I do not think, however, that one transgression justifies the other, although perhaps one may have caused the other.

Mr. DAVIN. Am I to understand that it is henceforth the rule in this House of Parliament, that it is a breach of the rules to say of a member that he shows a miserable insect spirit?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes. I wish to say to the hon. member (Mr. Davin) that such is my ruling. Language that one gentleman would not use to another in any other place without being offensive, should not be used by one hon. member towards another in this House. That is the simple rule which I would like to see followed.

Mr. DAVIN. Shades of Disraeli. I wish we had Mr. Disraeli here; I wish we had Mr. Gladstone here as a witness. I am very glad to know, Sir, that the Parliament of Canada has risen to such a high dignity that we have a Speaker who lays down laws that would condemn Disraeli and Gladstone——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. When a ruling has been given by the Speaker, there is only one course open to any hon. member who objects to that ruling, and that is, to appeal to the House against the decision. I shall not permit any more discussion upon the ruling that I have made.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, Mr. Speaker, I won't show an insect spirit and appeal to the House. If I were to appeal to the House on the subject, I think I would show an insect spirit, and I suppose I do not break the rules of the House if I refer to myself as possibly likely to show an insect spirit.

Mr. CASEY. Not at all. Carried.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, and I can say in regard to the hon member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) that I have never shown an insect spirit, nor a worm-like nature, and I have never growled and grovelled. I can say a whole lot of things like that, but, Mr. Speaker, I bow entirely to your ruling. What I hope, then, is that we shall not have apotheosized in this House the demeanour of the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver). I hope that when a member comes to this House and endeavours to do the best he can for the country, and when he makes a proposition that an hon. gentleman opposite to him cannot controvert, that that hon. gentleman shall not abuse him and get mad. If the hon. gentleman does so, I will have henceforth to declare that that hon. gentleman shows a god-like temperament. Now the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) said that he hoped that if I should be able to induce this Government to bring in a Bill giving the Territories these things asked for in the memorial, that then hon. gentlemen on this side of the House would be ready to support such a measure. There is nothing whatever in the past history of the Conservative party to indicate that any good proposals for the North-west Territories would not meet with as fair consideration at their hands as it would at the hands of the Liberal party. The most determined opponents that we have had in the past, and the harshest critics in regard to the North-west Territories were gentlemen—not gentlemen of an insect spirit; but gentlemen of magnanimous soul like the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) and like the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey). Sir, I have not the least doubt whatever that if a good measure is introduced by this Government it will require no effort on my part to induce my friends on this side to support it; but you may be perfectly certain that I will use any influence I may be supposed to have with them.

Now, with regard to the suggestion that I have made. I suggested that there should be an auditor in the North-west Territories, precisely in the position of the Auditor General here. Is the existence of an auditor such as we have here, any reflection whatever on the present Government?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Is there not an auditor there now?

Mr. DAVIN. I do not understand that that there is an auditor in that position.

Mr. FOSTER. All these accounts are audited by our auditor.

Mr. DAVIN. They were audited in that way when we had the sums voted individually, but I am not aware that they are audited in that way now. At any rate, we should have an auditor in the North-west Territories where the audit could be done more efficiently than the present auditor can do it. What I suggest is an auditor there placed in precisely the same position as our Auditor General. We have no authority in Canada that has power to give us an auditor here except ourselves, and if we have an auditor what matter who gave him the independence that he possesses. It is an advantage to the Government to have such an auditor here, and I have often heard Sir John Macdonald say that it was a great advantage to him to have an auditor that was perfectly independent of the Government. And because I suggest that we should have in the North-west an auditor in precisely the same position as our auditor here, an hon. gentleman gets up and says that I made an insinuation against these two gentlemen in the North-west Territories. Well, Mr. Speaker, these two gentlemen are members of that North-west Government, and they will compare with any two gentlemen in any provincial executive. The head of that executive, Mr. Haultain, is a personal friend of mine. He is a man than whom there is not in any Government in Canada, or in any Government in the world, one more honourable. When I am advocating giving these gentlemen enlarged powers and larger grants of money to spend, is it to be supposed for one moment that I would make any suggestion that would be derogatory to them? I am under the impression at the present time, although I may be wrong, that there

is not the same audit there that there used to be, and if there is not, then I say there should be. I may say further, Sir, that in performing my duty here, I have never been afraid of what construction any person inside or outside of this House would put upon my conduct. My record in this House, battling for the interests of the North-west Territories is not the record of a man who has shown any petty political spirit, because when my own friends were in power I have asserted my opinions against my party proclivities. I hope that if the present Government does not do justice to the Territories, the members from the Territories supporting that Government shall follow my example in that. I do not know that we shall hear any protest from the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) against the indifference of the Government he supports, to the North-west Territories. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) professes to be an independent, but as an hon. gentleman on his own side of the House told me, he professes to be an independent, but he is the worst Grit among them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. DAVIN. No, I will not give the name. That name is perfectly sacred with me. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am quite surprised that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies), who is the only member of the Government present, has not said anything in regard to this motion.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I had no opportunity. I intended to have spoken.

Mr. DAVIN. The Speaker rose after the hon. gentleman sat down.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend was too quick for me.

Mr. DAVIN. I beg pardon—I did not see my hon. friend (Mr. Dobell). I apologize to him. Nobody recognizes more thoroughly than I do the important part my hon. friend plays as a member of that Government; and, as he now comes back after doing great things in London, it would have been impossible for me to ignore his presence if I had known it. But I am surprised that no Minister rises to speak on this motion. We have to-day what we have lately been accustomed to have in this House, day after day—empty Ministerial seats. We are told that the Ministers are caucusing, patching up Cabinet differences and Cabinet squabbles; and while they are doing that here, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) has gone to patch up Liberal squabbles in Winnipeg. That is why we have empty Ministerial seats in this House. We have only one Minister with a portfolio present, and he was going to allow the motion to be put without saying anything upon it. I shall be very glad to let him say anything now.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I was not going to let the motion pass without making a remark or two; but the hon. gentleman was rather quick in getting on his feet, and I had not an opportunity. The hon. gentleman has asserted his independence in this House. I recognize his claim to independence, but there is this peculiarity about it, that while he asserts his independence, he does not support his assertion by his vote.

Mr. DAVIN. I rise to a point of order. That is a statement of fact about myself, and I say it is not true to fact. I say on the contrary that I have again and again supported my speech by my vote, and I dare the hon. gentleman to prove what he has stated. It is not true.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think I have sat in this House as long as the hon. gentleman——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr Davin) has made a statement, and unless the hon. gentleman is prepared to controvert it, he should accept it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not prepared to controvert it if he says that on any occasion he voted against the Government of which he was a supporter. I shall be particularly pleased if he will point out the occasion, and show us the "Hansard" in which the vote is recorded.

Mr. DAVIN. I will satisfy the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Passing, then, from this matter, which does not affect the question before the House, to the substantive motion which the hon. gentleman has made, I quite appreciate the importance of the subject-matter of that motion. It is a motion for papers relative to the claim of the North-west Government for increased executive powers and increased statutory allowances. The question was brought before this House at the first short session of this Parliament, when my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) made a lengthy statement containing a very large amount of information on the question, and he was supported by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Davin). The Government have not only had the advantage of these statements, but they have had the benefit of receiving from the North-west executive a memorial setting forth in detail what the claims of that Government are. The hon. gentleman in his speech followed very closely the terms of that memorial—in fact, reading it to the House. That memorial has been presented to the Government by Mr. Haul-

tain and Mr. Ross, and they have had interviews with the Government, in which they have pressed very strongly the claims they have made. But it is obviously impossible at the present moment to have an intelligent discussion, much less to form an intelligent conclusion, until the papers are in the hands of hon. members. There is no objection to the hon. gentleman's motion passing, but I will call his attention to the fact that while he elaborated the importance of an audit in the North-west, he has ignored the fact that there is an exhaustive audit of the vote of this House for the North-west, made by the Auditor General of the Dominion, and contained in his Annual Report. If the hon. gentleman will turn to that report he will see, from page H 15 to page H 40, the details of the expenditure which this House voted in a lump sum. But in addition to that audit by our auditor, there is the audit of the North-west legislative assembly on their own behalf; and if the hon. gentleman examines the account for last year, he will find that something like $2,200 was expended for their audit office. So that the hon. gentleman may rest assured that, whether the sum voted is sufficient or insufficient, there is an ample check by the Dominion audit and the North-west audit to insure the proper expenditure of the money. In addition to the memorial which has been presented to the Government, and which has been supported ably by oral statements and arguments by Mr. Haultain and Mr. Ross, the Government have had the advantage of having the claims of the North-west presented to it by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) and other members of this House who support the Government. There is no danger, therefore, of these claims being lost sight of. Whether any legislation on the subject can be carried through this session or not will depend largely, I suppose, on the length of the session. We have to carry our Estimates and our tariff, which will occupy a great deal of time; and if hon. gentlemen find it desirable to shorten the session so as to enable prominent members on both sides to attend the Queen's Jubilee, it may be that we shall not be able to carry through many measures that we would like to bring down. I am not able to give the hon. gentleman any definite assurance at the present moment, because the matter is being and has for some time past been carefully considered by a committee of the Government here; but the papers he asks for will be brought down as early as may be, and I shall be glad to have them thoroughly discussed in this House, because I recognize the importance of the question. The hon. gentleman will remember that an autonomy almost equal to provincial autonomy has already been conceded to the North-west Territories. With the exception, I think, of the power to legislate on railways and one other item given to the provinces under section 92 of the British North America Act, we have conceded to them every power which a province now possesses. But they do desire some change with reference to the executive powers which have been conferred upon them, and there is no doubt that the process of legislative evolution is going on there, a constitutional evolution which this House will, at the proper time, I have no doubt, recognize by granting the fullest statutory powers to enable it to be brought to a successful completion.

With regard to the matter in point, the subsidy which was voted by this House to the North-west Territories, that is also being considered in great detail by the Government. The custom heretofore which has prevailed, and which has been objected to by gentlemen from the North-west, was this. The North-west executive presented in detail their claim for a subsidy, but an arbitrary sum frequently was deducted from the amount of that claim, and they then had, out of the smaller sum granted, to rearrange and appropriate amounts for the specific purposes as they best could. An improvement, I hope, will be obtained in this regard, and while we must and will recognize fully the claims of the North-west to generous treatment, we must also recognize that there are limits to which that treatment can extend. The whole subject is now, and has been for weeks past, receiving consideration at the hands of a committee of the Government.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has for a long time been a perennial spring of joy and amusement to this House. His humour has always borne that peculiar stamp which distinguishes the humour of Irishmen from that of even the most talented men of all other countries, and perhaps the most remarkable instance of this is the fact that the hon. gentleman poses constantly as the representative of the North-west Territories. When we remember that at present his majority, as representing one of these great North-west Territories constituencies, is a unit, and that the unit which returned him to Parliament was the vote of a partisan returning officer, we must recognize that his claim is a very Irish one indeed to represent the North-west Territories. Still, we have enjoyed for many years his attempt to be a westerner. He has been wild enough perhaps, but he can hardly be classed as western or as woolly, and in attempting to represent the wild and woolly west he has only afforded amusement to the House. This was all very well while his friends were in power, because at that time the coruscations of his humour were under some restraint, but now, since, unfortunately for him, he is sitting on the wrong side of the House, those corusca-

tions are almost too frequent to be either dazzling or amusing.

Mr. DAVIN. Or pleasant.

Mr. CASEY. They are pleasant in themselves, but like honey or some other things we could name, too much of them is not as pleasant as a mere taste once in a while. He assures the House to-day that he has never been bitten with a sentiment, to use his own peculiar Hibernian way of putting it, of a certain kind, and he has made reference to insects. Now, insects bite sometimes, as well as sentiments, and I am not at all sure that my hon. friend has not been bitten with a certain kind of insect called the gadfly, which is known to drive those it bites into great disorder of mind and conduct. I should certainly judge from his reply to the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) that something must have bitten him, if not a sentiment, then a gadfly.

Mr. DAVIN. I rise to a point of order. I understand your ruling, Mr. Speaker, is that no hon. gentleman should use insect illustrations. My hon. friend is transgressing that ruling by implying that the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) is a gadfly, and, in the character of a gadfly, bit me. I do not care a pin about it, Mr. Speaker, but your ruling must be respected.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman will say that the statement of the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) is offensive to him, I shall consider his point.

Mr. DAVIN. It is not in the least offensive to me. At that distance my hon. friend, or any other insect, would not annoy me.

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend's interruption is rather clever. He wanted to draw in the hon. member for Alberta again, but I wish to assure him that there are no flies on the hon. member for Alberta, neither gadflies nor any other kind, and that the gadfly which appears to have been biting my hon. friend must have been one of his own imagination. It must have been an insect spirit, in other words, which must have bitten him. I hope the hon. gentleman will obtain a supply of insect powder and get done with this gadfly, and the rest of us will have peace to attend to serious matters of discussion.

Motion agreed to.

CLAIMS OF WOOD MOUNTAIN SCOUTS.

Mr. DAVIN moved:

That in the opinion of this House the time has arrived when the claims of the Wood Mountain Scouts to secure scrip or land warrants for services rendered by them during the rebellion, should be settled.

He said: The claims of these scouts have been again and again brought to the attention of the Government, and it is therefore not necessary that I should elaborate them. These gentlemen of Wood Mountain did yeoman's service during the rebellion. They were placed in a position of great danger—a position in which they might have been taken between two fires. It was a position also of great responsibility, because the object of employing them was to prevent the half-breeds of the United States crossing the line and joining our half-breeds here. They performed that service most effectively. They kept the half-breeds of the United States from coming over and joining Riel, and had these half-breeds come across the rebellion, instead of costing $5,000,000, might have cost $10,000,000. The amount required to give these men scrip is but a small one, and as the Militia Department has got the material before it, I hope the Government will come to the conclusion that the time has come to settle these claims.

Mr. OLIVER. Before the motion is adopted, I wish to say a word on the general proposition connected with it. The question of scrip payments following on the North-west rebellion has been brought before the country and this House from time to time until perhaps a good many people are tired of it. At the same time, I want to say that, as far as the opinions of a large number of people of the North-west are concerned, there are claims for recognition of services in the North-west rebellion, just claims, that have not been recognized yet; and I can only say that it is right and proper they should be recognized. I hope that, with a new House and a new Government, the matter will be finally dealt with. I am not familiar with the claim alluded to in this motion, but I will say that, so far as the Mounted Police force which served in the North-west rebellion is concerned, their claim for recognition for their services in that campaign has hitherto been ignored or rejected—I do not know which. But I want to say as a member of this House that I consider that force had good and sufficient and reasonable claims to recognition, and that, in my humble opinion, those claims should be recognized even at this late day. The fact that a man has rendered service to his country is, it seems to me, not something that passes away by effluxion of time. The fact that this service was rendered so many years ago and the fact that it has not been recognized do not detract from the value of the service rendered, from the necessity and propriety of that recognition, or from the credit that will be due to those who give it. There was a certain distinction, an invidious distinction, made between two classes of men who served and served equally well in suppressing the rebellion, that is, between the volunteers who came from the east and the North-west Mounted Police. I should say, I believe that volunteers from the west were included, as well as

those from the east, and received recognition in the way of medals and scrip. But the men who stood beside them in the fight and who endured with them the hardships of the campaign did not receive either medals or scrip. That was an invidious distinction between two classes of men who rendered equally good service. I have not been able to find out why that distinction was made, and I do not believe that there was any good reason for making it. But I am bound to say that the fact of its being made has tended to prejudice the North-west Mounted Police in the minds of the people, the idea being that when such a clear, palpable distinction was made there must have been a reason for it. It is a conclusion which is inevitable. Eminent services were rendered by two classes of men of exactly the same kind, and the Government see fit to recognize one and refuse recognition to the other; certainly the public generally were bound to come to the conclusion that the Government had good reason for what they did. And that conclusion has militated seriously against the name and fame and welfare of the Mounted Police force of the North-west Territories ever since that day. Now, I say it is high time that the slur then cast upon the Mounted Police should be removed. For, there was no cause for that slur. The matter should be investigated or the Government should move in the matter. There are other claims for recognition for services in suppressing that rebellion which have been ignored on account of petty and trivial technicalities, very little to the credit of those who were influenced by them. I think the time has come for straightening up all these matters, all these obligations—for I consider that they are obligations—for the recognition of the services that were rendered, not to the North-west Territories, but to the whole of the Dominion of Canada by the sons of the Dominion. The time has come to sweep aside technicalities and recognize these services. At that time, Mr. Speaker, it was recognized that great services were necessary, the country being in a critical condition. Those great services were rendered, and the least the country should do is to recognize them. I have stated that the country did recognize these services in the case of a great many of the men who took part in the campaign. There is nothing that could be more agreeable to the mind of a patriotic citizen than that the men who left their homes and turned out to risk their lives and fight for the welfare of their fellow-citizens and the credit of their country, should be recognized handsomely. But, inasmuch as it was right and proper that this recognition should be given, so the slur that is cast by it not being given to a certain branch of the force is all the more disgraceful and should be removed all the more quickly. I have pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in supporting the hon. gentleman's motion.

Mr. SPROULE. I have pleasure in seconding the motion, for the same reason that I have seconded other motions of that kind that have been brought before this House. I am quite satisfied from the knowledge I have of the work of the Wood Mountain Scouts, that they took as able and active and important a part in quieting the rebellion as did any other portion of the militia; and why some of the men who took part in suppressing the rebellion were rewarded and others left out, I could never well understand. It must be said for the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), that he has at different times brought this question to the attention of the House, and that he has, in a measure, succeeded. He succeeded to the extent of getting a commission appointed to inquire into these cases, and a number of men who had been previously left out were included amongst those who were considered deserving of recognition according to the ruling of the Government. But there were still a few who were left out. Now, why should they be left out? If nine-tenths were granted compensation, why not the whole? I must say I looked over the matter several times and I never could understand why the Government did not go so far as to compensate the whole of these men, and I think the hon. member for West Assiniboia is entitled to the gratitude of the people of that country for the way he has fought in their interest every time he has had an opportunity in this House. It cannot be said that when his own friends were in power he failed to impress the matter upon their minds as he is doing to-day. On previous occasions he has spoken at greater length and with greater emphasis than he has at present. I think he deserves credit for the fight he has made, and I hope that the Government will take into consideration the case made out for these people and will give them the same recognition that was accorded to other scouts that took part in the suppression of that rebellion, so that justice may be done to all.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Before the question is put I would like to call the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) to the fact that the House has not been placed in possession of sufficient information to justify them in coming to a vote upon this question one way or another. The hon. gentleman has contented himself with almost formally moving the motion. Unfortunately the Premier is engaged elsewhere on important business which prevents him being in the House, and my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), who of course would have this matter particularly under his charge, is not here either. Therefore I take it that it would not do to ask the House to come to a decision in the absence of these gentlemen and the information necessary to form a judgment. I think I shall meet the views of the hon. gentle-

man and the circumstances of the case if I move that the debate be adjourned. When it again comes up these gentlemen will be present and able to announce the policy of the Government upon the matter, and I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE PRESENT GOVERNMENT.

Order being called for the following notice of motion in the name of Sir Charles Tupper :—

Copy of Schedule B, showing recommendations of the Treasury Board as submitted by report of Council to His Excellency the Governor General on the 6th and 7th July, 1896, and intended to be approved by him, laid upon the Table of the House last session, with a statement of the action taken by the Government on each of these appointments as made by the said Order in Council approved by His Excellency, or, where no action has been taken, the reason for such a course.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). May I ask the hon. gentleman if he intends to preface his motion by lengthened remarks ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I should like the Premier to be present.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I took the opportunity of saying some time ago to the First Minister that I intended to speak on this motion.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not wish to stop the hon. gentleman.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I extremely regret his absence, because it is very important that he should be here.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will note whatever the hon. gentleman says.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am very sorry that the First Minister is not here.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I regret to say that his absence is quite unavoidable, a matter of very grave importance is detaining him.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, Mr. Speaker, as my remarks on this motion were to be so mainly directed to statements made by the First Minister, perhaps I had better allow this motion to stand and take it up again. I suggest to my hon. friend who is leading the House, that I should have as early an opportunity as possible of making this motion.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The motion will stand nearly at the top—there are very few motions before it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope I shall have an early opportunity of making the motion.

Mr. DAVIN. Why not put it at the top ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is no other formal motion before it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Under the circumstances, at the request of my hon. friend opposite, I will allow the motion to stand.

DISMISSALS OF POSTMASTERS IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. MARTIN moved for :

Copies of all correspondence, papers, petitions, &c., in connection with the dismissal of the late postmaster at Little Sands, province of Prince Edward Island.

He said : I may say, Mr. Speaker, that since I placed this notice on the Order paper, I have learned that a gentleman has been dismissed from the office of postmaster in Prince Edward Island, who had occupied that position for 30 years, I mean Mr. David Ross, of Kinross in Prince Edward Island. I can assure you that the action of the department has caused great surprise in Prince Edward Island, because we had never supposed hitherto that the office of postmaster was a political one. It never was so considered in Prince Edward Island. The people down there are surprised that the exigencies of the Liberal party are such as to require the dismissal of an official of so long standing as the gentleman I have named, whose appointment antedates confederation, as well as many others who attended to their duties and performed them faithfully and well, without any political or other reasons being given, and entirely because some other persons wanted the positions. We were told by the leader of the Government that he was a Liberal of the English school. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that it would be very hard indeed to find in the annals of modern Liberalism in England anything to parallel the dismissals to which I am calling attention ; you will search in vain the annals of the Liberalism of to-day in Great Britain to find anything like the indiscriminate discharge of officials all over Canada, especially of officials like postmasters, whose salaries, as everybody knows, are very small. They were never accounted as political partisans, and the office was never held to be a political office, and in Prince Edward Island there has never been any charge of political partisanship made against the gentleman mentioned in my motion. Instead of being Liberals of the English school, the policy adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite shows that they are

Democrats of the American school, that they are adopting the spoils system which is in force to the south of us, as a result of which we find dismissals of postmasters going on all over Canada. I think every hon. member of this House will agree with me in saying that the exigencies of the Liberal party must be desperate indeed when they have to descend to making these dismissals. I cannot believe that the Postmaster General himself is fully aware of the circumstances in Prince Edward Island; I think if he were, he would proceed with more caution in making dismissals. I know in a very small section in the riding I represent, within a circle of six miles, no less than three dismissals have taken place, and that is going on all over the province. In these cases there have been no charges of political partisanship or anything else as far as I can learn. The dismissals have been made simply because the party had made so many promises to their followers and their heelers, that they are now obliged to create vacancies so that they may fulfil their promises. I think the action of the Government is degrading the civil service of this country, especially the postal service.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). There is no objection whatever to an order of the House, as asked for by the hon. gentleman. With regard to the observations which he made of a sweeping character, I think, so far as they have any application to this particular case, they were quite irrelevant, and in so far as they had any application to any transactions in the Post Office Department, they are wholly unwarranted by any facts. I say, Mr. Speaker, that in my department no man has been dismissed without sufficient cause, and I am prepared, upon the floor of Parliament or any other place, to defend and to justify every administrative act that has taken place since I assumed charge of the department. I deem it proper to make these remarks in order that the hon. gentleman's observations may not pass by unchallenged.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all documents, correspondence, reports, &c., havin greference to the appointment of Thomas E. Anderson to the position of collector of customs in the town of Napanee.-(Mr. Wilson.)

Copies of all papers, correspondence, petitions, evidence, reports and documents of every nature connected with the dismissal of J. H. Crépeau as postmaster at St. Camille, county of Wolfe, province of Quebec.—(Mr. Ives.)

Copies of all letters, correspondence, petitions, &c., relating to the dismissal of David Ross as postmaster of Kinross, in the province of Prince Edward Island.—(Mr. Martin.)

Copies of all papers, petitions, evidence, reports and documents of every nature connected with the dismissal of Andrew Carmichael, postmaster, Spencerville, Ont.—(Mr. Reid.)

Return showing the names of all persons appointed to the Department of Customs since the first day of July, 1896, also the names of the offices respectively to which they were appointed and the salaries thereto attached; also the names of all persons in the service of the Department of Customs whose services have been dispensed with since the first day of July, 1896, with the names of the offices and the salaries attached thereto respectively.—(Mr. Wood, Brockville.)

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

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 34) to incorporate the Canadian Securities Company of Montreal.—(Mr. Madore.)

Bill (No. 35) respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Bill (No. 36) respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. MacPherson.)

Bill (No. 37) respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—(Mr. Ingram.)

Bill (No. 38) respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.—(Mr. Britton.)

Bill (No. 39) respecting the Canadian General Electric Company (Limited).—(Mr. Lount.)

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. MACLEAN moved second reading of Bill (No. 4) to amend the Railway Act. He said: I desire to call the attention of the House for a moment to the provisions of this Bill. The first and main clause reads:

Upper berths in sleeping cars when not occupied or engaged for the night shall not be lowered; and any company violating this provision, after complaint has been made to the porter or conductor, shall be liable to a fine of ten dollars, which may be recovered in any court of competent jurisdiction.

A similar provision has been adopted by various states in the neighbouring Union, and that law has been found to work satisfactorily. It is without doubt a great convenience to those who travel in sleeping cars, that the upper berth should be closed while it is not in use. There is really no hardship sustained by the railway in this; and if the railway companies suffers nothing, and if the convenience of the passenger is increased, then let us adopt this law. It is perfectly constitutional for this Parliament to pass this law; and from the expressions of opinion in the public press and from letters I have received from travellers who use the railways a great deal, I know that public opinion will sustain this clause of the Bill. Now, with regard to the second clause, I might say that the transportation problem, next to the

trade problem in this country, is to my mind the most important that this Parliament is called upon to solve. We have had a great deal of talk in this House about the constitution and the interpretation of the constitution, but in my opinion, it is not at all so important as the transportation problem. I have attempted on several occasions to deal with the problem by Bills of more or less importance, but as yet I have not met with a great deal of success. However, we are making some progress; we are engaging more and more the attention of this House, and to-day in the Railway Committee, we have made considerable progress in this direction. Hon. gentlemen say: Why do you not go in for a Bill dealing with the whole transportation problem? Well, I have tried that, but have not been very successful up to the present time, and there is nothing left for us but to take up the question in detail. We now propose in dealing with the railway passenger rates to get at the facts. We shall know when the returns provided for in the second section of the Bill are rendered, what amount of free transportation is given by the railways, and what preferred passenger rates are given to certain classes in the community. The second clause of the Bill provides:

> The said Act is hereby further amended by inserting the following section immediately after section 301:—
>
> Every company shall, within one month after the first day of January in each year, make to the Railway Committee, under the oath of the president, secretary or chief executive officer of the company, true and particular returns—
>
> (a.) Of all annual and trip passes issued by the company during the year next preceding, with the names of the persons to whom they were issued, the reasons why they were issued, and the distance of travel included in the said passes;
>
> (b.) Of all special passenger rates given to various organizations, trades or professions, or to any other persons, together with the number of miles of passenger travel included under such special rates.

One reason why the people of this country have not got lower passenger rates is, because so many free passes and so much preferred transportation rates are given by the railway companies. If we know from this return the extent of this, the persons who pay 3 cents a mile would be in a much better position to command more equitable treatment than they now receive. When the Bill comes before the Railway Committee, as I hope it shall, I will be prepared there to give further reasons for the adoption of the measure. I shall content myself to-night, with merely moving the second reading, and that it be referred to the Railway Committee.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph lines.

Mr. MACLEAN.

SEDUCTION AND ABDUCTION.

Mr. CHARLTON moved second reading of Bill (No. 13) to amend the Criminal Code, 1892, for the purpose of making more effectual provision for the punishment of seduction and abduction. He said: Mr. Speaker, I ask the attention of the House for a few moments to the provisions of the Bill, the second reading of which I now beg leave to move. The object of this Bill is to afford additional protection to females. One of its provisions is to raise the age of consent from 16 years to 18 years. Another provision is to make the male responsible for seduction under promise of marriage, from the age of 18 instead of from the age of 21, as at present. The third provision is to increase the age of responsibility for abduction for immoral purposes from the age of 16 to the age of 21.

These three provisions are provisions which in my opinion should command the assent of this House.

I am quite well aware that reasons will be urged against the adoption of all these provisions, especially the first two. It will be claimed that females over the age of sixteen years have sufficient experience to enable them to resist wiles of the character to which they are exposed, and are not entitled to the protection of the law. There is one feature of the usages of society in Canada, and in all other civilized countries, which entitles the young female to special consideration; that is the fact that society deals with the female much more severely and unjustly than with the male. Lapses of this kind on the part of the female consign her to a position in society from which she can never recover. She becomes an outcast. The results of an indiscretion of this kind are more terrible in her case than any punishment that may be inflicted on the male, in whose case the offence is commonly regarded by society as a very trivial one. For this reason the female is entitled to a greater degree of consideration under the law than the male. The female between the ages of sixteen and eighteen in this country can scarcely be claimed to have attained the full years of experience that will enable her to understand as perfectly as she will later in life the temptations to which she is exposed, or to guard against those temptations as later in life as she will certainly do.

The same reasons which will doubtless be urged against this Bill were urged against the measure now on the Statute-book, providing that the age of consent shall be limited to sixteen years. I had the honour of promoting that measure in this House. It was discussed here for several years before it passed this House. After it passed the House of Commons, it had to run the gauntlet of the Senate, and it was discussed in that body for two or three years before it become law. That Bill originally provided for the age of consent being fixed at eighteen

years, but it was finally fixed at sixteen years. Those who were in the House at that time will no doubt remember that that Bill, when first introduced, met with a great deal of badinage. It was treated as a huge joke. For one or two sessions the House would hardly consent to treat the matter seriously, and jeers and gibes were the fortune of the promoter of the Bill. Finally, the Bill became law. It has now been on the Statute-book for ten years, and its operation has unquestionably been salutary, and in the public interest. Nobody now questions that it should have a place on our Statute-book, or would suggest that it should be repealed, and that the protection which females enjoy under the laws of Canada should be removed. I think we may now take a step in advance, and increase the age of consent to eighteen years, as proposed by this Bill. If good, substantial, tangible reasons exist for giving protection to the female up to the age of sixteen years, I can scarcely understand why the same reasons will not apply with equal or almost equal force to the proposal to extend that limit to eighteen years. From sixteen to eighteen years is an age of inexperience on the part of the female; there can be no doubt about that. In this country, and more notably in many other countries, if the seduction of a female is visited by the punishment of death by a brother or a parent, it is customary that conviction cannot be obtained. Society holds that the brother or the father or the friend of the female who has been robbed of her virtue, has the right to visit the crime with the punishment of death; and in many countries the fear of the guardian or the friend of the female taking justice into his own hands and inflicting this summary punishment, acts as a salutary restraint—such restraint which it is proposed by this Bill shall be imposed legally and decorously and in a proper manner.

It is not necessary to say much about the serious affect of the canker of vice, and the great importance of preserving chastity and public virtue. Anything that will conduce to that condition in society is commendable and salutary, and should be applied by all means. The object of this Bill is to protect the female, and to restrain those who have designs against her virtue—to serve the public good by holding out the prospect of punishment to the male who will not be otherwise restrained from giving full rein to his vicious propensities. There are many states in the American Union that have the age limit which this Bill proposes to establish. The State of New York, with a population of over six millions, has the age of consent placed at eighteen years. I do not know that it is necessary to give a list of the states which make the age limit eighteen, but there are ten or twelve of them, and there are others that have fixed the limit at seventeen, and others again that fix it at sixteen; and I believe that those which have the age limit at eighteen have more advanced legislation than the others have. It is proposed to amend section 181 of the Criminal Code, which reads as follows:—

> Every one is guilty of an indictable offence, and liable to two years' imprisonment, who seduces or has illicit connection with any girl of previously chaste character, of or above the age of fourteen years and under the age of sixteen years.

The Bill proposes to substitute eighteen for sixteen. It is proposed to raise the age of consent from sixteen to eighteen.

The second section of the Bill proposes to amend section 182 of the Criminal Code. Sec. 182 reads as follows:—

> Every one above the age of twenty-one years is guilty of an indictable offence, and liable to two years' imprisonment, who, under promise of marriage, seduces and has illicit connection with any unmarried female of previously chaste character and under twenty-one years of age.

The original Bill provided for the punishment of seduction, under promise of marriage by a male over the age of eighteen. I understand that some of the Senators were afraid that some of our young men, at this age of indiscretion, might commit a crime for which they were scarcely responsible, and thought it would be better to advance the age to twenty-one. I think, however, that any young man who deprives a woman of her virtue, who commits the flagrant offence of seduction under promise of marriage, is old enough at the age of 18 to know that he has committed a base act, and to comprehend the provision of a law which makes the act punishable, and I believe if it is proper to impose this penalty at the age of 21, it is just as proper to impose it at the age of 18 on the part of a male.

The third section of the Bill proposes to amend section 283 of the Criminal Code. That section reads:

> Every one is guilty of an indictable offence, and liable to five years' imprisonment, who unlawfully takes, or causes to be taken, any unmarried girl, being under the age of sixteen years, out of the possession and against the will of her father or mother, or of any other person having the lawful care or charge of her. It is immaterial whether the girl is taken with her own consent or at her own suggestion or not. It is immaterial whether or not the offender believed the girl to be of or above the age of sixteen.

The provision is aimed at the punishment of the offence of enticing girls into brothels or houses of ill-fame or enticing them out of the country under false pretenses, for the purpose of robbing them of their virtue and making them inmates of dens. If a girl, 21 years of age, has been inveigled from her home—made to enter a brothel, I am unable to see why her parents or other guardian should not be able to re-

claim her under a provision of the law, and why punishment should not be inflicted on the wretches who have abducted her, under any pretense whatever, and consigned her to a life of shame. For that reason the Bill proposes to raise the age when abduction is punishable from 16 to 21.

These are the provisions of the Bill I have the honour to submit to the House. I believe that all the hon. members are in favour of our establishing every safeguard possible for the purpose of conserving public virtue and punishing crime on the part of any individual, the purport or result of which is to sap the foundations of public virtue and render the chastity of females in this country less secure than it is at present.

Mr. CRAIG. With the general purport of this Bill I have full sympathy, and I have entire sympathy with those who are advocating this measure. I am not, however, able to agree in the whole Bill. While I have no objection at all, personally, to the first section which provides for raising the age of consent in women from 16 to 18, and while I think that is a part of the Bill which will commend itself to the judgment of this House, because 18 is not very old for a girl, I cannot support the second section of the Bill which provides for reducing the age of responsibility in the man from 21 to 18. It seems to me that that is a step in the wrong direction. The law, as it stands, is aimed at a man over twenty-one who seduces a woman under promise of marriage. But suppose we reduce the age limit from twenty-one to eighteen, then the man, instead of the woman, would require to be protected. Take a young man of nineteen, we might easily imagine cases in which he might be led into temptation and induced to commit the crime mentioned in this Bill by the woman herself, so that I think the age is very properly put at twenty-one. I say further that if we raise the age from sixteen to eighteen in woman, we are going far in that direction to protect the woman, because a woman at eighteen years of age, we know from experience and observation, is just as old as a man of twenty-one. I think it would be a most unfortunate step to take to reduce the age of responsibility in a man from twenty-one to eighteen. I can support the first section, but am compelled to oppose the section reducing the age of responsibility in a man from twenty-one to eighteen. Instead of having a good effect, this would have a bad effect. As to the third section, I have not looked into it particularly, but do not see that there is any particular objection to it. I think, therefore, that I might support the first and third sections, but as the Bill now stands I shall have to vote against it.

Mr. CHARLTON.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I quite agree in the remarks of my hon. friend from East Durham (Mr. Craig), but I do not see any objection to this Bill taking its second reading and being discussed in Committee of the Whole. The first clause, I think, might be very fairly accepted, but to the second clause I have the very same objection which has been urged by my hon. friend from East Durham. I do not think that it would be wise in any way to accept the modification proposed by my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). Under the civil law in the province of Quebec, and I think it is the same in the other provinces, but I can speak only for Quebec, a man cannot contract marriage legally under the age of 21 without the consent of his parents. Such being the law of the land, if a girl is so imprudent as to accept the promise of marriage of any boy under 21, she has only herself to blame for the consequence which may follow; and if you are to amend the law so as to make a man responsible for any promise of marriage he may give, being under 21 years, in my opinion such a change would not be conducive to morality but the very reverse. It would lead necessarily to blackmail in many cases and to boys being entrapped. The best age to be fixed, I think, is that already fixed—21 years. If a girl wants to accept the promise of a man, let her accept the promise of a man and not of a boy, and, by the law a man is not a man and able to give consent before he is 21 years of age. Barring thus, one criticism, I think the first clause should be admitted. As to the third clause, I am not prepared to give an opinion at this moment. It should be reserved for a future occasion.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

DRAINAGE ACROSS RAILWAY LANDS.

Mr. CASEY moved second reading of Bill (No. 14) respecting drainage on and across the lands of railway companies. He said: In moving the second reading of this Bill, I am merely following what I understand to have been the drift of opinion in this House on the last occasion when the House considered this subject. In consequence of many petitions from municipalities to this House in former years, and of complaints made to myself by individuals who wished to drain their lands across railways, I introduced on two former occasions Bills to make the Dominion railways subject to provincial laws concerning drainage. These Bills were attacked by the Government of the day, by many friends of the railways, and by many disinterested members of the House, on the ground that it would be far better to have a law which was applicable to all railways in the Dominion, so far as they were under the con-

trol of this Government and Parliament. Consequently, I have, this year, prepared a Bill intended to apply to all these railways, framed upon the basis of the law already for years in force in the province of Ontario. That Ontario Railway Drainage Act of 1890 made use of municipal machinery to a large extent and referred, almost entirely to drains constructed by municipalities under the different drainage Acts of that province. In making a Bill which is to apply to all Canadian railways, I have been compelled to drop the use of a good deal of municipal machinery, since our legislation cannot command that machinery in the same way that provincial legislation can. But I have preserved the main principles of that Bill, and I now ask this House to accept the measure.

I may say, in general terms, that the first object of the Ontario Act, and of my Bill, is to provide a cheap and quick settlement of all disputes between land owners and railways in connection with the question of drainage. It is to be admitted that drainage across the property of a railway company must be proceeded with much more cautiously than drainage across ordinary land. The road-bed must not be spoiled, and the safety of the road must not be endangered. For these reasons, and these alone, I think, special legislation is required. That special legislation was provided, as I have said, in Ontario. But when farmers and municipalities tried to take advantage of it by bringing their disputes to an issue, it was held by the courts, so far as any such cases have heretofore gone, that the provincial parliaments had no jurisdiction over Dominion railways. So that as a matter of fact, in the province of Ontario, that legislation, which has been in force since 1890, has been of no effect whatever, and has been of no use to those who desire to take advantage of it. My own opinion, given for what it is worth on a constitutional point, is that on a question of drainage the right of the provincial authorities to legislate seems very strong. But I do not set that opinion up as against the judgment of the courts ; and, at present, all the decisions in existence go to show that that power, so far as Dominion railways are concerned at all events, rests with this House. In consequence of these decisions the old system of appealing to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council on any question of dispute as to such drainage had to be continued. Farmers and municipalities find that system a tax upon them which, in some cases, they have borne, and, in some cases, they have refused to bear, preferring to put up with the inconvenience and loss which they suffered, rather than incur the necessary expense without any certainty of getting a quick and proper decision on the question if they came here.

I wish to urge upon the attention of the members of this House what it means to come before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. In the first place many municipalities, even in Ontario and Quebec, are very far indeed from Ottawa. When we come to the case of other provinces, the question of an appeal to the Privy Council seems even most absurd. An appeal to Ottawa from British Columbia, from Manitoba, from Nova Scotia, from New Brunswick, or from Prince Edward Island, on a question as to whether farmer Jones, or the township of whatever-you-like-to-call-it, has the right to drain across a certain railway, is entirely out of the question. To send a delegation here and hire a lawyer to appear would cost more than to suffer the inconvenience or even, in many cases, to abandon the land which it is proposed to drain. There is not at present any means of obtaining justice or, rather, of obtaining a decision—let me put it on that ground—on these questions of drainage, where such questions arise at a great distance from Ottawa. Gentlemen in this House have told me—and there may be hon. members present who know of such cases—that they have known farmers who have abandoned their farms simply because the railways refused to give them an outlet for their drainage, and they could not afford to come here and have that question tried out.

Suppose they did take the alternative of coming here, what would they have to encounter ? They are met by the permanent counsel engaged by the different railways, some of the ablest professional men in Canada who, on account of their age and experience, and by reason of having been long in that position of railway counsel, have more or less the ear of Ministers, whoever they may be at the time. They have their ear, and they have it justly, because they are known to be men of standing and position in their profession. It is very hard to expect a farmer or a poor township to engage counsel sufficiently able to contend with these railway counsel before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. Then, again, that Railway Committee is composed of the Minister of Railways and such other Ministers as may be associated with him, very few in number, perhaps none of them, except the Minister of Railways himself, much versed in railway matters, probably none of them knowing much about the needs of drainage in a country neighbourhood.

The tribunal is one which should not be occupied over such works ; it should be discussing questions of railway policy, and not questions of railway drainage. The location of the tribunal puts it out of reach of the most of those who need to have recourse to it. The conditions of trial before that tribunal are unnecessarily costly and unfair, to the rural litigant, at all events. For all these reasons, I ask the House to support the principle of the Bill which I now propose. Let me tell the House briefly what it amounts to.

In the first place, it declares the abstract right of all land owners to drainage across railway property to the same extent as across any other property, subject to the terms of this Act itself, which are intended to make provision for safeguarding the rights of the railway. When a municipality or an individual wishes to obtain drainage across a railway track, the first step in either case is to secure an engineer to make a plan of the proposed drainage works, so far as they affect the property of the railway company, together with profiles of any necessary structures, and an estimate of the cost. This plan, report and profiles are to be sent to the manager of the railway company, with a request to know whether he agrees to them. If he agrees, the documents showing that agreement are to be filed as herein provided, and form a basis for closing the whole matter. If they are not accepted by the manager of the railway company, he shall notify the other parties, and must then send an engineer within a certain time to confer with the engineer of the municipality or land owner, on the spot where the work is to take place, and see if they can not come to an amicable conclusion. If they do, their agreement is valid, and becomes a settlement of the case. If they do not agree, two courses are open to them. They may agree upon a third engineer to act as umpire, or third arbitrator, and go on, with his assistance, to settle the case then and there, or at such future time as may be appointed. If they do not do that, the party not satisfied in the case appeals to the Minister of Railways, who shall appoint a third engineer, a competent man in his opinion, to act as such umpire, or third arbitrator. The decision of these three engineers, in either case, shall be final and without appeal. The Act itself provides that no such drainage works shall be carried on in such a manner as to render the road-bed of the company unsafe or to do any permanent injury to it. I need not go into all the details on that point, but the rights of the railway in that respect are fully safeguarded. After it has been decided that the work shall be done, if it is so decided, the question arises of how it shall be done, and there is ample provision in the Act for obtaining the consent of the railway company to its being done by their own men, or by persons hired by the other party, as the case may be. If the railway company, or the other party to the case, does not act up to the provisions of this Act by appointing an engineer of their own, or if the engineer so appointed does not act, the Minister of Railways can again step in and appoint an engineer to act for such party, who shall have all the rights and duties of the engineer who should have been, or was, originally appointed. I think those explanations are sufficient as to the principle of the Bill, though I should like to have given you some more details, but there will be an opportunity for that in committee.

Mr. CASEY.

I have great confidence in the soundness of the provisions of this Act, as the action on which it is based was passed in Ontario under the eye of our present Minister of Justice, Sir Oliver Mowat, who was then Premier of that province. I have no doubt they were well considered by him before he allowed them to pass into law as a provincial Act; and I have no doubt that he still believes the principle of that Act to be sound. I had intended to ask for this Bill, as for my Bill in regard to railway employees and passengers, a special committee; but as it is a much longer Bill, and involves a question of jurisdiction between this legislature and another, I have been advised by the Government to allow it to go to the Railway Committee, and to have the question of jurisdiction submitted to the Minister of Justice before it passes through. Of course I am quite content to submit to his arbitration on that subject. I have no doubt that he is the best authority on that point that we have in Canada, and if his verdict is against the constitutionality of such an Act, then some other means must be taken of getting the relief proposed for the farmer or the municipality concerned. In that case I should have to revert, probably, to my other proposal to make Dominion railways subject to provincial legislation such as it may be. I have therefore the honour to move, seconded by Mr. Hurley, that this Bill be now read the second time, and I propose to follow that up by a motion that it be referred to the Railway Committee. I had, as I say, strong objections to sending it to that committee, and have them still, for that matter. I have not found that a committee of that kind, a rather tumultuary committee, inasmuch as there is an absence of the sense of dignity which prevails in a session of this House, is not the best tribunal to pry into and try the fitness of the details of a public Bill. I do not believe it is one of its functions to discuss a public Bill, but in deference to the expressed wish of the Government, under the peculiar circumstances of this case, I am willing to let this Bill stand the ordeal, believing in its intrinsic merits to carry it through.

Mr. HURLEY. I have presented a petition to this House from the county council of Hastings in favour of some legislation in this very direction. The township council has had considerable difficulty there with regard to drainage. A great deal of the land has been drained by private individuals, and the work was found very expensive, so I think there will be in the future little land drained unless there is an easier way of carrying out the undertaking. Difficulty has arisen in regard to the amounts to be paid by the owners of the different farms. I know two or three farms, which were not considered of very good quality, that were expected to be benefited by drainage, and

yet they have been abandoned by their owners rather than pay the taxes levied. I am aware that the reeve of one of the principal townships in Hastings has been called upon to pay $600 for a drain across his farm, which a man could dig for $60. The county council thought fit to send a petition asking for legislation in this direction, and especially asking in regard to drainage across railway tracks, which is often found more costly than all the other parts of the drainage put together.

Mr. LISTER. The Bill under consideration is one that affects a very large section and a very large number of the people of this country. For the western part of Ontario, where the land is flat, and where it is absolutely necessary that it should be drained for the purpose of cultivating it, a law of this kind should be passed. The Bill which my hon. friend introduces is substantially a statute passed by the province of Ontario, whereby the owner of the land can bring any railway corporation under its provisions and compel the corporation, the same as an individual, to do what is necessary to give the owner of the land drainage. Our courts in Ontario have held that the law passed by the legislature is ultra vires of that legislature, holding that that legislature has no power to pass an Act affecting railway companies incorporated by the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada, or which has been brought under the control of the Dominion of Canada by the provisions of the British North America Act. Such being the case, the farmers, at all events of western Ontario, are left practically without any remedy. Within my own knowledge farmers in my own county have for years been trying to get drainage for their lands under the tracks of railway companies. The courts, as I have said, have decided that these railway companies do not come under the laws of the province, and the difficulty has been to get the companies to do what they ought to do under ordinary circumstances. The law being as at present, the owner of the land was without any machinery by which he could compel a railway company to allow him even to go upon railway property and drain. The consequence has been, as my hon. friend stated a moment ago, that the farmer was either compelled to come to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council and ask for a judgment of that court, or he was bound and compelled to accept the terms dictated by the railway company, and I need hardly say in many cases those terms have been exceedingly harsh. Petitions have been presented to this Parliament, over and over again, by the farmers of the country asking that some legislation should be passed by Parliament; but as yet no steps have been taken, the answer on one or two occasions being that those people have a complete remedy by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. The Railway Committee of the Privy Council is many hundreds of miles away and in some cases thousands of miles away from the people interested, and the simple mention of that body deters those people from coming here for that redress which I am sure that committee would give them. There is no injustice in compelling a railway company to stand in the same position and on the same footing as an individual. Under our law, by a very simple process, if a man requires drainage for his land, he serves on the owner of the adjoining lands, or the municipality if it is necessary to go across the road, a notice, and if the parties cannot agree to the terms on which the ditch shall be constructed, then an engineer is brought in, and his award is final and binding on all the parties. It may be said so far as the railway companies are concerned: we owe a duty to the travelling public, that it is absolutely necessary that no person should interfere with the railway tracks in any way whatever. That it is quite true so long as the measure provides that this work shall be done under a competent engineer or under the superintendency of a Government engineer, or of an engineer of the railway company, and the rights of the public are perfectly protected. So I can only repeat what my hon. friend has said, that this is a measure demanded by the people, that it is in the interest of the people, that it cannot injure the railway companies in any degree whatever; and while this may not be the exact law that is required, a reference to a committee, as has ben proposed, may enable us to bring before this House a measure that will be acceptable to the people at large and to the railway companies of the country as well. There is no doubt whatever that the time has come when it is necessary there should be legislation upon this question.

Mr. SEMPLE. I certainly think that the measure introduced by the hon. member for Elgin should pass. Frequently owners of lands through which railways pass have been subjected to great inconvenience and loss of money from not having an outlet for the surplus water that passes through their farms. I no one case where a large portion of the farm is often covered by water. The owner has asked the agent of the railway company to be allowed the privilege of draining across the railway track, and has offered to have the work carried out to the satisfaction of the manager or the foreman of the company, and to place tiles and do the work in a first-class manner, but the railway company will not allow the work to be done. This involves a loss both to the country and to the farming community, and a Bill like that introduced by the hon. member for Elgin has become a necessity.

Mr. BRITTON. There is no doubt in the world that some such legislation as this proposed is necessary in the interests of the farmers at all events in the province of Ontario, about which I know perhaps more

than I do about any of the other provinces. It is not exactly the question that damage is often done by railways crossing farms and backing the water up on the land, for as to that, the courts are open to the farmers and they can either get damages or compel the construction of a culvert. But the railways have been constructed in many of the western parts of the province through unsettled lands or partly settled lands, and at the time of construction the farmers did not need to drain this land. Under the Ontario law the owners of a particular area can by petition to the council have an engineer sent, and if the engineer recommends it, they can have a drain made sufficient for the purpose of draining this swamp land. It so happens, however, that by reason of the railway crossing between this area and the outlet, the drain has to be carried a long distance to some stream, and so there is an enormously increased expense entailed in order to reach a proper outlet. Sometimes this drain benefits the railway company, but the man who needs the drain has to pay the increased expense, without having redress to the extent of a single farthing against the railway company that blocks the way. The railway companies now simply stand by, and so far as Dominion railways are concerned, they are beyond the jurisdiction of Ontario legislation, as my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister) has pointed out, and cannot be compelled to pay a part of the expense. This constitutes a grievance. I have read with some care the Bill of my hon. friend (Mr. Casey), and notwithstanding the care with which he has drawn it, it will no doubt require a great deal of attention in the committee, and unquestionably considerable amendment in order to make it workable without doing any injustice to the railway companies of the Dominion. The point now is, to affirm the principle of the Bill, and that I do most cordially.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 9.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 22nd April, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 40) to incorporate the Maritime Milling Company (Limited).—(Mr. Fraser.)

Bill (No. 41) respecting the River St. Clair Railway Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 42) to incorporate the St. Mary's River Bridge Company.—(Mr. Dyment.)

Bill (No. 43) respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 44) respecting the Welland Power Supply Canal Company (Limited).—(Mr. Sutherland.)

REPORTS.

Report of Commissioner for North-west Mounted Police for the year 1896.—(Mr. Laurier.)

Report of the Board of Civil Service Examiners for 1896.—(Mr. Fisher.)

TRADE MARKS.

Mr. LOUNT moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 45) in further amendment of the Trade Mark and Design Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS Explain.

Mr. LOUNT. I had supposed that this Bill might have been introduced without explanation, but probably it is not out of order and may be useful for the further consideration of the Bill that something should be said at its introduction so that members of the House may be able to form some opinion and come to some conclusion respecting the propriety of the measure. The Bill is intended to enlarge the Act respecting Trade Marks and Design. By the third section of the present Act it is provided that :

> All marks, names, brands, labels, packages or other business devices, which are adopted for use by any person in his trade, business, occupation or calling, for the purpose of distinguishing any manufacture, product or article of any description manufactured, produced, compounded, packed or offered for sale by him—applied in any manner whatever either to such manufacture, product or article, or to any package, parcel, case, box or other vessel or receptacle of any description whatsoever containing the same, shall, for the purposes of this Act, be considered and known as trade marks, and may be registered for the exclusive use of the person registering the same in the manner herein provided ; and thereafter such person shall have the exclusive right to use the same to designate articles manufactured or sold by him.

By the operation of the Act it is confined solely to trade marks of persons or individuals, and is made a valuable interest beyond any doubt, if there is any valuable interest to those who adopt trade marks, labels or devices used by them in their trade or calling. But while it has advantage to the individual it does not go far enough in the opinion of the trade organizations of this country, and so far as my instructions go and from the best information I can obtain, the trade associations, which have their headquarters largely in the city of Toronto

and which have a legislative committee considering all these questions in relation to trade, feel that it would be in the interest of their associations that the Act should be enlarged so as to enable those associations and unions to take advantage of trade labels and trade devices. I for my own part must say that the question is one that is open to, I will not say criticism, but open to mature consideration perhaps before it is enacted as law. At the same time I am of the opinion that it is a Bill which should be fairly and carefully considered by the House, and the association of trade unions should have an opportunity to be heard and their interests subserved and advantaged if such interets commend themselves to Parliament. I am aware that this is not the only occasion when this question has been under consideration. I am not in a position to say whether or not it was before the last Parliament, though I understand that the former hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Coatsworth) brought the matter up for consideration. I must say from my study of the present position of this matter, that I believe the inspection which is asked for by this Bill is in the right direction. I learn from the Minister of Agriculture, or rather from an officer in his department having special regard for the registry of trade marks, that these associations have been in the habit of registering their trade marks, but it is a matter of very grave doubt whether or not such registration is legal, and it is open to the danger of litigation at times to determine its validity. I desire, as far as I can by this Bill, to remove from the realm of doubt the right of registration by these associations. I understand that it was determined in the United States courts, in the case of Weiner vs. Graton, that trade associations of this character have not the legal right to register such marks. The provisions of this Bill will establish beyond peradventure the right of these associations to be recognized. I may say, Sir, that the trade associations of the city of Toronto have had this matter for several years under their careful consideration. Their legislative committee, which is composed of a large and intelligent body of representative men, in the interests of trade and in the interests of the working classes, have from time to time endeavoured to obtain such legislation as this.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LOUNT. I am delighted to find from the cheers on the other side that the rights of the working classes are not lost sight of. Hon. gentlemen opposite, having in mind the next elections, are very loud in their expressions of opinion favouring the interests of the working classes.

An hon. MEMBER. Give them free sugar.

Mr. LOUNT. What hon. gentleman spoke so sweetly? I am not aware that this Bill has any reference to sugar, but I have no doubt there will be found some sweet features in it before it passes into law. I trust that hon. gentlemen opposite will not permit their enthusiasm to subside, but that they will continue it until this Bill passes the House. What I was about to say when interrupted was that the associations that I have mentioned, having considered this question very carefully, have placed in my hands this measure for the consideration of the House, and I venture to believe that the House will unanimously endorse their request.

An hon. MEMBER. What are the features of your Bill?

Mr. LOUNT. I shall be delighted to give the features of the Bill later on, but I know there is a burning desire to hear from the Finance Minister.

Mr. FOSTER. He is not here.

Mr. LOUNT. I propose to block the way just a little time, by discussing this important measure.

An hon. MEMBER. Obstruction.

Mr. LOUNT. The tariff is a very important question, and it is agitating the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite, but if they possess their souls in patience until it is launched, they will be able to draw some conclusions from it. In the meantime, in my opinion a matter perhaps more important than the tariff is the safeguarding of the interests of the labouring classes of this country, and I trust I shall obtain an enthusiastic endorsation of this measure from hon. gentlemen on both sides. I have no doubt that the House is full of intelligence and wisdom, and perhaps an humble member like me cannot give it much information, but I shall for a few moments believe that hon. gentlemen are in benighted darkness on this subject, and therefore I shall give them new light.

By section 8 of this Act the trade mark is to be registered, and such registration makes it property vested in the person so registering. By section 11 of the same Act the Minister of Agriculture is made for the time being the judge and jury who is to determine whether or not a trade mark is an infringement of any other trade mark. By section 16 the trade mark is capable of assignment. Now, I understand that the Minister of Agriculture of the late Government gave his judgment that trade associations or unions had no right to register trade marks, labels, and so forth. Now, this Bill provides:

Section 3 of the Trade-mark and Design Act, Chapter 63 of the Revised Statutes, is hereby amended by adding the following subsection thereto:—

(3.) All marks, names, brands, labels, packages or other business devices which are adapted for use by any association or union of workmen in its trade, business, occupation or calling, for the

purpose of distinguishing any manufacture, product or article of any description manufactured, produced, compounded or packed by or through the labour of any of the members of such association or union of workingmen, and applied in any manner either to such manufacture, product or article, or to any package, parcel, case, box or other vessel or receptacle of any description containing the same, shall, for the purposes of this Act, be considered and known as trade marks, and may be registered for the exclusive use of the association or union of workingmen registering the same in the manner herein provided, and of the members of such association or union; and thereafter such association or union of workingmen, and its members, shall have the exclusive right to use the same, to designate articles manufactured by or through the labour of the members of such association or union of workingmen, which for the purposes of this Act shall be considered the proprietor of such trade-mark.

The purpose of the Bill is to place a trade association or union in the same position and to confer upon it the same rights and privileges under the law as individual persons with regard to trade marks. For my part, I cannot see why an association or a union of men should not have the right to use a trade mark for their advantage, and to have the protection of the law in using it, as well as an individual person; and, from the enthusiastic support which this Bill appears to receive from both sides of the House, I judge that there is no opposition to it, and that the trade associations of this country will receive from this House that consideration which it has always shown for the tradesman and the worker, and that this Bill will be passed into an Act before this session closes.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

TRADE AND OTHER LABELS.

Mr. LOUNT moved first reading of Bill (No. 46) respecting Trade and other Labels. He said: Mr. Speaker, the explanation which I have already given of the previous Bill largely explains the purpose of this measure, which is intended to be as it were first cousin to that Bill. It is intended to protect trade and other labels, and to make it an offence to violate any of the provisions respecting them. It is a Bill necessarily following upon the Bill already introduced.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time

GENERAL INSPECTION ACT.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 47) in further amendment of the General Inspection Act

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. McMULLEN. Under the present inspection law, an inspection of cheese is provided for, but the intention is, by this Bill, to clothe the inspector with power to act as a referee in disputes between buyer and seller. Through the western portion of Ontario, during the last year or two, very serious disputes have arisen between the sellers and buyers of cheese. It is well known that cheese fairs are held at several centres in that district—Woodstock, London, and Listowel,—which are attended by representatives of the different cheese factories and by the buyers. Very often sales are made subject to inspection. A buyer will send around his inspector for the purpose of examining and grading the cheese, and when he comes to the factory and makes the inspection, sometimes the sellers and the buyers disagree as to the quality. In some cases the buyers are disposed to grade the cheese very much below what the seller thinks is its grade, and it often happens that, in a receding market, the inspectors are very much more exact in their grading than they possibly might be if the market were advancing. The result has been that very serious reductions have taken place in many cases, resulting in a great deal of dissatisfaction amongst the patrons. At a meeting which I attended in my riding last January, and at which there were representatives from fifty-seven factories, a resolution was passed strongly urging the appointment of an inspector of this kind. Some factories, during the past season, have lost at least $500, others perhaps more and some less than that, but the unfortunate feature of the present condition is this, that a great many of the patrons of those factories are disposed to withdraw their patronage altogether, and a good many factories are in serious danger of standing idle. That would be a very serious matter, because the cheese industry is unquestionably exceedingly important, and any legislation to protect it against any injustice on the part of buyers or any want of confidence in the buyers' inspectors ought to have our unqualified support. I am not charging the buyers of cheese throughout the country with dishonesty. They may possibly have branded all the cheese they bought during the last season honestly according to what it should be branded in their opinion, they may have done what was perfectly right, but the object of my Bill is to secure to the patrons of cheese factories a price proportionate to the merits of their cheese and give them confidence in the inspection of their cheese. When a number of factories have been used by buyers in this way, they the patrons feel that they have been imposed upon, and the result is they are disposed to drop the manufacture of cheese altogether. If there is any one industry that we should endeavour to encourage throughout the province of Ontario, at least, it is the manufacture of cheese, which is to-day becoming a leading branch of the great industry of dairying, and if we neglect to provide the necessary legislation to protect those engaged in that

industry, we certainly, by our omission, may lead to very serious injury. The object of my Bill is to clothe the Government inspector with authority to decide in matters of dispute between the parties. I do not propose to make the inspection of all cheese compulsory, but leave it optional. The cheese may be inspected, or it may not; but where a buyer makes a bargain and then comes with his inspector and pronounces the standard of the cheese below the standard anticipated by the patrons of that factory, the patrons will have the right to telegraph for the Government inspector to come and certify as to whether the grade which has been placed upon that cheese by the inspector of the buyer is a proper and honest grade or not. If the Government inspector, after careful investigation, decide that the grading has not been honest, but that an attempt has been made to take advantage of the seller, then the buyer would be required to take the cheese at the price agreed upon when the purchase was made. If, on the other hand, the inspector decided that the grading of the cheese is honest and fair, the seller then will have the option of taking the price offered by the buyer or of withholding the cheese and trying to secure a better price in some other way. This is the object of the Bill, and I hope it will receive the support of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Since notice has been taken of this matter in the public press, I have had communications strongly endorsing the Bill and strongly urging that it should become law. The cheese-buyers themselves, will, I think, be quite willing to accept it. I am sure they will be anxious to cultivate the confidence of those with whom they are brought in contact in business transactions, and I feel certain that this Bill, if it becomes law, will be a means of having disputes settled amicably and peaceably and will tend to produce that confidence in the manufacturers which is absolutely necessary if the trade is to prosper.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

GRAIN STANDARDS IN MANITOBA AND NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville) asked:

Is it the intention of the Government to make any changes in the mode of selecting, allotting or regulating the grain standards for Manitoba and the North-west Territories, during the present session of this Parliament?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). This matter is now under consideration. The grain committee of the Winnipeg Board of Trade recommend that inspectors should be instructed to grade according to the wording and meaning of the Act or Orders in Council appertaining thereto, dispensing with samples, except when the crop from climatic or other reasons is abnormal, in which case they recommend that the grain inspectors of Winnipeg and Port Arthur should, with the chairman (pro tem) of the Winnipeg Grain Board, be a permanent board to establish, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, grades for that season.

COAL OIL, ST. JOHN'S, P.Q., BARRACKS.

Mr. MORIN asked:

Who are the parties who sent in tenders to the Government, in November last, for coal oil to light the barracks at St. John's, P.Q.; giving names and prices?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Tenders for the supply of coal oil for the permanent corps at St. John's, P.Q., were as follows:—J. A. Lomme, 17½ cts. per gallon; J. G. Hebert, 18 cts. per gallon

MR. A. R. McDONALD.

Mr. ANGERS (for Mr. Pouliot) asked:

Is it true that Mr. A. R. McDonald has been appointed by the Government inspector general of the Intercolonial Railway, with a salary of $3,000 per annum?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). No such appointment has been made.

GANANOQUE DRILL SHED.

Mr. TAYLOR asked:

1. When do the Government intend to remove the drill shed off the lot they sold to the town council of the town of Gananoque for the sum of one thousand dollars?

2. Is the Government aware that by not having moved the drill shed as agreed with the said council, that they are causing great damage to the high school lately erected on part of said lot?

3. Has the Government exceeded the time on which they agreed with the said council when they sold the lot to them, to remove the same?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). 1. The shed will be removed as soon as the department has secured a new site for the building. 2. The department is aware that the school board wish for the removal of the shed, and they were allowed in 1895 to take down a portion of one end to facilitate the erection of a school-house. 3. The time allowed for the removal of the shed was necessarily prolonged because of the difficulty to find a suitable site for the building.

TENDERS FOR INDIAN SUPPLIES.

Mr. DAVIN asked:

Will the Minister of the Interior lay on the Table copies of the schedule calling for tenders for Indian supplies in Manitoba and the North-west Territories for the fiscal years 1896-97 and 1897-98?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) to move for these papers; they are very bulky.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. Premier is quite mistaken. These papers are already distributed. I am in possession of the papers, and I only ask the question so that it may be laid upon the Table for the information of members.

The PRIME MINISTER. I will look into the matter again.

POSTMASTER, ALLANDALE, N.B.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

Has D. Connolly, postmaster, Allandale, York county, been dismissed?
Was any charge made against him?
If so, was he granted an investigation?
For what reason was he dismissed?
Who has been appointed in his place?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The postmaster, Mr. Connolly, has not been dismissed. There was no charge made against him, and, consequently, there was no investigation. But the conveniency of the office was referred to the post office inspector for his report, and on his report, the office was, in the public interest, removed from the residence of Mr. Connolly to a more convenient position. This involved the appointment of Mr. Dominick Doherty to the new post office.

QU'APPELLE MAIL CONTRACT.

Mr. DAVIN asked:

Whether the contract for carrying the mail between Qu'Appelle station and Fort Qu'Appelle has been let? Were tenders called for? If so, in what papers did the advertisement for tenders appear?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The contract for the Qu'Appelle and Qu'Appelle station mail service has not been let. Tenders have been invited. Instructions are given to inspectors in all cases to advertise in the public interest in such manner as they deem advisable. The department has no information as to what steps have been taken in regard to advertisement, but I am satisfied they will be in every respect satisfactory.

MR. JOHN SPENCE.

Mr. McMULLEN asked:

1. Whether one John Spence, of the Inland Revenue Department, has been superannuated, and if so, the date of his superannuation?
2. Did the said John Spence make application to the Inland Revenue Department to be retired and placed on the superannuation list, and filed the medical certificate required by the Act along with his application, and whether said application and certificate are on file in the department?
3. Are applications for other retirements under the Act, on file in the department; if so, why was an exception made in this case?
4. Did the Deputy Minister recommend his superannuation on the grounds of efficiency or economy?
5. Was there any complaint against Spence of inefficiency or misconduct?
6. If there is no evidence on file of his having applied for superannuation, and if the office has not been abolished and that no complaint is on file against him, and that his retirement was not recommended by the deputy head on the grounds of efficiency and economy, under what clause of the Act was he superannuated, and is he now permitted to draw a retiring allowance?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). The following are the answers to the gentleman's question in their order:—1. John Spence has not been superannuated. 2. No such documents are on file in the department. 3. Applications made officially to the department are on file. 4. The Commissioner of Inland Revenue was requested to make a list of officers who had attained the age at which they could be superannuated. 5. No; the only complaints against him were that he did not agree with his subordinates. 6. He is not superannuated, neither is he drawing a retiring allowance, and he continues to perform the duties of his office on his regular salary.

THE THOUSAND ISLANDS.

Mr. TAYLOR asked:

Is the Government aware that the State Legislature of the State of New York, one of the United States of America, bordering on the River St. Lawrence, has appropriated the sum of $30,000 to be expended in purchasing and beautifying some of the islands on the American side of said river, for the purpose of establishing public parks which are to form the United States' share of an international park proposed to be established in the River St. Lawrence?

Is it the intention of the Government to purchase from the Indian Department some of the Canadian islands, and set them apart for park purposes? Also to appropriate a sufficient sum of money to beautify the same, and to meet the propositions made by the American authorities to establish an international park in the said river, extending from Kingston to Prescott, on the Canadian side, and from Cape Vincent to Ogdensburg, on the American side of said river?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The Government has no official information that the State of New York has appropriated any sum of money to be expended in purchasing and beautifying some of the islands on the American side of the River St. Lawrence. Eleven of the islands on the Canadian side were set aside by the late Government for the purpose of turning them into a park. Two of these islands were subsequently sold. The present Government has stopped the sale of these islands. The question of appropriating money for the purpose of turning these islands into a

park is now receiving the consideration of the Government.

INDIAN AGENT WM. BATEMAN.

Mr. HUGHES asked :

1. Has Mr. Wm. Bateman, of Port Perry, Ont., been removed from the position of Indian agent to the Indians on Scugog Island ?
2. Was there an official inquiry into Mr. Bateman's conduct before he was dismissed from the position of Indian agent ?
3. Who recommended the dismissal of Mr. Bateman, late Indian agent to the Scugog Island Indians ?
4. What were the charges preferred against Mr. Bateman, late Indian agent for the Scugog Island Indians ?
5. Who is Mr. Bateman's successor as agent to the Scugog Island Indians ? Can Mr. Bateman's successor (whose name, I believe, is Williams) write or read ?
6. Was Mr. Williams, in his recent visit to pay the Scugog Island Indians, accompanied by his brother who sells liquor in Port Perry ?
7. Did Hon. John Dryden communicate with the Government, or any member thereof regarding the dismissal of Mr. Bateman or the appointment of Mr. Williams as agent to the Scugog Indians ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). 1. Mr. William Bateman has been removed from the position of Indian agent to the Indians of Scugog Island. 2. There was an inquiry, a departmental inquiry, not by commission. 3. As to who recommended the dismissal of Mr. Bateman, this is a question as to which the Government does not feel bound to answer. 4. The charge preferred against Mr. Bateman was offensive partisanship. 5. Mr. Albert Williams is the successor of Mr. Bateman. The department has no reason to doubt that Mr. Williams will discharge the duties of his office efficiently. 6. The department has not yet received any report of the visit referred to, and has no knowledge of any one accompanying Mr. Williams on that occasion. 7. The department has no knowledge of any such communication having been made.

FISHERY GUARDIANS, NORTH VICTORIA.

Mr. HUGHES asked :

1. Who are the fishery guardians under direction of the Federal Government in the waters of North Victoria, Ontario ?
2. Why were the services of those fishery guardians formerly in the service of the Government in North Victoria, dispensed with ?
3. On whose report were the former fishery guardians in North Victoria, i.e., those in service last year, retired ?
4. Was there an investigation into the conduct of the fishery guardians in North Victoria ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). 1. The overseer in the district referred to is Archibald Bradshaw. 2. The services of the officers referred to were not dispensed with. This answers also questions 3 and 4.

Mr. HUGHES. All wrong.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) had better take charge of the department.

DISMISSAL OF EUGENE BLANCHET.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked :

1. Is Eugene Blanchet, of Fraserville, P.Q., employed on the Intercolonial Railway ? 2. If so, in what capacity and since what date? 3. Was the same Eugene Blanchet dismissed from the service of the Intercolonial Railway after an investigation about the year 1879 ? 4. If so, what was the cause of his dismissal ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The man named Blanchet is not in the employ of the Intercolonial Railway, but was dismissed, I believe, in 1879. The offence of which he was found guilty was the sending of time-sheets which were irregular.

OPENING OF THE CANALS.

Mr. PENNY. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask the privilege of putting to the Minister of Railways a question which is of vital importance to the city of Montreal, and that is, when may we expect the canals along the St. Lawrence to be opened ? Ships have already started from the other side, and the merchants of Montreal would like to know when they may expect the canals to be opened in order that they may be able to load these ships.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I may say to my hon. friend that the department is fully sensible of the importance of having this work completed, and the repairs which are now proceeding finished at the earliest possible date. Instructions have been given to those who are in charge of the work to prosecute it vigorously, both day and night. I think I may assure the hon. gentleman that an hour will not be lost in bringing these works to completion. It would be quite impossible for me to give him any positive assurance as to the date upon which the work will be completed ; but I am given to understand that it will be quite impossible to have the canal ready before the end of the present month. That, I think, is the best information that I can safely give the hon. gentleman upon this subject.

THE QUEEN'S JUBILEE.

Mr. HUGHES. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I take the opportunity of drawing the attention of the hon. the acting Minister of Militia to the fact that two important regiments of city corps, the 6th Fusiliers of Montreal and the 43rd Regiment of Ottawa, are not represented in the published list of regiments to furnish the quota to the Imperial contingent. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if that is a fact.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I may say to my hon. friend that I have not got the list by me at present, and therefore I cannot speak authoritatively. He may be correct in his statement. All I can say is that we should do our best to make it as representative as possible. But as we have got applications from about 2,000 officers, and we can only send twenty or thirty, there are difficulties in the way of meeting everybody's wishes.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved :

That the House resolve itself into committee to consider the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

He said : Mr. Speaker, I avail myself of this motion to address to the House such observations as may seem to be necessary at the present time in explaining the financial position of the Dominion ; and also to submit to the House the details of the tariff policy which, in the judgment of the Government, is best calculated to promote the welfare of the people of Canada. I feel sure that, as I proceed, I shall have abundant reason to ask the generous indulgence which the House is always ready to accord to one who, for the first time, undertakes a task of so great magnitude, a task which to me, I confess, is all the greater when I remember the long line of able and distinguished men who have preceded me in the office of Minister of Finance. My first duty will be to deal with the affairs of the fiscal year which ended on the 30th of June, 1896; and this portion of my speech must of necessity be somewhat of a statistical character. It will not be necessary for me to occupy the time of the House at great length in regard to the year 1895-96, because the House has already been placed in possession of the principal points of interest through the public accounts and the appropriation accounts which have already been laid on the Table. In each of the three classes into which our revenue is usually divided, namely, customs, excise and miscellaneous, there is a marked increase over the year of 1894-95. The amount of that betterment I will give in detail :

Service.	1895-96.	1894-95.	Increase.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Customs...	19,833,279 48	17,640,466 00	2,192,813 48
Excise.....	7,926,005 94	7,805,732 71	120,273 23
Miscellaneous.. ...	9,859,305 30	8,531,930 76	327,374 54
Total.....	36,618,590 72	33,978,129 47	2,640,461 25

The total revenue of $36,618,590 fell short of the estimate made by my predecessor in his financial statement of 31st January, 1896, to the extent of some $370,000. Now, taking the report of my hon. friend the Controller of Customs as my authority, it will be found that on nearly all the general lines of imports we have received increased revenue over the year 1894-95. The following, however, are the main items of increase, sugar, of course, being the principal :—

Grain of all kinds.....	$ 42,902
Flour and meal of all kinds.....	38,361
Carriages	211,737
Coal and coke.....	56,222
Cotton, manufactures of.....	111,794
Drugs, dyes, chemicals and medicines...	21,786
Flax, hemp and jute, manufactures of...	41,297
Fruits and nuts, dried.....	17,915
Fruits and nuts, green	11,549
Hats, caps and bonnets.....	13,472
Iron and steel, and manufactures of.....	223,123
Leather, manufactures of.....	11,683
Oils, coal, kerosene, and products of.....	18,597
Oils, all other.....	14,377
Paints and colours.....	10,024
Provisions, viz., butter, cheese, lard and meats	17,059
Seeds and roots.....	14,608
Silk, manufactures of.....	97,527
Soap of all kinds.....	10,351
Spirits and wines.....	84,754
Sugar of all kinds.....	894,428
Wood, and manufactures of.....	21,033
Wool, and manufactures of.....	231,569

Of the comparatively few classes of goods on which the customs revenue declined, the following may be cited :

Arrowroot, biscuit, rice, macaroni, &c...	$ 38,395
Fancy goods.....	14,131
Glass, and manufactures of.....	18,485
Gutta percha and india-rubber, manufactures of.....	20,265

The second principal source of taxation, excise, shows an advance in the receipts from this important branch of our service. Of the different items included under this heading, tobacco and snuff proved the only cases in which the revenue fell behind that of the previous year. The following statement will exhibit the quantities taken for consumption, and the duties accrued thereon, of the several excisable items :—

Article.	Quantity.	Quantity.	Duty.	Duty.	Increase.
	1895.	1896.	1895.	1896.	1896.
Spirits, galls.	2,545,054	2,344,767	$3,870,752	$3,973,300	102,548
Malt, lbs.	50,659,627	51,690,278	759,929	775,354	15,425
Cigars, No.	106,131,294	108,290,260	635,028	648,462	13,434
Cigarettes, No.	66,628,440	80,461,900	99,943	120,692	20,749
Tobacco and snuff, lbs.	9,568,437	9,392,487	2,267,738	2,228,697	.....

Showing a decrease in tobacco and snuff of $39,041.

It is worth noting at this point that according to the report of the hon. Controller of Inland Revenue the per capita consumption of spirits and wines in 1896 reached the lowest point since confederation. The per capita consumption of spirits being ·623 gallons; and of wines, ·070 gallons against an average of 1·037 gallons of the former and ·131 gallon of the latter. The following statement gives the average per capita consumption from 1867 to 1896, and the per capita consumption for the years 1895 and 1896:—

	Spirits. Galls.	Beer. Galls.	Wine. Galls.	To-bacco. Lbs.
Average from 1867...	1·037	2·900	·131	2·170
do 1894-95.	·666	3·471	·090	2·163
do 1895-96.	·623	3·528	·070	2·120

From the miscellaneous sources of revenue the most important increases occurred in post office, $171,225.39: interest on investments, $33,953.62; and casual, $121,412.32.

On the whole, therefore, the revenue in 1895-96 showed a buoyancy and expansion in marked contrast to the year 1894-95

Having so far given our attention to what was received into the treasury, let us now turn to the other side of the account, the expenditure. My predecessor estimated that the outlay for 1895-96 would amount in round numbers to $37,000,000, and that the receipts and expenditure would about balance. The actual expenditure was within $50,000 of the estimate and amounted to $36,949,142.03, but as the revenue fell short of expectations, instead of both sides of the account balancing there has again occurred a deficit amounting this time to $330,551.31. Compared with the expenditure of 1894-95, the year that elapsed on 30th June last, was remarkable for a distinct decrease in the public outlay, a decrease amounting to $1,182,863.02. The decreases were pretty generally spread throughout the various services, but the following are the most important heads:—

Premium, Discount and Exchange	$ 34,099
Civil Government	25,599
Legislation	36,882
Penitentiaries	64,372
Immigration	75,453
Militia	437,300
Mounted Police	113,111
Public Works, Consolidated Fund	442,548
Railways and Canals, Consolidated Fund	126,272
Ocean and River Service	$ 23,640
Indians	74,995
Customs	21,299

As against these reductions the following increases must be noted:—

Interest on public debt	$ 36,135
Sinking funds	52,976
Superannuation	45,846
Mail subsidies and steamship subventions	21,648
Government of North-west Territories	27,076
Post Office	71,363
Railways and Canals, collection	122,099

Notwithstanding the contraction of the expenditure the net outcome of the year was a deficit in the ordinary running expenses of the country as above stated of $330,551.31. The deficit for the year 1894-95, you will remember, was $4,153,875.58.

Having reviewed the main features of the accounts of the Dominion for the year ended 30th June, 1896, I must now ask your attention to the condition of affairs of the present fiscal year of which nearly ten months have elapsed. First, let me give you as briefly as I can, my estimate of the result of the year's operations, taking the actual figures for the period elapsed, and adding thereto the figures appertaining to the period from 20th April to 30th June of the previous year, making such allowances as the altered circumstances prompt.

Taking up the revenue side first I find that up to the 20th April—that is up to last Tuesday night—we received as ordinary revenue $30,254,403.74. Adding to this for the purposes of estimate, the actual receipts between 20th April and 30th June of last year $7,892,251.81 would give us probable receipts to the amount of $38,146,655.55. But this I consider beyond the mark for this reason. The income from excise has been unduly swollen by reason of duties paid in anticipation of tariff changes, that must necessarily affect the revenue for the balance of the year, and in our customs receipts there has been a development in the last couple of months that must likewise affect materially the year's results. I am convinced, therefore, that to arrive at a safe and reasonable estimate I must drop $850,000 from the $38,146,655, given above. In round numbers, therefore, our income to 30th June next will, I expect, reach $37,300,000. Let us deal now with the expenditure in a similar manner. Up to the 20th April, instant, we have expended $25,463,830.05. In the period from

the 20th April to the 30th June, 1896, we expended $12,393,949.37. Summing these two up, we have the estimated expenditure to the 30th June next as $37,857,779.40; or say in round numbers, $37,850,000. I have just estimated the revenue to be $37,300,000; so that you will see, Mr. Speaker, that if I were to take these figures as being exact, we might expect to close the present year with a deficit of not a very large sum.

As I have already stated, the actual expenditure for the year 1895-96 was $36,949,142, or in round numbers $37,000,000; so that the anticipated result of this year's expenditure will be greater than that of last year by $850,000. Now, I think it will not be out of place at this point to state the reason for this increase. Taking the detailed services, I find the responsible increases to have taken place on: Interest on Public Debt, Legislation, Militia, Public Works and Post Office. What are the reasons for the increase in each of these services?

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend permit me. Do I understand him to say that he estimates the deficit to be $850,000?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. If I were to accept the figures that I have given as exact, they would lead me to expect that we might reach the end of the year with a deficit of perhaps $500,000 or $600,000. I wish to say further, that that might be too sanguine a view, and I would not wish to be bound closely by it. I think we will have to make further allowance for the uncertainties of our trade during the two remaining months. I shall not be far astray if I say we will come out of the year with a deficit well within a million dollars, and I shall not be surprised if it does not exceed $600,000.

In the case of the Interest on Public Debt we had to discount additional treasury bills to the extent of $600,000, necessary to meet liabilities incurred previous to the present Ministry coming into power.

In Legislation, you will remember, we had an extra session of Parliament last August.

In Militia, owing to the undoubted desire on the part of the late Government to make a show of retrenchment, the usual militia camps for 1895-96 were omitted, making it all the more necessary in the following year that this important service should receive the more attention.

In Public Works, the appropriations were cut down below what was needed for works actually in progress, with the result that we have had to pay during the current year for work done in 1895-96.

In the case of the Post Office, a similar cause produces a similar effect. Accounts for 1895-96, for work done chargeable to that year, were held over and not paid until the present year.

This current fiscal year, Mr. Speaker, is the one in which we enter fully into possession of the legacies left us by our predecessors in office, and may I repeat what I have already stated on the floor of this House, in some observations which I had the privilege of addressing during the summer session. I then said:

> It will not be until this fiscal year is completed, until we have paid the debts of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and entered upon a new year for which we shall prepare the Estimates ourselves and have full and complete control of them, that we shall be in a position to make comparisons.

My hon. friend who leads the Opposition declared in some remarks on the closing day of our summer session, that this country was face to face with a deficit in the first year of the present Ministry of not less than something like $3,000,000. I ventured to say to my hon. friend then, that I thought he was playing the part of an alarmist. Notwithstanding the legacies that have been left us by hon. gentlemen opposite we have been able to keep within their leader's estimate, and to go below it, to the extent of $2,500,000.

While on the subject of the current year's affairs, I may refer to the extent of our temporary indebtedness. On the first of July last treasury bills to the extent of £400,000 sterling were negotiated by our predecessors in office. These were renewed on the 1st of January last, and to meet the requirements of the country a further sum of £600,000 in treasury bills was issued; so that to-day our temporary loans amount to £1,000,000 sterling, maturing on the 1st of July. In the course of some remarks at the close of last session, my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) who preceded me as Finance Minister, stated his belief that before this year was out I would have to borrow on the market at least $10,000,000 to make things square, and that the money so borrowed, would in the main, go, not for capital expenditure, but actually to meet our daily needs. The position of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) as an ex-Finance Minister entitled that prophecy to consideration, but I hope he will be pleased to know that he was very far astray. Instead of having to borrow as he anticipated $10,000,000 to meet current expenditure, he may be pleased to be assured, that all we have had to borrow is £600,000 sterling, and that that sum was necessary, not for one service only, but to put us in funds for all the charges against both capital and ordinary expenditure.

So far, Sir, I have dealt with the expenditure chargeable to consolidated fund. I now turn to the debt and capital expenditure of 1895-96 and 1896-97. The capital expenditure for 1895-96 was incurred under the following heads:—

Railways and Canals	$2,519,174 51
Public Works	114,825 58
Dominion Lands	82,184 15
Militia	1,000,000 00
Total	$3,716,184 24

We also paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway, $68,669.49, and on railway subsidies, $834,745.49; making a total of altogether, $4.619,599.22.

To arrive at the increase in our debt for the year, we have to add the following items that affect the debt. Quebec railway subsidy, shown first as liability in 1895-96, $2.394,000; making a deficit for 1895-96 of $330,531. Then there are sundry amounts chargeable to consolidated fund amounting to $137,185.19; making in all, $7,481,335.72.

From this, however, we must deduct the expenditure for sinking fund, and a small refund of $542.52 on account of the North-west rebellion expenditure, making $2,055,-830.04. Taking this from the $7,481,335.72, above mentioned, we have $5.425,505.68, which represents our increase of debt for the year 1895-96, and that debt stood—that is the net debt—on the 30th June last stood, at $258,497,432.77.

Mr. FOSTER. Is my hon. friend going to make any further explanation with reference to the Quebec debt of $2.394.000 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not know that any explanation is called for. My recollection of the facts, is, that the amount was originally placed to the credit of the province of Quebec and they were entitled to draw the interest. It was granted to them, if my memory serves me, as practically a refund of railway subsidies, and I think there was much to be said in favour of treating it as a railway subsidy, and placing it in the Public Accounts along with other railway subsidies. Very possibly that was not the view, and at all events it was not done; but upon a subsequent occasion—the hon. member will perhaps remember the year—an Act was passed whereby the capital sum was placed to the credit of the province of Quebec, and that province was free to withdraw that capital sum whenever it so desired. If that was the fact, it properly became an obligation of the Dominion, and should have appeared in the debt account.

Mr. FOSTER. But my hon. friend will agree with me that that was not a liability which was incurred in 1895-96. In reality, it belongs to 1883-84. It is simply a change of book-keeping.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I quite agree that it is not a new liability. It is an old item, which I think my hon. friend should have included in the debt account some years ago.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a fair question for argument.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not wish to convey the idea that it is a new liability. It is, as the hon. gentleman says, a mere matter of book-keeping. If it was an obligation of the Dominion, I think it should have appeared in the debt account.

Mr. FOSTER. But my hon. friend will remember that a change took place under legislation which was passed the year before last, in this House and in the Quebec House, which was the only reason for making a change in book-keeping.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Passing to the current fiscal year, our expenditure for capital purposes, which up to the 20th April reached $2,823,078, will probably, by the end of June next, be in the neighbourhood of $3,425,000.

To arrive at the probable effect of the whole year's operations on the net debt, we will have to add to this the probable deficit, which may perhaps be placed as low as $550,000, though I hesitate to commit myself to an amount so low. But if we take that figure as correct, we would then have to charge against capital account $3,975,000. But as this includes the amount of our investments for sinking funds, which, while an expenditure on one hand, must be regarded on the other as an asset, we must deduct the estimated investments to the 30th of June, $2,214,000, leaving an anticipated net increase of the debt of, in round numbers, $1,750,000. In all the foregoing I have kept well within the limit of fair estimate, and any marked improvement in our revenue between this and the 30th of June next, will of course ameliorate to that extent my estimated deficit, and increase of debt.

Having, Sir, occupied so much time with the two preceding years, I now turn to the year 1897-98. With regard to the expenditure of 1897-98, my expectation is that while undoubtedly supplementary Estimates will be brought down, the savings in the Estimates—that is, unexpended balances which always arise owing to expenditures not being carried out as proposed, and to amounts being carried over by re-votes and otherwise—will be considerable. At this moment we are not, of course, in a position to state what the amount of our supplementary Estimates will be, but I hope they will not be large. If we take into account the savings to be made in the way I have indicated, I think they will nearly represent the outlay under the supplementary items; and it would not be far astray to estimate for the year an expenditure of about $38,-250,000.

On the basis of the present tariff, and looking at the probable results of the present fiscal year, it would appear as if the revenue for 1897-98 would be in the neighbourhood of $37,500.000, which would on its face leave a deficit of $750,000. It is of course neither desirable nor desired that there should be any deficit. We have had deficits now for three years in succession, and we all agree that we should, if possible, avoid a continuation of such an unsatisfactory condition of affairs. Before I conclude, I will show what steps we pro-

pose to take to make up the additional sum required to meet the anticipated deficiency. Taking the capital expenditure for 1897-98 at $5,000,000, and deducting the expenditure for sinking fund investments of $2,300,000, it would appear that the results of the operations of the year 1897-98 would increase the net debt to the extent of about $2,700,000.

Before passing on to another subject, I may perhaps occupy the attention of the House for a few moments while I dwell upon the fact that the expenditure asked for next year, in comparison with the expenditure of the present year, appears to be beyond what would be supposed to be required. If hon. gentlemen will recollect, in the year 1895-96, the last year for which full returns have been issued, the expenditure was in round numbers $36,949,000. This diminished outlay was arrived at, I think I am justified in saying, by the postponement of necessary expenditures. As before pointed out, the militia camps were dispensed with, and bills of various departments were held over. The expenditure, therefore, of that year cannot at all be regarded as a normal expenditure. It will be recollected that in the Estimates that my hon. predecessor in office laid on the Table of this House during the first session of 1896, he asked for a service on consolidated fund account of $38,300,000; and, in addition to that, although it has been said that they were not settled upon by the Government and were not presented to the House, there were supplementary Estimates to be brought down, of which we have heard something in past debates. I know that my hon. friend has desired it to be understood that those Estimates had not received the sanction of the Government in all respects, and he has not been willing to be held responsible for them; but at all events he will, I am sure, admit that a considerable portion of those Estimates had become public property, inasmuch as hon. gentlemen who had the confidence of the Government thought proper to assure their friends in different parts of the Dominion that the expenditures contemplated under those Estimates were to be made. When we came into office, we found large estimates prepared in the departments, and we cannot suppose that they were prepared without any intention of their forming part of the expenditures of the year. If we add to the main estimate of $38,300,000 above given the probable amount that would have been asked for in supplementary Estimates for 1896-97, it will be found that the expenditure asked for by me next year, say $38,250,000, is much less than the probable sum that would have been asked for had hon. gentlemen opposite remained in power.

Mr. FOSTER. Rather speculative.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend says that is rather speculative, and he laughs at the idea that those supplementary Estimates represented expenditures. I regret that he does so, because he laughs at his friends who on every hustings throughout the Dominion represented that those expenditures were to be made; and, as many of those gentlemen are no longer here to meet him, I do not think he should laugh at them in this way to-day.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having said so much in explanation of our financial position, it becomes my duty to turn my attention to what I am sure is a more interesting part of the subject; that is, the new tariff that we are about to submit. Before I proceed to speak of that tariff, I think it is well that we should reflect for a moment on the history of the present tariff, commonly called the National Policy.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a new version, I suppose.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend will find that it is not my habit to give new versions of things which are always the same. I cannot hope, Sir, to offer anything that is new on the subject, because I know it has been well threshed out in this House again and again by men abler than myself. But I do think that at a moment when we are about to turn away from the policy, which I regard as a mistaken policy, we shall do well to make some reference to the present policy and the circumstances under which it came into existence. I suppose it will not be questioned that at the time of the union of the provinces, one of the most serious obstacles which the promoters of that great movement encountered was the difficulty on the tariff question. The lower provinces were firm believers in the policy of free trade, as the words were understood; at all events, in favour of the policy of a low tariff. The upper provinces—Old Canada—had a tariff which the maritime people regarded as somewhat high, though I am bound to admit that, in comparison with tariffs of later years, it was very moderate. But I am sure the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), who was intimately and prominently connected with the movement for confederation, will bear me out when I say that the tariff question was one of the great causes of difficulty in bringing about the union of the provinces. The hon. gentlemen who desired to promote that movement found it necessary to give to the people of the maritime provinces the most sacred and solemn assurance that if this union could be accomplished, the maritime provinces would not have to assume the burden and responsibility of a high tariff. True, you will not find that in the British North America Act, but I venture to say it was an unwritten treaty between the promoters of the union and their friends in the maritime provinces, and it is but fair to say that, in the beginning that treaty was

observed. The first tariff of confederation was a moderate tariff, and although a year or two later it became necessary to change the duties somewhat in the interests of revenue, there was no substantial departure from the terms of what I have described as the unwritten treaty with the lower provinces. It was not indeed until 1876, or about that time, that the question of a high tariff gravely occupied the attention of this House. True, in 1870 or 1871 the question of protection had been mooted, and a policy of protection, as respects a limited list of articles, had been agreed upon temporarily, but that policy was abandoned in 1871, and from that time down to the moment at which the Government of the late Sir John Macdonald retired from office, no further movement was made in the direction of what was called a protective tariff. It was not until the Government of Sir John Macdonald had been defeated and Mr. Mackenzie was in power, it was not until a period of great depression had come upon the country—and not upon Canada alone but the world at large—it was not until there were conditions more calculated to make people anxious in Canada, as well as elsewhere, as to the business prospects of the country, that any serious movement took place in Canada for the establishment of a protective tariff. Now, it is well known that the manufacturers came to Mr. Mackenzie between 1874 and 1878, and proposed to him that he should increase the tariff. No doubt they thought that they were correct, no doubt they believed that prosperity would result from the adoption of a protective system, and, therefore, desired that Mr. Mackenzie should yield to their views. But we all know that Mr. Mackenzie refused to do so. Now, I believe that Sir John Macdonald was up to that time as good a free trader as Mr. Mackenzie. I have seen no evidence that he ever deliberately adopted the policy of protection with the intention of adhering to it as the fixed policy and principle of the Conservative party. On the contrary, I believe that he was tempted to yield to it for the moment by the clamour that was raised by the protectionists, and the belief that he might be returned to power. But if we refer back to the discussions of these days, we will find that in the resolutions submitted and the speeches made by Sir John Macdonald and his followers, the whole question of protection was treated in a very gingerly way indeed, and the resolutions for which the Conservative party voted at that time were resolutions which might mean almost anything. They were protectionist, it is true, but the platform was one which enabled a Minister of the Crown to go down to the maritime provinces and offer himself for election on it as the champion free trader. I mention this to show that the policy of protection was not deliberately adopted even by the Conservative party, but was the outgrowth of political difficulties in which the leaders of the Conservative party, I think erroneously, permitted themselves to be led away from the old faith; and I venture to say now that, in the light of history, many Conservatives of this country look back upon that departure with regret. Though they supported the National Policy believing it would be instrumental in developing the best interests of the country, they will admit to-day that it was a policy of disappointment, and that, in all probability, Canada would have prospered more if she had adhered to the policy of a low tariff.

I have pointed out that the Conservative party adopted the policy of protection at a time of considerable depression, when there was too much disposition, I am afraid, on the part of the people to take up any nostrum which seemed to give a promise of a better state of things. But we may well ask ourselves to-day what were the inducements that were held out to the people to accept that policy? I shall not detain the House by going through all the predictions which were made and the expectations which were created, but some of the things which occurred at that time may well be mentioned. One of the most important and one of the most common arguments used was that a protective tariff, though probably not a very good thing in itself as a permanent policy, might be a good policy to adopt temporarily. If you will give, they said, these infant industries protection, they will, in a very short time, become strong and vigorous and be able to stand alone without protection. Well, Mr. Speaker, we are able to deal with that argument to-day in the light of experience. We have had eighteen years of pretty high protection carried into effect under conditions as favourable as could be wished for in Canada, and what has been the result? These infant industries have grown bigger and their voice stronger, but their voice still cries out that if the nursing bottle be taken from them, they will immediately perish from the face of the earth. And so we find that the prediction made then that the policy of protection was only intended to encourage infant industries, and that for a very short time, has not been realized.

Then we had another strong temptation to adopt the National Policy. There was a very strong desire among the people for a reciprocity treaty with the United States, and hon. gentlemen opposite thought they could do nothing better than use the reciprocity cry to help them to make the National Policy acceptable. The hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) went down to the maritime provinces, where the idea of reciprocity was very agreeable to the people, and gave the electors there the assurance, with all the vigour we know he is capable of, that if they would accept the National Policy, in two years he would

undertake to bring about reciprocity with the United States. On another occasion, later on, my hon. friend extended the time one year—he only wanted three years to bring about a reciprocity treaty. Well, we have had eighteen years of the National Policy and I am sure my hon. friend will not dissent when I say that in the last year of the Conservative term of office, they were farther away from reciprocity than they ever were during any previous year of their existence.

I think that the National Policy may very properly be tested to-day in the light of all these promises. But there was another promise made which was of greater importance. I think that the strongest argument used by my Conservative friends in advocating the National Policy was that it was going to increase the population of our country. I think that this test of population, which has so often been applied before, may well be applied for a few moments again, because I think the lesson is full of importance and cannot be applied too often. The policy which was inaugurated in 1879, and which had been previously known in 1870, for a short time, as the National Policy, told the people in very glowing terms what it would accomplish and lead to. It was to remove distress whether in agriculture or manufacturing,—and distress did exist, as had to be acknowledged, during the period that Mr. Mackenzie was in power—and it was to lead to great prosperity and the rapid up-building of the country. Immigrants were to flow in and employment was to be furnished for all. The present leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) said that this was the supreme test of prosperity:

> If we are to have a country at all,——

said he, as reported in the "Hansard" of 1877, page 167—

> —it must be by bringing people into it. It is our policy to bring people into our country and to furnish employment for them when here, and that is the only policy by which Canada can hope to attain any position of importance in the world. We must have a large and extended immigration and give work to people when they come here.

Taking population as the test of prosperity, the results of the census of 1891, the last official figures to hand, were certainly disappointing. I have here the official figures. In the province of Ontario, in 1871 the population was 1,620,851. In 1881 it had increased to 1,926,922, an increase of 18·6 per cent. In 1891 the population had grown to 2,114,321, an increase of 9·73 per cent, as compared with 18·6 per cent in the previous ten years. In the province of Quebec the increase of population from 1871 to 1881 was 14 per cent, and from 1881 to 1891, 9·53 per cent. In the province of Nova Scotia the increase in the first period was 13·6 per cent, and in the second it was 2·23 per cent. In the province of New Brunswick, from 1871 to 1881, the population increased 12·4 per cent, and in the next ten years it increased 0 per cent. In the province of Manitoba the increase from 1871 to 1881, was, of course, very large, as this was in the early history of that province. The increase in those years was 247 per cent. In the next ten years the increase was 144 per cent. Of course, I do not think the same force would attach to this comparison, because the country having just been opened up, the rush of population would naturally be somewhat larger than afterwards. But I am sure that even in regard to Manitoba the census returns must have been sadly disappointing. The province of British Columbia increased in a larger degree from 1881 to 1891, than in the previous decade, the increase for the earlier period being 36·4 per cent, and for the later, 98·49 per cent, a large increase in that province, as we should acknowledge. In Prince Edward Island, the increase from 1871 to 1881 was 15·8 per cent, and from 1881 to 1891, it was 0·17 per cent. In the Territories the comparison is not given so closely, and I cannot give the percentages. The increase disclosed by the census of 1881 for the whole Dominion was 18·97 per cent, and by the count of 1891 it was 11·76 per cent, a decrease in progress of a little over 7 per cent. The growth of the country, therefore, in point of population was much slower under the National Policy than it was during the period before that policy was put in operation. Eliminating the new portions of the Dominion, and considering the provinces of old Canada, which include the whole population except about 400,000, the results are still more disappointing. According to the census figures that I have given the increase in these provinces was exceedingly small. In point of population the growth of the older provinces from 1871 till 1881 was more than three times as great as it was during the decade spent wholly under Conservative rule and wholly under a protective tariff. The population of the maritime provinces in 1871 was 767,000, and in 1881 it was 870,000, an increase of 103,000. In 1891 the population of those provinces was 880,000, an increase of only 10,000 people in ten years. At the rate of 2 per cent per annum, the natural increase of 870,000 persons would be 174,000, instead of the actual increase which we find. In other words, the increase for ten years in the maritime provinces was less than the natural increase for one year. The aggregate population of the three chief cities of the maritime provinces, Halifax, St. John and Charlottetown, in 1881, was 73,712. In 1891 it was 74,113, an increase of 400 souls in ten years. This National Policy was to do great things for the farmer. The number of farmers and farmer's sons engaged in farming, by the census of 1881, was 656,712, and, by the census of 1891, it

was 649,506, a decrease of 7,206. The numbers increased in British Columbia and the North-west Territories, but the old provinces show a decrease in the number of farmers, during this ten year period under the National Policy, of 36,042. The decrease of farmers in Ontario was 2·5 per cent, in Quebec 4·6 per cent, in Nova Scotia 15·9 per cent, in New Brunswick 15·8 per cent and in Prince Edward Island 1·3 per cent. The rate of natural increase which can properly be credited to a country like Canada is about 2 per cent per annum, or 20 per cent in ten years. So, by adding one-fifth to the population of 1881, and by adding also the immigrants, we get the population that should have been found here in 1891. The natural increase on the whole population of 1881 is 865,000, and the number of immigrants officially certified as entering the country during the decennial period ending 1891, was 886,000, making a total increase of population of 1,751,000. But the actual increase found by the enumerators was only 509,429, thus showing a loss of 1,241,000. If the anticipations of the promoters of the National Policy had been realized our own people would have remained with us and all these immigrants as well. So that, estimating the loss of population as compared with the gain we would have had if predictions had been fulfilled—it might fairly be claimed that the natural increase of those who went away should also be taken into account, but even omitting this—that loss amounted to about one and a quarter millions of souls. The total foreign-born population in 1881 was 609,348, or 14·3 per cent of the total population. In 1891 the total was 645,507, a little less than 14 per cent, the increase in numbers being 36,159. The number of immigrants already stated as arriving in the country in the ten years from 1881 to 1891, was 886,000. So, the loss of immigrants was 850,000. These general results are borne out by the details. The census found fewer Irish and Scotch in Canada than ten years ago. The Scotch decreased by 8,000, and the Irish by 36,000. During the same period no less than 655,000 immigrants left Ireland and went to the United States. The immigration into Manitoba and the North-west from 1881 to 1890, both inclusive, numbered, according to the blue-books, 258,814. The population in 1881 was 118,706, which with the 258,814 of official immigrants, should have enabled the enumerators to find at least 377,520 residents in the Territories and Manitoba; all they did find was 254,164, a loss of over 122,000 settlers. As the Department of Agriculture reckoned each settler as having a value to the country of $1,000, there is a loss to the country of 122 millions, if we are to accept those figures. The following are some of the places in Ontario where there was not only a failure to retain the natural increase, but an actual decline in numbers: Cobourg, Goderich, Dundas, Bowmanville, Amherstburg, St. Catharines, Port Hope, Ingersoll, Napanee, Strathroy, Paris, Prescott, Whitby, Kincardine, Mitchell, Port Perry, Thorold, Dunville, Harriston and Fergus. Most of these had a steady growth from 1871 to 1881; and if the predictions of the National Policy had been even partially fulfilled, all these towns, among the most thriving in Ontario, would have prospered exceedingly and furnished a home market to the farmers that they were led to expect. Dundas was a prosperous manufacturing town, and increased by several hundreds up to 1881; but that growth was stopped and it declined in population until, in 1891, there was some two hundred less than in 1881. Now, I believe these census returns are of the utmost importance, and they are a proper subject of discussion, because it was claimed that the National Policy was to be the instrument whereby the population was to be increased, whereby our young people would be prevented from going away, whereby immigrants would be brought to the country; yet from these figures, which I have shown are official, I fail to see how any thoughtful man could doubt, from the moment those returns were published, that the National Policy had failed to accomplish its purpose. Prior to the publication of those returns, many intelligent people who had not given the subject serious consideration were no doubt convinced in their own minds, partly through party zeal and partly, I suppose, from reading the public press, that the National Policy was filling up the country; but when these census returns were brought down, then every thoughtful man in the country must have understood that the National Policy had been a very great failure, and indeed a bitter disappointment to every man who had honestly supported it. My hon. friend who leads the Opposition was High Commissioner in London at the time; and in his official report, in 1892, he felt obliged to make this sad statement:

> I need hardly say that the returns of the census in Canada were received here (in London) with a certain amount of disappointment, as it was quite expected that the population would exceed five millions. What effect this may have on immigration, I am not prepared at this moment to say.

I am afraid, Sir, that it had a very serious effect on immigration, because we know that the immigration returns for recent years have been far from satisfactory. I had a conversation recently on this subject, Mr. Speaker, with a very prominent member of the Conservative party, who is the head of one of the great manufacturing enterprises in Canada. I do not imagine for a moment that he was less loyal than he had been to his party; at all events, I knew him as a Conservative then, and I believe he is a Conservative still. But that gentleman, in discussing the subject,

said to me: The returns of the census were to me a bitter disappointment. We cannot stand, he said, another census in Canada like that. If we should find as a result of the next census that there is no better showing, then, he said, I shall lose all faith in the future of Canada, and I shall have to look to some other country as a field for my capital and my enterprise. We hope and believe that by a change of policy the census returns of the present decade will not show such a bad result, and we hope and believe that when the second census is taken, and when we shall have an opportunity of comparing ten years of Conservative rule with ten years of Liberal rule, the results will not be such that any one of our leading Liberal manufacturers or capitalists will have to say that he is losing faith in the country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as to the manner in which this tariff revision should be brought about, I want to read to you, not that it has any element of novelty, but because it properly fits in at this stage of my speech, the platform adopted by the Liberal party in the great convention held in the city of Ottawa in 1893:

We, the Liberal party of Canada, in convention assembled, declare,—

That the customs tariff of the Dominion should be based, not as it is now, upon the protective principle, but upon the requirements of the public service;

That the existing tariff, founded upon an unsound principle, and used as it has been by the Government, as a corrupting agency wherewith to keep themselves in office, has developed monopolies, trusts and combinations;

It has decreased the value of farm and other landed property;

It has oppressed the masses to the enrichment of a few;

It has checked immigration;

It has caused great loss of population;

It has impeded commerce;

It has discriminated against Great Britain;

In these, and in many other ways, it has occasioned great public and private injury, all of which evils must continue to grow in intensity as long as the present tariff system remains in force.

Mr. FOSTER. Here endeth the second lesson.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There are some excellent lessons yet to come.

That the highest interests of Canada demand a removal of this obstacle to our country's progress, by the adoption of a sound fiscal policy, which, while not doing injustice to any class, will promote domestic and foreign trade, and hasten the return of prosperity to our people;

That to that end the tariff should be reduced to the needs of honest, economical and efficient government;

That it should be so adjusted as to make free, or bear as lightly as possible upon, the necessaries of life, and should be so arranged as to promote free trade with the whole world, more particularly with Great Britain and the United States;

We believe that the results of the protective system has grievously disappointed thousands of persons who honestly supported it, and that the country, in the light of experience, is now prepared to declare for a sound fiscal policy.

The issue between the two political parties is now clearly defined.

The Government admit the failure of their fiscal policy, and now profess their willingness to make some changes; but they say that such changes must be based on the principle of protection.

We denounce the principle of protection as radically unsound, and unjust to the masses of the people, and we declare our conviction that any tariff changes based on that principle must fail to afford any substantial relief from the burdens under which the country labours.

This issue we unhesitatingly accept, and upon it we await with the fullest confidence the verdict of the electors of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the electors of Canada, in due course, gave their verdict upon that and upon other issues, and subject to such changes as changing circumstances may require, and as to which I shall have something to say as I proceed, we accept the Liberal platform of Ottawa as the declaration of principles which we are bound to follow in our tariff reform.

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

After Recess.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair at six o'clock, I had just finished reading the Liberal platform adopted at the Ottawa convention, in which the party placed on record its desire for tariff reform. It has been a common complaint of our opponents that the policy of the Liberal party on the tariff and in the direction of tariff reform was a policy that was adverse to the interest of the manufacturing industries of the country. We have in times past protested against this view, and we still protest against it. We do not admit that a high protectionist tariff is necessary for the development of manufacturing industries in Canada. One would almost think from the manner in which this argument is so frequently used by our opponents that there were no manufacturing industries in Canada before the days of the National Policy. The fact, I think, is that while perhaps we had not so many large industries as we have to-day, we had on the whole a more healthy and satisfactory condition of manufacturing industry before the days of the high tariff than we have had since. That, Sir, I think has been the experience of many of the communities of Canada.

It is true that we have changed our methods of dealing with manufacturers, and the change, I think, has not been for the better. We developed manufacturing in the good old days in the good old-fashioned way. An honest workman opened his modest shop in a growing town. He made

the things which the community wanted. He made honest goods and earned a reputation for the articles he produced. He had the good sense not to attempt to make things not suited for the market and which, with his limited equipment and the small area of the market, he knew it would be foolish to attempt to make, articles of a very advanced character. But he made the things which for the moment served the community, and as days rolled on the community grew and his shop grew with it. He enlarged the field of operations; his reputation for making honest goods at fair prices helped to build up his industry. By and by sons came to him and joined him in the factory, and their youth and energy enlarged the scope of its operations. The shop was enlarged; new machinery was introduced; more help was added, and so growing with the growth of the community, there were built up legitimate manufacturing industries in many parts of Canada. That was the development of manufactures in a legitimate way.

And now the times have changed. We have had another way of developing manufactures, and it will not be unprofitable for us if we look at what the results have been in many cases. The old fashion workman never dreamed of asking bonuses, exemptions, or favours or anything of that kind; he expected to pay his way like a man and to earn every cent he got. But now under the high tariff policy the first step in the direction of a new factory is to have the bonus hunter set out on his way. He expects to receive as a matter of course exemption from the taxation which every other citizen expects to pay as a matter of course. Not content with having an Act of Parliament to license him to charge high prices for his goods, he thinks the city, town or village must give him further help by way of a site for his factory or by some grant of that kind; and if perchance the people of the town shake their heads and do not think they should help him in that particular way, he will remind them that there are other towns quite ready to do so and he will intimate that if they do not grant the bonus, the rival town not far away will grant it. And so this system of protection, always selfish, always greedy, sets these two towns by the ears to bid against one another, to be rivals and jealous of each other, instead of cultivating those friendly relations which should exist. Then the factory is built in one town or the other. If it is fortunate enough to have a market for its products, if the business has not been overdone, undoubtedly for a short time this factory will prosper, and it will take advantage, I am sure, of the high tariff and charge the consumer every penny the law will permit. For a little while this will go on, and then we will reach the next stage of the protective movement; then we will reach the stage at which excessive competition comes, the competition which results from over-production at home. After a short struggle it will be discovered that his factory, heralded with such a flourish of trumpets, can no longer find work for its people or a market for its goods; so the factory closes up, and the workingmen in whose interest we were told the National Policy was framed may go abroad and find work as best they can. Has not that been the history of many a National Policy factory in Canada?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Then we pass on and reach the next stage, which inevitably follows the stage of over-production. Then the big manufacturer comes in and buys up the little factory for a song. The stockholders, many of whom are generally people of small means, have to suffer the loss of their investment, and the factory, then in the sheriff's hands, passes into the hands of some wealthy manufacturer, who will be willing to pay therefor in order that he may control the market with the products of his larger factory. We have had that development, and all over Canada we have had complaints of that condition of affairs, which was referred to in the Liberal platform as the "development of monopolies, trusts and combines."

I submit that the development of the olden times, if it was slow, was a more wholesome development, and that there is a better chance for the development of manufacturing enterprises in the end under a moderate tariff than there is in the end under the high tariff policy. The big fish will eat up the little ones. Under the National Policy the small manufacturers were driven to the wall; the large ones may hold on for a while, but even for them in most instances the end comes, because the whole business rests on an artificial basis. I say, therefore, that the manufacturing interests of Canada should not be misled by the cry that they are identified necessarily with the success of a high tariff policy, and I believe many a manufacturer has now made up his mind that it would be better for him if we had a very moderate revenue tariff than the artificial condition brought about by the National Policy.

Let us remember, Sir, that the protectionist had more than the advantage of the rate of duty imposed on the articles he manufactured. Nature is to a certain extent a protectionist, because she has placed advantages in the way of the home manufacturer. In the first place, he has the advantage of what I may call convenience. It is more convenient to buy things at home than to send abroad for them, and other things being equal, any one in Canada would prefer to buy them at home. Then he has

the advantage which I will call the protection of transportation. It costs not only time but money to bring things from abroad, and when you consider freight, insurance and other expenditures connected with the handling of goods, that particular element affords a large measure of protection for the manufacturer of the country. There is another advantage, which I will describe as the protection of patriotism, a desire which ought to exist, and I hope if it does not exist now, it will soon among Canadian people, and it is to encourage home industry in every legitimate manner. I do not forget that at several tariff hearings we were informed by gentlemen who came before us urging the retention of a higher tariff, that one of the great difficulties under which they laboured was that the people of Canada would not buy Canadian goods, that the people of Canada had prejudices against Canadian goods and actually preferred to buy foreign articles. I hope, Sir, it is not true. I am unwilling to believe that it is true, but I give it to the House as I received it on the testimony of the protected manufacturers of this country who came before our tariff commission. Well, Sir, if that has been the result of the National Policy, I can hardly imagine a more severe arraignment of that policy. If after eighteen years of encouraging manufactures by all the methods that were known to the ingenious Finance Ministers of the Conservative Government; if after eighteen years of boasting that this was indeed the golden era of Canadian patriotism; if we have to recognize it as a fact that the people of Canada to-day have no faith in Canadian goods and have a prejudice against them, and actually prefer the goods of foreign nations, then I say, it is a startling result to the National Policy. It is just possible that if the people could not be induced to buy Canadian goods under a high tariff policy, perhaps we may induce them to buy Canadian goods under a policy which looks to moving in the direction of a lower tariff. I feel that we have every reason to hope that that would be the result of any changes that we are able to make. In other matters we have found in this House, that coercion failed where conciliation succeeded, and if you have not been able to make the Canadian people buy Canadian goods by Acts of Parliament designed to compel them, let us try some other way. Let us admit a little of the free air of competition into the manufacturing industries of our country. Let us make the manufacturers feel that they should sell their products to the people of Canada, not because there is a law on the Statute-book to oblige the people to buy them, but because the articles themselves are good, and because they will stand on their merits irrespective of any National Policy.

I feel therefore, Sir, that we can say to the manufacturers of the country, that they have much to hope for from a reform of the tariff which will move in the direction of lower taxation. If upon these advantages to which I have referred, if you take the protection, as you may call it, a protection of convenience; if you take the protection of transportation which is considerable, and if you take that protection which I think the people ought to give—the protection of the patriotism which would make them desire to buy Canadian goods; and if on top of all that you put a moderate revenue tariff, in which nearly always there is a considerable measure of incidental protection, I say, that by all these means you have given the manufacturer of Canada a fair chance to live, and there is no reason why he should not live and prosper and flourish under such conditions.

Now, Sir, the question arises as to how far we shall be able to apply at once, or at an early day, these principles of tariff reform which we have in the past declared we wished to carry out. We have heard it stated at times, that we should immediately undertake to bring in a radical free trade tariff. It is but fair to say that we generally hear that observation, not from free traders, not from friends of the Liberal party, but from hon. gentlemen who sit on the other side of the House, who are not supposed to be free traders, and who are not supposed to be friends of the Liberal party. However, these gentlemen kindly undertake to tell us, that in view of this, that and the other thing, it is our duty to bring down at once a tariff based upon free trade.

No man who ever spoke in the name of the Liberal party of Canada, ever announced that we were going at one step to adopt the principles of free trade to that extent. We never found in the old motherland, when they had to deal with the same question, that they at once came down to the basis of the low taxation which they reached in later years. But, Sir, we have an opportunity of calling some witnesses on this point. I well remember that immediately after the last elections in 1896, the London "Times" in a very able article on this question, pointed out that it was unreasonable to suppose, and that nobody should suppose, that the result of the Canadian elections must of necessity lead to the immediate adoption of a free trade policy. After some observations on the subject, the "Times" spoke as follows:—

> The present generation has grown up to manhood under a protective system. The conditions of any other system are unknown, and Mr. Laurier's Administration will do much, if, by cautious and tentative beginnings, it can bring about an intelligent reconsideration of much that has been taken for granted. If Mr. Laurier's accession to power means anything, it means that in so far as experiment is possible, the way will be prepared for a change in the fiscal system of Canada, when such a change shall have become demonstrably profitable to the community.

The "Times" is supposed to be a tolerably firm believer in the principles of English free trade as intelligently applied to any colonial condition. But I may quote another English writer who is even more marked as an exponent of free trade principles. I allude to Lord Farrer, whose free trade views will hardly be questioned by any one. In a recent pamphlet Lord Farrer says:

> The colonies must, for some time at any rate, raise revenue by duties, and these duties can hardly fail to be, to some extent, protective.
>
> Again, no reasonable free trader wishes to see a system of protection which has been in force for years, and under which industries of various kinds have grown up, abolished at a single blow. Such a step would be both unjust and unwise.
>
> What free traders desire is a much more moderate and safer course.
>
> They wish to see the colonies abandon protection as a theory, and gradually reduce the most obnoxious of their present protective duties. This would probably, by increasing importation itself, increase revenue, and make further reductions possible. Gradually the colonies would thus approach, and ultimately attain, the state of things which obtains in the United Kingdom, without undue sacrifice of revenue, and without injustice to existing interests. But it is out of the question to do this except cautiously and by degrees, as indeed it was done in this country. This is what we may hope for under the new regime in Canada.

These views have a practical bearing on the question of how far we may go in the direction of tariff reform. I have sometimes heard the expression used, that the manufacturers had vested rights in these matters. I wish to protest against such an expression. No manufacturer has any vested right under the National Policy. Every man who invested a dollar under the National Policy did so with his eyes wide open to certain important facts. He was well aware that from the beginning down to the end, the National Policy was condemned by one of the great political parties in Canada. He was well aware that every effort had to be put forth by governmental influence, and such influences as the manufacturers themselves are well aware of, in order to obtain from the public an apparent endorsement of that policy. I would be justified in saying that at no time from the beginning of this question to the present day, has there ever been a substantial majority of the people of Canada, looking at the question on its merits, who believed in the principle of high protection. Accidental circumstances doubtless brought about the election of a majority of members who supported that policy, but at all events I can say, that from the beginning of the discussion to the end, the Liberal party of Canada—always a great party, nearly always one-half the people, and in more recent days very much more than one-half the people—placed themselves upon record as condemning the principles of the National Policy.

Now, the manufacturers knew of this, and they must have known that when they put their money into these factories they were taking their risks. There was a speculative element in this whole National Policy business, and the men who play the game and gather in the winnings ought to be prepared, when the turn of the tide comes, to pay the losses and try to look pleasant. Therefore, I say, if it suited the people of Canada, as represented by this Parliament and by this Government, to strike out of the fiscal policy of Canada to-day every vestige of protection, the protective interests would have no right to complain. They had taken their risk, and they should be prepared to abide the consequences. But, Sir, while that would be stern justice, unfortunately there is no dispostion on the part of this Government to destroy——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Scoundrels great and scoundrels small.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friends opposite are in such an amiable frame of mind that they venture to applaud before I have finished the sentence. They are very happy in being able to anticipate what we think. I say there is no disposition on the part of this Government to deal with the manufacturing and protected classes in that spirit, although I do submit that if it suited the view of the majority of the people of Canada to adopt a policy which would simply reverse the principle of protection and establish free trade, while it might be and would be a dangerous thing if done at once, so far as the protected interests are concerned, they would have no right whatever to complain. But, Sir, we are dealing with more than the protected interests of the manufacturers. The evil of protection, like most other evils, is wide-reaching in its influences, and it has become so blended and interwoven with the business of Canada that if we should attempt to strike it down to-day, we should do harm not only to the protected interests, which have no claim upon us, but to other interests which are not directly connected with the protected interests. It would be folly not to remember that we are dealing not with the protected manufacturers only, but that the interests of labour have to be considered as well as the interests of capital. We have to remember that the trade of the country is so permeated by this system that, in the matter of banking alone, there are vast interests associated with this question. I hesitate not to say that if we should to-day, by some rash step, do that which some hon. gentlemen say we are bound to do, but which intelligent men know we are not bound to do, and would not do, we would not only break down the manufacturing interests of the

country, but we would deal a blow to other interests of a wider and more serious character.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, come to the point—you make us tired.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. McMILLAN. Do not let this moment of weakness put you into such a rage.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If I were quite clear as to what point my hon. friend wishes me to come to at once, I am not sure that I would not be pleased to gratify him. However, I wish to say, and to emphasize the fact, that it has never been the policy of the Liberal party, as declared by any member of the Liberal party occupying a responsible position, if they came into power, to destroy at one movement all the manufacturing industries, or to so change the policy as to place them in peril. We are willing to be tried by the policy of the Liberal party as plainly understood, but we are not willing to be tried by the Liberal policy as expounded by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House.

Now, Sir, I have referred to-day to certain conditions which have altered, and I wish to speak briefly of these. The convention of the Liberal party was held in the city of Ottawa in the month of June, 1893. At that time we had every reason to believe that the people of the neighbouring republic had resolved to enter upon a more liberal trade policy. A few months before that date a presidential election had taken place in the United States, in which the issue of tariff reform was prominent; and, whatever may be said of the matter in view of later events, in the light of that day it did seem clear that the people of the United States had resolved to enter upon a policy of tariff reform. The Democratic party, which had just entered upon power, were at that very time engaged in propounding their policy of tariff reform. We thought the moment was opportune for us to place on record in the clearest and most emphatic way our desire, as representing a great party in Canada, to carry out a policy of tariff reform, and particularly to extend, if possible, our trade relations with the neighbouring republic, if they were disposed to reciprocate. There was more than the action of the Democratic party to encourage us in the belief that something could be done in that direction. Before that time the Republican party, who were in power, pledged as they were in the main to a high protective policy, had qualified their adhesion to protection by a declaration in favour of reciprocity treaties; and we had reason to believe, and did believe, that even with the Republican party in power it would be possible to obtain a reciprocity treaty with the United States if steps were taken in a proper way to secure such a treaty. However that may be, we were disposed to believe that the day was close at hand when more friendly relations would be established between the people of the great republic to the south of us and the people of Canada. Unhappily, Sir, the present indications are that the American people—if we may judge by the action of their House of Representatives—have changed their minds on that question. If we may take the expression of that House as being a fair exposition of the views of the American people, speaking not with reference to any particular article of the tariff, but speaking generally, the people of the United States appear now disposed to adhere to the policy of protection.

I believe that some of us in Canada make the mistake of imagining that our neighbours frame their tariff chiefly with reference to how Canada will act and what effect it will have on Canada. It may be very flattering to Canada to think that; but I rather think that they frame their tariff with reference to the world at large, and that a very moderate part of their attention is directed to what is taking place in Canada. Though I believe that some parts of the Dingley Bill were made to suit the interests of certain people who feared Canadian competition, I do not think we ought to assume that it is simply a measure of hostility towards the people of Canada. I think it only fair to mention that leading public men in the United States have intimated to men on this side of the line that while the Republican party feel bound to uphold the Dingley Bill, they do not of necessity mean to refuse to enter into improved trade relations with Canada. On the contrary, it has been urged that that is part of their policy, and they point to the fact that when the late Mr. Blaine was in power, though a high protectionist, he was disposed to negotiate reciprocity treaties with any countries which were disposed to deal with the United States. But while I think there is some ground for hoping for an improvement in our trade relations with the United States, we cannot but recognize the fact that the Dingley Bill, whatever the motive of it may have been, and I do not question the motive, will undoubtedly, if it becomes law—which seems highly probable, although I think it will be amended in some particulars—affect the trade relations between Canada and the United States to a very considerable degree. In view of that, we feel that we are justified in stopping to think what would be the effect of our policy if to-day, while on the eve of negotiations on the subject of reciprocity—if our American friends are willing to negotiate—we should, in advance of such negotiations, reduce our tariff down to low figures. I believe that there is nothing inconsistent with sound free trade principles in a Government endeavouring, in dealing with a neighbour, to hold in its hands whatever

levers it may possess in the negotiations; and I say so to-day, not in the spirit of retaliation, because I say, Sir, that we ought not to retaliate upon the United States in the way some people advocate. There are men, well meaning men, in Canada—Liberals, some of them, let us admit—who say that we should meet the Dingley Bill on the principle of an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, and a dollar for a dollar. Such is the demand of many men in Canada to-day, but we submit it would not be wise to adopt that policy. We submit that it is a wiser policy to wait and see what shall be the outcome of the present uncertainty in the United States in relation to their trade policy and of the negotiations which we are willing to enter into with respect to reciprocity. We submit that pending such negotiations and pending the settlement of the American tariff question and a clear understanding of what will be the effect which their policy may have upon the affairs of Canada, it is the part of prudence that we should to-day hold our hands and not extend to that country the measure of tariff reform which we would be anxious to extend if they would meet us on liberal lines.

But there are those who say that if we do not care to deal with the tariff in its relations with the United States to-day, we ought not to disturb our existing tariff at all. I have heard it argued that what we should do is to let our own tariff stand as it is to-day. I cannot subscribe to that doctrine. The Liberal party has pledged itself to give tariff reform, and the country expects the Liberal party to fulfil that pledge. And if the events across the border have taken such a course as to justify us in withholding action in relation to our trade with that country, that is no reason why we should not proceed to deal with tariff reform in its relation to those countries which are prepared to deal with us. We are prepared to declare to this House and the world, that we will trade with those people, whoever they may be, who are willing to trade with us. We do it as individuals with our neighbours; we would buy from the neighbour who is willing to buy from us. What is a nation but a combination of many thousand individuals? And if an individual would be justified in dealing with the neighbour who wants to trade with him, why should not the nation be justified in adopting the same principle? We recognize the fact that if the Dingley Bill becomes law, it will have some effect on our trade. We do not complain of it; we have no right to complain of it. The American people have an undoubted right to frame their tariff policy with a single eye to their own interests, and we must recognize that without murmur; but they are an intelligent people, and intelligent enough to recognize the fact that if they have the right to frame their policy with a single eye to their own interests, we have the right to frame our policy with a single eye to what we believe to be our interests. Therefore, while we say to our American brethren that we will not yield to this spirit of retaliation which is in the air, and for which there is, perhaps, very considerable justification, while we are not willing to put up the barbed wire fence which already exists three or four strands higher, there is no particular reason why we should take it down to-day. This leads to the conclusion that we must be prepared to deal with this question from the point of view of having one tariff for the countries which are willing to trade with us and a different tariff for the countries which are not. So far as our tariff has relation to those countries which have no particular desire to trade with us, we recognize that there are in it some items of sufficient importance to justify us in making reductions, not to please foreign countries, but to please ourselves. There are things we want to buy from foreign countries, and our desire to obtain these things on fair and reasonable terms is paramount to every other consideration in dealing with the tariff question. But with the exception of these articles to which I shall refer as I proceed, I have to tell the House that it is not the intention of the Government—speaking of the question generally, and not with reference to any particular article—to propose any great reduction in the tariff as applied to those countries which are not disposed to trade with us. We propose, therefore, to have a general tariff, and that general tariff will be, to a large extent, the tariff of to-day—but the tariff of to-day freed from some of its enormities, freed from some of the injustices of which the people complain, freed from many of the specific duties, freed from the conflicts, annoyances and irritation which have created war between the importer and the customs authorities—the tariff of to-day, in that sense, but not the tariff of to-day exactly, for if you remove from it all the evils I speak of, it is certainly not the tariff which hon. gentlemen opposite favour. We propose to adopt a general tariff, and then we propose to adopt a special tariff having reference to the countries which are desirous of trading with us; and as a matter of course, not by the express words of the resolution, but by the condition of affairs which exists, that preferential tariff gives preference, above all others, to the products of Great Britain.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having thus stated the guiding principles in the matter, I propose to invite your attention to the general tariff; and in doing so, I wish it to be distinctly understood that, as I have already explained, the duties are considerably higher than we intend they shall be, as applied to countries which are willing to trade with us. And if, as I read the items, hon. gentlemen think that the rate upon any of them is too

high, I beg them to believe that before I close I shall have something to say which will show that in respect of our relations with Great Britain and in respect of our relations with any other country that is willing to meet us on equal terms, we shall be prepared to offer a measure of tariff reform of the most substantial character which is not contained in this tariff which I am going to read. With these observations, I now beg to invite your attention to the rates of duty in the general tariff.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. May I take the liberty of asking my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) if he will kindly repeat the last sentence.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid I have almost forgotten it myself. If the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) would state the point——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The point was as to the mode in which the hon. gentleman intended to have the tariff, which, I understand, he is about to state to the House modified by some subsequent——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I thank the hon. gentleman for reminding me. I stated that the tariff that I am about to read to you is the general tariff, but that before I conclude, I shall be prepared to make a statement in relation to a special tariff that will apply to Great Britain and any other country which is prepared to accept the conditions that that tariff imposes. Let me say, Sir, that the classification of goods that we have in this tariff does not materially differ from the form of the tariff which is now in force, that is to say, where the late Government gathered goods into one class for convenience, we have thought it well, generally speaking, to follow that method of grouping. There is an advantage perhaps, and perhaps some disadvantage also, in having a very elaborate tariff. Undoubtedly, if one were beginning from the beginning, he would make a tariff that would be much simpler than the present one. As one of our newspaper writers very happily said, a man who undertakes to remodel a house will not find it so easy and satisfactory a job as if he had the opportunity to build from the foundation. We have to adapt ourselves to our conditions. I think it would be an advantage in one way to have fewer items in the tariff. But the evil of multiplicity of items is not so great if you can avoid a multiplicity of rates; and we hope that on investigation of our tariff it will appear that we have, to a certain extent, removed this difficulty by gathering a number of items of a like character and bringing them under one rate. Probably there is room for improvement in this direction, but we hope something has been done to make the tariff more convenient and more simple. The first item is:

Ale, beer and porter, when imported in casks or otherwise than in bottles, 16 cents per gallon.

The duty on this remains unchanged. And I think I should say that, if I am not to weary the House with details, I will only mention those duties that have been changed There are no changes until we come to the duty on spirits, which are increased by 15 cents a gallon—I would remind hon. members that I am dealing with the customs duties now.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman will have to read the items to get them in "Hansard."

The MINISTER OF FINANCE—

Ale, beer and porter, when imported in bottles (six quart, or 12 pint bottles to be held to contain one gallon), 24 cents per gallon.

Cider, not clarified or refined, five cents per gallon.

Cider, clarified or refined, 10 cents per gallon.

Lime juice and fruit juices, fortified with or containing not more than twenty-five per cent of proof spirits, 60 cents per gallon; and when containing more than 25 per cent of proof spirits, $2 per gallon.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Where there are changes I take it the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) will mention the fact.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is an increase in the spirit duties all along the line of 15 cents per gallon.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I spoke generally to suggest that the hon. gentleman should mention when changes occur.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Very good. I am in the judgment of the House, but it seems to me that if I am to read all the items, even when no changes occur——

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman might mention the item by number and tell whether there is a change or not. Has the hon. gentleman the numbers there, as in the present tariff?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not exactly; the numbers will not quite correspond, and in some cases the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) would not get much help from the reading of the number.

Lime juice and other fruit syrups and fruit juices, n.o.p., 20 per cent ad valorem.

Spirituous or alcoholic liquors distilled from any material, or containing or compounded from or with distilled spirits of any kind or any mixture thereof with water——

The item reads substantially as in the present tariff, and the duty is $2.40 per gallon, instead of $2.25 as at present.

Spirits and strong waters of any kind, section B of this item, $2.40 per gallon and 30 per cent instead of $2.25 and 30 per cent.

Alcoholic perfumes remain the same, 50 per cent when in bottles or flasks, contain-

ing not more than four oz., and when in bottles and flasks containing more than four oz., $2.40 per gallon and 40 per cent, instead of $2.25 per gallon and 40 per cent as at present.

Nitrous ether, sweet spirits of nitre and aromatic spirits of ammonia, $2.40 per gallon and 30 per cent, instead of $2.25 per gallon and 30 per cent, as at present.

Vermouth containing not more than 30 per cent, and ginger wine containing not more than 26 per cent of proof spirits, 90 cents per gallon, instead of 80 cents per gallon, and if containing more than these percentages, $2.40 per gallon, instead of $2.25.

Medicines or medicated wines containing not more than 40 per cent of proof spirits, $1.50 per gallon.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that a new item ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Wines of all kinds except sparkling wines &c., remain the same as at present.

Champagne and wines generally remain unchanged.

Mr. FOSTER. Tax the poor man's whisky.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend's sympathy for the poor man on account of his whisky is, of course, exceedingly interesting. The next section relates to animals, agricultural and animal products. This class of products are imported largely from the United States, and we think that pending negotiations for freer trade relations with that country, we should leave these items largely unchanged. There are, however, a few exceptions to that.

In the case of corn, we place it on the free list, except for the purpose of distillers.

Flour is reduced from 75 cents to 60 cents per barrel, and wheat from 15 cents per bushel to 12 cents per bushel.

Corn meal, 25 cents per barrel instead of 40 cents. We propose to abolish the regulation which permits the grinding of corn in bond for so-called human food. That system has been the cause of very considerable complaint. It has been represented to us that it is almost impossible for gentlemen engaged in the milling industry to subscribe to the affidavit which they are required to take in order to obtain the necessary rebate. By the law as they now stand, they are supposed to pay duty on the corn, and then, upon evidence, or upon affidavit, that they ground the corn for use as human food, they are entitled to have a rebate of 99 per cent of their duty. It is alleged that when a miller has sold corn for human food, he is not in a position to follow it through the country and guarantee that it is always used for human food. The same thing has occurred with regard to seed corn. Seed corn was admitted free, and it is alleged that that privilege has also been abused. We simplify the matter by putting corn on the free list except in the case of corn for the purpose of distillation which, under regulations to be made by the Government, is still to pay the same duty of 7½ cents. There is also one other item in that large class to which I ought to refer. At present the duty on uncleaned rice is three-tenths of a cent per pound, and 1¼ cents per pound on cleaned rice. It is the duty on the cleaned rice which affects the price in Canada ; our people do not eat uncleaned rice. We make no change in the duty on the cleaned rice, but we do make a change in the duty on the raw material. We say that instead of receiving the raw material at three-tenths of a cent, they should pay ¾ of a cent. The fact is that while the duty on cleaned rice remains the same, although the price will not be increased to the consumer, the manufacturer will have to pay a larger price for his raw material, and that increase will go into the public treasury.

Mr. FOSTER. But you do not cheapen the food.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Well, we cheapen a good many things in this tariff, but we have to have a little regard for the revenue in order to meet the obligations of my predecessor. We pass on to the class of articles known as fish and fish products ; and as these remain substantially the same, I will not detain the House by reading them.

Illuminating oil, brings us to the item of coal oil. There is no item in the tariff which has been more discussed in the House. I think there is a very strong desire in the House to have a very considerable reduction made in this item, and it has been our desire to grant a reduction. We are free to say that in view of the representations made that we are not disposed, or do not feel warranted in going in that direction so far as we would like to do. We reduce the duty on coal oil one cent. Crude petroleum for fuel which is now 3 cents will be 2½ cents. Barrels containing petroleum remain at the same rate 20 per cent. We propose to make another change, which is especially sought by the trade, and that is to abolish the restrictions that now exist in regard to sale from tank vessels. If the trade desire to use tank vessels, there is no reason why dealers should not be permitted to do so. Lubricating oils remain unchanged, at 20 per cent. Olive oil, now 30 per cent, is reduced to 20 per cent.

In regard to bituminous coal, we do not propose at this stage of the tariff measure to make any reductions in the duties on coal. Reference was made some time ago in this House to certain observations I made in Montreal in replying to a deputation representing the coal interest. It was regarded by many hon. members in this House sitting opposite as an exceptional course to adopt that I should, in anticipation of the Budget, make a statement on

that subject, not exactly a statement perhaps as to the amount of duty to be imposed, but a statement sufficiently plain to indicate the lines on which we would proceed. I do not require to enter fully into the circumstances under which I made that statement. I quite realized at the moment that I must submit to some misunderstanding prevailing as to my action, but we feel assured that the wisdom of the policy pursued by the Government will be in due course vindicated before the House. I believe it was in the interest of all concerned that certain doubts and misunderstandings which existed at Washington in regard to the position of Canada on the coal question should be removed.

An hon. MEMBER. Particularly Mr. Whitney.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I believe that statement served a useful purpose in removing doubts and misunderstandings.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In Nova Scotia.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I must say that I am surprised the hon. leader of the Opposition should have the courage to mention Nova Scotia. I was disposed to be exceedingly good, nice and gracious in the matter, and never mention the words. Now that the hon. gentleman has called attention to the subject, I suppose it will be in order to say that something happened in Nova Scotia two or three days ago. The hon. gentleman is not so proud of Nova Scotia as he used to be in the old days. But so far as the interruption imputes that my remarks in Montreal were made with any regard to Nova Scotia elections, or after any communication had with the Nova Scotia Government, I have already stated, and if it is important I will repeat it, that there is no foundation whatever for any statement of that kind. However that may be, I believe and the Government believe that a good purpose was served not only as regards the interests of the Dominion but in regard to all interests by having that statement made in Montreal in anticipation of the Budget speech.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And the Nova Scotia elections, which had been postponed for the purpose.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Nova Scotia elections, we are told by the hon. gentleman were postponed for a purpose. I do not know the source of his information. I think the hon. gentleman does not know the people of Nova Scotia so well as he imagines he does; but one thing is certain, that Nova Scotia knows a good deal about the hon. gentleman, and voted accordingly. I was about to say, Sir, that the purpose for which my statement was made was a purpose having in view the best interests of the Dominion, as time will show. I believe that American public men are at this moment reconsidering their action in regard to the duty on coal, and whatever they may do in relation to their general policy, there is reasonable probability that they will reconsider their action on this point. I have strong hope, amounting to expectation, that in the end they will reduce the duty proposed in the Dingley Bill to 40 cents per ton, which is the duty in the American tariff to-day. I stated in Montreal, and I repeat now, that it is the desire of the Government to reduce the duty on coal. I stated at that time that if the American Government would leave the duty at 40 cents per ton, instead of increasing it to 75 cents as proposed in the Dingley Bill, our Government were prepared to meet them on that line and reduce our duty to meet their duty. I repeat that statement now. I have strong hopes that the Americans will eventually settle their duty at 40 cents per ton. If placed at 40 cents, I undertake to move that our duty be made 40 cents per ton, and I have strong expectations that this will be the end of the matter. But I think in the interest of the coal trade of the Dominion we should not act to-day on the assumption that the change will be made, and so, having clearly and distinctly stated that we are ready to reduce our duty to 40 cents if the American duty remains at that figure, we propose to defer action and see what they are going to do about it. I quite realize the possibility that the Americans will not be in a position to deal with the question, or at all events may not deal with it, before our tariff Bill goes through the House. If that should prove to be the fact, we would be prepared to come down to the House and make a further statement in relation to the coal duties.

Mr. HUGHES. I should like to ask why, on the same principle, the hon. gentleman does not maintain the duty on corn, so as to hold it as a set-off later to balance the duty on barley?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot argue that question; there is good and sufficient reason for pursuing a different policy.

Mr. WALLACE. I understood the Minister of Finance to announce that he proposed to reduce the duty on olive oil from 30 per cent to 20 per cent. A large quantity of it, however, is at present free.

Mr. FOSTER. The item at present reads 30 per cent for olive oil prepared for salad purposes, all other olive oil is free. Is the same wording used in regard to the proposed duty of 20 per cent.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The item is n.e.s. 20 per cent instead of 30.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend reads it that way he will add 20 per cent to the duty because olive oil n.e.s. is free.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think my hon. friend is mistaken because such is not our intention. It has been represented to us with regard to cement that the barrels of cement are not always equal in weight, and that it is better to have the duty at so much per hundred pounds. We have therefore placed the duty at 12½ cents per 100 pounds.

My hon. friend the Controller of Customs has offered to read for me, and if the House has no objection he will do so.

Mr. FOSTER. None at all.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the hon. gentleman's colleague takes up the consideration of these items, would he allow me to ask him, whether I understand, that in case the American tariff should be retained at 75 cents on coal as passed by the House of Representatives, that the hon. the Finance Minister intends to carry out his declaration at Montreal, not only to retain the present duty of 60 cents on bituminous coal but to impose a duty on anthracite as well.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) has possibly not correctly understood the declaration at Montreal. However, without debating that, I will answer his question : that under these circumstances it would be the intention of the Government to carry out my declaration at Montreal.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And impose a duty on anthracite coal.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. And impose a duty on anthracite coal.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. At the request of my hon. friend I will continue reading.

Mr. McNEILL. Before the hon. gentleman passes away from these items would he kindly say what the 12½ cents per 100 pounds on cement would amount to on a barrel ?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. The barrels vary in weight and if a barrel contained 325 pounds it would be something about 40 cents. The hon. gentleman can figure that out for himself.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. the Controller knows there has been considerable dispute about the barrels.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. In the new item it is provided that whether the cement comes in bags or in barrels, the packages shall be included in the weight for duty.

With regard to the iron duties, I regret that my hon. friend—who you can imagine has had a very great deal of work lately, and whose strength has almost given out to-night—is not able to explain these changes as he would have done it much better than I can. But, in short, I may say that the policy of the Government is this. They have felt that pig-iron, wrought-iron and scrap-iron, being the base of so many important manufactures in the country, it was desirable, in the interest not only of the manufacturers, but of the consuming public, that there should be some reduction in the duties. Though iron comes from our friends across the border, we have made the reductions in our own interest, and not to promote any interest of theirs. While we have thought that our duty as a Government and as prudent business men, required us to lower those duties which will give relief from a heavy burden to many of our manufacturers, at the same time, in order that the industries engaged in the business of manufacturing iron may be enabled to go on. we offer them, not what they had before, but we propose in a measure to compensate for the withdrawal of the share of protection involved in the high duties, by giving them somewhat larger bounties than they had before.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Hon. gentlemen are somewhat amused at that, but I cannot help that. I have simply told you the truth.

We combine items 286 and 227 the first of which was at 22½ per cent and the other at 30 per cent, and make a uniform duty of 30 per cent. This includes builder's hardware, cabinet makers, upholsterers, carriage hardwares, including buts, hinges, locks, curry combs or curry cards, horse boots, harness and saddlery, n.e.s. This is one of those items several of which we have arranged, that will make the work at the Custom-house very much simpler than it has hitherto been, and I trust will remove a great deal of friction that has existed among so many varied and different rates on articles which might be interpreted by one custom's appraiser to come under one head, and by another to come under another head.

Item 277 of the old tariff bore a duty of 25 per cent ad valorem, while item 345 bore 35 per cent. I may say that many of the articles enumerated in this list caused great difficulty in the matter of appraising and it has been represented that different appraisements took place at different ports, which, any gentleman can understand is a most undesirable thing. We think we are warranted in combining those two classes which the judgment of the House heretofore thought should be divided, one bearing 25 per cent and the other 35 per cent duties. We combine them to effect the great purpose we have and we make a uniform duty of 30 per cent. This item includes, generally, cutlery, including carver knives, and forks of steel, butcher and table steels, oyster, bread, kitchen, cook's, butchers, shoe, farrier, putty, hacking, and glazier's

knives, cigar knives, spatulas, or palette knives, razors, erasers or office knives, pen, pocket, pruning, sportsman and hunter's knives, manicure files, scissors, trimmer's, barber's, tailor's, and lamp-shears, horse, and toilet clippers, and all like cutlery, plated or not, n.o.p. For additional simplification we provide that if any of the articles are imported in cases or cabinet, the cases or cabinets shall be dutyable at the same rate as their contents. In many cases it was found that a merchant would pay one rate of duty on what was in the case and another rate of duty on the case itself. We thought it better to have a uniform rate of 30 per cent.

In item 283 there is a considerable reduction. It comprises axes, scythes, sickles, reaping hooks, hay and straw knives, hoes, wringers, forks, post diggers and other agricultural implements. These are implements used upon the farm, and have been hitherto at 35 per cent; we have reduced them to 25 per cent. Item 357 was electric light carbons, or carbon points of all kinds, the duty on which was 2·50 specific per 1,000; we have abolished this specific duty and established an ad valorem duty of 35 per cent. Then we have an item which might be considered a new item. There are some very large carbons that are being used now by miners and others, and there is a very important industry, having a rapid development, in our country. It was difficult under the old tariff to determine what the rate of duty should be. I think they have come largely into use since the tariff was framed. Recognizing that, therefore, we have taken them from the list of electric light carbons, and on all carbons over six inches in circumference, and with a view to the use which is made of them, we have reduced the duty 15 per cent ad valorem.

We combine tariff items 401 and 402, which reads "cotton fabrics, white or gray, bleached or unbleached." Item 401 under the old law was dutiable at 22½ per cent and item 402 was 25 per cent, and we make them both dutiable at 25 per cent.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear, legalized robbery.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Mr. Speaker, I take the cheers of hon. gentlemen opposite as an indication that I read that item in a sufficiently loud tone to be heard by them. It is perhaps well to bear in mind what effect will be had upon that article when another schedule is brought before the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite, and which I suppose they will be delighted to hear read after the cheers which they have given. Here is item 403. I may as well prepare the hon. gentlemen opposite to be ready for another cheer. This item reads cotton fabrics, printed, dyed or coloured, which under the old tariff was 30 per cent, is now 35 per cent.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Hon. gentlemen opposite will also bear in mind that a future announcement will have an important bearing on that article.

Items 424 and 425, which were dutiable at 25 per cent, are now made uniform and put at 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. FOSTER. That is an increase.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, but we must have revenue from something, and we are trying to get it in as fair a way as we can in the interests of the country. Tariff items in the old tariff 414 and 408 are combined. One was 30 per cent ad valorem and the other 32½ per cent ad valorem, and we make them both 35 per cent ad valorem. I might explain, as the hon. gentleman will readily see, that this has been done as in many other cases, for the purpose of simplifying the tariff very much, and regard is also had to the fact that they are articles upon which it was thought, taking them generally, they might bear a duty.

Item 413, jeans, sateens and coutiles, was 25 per cent, and is now 30 per cent. Items 404 and 405 have been combined. They were under specific and ad valorem duties, which were very high, and which would run probably up to 50 or 60 per cent, and we have reduced them to an ad valorem basis. We have given them the highest rate of duty, I think, that we maintain in the tariff, and we have them at a uniform rate of 35 per cent ad valorem.

The next item to which I invite the attention of hon. members is the old tariff item 437: "Yarns, composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat or other like animal, costing 20 cents per pound and under, 5 cents per pound and 20 per cent ad valorem." We have for reasons which we thought good and in the interest of the country reduced that duty to 15 per cent ad valorem. I suppose the combined duties before would probably amount to over 30 per cent. The reasons for this change will no doubt be given when the item comes up for discussion. I think, however, that this is a reduction in which a very large number of manufacturers in this country are concerned; and if there are some whose interests are different, we have placed in the free list an article on which I think they will receive some compensating advantages for this reduction, which I frankly admit is a large cut, but which has been made in the interest both of the manufacturers of the country and the consuming public.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have to express my thanks to my hon. colleague (Mr. Paterson) for having so kindly relieved me and to the House for having permitted him to continue the reading of the tariff, and thus relieve me from what would otherwise have been a very great burden,

and I shall take up the list where my hon. friend left off.

In item 420, of the old tariff which relates to binder twine I have an announcement to make which, I am sure, will be received with satisfaction by the House. We propose that binder twine, which is now 12½ per cent shall be immediately reduced to 10 per cent.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friends had better not laugh too quickly; he laughs best who laughs last. The duty on binder twine is reduced from 12½ per cent to 10 per cent at once, and dating from the 1st of January, 1898, binder twine shall be on the free list, and all the articles entering into the manufacture of binder twine shall also be placed on the free list for the purposes of manufacturing.

I come now to the items of sugars, syrups, and molasses, and in that connection I may associate tea. In dealing with a large class of the items to which I referred in a general way, I made no mention of tea. There is a 10 per cent discrimination in tea with regard to importations not being direct. That 10 per cent remains. I know there has been a popular idea that the Government would have to impose a duty on tea. Well, I have the pleasure of announcing that we do not propose to do so.

With regard to sugar, I find also that the same general idea prevails in the minds of certain people, who know all about the Government's policy, that there was to be a high duty on sugar. The duty on raw sugar now, used for refining purposes, is ½ cent per pound, and on the refined it is $1.14 per 100 pounds, the difference being 64 cents per 100 pounds. We propose that the duty on raw sugar shall remain as it is to-day because the revenue is derived from raw sugar. That means that we shall get the same amount of revenue. But the price to the consumer is regulated by the duty on the refined article, and that is to-day $1.14 for 100 pounds. We propose to reduce that $1 per 100 pounds, so that the duty shall hereafter stand at 50 cents per 100 pounds for the raw sugar and 50 cents additional for the protection, if you care to use that word, to the refiner, as against 64 cents in the present tariff. By this step we do not take a dollar from the public revenue, but we give to the people cheaper sugar to the extent of $400,000 per annum. The duty on glucose or grape sugar, item 393 of the old tariff, is now 1¼ cents per pound. Representations were made to us that satisfied us that that duty was an excessive one. We propose to reduce the duty on glucose to ¾ cents per pound. It may be mentioned that the manufacturer of glucose will get some compensation in the form of free corn. The duty on sugar candy, now ½ cent per pound and 35 per cent ad valorem, we propose to make 35 per cent ad valorem. Item 463 of the present tariff, cigars and cigarettes, the weight of cigarettes to include the weight of the paper covering has now a duty of $2 per pound and 25 per cent ad valorem. We increase the rate of duty on cigarettes to $3 per pound and 25 per cent ad valorem. The duty on cut tobacco, item 464 of the old tariff, is 45 cents per pound and 12½ per cent ad valorem. We increase that duty to 50 cents per pound with 12½ per cent, an increase of 5 cents a pound. Manufactured tobacco, n.e.s., and snuff, item 465 of the old tariff, the old duty is 35 cents per pound and 12½ per cent. We make it 45 cents and 12½ per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. What increase does the hon. Minister expect to get from that change?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I shall be glad to present to the hon. gentleman in a little while a general statement of expected revenue, so I trust he will excuse me if I do not mention that item now. I shall not detain the House by giving the free list. It will be enough to say, in general terms, that we do not make any material change, except for the purpose of placing certain things on the free list to which reference has been made. Speaking generally, and subject to correction, the free list remains the same. Unenumerated articles, as in the present tariff, will stand at 20 per cent.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would ask the hon. gentleman what he has done with item 320 of the old tariff: "Corset clasps, spoon clasps, or busks," &c.?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think my hon. friend will find that is included with others.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). Items 320 and 321 were cut out altogether. The articles named in them will take their rating among the different classes of goods to which they belong.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The usual provisions are made with regard to classes of prohibited goods. I am sure the House will be glad to have me deal with the question put to me at an earlier stage by the hon. leader of the Opposition as to the method by which we propose to establish a different tariff for those countries that are disposed to deal with us.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Would the hon. Finance Minister say if he leaves the free list exactly as it is now?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not exactly.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). There are certain items on the free list providing that where goods are imported by manufacturers they shall come in free; but if imported by a merchant to sell to a manufacturer duty

must be paid. I think this is class legislation that should not be allowed to exist in any country. The smaller manufacturer is placed at a disadvantage——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). If I am not in order, I will not continue The small manufacturer who is not able to import these goods may buy them from a merchant who imports them, and so he has to pay the duty, while the large manufacturer who can afford to import the goods in large quantities——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I am simply putting a question in shape for the hon. Minister to give an answer——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). The large manufacturer can import these goods free while the smaller manufacturer must pay the duty.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I asked the hon. Minister if he would answer the question, and he said that he would.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I sympathize to a considerable extent with the feeling of the hon. gentleman as to the embarrassment that arises from having a duty so arranged that an article comes in at one rate for one purpose and at another rate, or perhaps free, for another purpose. I will only say that I think in some cases it will be found we have removed these anomalies; but I frankly confess that a number of them remain as we did not find ourselves with sufficient time to deal with them as we would desire. I think a time we are reducing the duty on manufactured goods, and thus, perhaps, giving the manufacturer an anxious time, is not the best time to take away from him any privileges he had in the way of concessions on his raw material. So we are disposed to allow these things to remain at present, though I confess I do not like them any better than my hon. friend (Mr. Wood, Hamilton) does.

Mr. DUGAS. Did I understand the hon. Minister to say there was a duty on raw leaf tobacco ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think that, so far, no mention has been made of that, but I may have occasion to mention it before I sit down. I propose now to read one of a series of resolutions dealing with the particular subject of the reciprocal tariff. Of course a number of the resolutions are of a purely formal character, and I shall not detain the House with them ; but one or two are of special importance, and one is of paramount importance, as follows :—

Mr. FIELDING.

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

That any question that may arise as to the countries entitled to the benefits of the reciprocal tariff shall be decided by the Controller of Customs, subject to the authority of the Governor General in Council.

That the Controller of Customs may make such regulations as are necessary for carrying out the intentions of the two preceding sections.

We propose to mention the articles on which we do not propose to grant the special concession, and that all the other articles not being so enumerated, should be entitled to the benefit of that concession. Our proposal is that as respects all the articles not excepted in the way I have just mentioned, there should be a reduction, not all at once, but in two steps, one part of the reduction taking effect instantly, and the second part taking effect a year later ; and with these two steps we propose there should be a reduction of one-fourth as respects the duties upon all articles imported from Great Britain, or from any other country which will deal favourably with us.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. From the statement of the hon. gentleman, I do not quite understand what he means by " dealing favourably with us." It appears to me very important that we should understand what the hon. gentleman means.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Perhaps the resolution which I had the privilege of reading my hon. friend did not catch as fully as I desired. It reads as follows :—

That when the Customs tariff of any country admits the products of Canada on terms which, on the whole——

I wish to emphasize that, because we may find that they admit our products at one point on favourable terms and that at another point on terms which we may regard as unfavourable. They might admit one article at a fair rate, and some other article at a high rate. Therefore we want to average the thing and say that if their tariff is favourable to us on the whole, then we propose to regard them as coming under this privilege.

——are as favourable to Canada as the terms of the reciprocal tariff herein referred to, are to the countries to which it may apply, articles which are the growth, produce, or manufacture of such country, when imported direct therefrom, may then be imported direct into Canada, or taken out of warehouse for consumption therein at the reduced rates of duty provided in the reciprocal tariff set forth in Schedule " D."

I hope I have answered my hon. friend.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I suppose it is owing to my obtuseness, but I do not yet understand the hon. gentleman. As I understand him, suppose a country receives the products of Canada upon the same terms as it receives the products of the United States and Germany, is that country regarded as receiving the products of Canada upon the same favourable terms as the reduction that the hon. gentleman proposes will be extended to it?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The question will be whether, on the whole, the terms are as favourable as we ourselves offer in our reciprocal tariff. Now, I beg, with your permission, to read the terms of schedule "D" referred to in the enacting clause:

On all the products of countries entitled to the benefits of this reciprocal tariff under the provisions of section——

Left blank. The number will have to be filled in corresponding to section 15:

——the duties mentioned in Schedule "A" should be reduced as follows:—On and after the 23rd day of April, 1897, and until the 30th day of June, 1898, inclusive, the reduction shall, in every case be one-eighth of the duty mentioned in Schedule "A," and the duty to be levied, collected and paid shall be seven-eighths of the duty mentioned in Schedule "A." On and after the 1st of July, 1898, the reduction shall in every case be one-fourth of the duty mentioned in Schedule "A," and the duty to be levied, collected and paid shall be three-quarters of the duty mentioned in Schedule "A"; provided, however, that these reductions shall not apply to any of the following articles, but such articles shall in all cases be subject to the duties mentioned in Schedule "A," namely; ales, beers, wines and liquor, sugar, molasses and syrups of all kinds, the product of the sugar cane or beet root; tobacco, cigars and cigarettes.

These are items which are large producers of revenue, and we think it is not desirable that there should be two rates of duty as respects these articles. With the exception of these articles mentioned, and they are very few, this preferential rate should apply to all the products of Great Britain and to all the products of any other country which is willing to put itself on the same terms as Great Britain, or on terms which will be regarded by the Government of Canada as coming within the privilege designed by this resolution. I have another resolution that I desire to read. The Liberal platform from which I read an extract to-night, declared that a protective tariff had fostered monopolies, trusts and combines. These combines, I am afraid, have not wholly been destroyed, I think there are some of them in Canada now; and I propose to give them a certain notice that they may govern themselves accordingly. Therefore, we propose a resolution which we hope will be useful. I know how difficult it is to reach the combines. I know how ingenious they are, and there is the barest possibility that they will be able to climb over this resolution. But that is no reason why we should not make an effort to deal with what is regarded as a great evil in the community. I propose this resolution:

That whenever it shall appear to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council that as respects any article of commerce there exists any trust, combination, association, or agreement of any kind among the manufacturers of such article, or the dealers therein, or any portion of them, to enhance the price of such article or in any other way to unduly promote the advantage of such manufacturers or dealers at the expense of the consumers, and that such disadvantage to the consumers is facilitated by the customs duty imposed on a like article when imported, then the Governor in Council shall place such article on the free list, or so reduce the duty on it, as to give to the public the benefits of reasonable competition in such articles.

Perhaps, Sir, before I go further, I ought to say something to the House in answer to the suggestions of my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) as to the amount of duty to be gained or lost by these changes. I have to confess frankly that it has not been found possible to make a very elaborate calculation on that point; it is difficult to make a calculation of what amount of duty will be lost or gained under the scheme which I have the honour to submit to the House. As respects a few items, we believe that the reductions made in the duty will undoubtedly involve some loss of revenue; as respects the tariff generally, with the exception of these few items, we think that, while the reductions will be very considerable and of great value to the people, they will be balanced to a large extent, if not altogether, by the expansion of trade which we believe will follow the adoption of this policy. It is not to be assumed that because the duties are reduced therefore, the revenue will be reduced. On the contrary, it is quite conceivable that by a policy of reduction of duty you may increase your revenue; in like manner, it is conceivable that by a policy of increasing your duties, you may not increase your revenue to the extent that you anticipate. Speaking generally, our expectation is that upon a large number of the items, in fact, upon the tariff generally, with the exception of a few items the reductions will amount to a very considerable sum to the consumer; but there will be such an expansion of trade that practically there will be no loss of revenue. But that would not be true of all the items. There are a few items on which, undoubtedly, we shall lose revenue, and perahps in the statement I make I shall omit to mention something which ought to be considered, because I have frankly to tell the House that the matter is one in which it is somewhat difficult to be precise. I think, however, that in the matter of iron, owing to the large reduction which we make, for example the reduction on pig iron from $4

to $2.50 in our general tariff, with a further reduction of one-eighth of that duty, and later on another eighth under the Reciprocal Tariff, there will undoubtedly be, in the beginning at all events, some loss of revenue. Making a rough estimate on that matter, I candidly admit it is only a rough one, I think we may lose on the item of iron $217,000. I think perhaps on the item of woollens we may lose $275,000; on cottons something like $66,000. On the item of corn we will lose about $207,000, less the amount which will be paid by the distillers, which I estimate to be in round numbers, $60,000. Deducting $60,000 from $207,000, the net loss will be $147,000. If we add these to the items already mentioned with respect to iron, woollens and cottons, we have a gross loss of about $700,000. I do not profess to offer this to the House as a very correct statement, I admit it is difficult to estimate, and we have to do it very broadly and with great doubt as to how it may turn out: but I think we will not be far astray when we say that for the first year we may lose on these items about $700,000.

We will gain something by the policy we propose, and I will refer to the resolutions I have to propose with respect to the excise duties. The duty at present imposed by the excise law on spirits is $1.70 per proof gallon. We propose to increase that to $1.90 per proof gallon. I know there is a desire on the part of some hon. members to still further increase the duty on spirits. It is naturally an article to which a Finance Minister turns in his desire to obtain revenue.

Mr. FOSTER. Takes to drink.

The FINANCE MINISTER. Some Finance Ministers do; as for myself I drink water. But every hon. member who has had any experience of public affairs knows that you may push your spirit duties to a point where you will not get increased revenue, or at all events you will get it at a high cost. I am free to confess that we are rapidly approaching that point in Canada. I do not suppose that we can place the duties much higher than we propose at the present time. If it is considered expedient to still further increase the duties, the experience of other countries leaves ample room for doubt as to whether by increasing the duties you will increase the revenue. I do not profess to give any absolute judgment on the point, but there is some doubt in my mind whether we would derive any increased revenue from the spirit duties if we increased them materially above what we propose. Some branches may be found on which increased duties may be levied, and if such is the case, some Finance Minister will call it into operation.

We propose to reduce the duty on vinegar from 6 cents to 4 cents per gallon, but at the same time we impose a duty of 4 cents per proof gallon on acetic acid. Those industries have come into conflict, and the manufacturers of vinegar and acetic acid do not agree. I have reason to believe that on the whole this will be measurably satisfactory to all as a fair compromise. It is also proposed that the Government may exempt acetic acid when used for mechanical purposes.

From the imposition of an excise duty on foreign raw leaf tobacco, we get an important item of revenue, as I shall proceed to show, and at the same time we confer considerable advantage on the growers of tobacco in Canada. How far it is possible for our growers to displace foreign leaf was much disputed before the tariff commission; but if the Canadian producer can as a result of this duty get some advantage, we see no reason why he should not have the same opportunity afforded him as has been afforded to other industries. Our main purpose is to get revenue, but at the same time there is no objection to the growers of tobacco in Canada receiving advantage from this resolution.

Mr. FOSTER. How much duty do you expect to receive from this increased duty on raw leaf?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. From raw leaf tobacco we expect to receive the comfortable sum of nearly $1,000,000. We expect to get from increased excise duties on spirits, $509,000, increased excise duty on cigarettes, $100,000, and from increased customs duties on spirits, tobacco and cigars about $173,000. If we should realize our expectations on all these items, and of course there is a probability that the effect of the increased duties may be to diminish consumption—if we would get our full estimate of the amount from increased duties on spirits, cigars and tobacco, the sum will reach $1,700,000. Of course I quite realize that we may not collect this sum, because it is well known that with increase of duties the difficulties of collection become greater. I have also stated that we shall lose about $700,000 through reductions in iron, woollens and other goods. I have mentioned in the earlier portion of my speech that if we were continuing the old tariff, we would need about $750,000 more than it would provide. So if we take three-quarters of a million, which we might probably need in that regard, and $700,000 we may need—perhaps that is a large estimate—to make up the loss we will sustain from the reduction of the duties—we will come out about even. The bounty on iron is also to be taken into consideration, and may vary the figures a little. It has already been stated that we are making very material reductions in the duties on iron. The iron industry was not specially favoured in the original National Policy. At all events in later years we know that hon. gentlemen opposite felt they were justified

in entering on a policy for the special development of the iron industry, and in doing so they granted bounties on iron and steel billets, as well as raising the duty to a very high point.

We have reduced the duty and we propose now to make up to some extent, for a short time, the loss to the industry by increasing the bounty. How far it was a wise policy to undertake the development of the iron industry in Canada in the way the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) attempted, in the face of many difficulties, and in the light of our experience—how far that was a wise policy may well admit of argument. But, it is not worth our while to argue it to-day. We know that large sums have been invested in this industry. We know that large iron industries exist in the country, and while we may not approve of the policy under which they are established, we have no desire to see them snuffed out now. As in dealing with all other industries, we have shown a very large measure of consideration, so we desire to show fair consideration to the iron industry. Therefore, we say, if it is in the interests of the people of Canada that there shall be a reduction in the duty on iron we are prepared to accept the responsibility of advising that the bounties on iron should be increased for a term of years in order that this industry may have a fair chance for existence.

We have substituted a bounty on the steel ingot for the bounty on the billet, and I am inclined to think that will be more satisfactory to all concerned. We propose the following resolution :—

1. That it is expedient to repeal Chapter Nine of Fifty seven fifty eight Victoria, being : "An Act to provide for the payment of bounties on iron and steel manufactured from Canadian ore" and all regulations thereunder made by Order of the Governor in Council.

2. That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may authorize the payment of the following bounties on steel ingots, puddled iron bars and pig iron made in Canada, that is to say :

On steel ingots manufactured from ingredients of which not less than fifty per cent of the weight thereof consists of pig iron made in Canada, a bounty of three dollars per ton ;

On puddled iron bars manufactured from pig iron made in Canada, a bounty of three dollars per ton ;

On pig iron manufactured from ore, a bounty of three dollars per ton on the proportion produced from Canadian ore, and two dollars per ton on the proportion produced from foreign ore;

3. That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may make regulations in relation to the bounties hereinbefore mentioned in order to carry out the intention of these resolutions.

4. That it is expedient to provide that the said bounties shall only be applicable to steel ingots, puddled iron bars and pig iron made in Canada prior to the twenty-third day of April, 1902.

5. That it is expedient to provide that the foregoing bounties shall be payable only on iron and steel for consumption in Canada, and that the Governor General in Council may, at any time by proclamation, impose export duties on such iron and steel if the same shall be exported from Canada ; such duties to be not greater than the amount of the bounty payable on such iron and steel.

Perhaps I may say in that connection that those who have no knowledge of the subject may too hastily assume that iron can be satisfactorily made in Canada from Canadian ore. It is not a peculiarity of the iron trade here, but it is known in the iron business generally, that it is found advantageous to blend different kinds of ore, and, therefore, the Canadian producer of iron would not be able to make iron of a satisfactory character if he were compelled to use only the Canadian ore. We recognized that fact, and propose to pay this bounty with due regard to the proportion of the Canadian ore which they may use. We give them the bounty for a term of five years from this date.

There is another provision. We always regard the action of a foreign country which grants bounties on products shipped to Canada in competition with our industries, as a somewhat unfriendly action. We believe that a bounty fed article is improperly brought into competition with our products, and we accordingly feel aggrieved. Now we are willing to pay a bounty on iron manufactured in Canada for consumption in Canada, but we have no idea of paying the manufacturers of pig iron or other iron a bounty to enable them to supply the world with cheap iron. Therefore, we say that the bounty shall be applied to iron produced in Canada for consumption in the Dominion, and if this iron is shipped beyond the Dominion we have the right to impose an export duty upon it equal to the bounty paid by the Government of Canada.

I think, Sir, I have now presented to the House all the resolutions which are of importance, although there are a number of others that are of such a formal character that I shall not deem it necessary to read them.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Would my hon. friend allow me to ask him a question, as the subject is a very important one. In granting the advantages which he has stated he proposed to grant to goods imported from the United Kingdom, how does he propose to get over the Belgian and German treaties which actually prohibit Canada from discriminating in favour of Great Britain against either Belgium or Germany, or any of the countries that have most-favoured-nation treatment ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am obliged to the hon. gentleman. That is a subject which I had next on my notes, and I was about to speak upon it. This question of the favoured-nation clause in Imperial treaties has been more than once before this House. There are very many of

these treaties but I think as respects the majority of them no question need arise. It will, I believe, be admitted that in most cases the terms of those treaties will not interfere with our liberty of action. Any question that may arise must come as respects the Belgium treaty of 1862 or the treaty with the German Zollverein of 1865. Both of these treaties do seem to provide, that it shall not be the privilege of any colony to admit the products of Great Britain into its market without extending similar privileges to all countries having the favoured-nation clause.

How far we ought to acknowledge that as a principle that could be properly applied to a self-governing colony like Canada, might well be a question for consideration; but, Sir, I am not disposed to raise that question to-day. I wish to draw attention to the fact, that there is an imporant distinction between the policy which seems to be forbidden by the Belgian and German treaties, and the policy which I have the honour to submit to the House. By the Belgian and German treaties, any colony would be forbidden to make a preferential agreement with Great Britain alone. We do not by our resolutions offer anything to Great Britain alone. We recognize the fact that Great Britain by her liberal policy is in a position to avail herself of this offer immediately, but we make our offer not to Great Britain only, but to every nation which is prepared to accept it. We make it to every country which is willing to establish fair and reasonable trade relations with Canada.

Now, I shall not undertake to pass any judgment upon this very important question of the most-favoured-nation clauses of these Imperial treaties. It is an international question, and it is well that we should reserve our final judgment upon it. We recognize that it is a question upon which we shall ultimately have to consult with Her Majesty's Government, and I need not say that any view that may be taken by Her Majesty's Government will be considered by the Government of Canada with the respect that is due to any representation that might be made upon any subject, but above all, on a question of an international character. I say that it does not seem fair and reasonable that we should be obliged, while we are offering certain terms, not to Great Britain only but to all countries which will place themselves in the same position—it does not seem to be fair and reasonable that we should be obliged to extend the privileges of this schedule, which we call a reciprocal tariff, to nations which are not willing to do anything in return.

I admit there may be difficulties in the way. It may be possible that the view we take of this matter is not the correct view, but we say it is only fair and reasonable in the interests of Canada, in the interest of fair trade between ourselves and Great Britain, that we should to-day take the position, that the favoured-nation clauses do not apply; and that this resolution which I put upon the Table of the House will only extend to such countries as are prepared to give admission to our products under fair terms.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would draw the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) to the fact that the treaty is not made between Canada and other countries. The treaty is made between Great Britain, Belgium and Germany, and applies to all countries that have most-favoured-nation treatment with England. The express terms of one of those treaties, at all events, is that England will not permit any higher rate of duty to be charged upon articles coming from those countries than is charged upon like articles coming from Great Britain herself. If I am correct in my reading of the treaties, the proposal of the hon. gentleman is entirely delusive, and will have no effect whatever.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have to thank my hon. friend for the information that Canada has not made these treaties. I thought, of course, that we all understood that Canada does not make treaties directly but does so only through Her Majesty's Government; and therefore there is not very much information in what my hon. friend has said on that point. What I understand, subject to the ultimate judgment of men who know more than I do—I do not speak as an oracle—with regard to the Belgian and German treaties, is that Great Britain will not allow any colony to offer concessions to Great Britain without at the same time offering them to those countries.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Nothing of the kind.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. While my hon. friend is willing to settle that question in that airy way which is so delightful——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The treaty speaks for itself in express terms.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Even if it does, the world moves, and possibly the step we are taking to-night may have the effect—and that may be one of the advantages of it—of drawing the attention of Her Majesty's Government and of the English public to the position of those treaties, and thus opening up the question. Meantime, Sir, recognizing the difficulties, recognizing the possibility that our judgment may be mistaken, and recognizing the obligations we may owe as part of the Empire, we intend for the present to take the view that inasmuch as we offer these conditions to other nations, if they do not see fit to accept them, the responsibility rests upon them and not upon Canada.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to ask my hon. friend if he has taken any steps in his Budget to provide for an export duty on logs or on pulp-wood ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is well aware, and the House is well aware, that numerous representations have been made to the Government on this question of export duties, as applied not merely to logs, but to a number of other articles. It is a large question and one which we believe should be approached with great consideration and deliberation. We are not prepared to-day to declare our final judgment on that question. In the tariff which I submit to the House, we do not propose an export duty on any article, except on iron which has received a bounty. We do not think it would be prudent at this moment to take the step which the hon. gentleman's question suggests. At the same time, we reserve our judgment on that point, and the matter may come up again at a later stage of the session.

We have of late read and heard expressions of opinion that the trade of the country has been very much upset, not so much by uncertainty as to the nature of the tariff, as by the delay in the announcement of it ; and while there seems to be some hesitation in the extension of trade at the time our fiscal system is under review, yet I cannot regard the existence of this period of suspense as wholly hurtful. Warehouses which have been over-full will be drained of their stocks, long credits and over-drafts will be considerably reduced, and in the end business will be established on a firmer basis ; and once the details of the tariff are announced, trade will not only seek its accustomed channels, but will flow in increased volume. Throughout the whole Dominion the prospects look encouraging. In Manitoba and the North-west Territories, in consequence of better harvest and better prices for grain, the cloud that has been overhanging for some time seems to be lifting, and with the removal of restrictions and a better administration by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), I look forward to that country going rapidly ahead. Further west, our distant province of British Columbia is experiencing an impetus from the development of her rich mineral deposits. In the older provinces there is the promise of a prosperous year, and, as I have said, business is only waiting for the details of the tariff to be announced, to resume its accustomed channels in increased volume.

In conclusion, permit me to sum up the chief points of the policy which I submit to this House. The Liberal party, in its platform at the Ottawa convention, declared itself to be in favour of a reduction of the tariff. That pledge we have fulfilled to-day by substantial reductions in our general tariff, and still further by the large reductions made in our reciprocal tariff. The Ottawa platform pledged the Liberal party to endeavour to bring about the desired reform with the least possible disturbance of business, and with no injustice to any class. That pledge we have fulfilled to-night by placing on the Table of the House a tariff which in its every line shows that the Government have approached the subject with the utmost consideration, and with a desire to disturb in the least possible degree the various business interests of the Dominion. The Ottawa platform pledged us to have particular regard for a reduction of duties on British goods, and my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) moved in this House a resolution affirming that policy. We have fulfilled that pledge to-night in the most ample manner. The Ottawa platform pledged the Liberal party to use all honourable efforts to bring about better trade relations with the United States. We have already taken the first step in that direction by commissioning two Ministers of this Government to visit Washington and make known the fact—if it was necessary to make it known—that Canada is willing to negotiate with our American neighbours for a fair and reasonable reciprocity treaty. If our American friends wish to make a treaty with us, we are willing to meet them and treat on fair and equitable terms. If it shall not please them to do that, we shall in one way regret the fact, but shall nevertheless go on our way rejoicing, and find other markets to build up the prosperity of Canada independent of the American people.

We present to this House a tariff which has the advantage of being simpler than the one that now exists, and I feel assured that it will to a considerable extent reduce that friction which has so long existed between the merchants of the country and the Custom-houses. We submit a tariff which largely abandons the specific duties that have been so unjust to the poorer classes. We submit a tariff in which the large free list is practically not disturbed, but has large additions made to it. We give to the country the great boon of free corn, which will have an important effect on the development of our farming interests, and particularly the dairying interest, to which we must look in a very large degree for the prosperity of our farmers and the increase of our exports. We give to the country a reduction of the duty on coal oil, and the removal of burdensome restrictions respecting the sale of coal oil. We give to the farmer his fence wire at a low rate of duty for the present year, and place it on the free list from the 1st of January next. We give him his binder twine on the same terms—a lower rate of duty for the present, and free binder twine from the 1st day of January next. We give the medical and dental professions a boon, which the younger and less

wealthy members of the profession will appreciate, when we put all surgical and dental instruments on the free list. We recognize the great mining industry of the country by placing on the free list all machinery exclusively used in mining enterprises. We do not confine it to mining machinery made in Canada, but we say it is more important to develop the mining interests of Canada than even to make a few machines in Canada, and so we put mining machinery exclusively used for the purposes of mining enterprises on the free list. We give the people the benefit of reduction on breadstuffs, flour, wheat and cornmeal. We give the manufacturers the benefit of cheaper iron, and much complaint has been made by them in the past of the burdens imposed upon them by the iron duty. We revise the duties on rice in such a manner that they will not add a cent to the cost to the consumer, yet they will add materially to the public revenue. We give the people a reduction almost all along the line. We provide the necessary revenue to meet the great needs of the country by increased taxes on articles of luxury, such as spirits, tobacco and cigars, and without any increased taxation on the necessaries of life. If hon. gentlemen opposite have ever had the free breakfast table they talk about, we make it freer to-day by reducing the duty on the sugar that goes on the breakfast table from $1.14 per 100 pounds to $1, which is a material reduction. And last, but not least, we give to the people the benefits of preferential trade with the mother country. This question of preferential trade has been mentioned in the House in times past. Leading public men have advocated preferential trade, but always annexing to their suggestions a demand with which it was well known England could not comply. All the advocates of preferential trade, at all events all who have taken an active part in that movement, have assumed that, as the first step, England must consent to put a duty on corn. We know that England does not view that project with favour. We know that no more unpopular project can be offered the English people than to ask them to put a duty on breadstuffs. It may be, as time rolls on, and at an early day, they may change their views. It may be that they may see it in their interest to make this distinction, and they may offer some preferential rate to the grain of Canada. If they can be induced to do that by fair argument, I have no doubt it will be a good thing for Canada. But why should we wait for England to take action? England has dealt generously with us in the past. England has given us a larger degree of liberty perhaps than is possessed by any other country on the face of the earth. She has given us liberty to tax her wares even when she admits our goods free, and we have taxed them to an enormous degree. Why should we wait for England to do more? Somebody must make a move in this matter, and we propose that Canada shall lead the way. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition says that our project of freer trade with England is a delusive one.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Is it delusive. When I place these resolutions on the Table of this House to-night, they go into effect, and I speak with pride, in the name of the Liberal party, and the hon. gentlemen around me will share that pride, when I say that to-morrow morning, at every custom-house in Canada from ocean to ocean, the doors will open on terms of preferential trade with the mother country. I cannot doubt that this tariff will commend itself to this House and country, and when this policy shall have passed its various stages, when it shall have passed into law, then the members of the Parliament of Canada may feel that, in this glorious year of jubilee, they have made a noble contribution to that splendid parliamentary record which Tennyson had in his mind when he pictured the reign of Her Majesty Queen Victoria:

> And statesmen at her council met,
> Who knew the seasons when to take
> Occasion by the hand; and make
> The bounds of freedom wider yet.

The following are the resolutions:—

1. Resolved, That it is expedient to revise and consolidate the Acts and parts of Acts now in force respecting the duties of customs, and that for this purpose it is expedient to repeal the following Acts or parts thereof not heretofore repealed, viz.:—

57-58 Victoria, Chapter 33, intituled: "An Act to consolidate and amend the Acts respecting the Duties of Customs."

58-59 Victoria, Chapter 23, intituled: "An Act to amend the Customs Tariff, 1894."

59 Victoria, Chapter 8, intituled: "An Act further to amend the Customs Tariff, 1894."

And to provide otherwise by enacting that the following be substituted in lieu thereof:—

1. That unless the context otherwise requires,

(a) The initials "n.e.s." represent and have the meaning of the words "not elsewhere specified";

(b) The initials "n.o.p." represent and have the meaning of the words "not otherwise provided for";

(c) The expression "gallon" means an imperial gallon;

(d) The expression "ton" means two thousand pounds avoirdupois;

(e) The expression "proof" or "proof spirits," when applied to wines or spirits of any kind, means spirits of a strength equal to that of pure ethyl alcohol compounded with distilled water in such proportions that the resultant mixture shall at a temperature of sixty degrees Fahrenheit have a specific gravity of 0.9198 as compared with that of distilled water at the same temperature;

(f) The expression "gauge," when applied to metal sheets or plates or to wire, means the thickness as determined by Stubbs's standard gauge.

(g) The expression "in diameter," when applied to tubing, means the actual inside diameter;

(h) The expression "sheet," when applied to metals, means a sheet or plate not exceeding three-sixteenths of an inch in thickness;

(i) The expression "plate," when applied to metals, means a plate or sheet more than three-sixteenths of an inch in thickness.

2. That the expressions mentioned in section two of "The Customs Act," as amended by section two of "The Customs Amendment Act, 1888," whenever they occur herein, or in any Act relating to the customs, unless the context otherwise requires, have the meaning assigned to them respectively by the said sections two; and any power conferred upon the Governor in Council by "The Customs Act" to transfer dutiable goods to the list of goods which may be imported free of duty is not hereby abrogated or impaired.

3. That subject to the foregoing provisions and to the requirements of "The Customs Act," Chapter thirty-two of the Revised Statutes, as amended, there shall be levied, collected and paid upon all goods enumerated, or referred to as not enumerated, in Schedule A hereto appended,—the several rates of duties of customs set forth and described in the said schedule and set opposite to each item respectively or charged thereon as not enumerated, when such goods are imported into Canada or are taken out of warehouse for consumption therein.

4. That subject to the same provisions and to the further conditions contained in Schedule B hereto appended, all goods enumerated in the said Schedule B may be imported into Canada or may be taken out of warehouse for consumption therein, without the payment of any duties of customs thereon.

5. That the importation into Canada of any goods enumerated, described or referred to in Schedule C hereto appended, is prohibited; and that any such goods if imported shall thereby become forfeited to the Crown and shall be destroyed, and that any person importing any such prohibited goods, or causing or permitting them to be imported, shall for each offence incur a penalty of two hundred dollars.

6. That the export of deer, wild turkeys, quail, partridge, prairie fowl and woodcock, in the carcase or parts thereof, is hereby declared unlawful and prohibited; and any person exporting or attempting to export any such article shall for each such offence incur a penalty of one hundred dollars, and the article so attempted to be exported shall be forfeited, and may, on reasonable cause of suspicion of intention to export, be seized by any officer of the customs, and, if such intention is proved, shall be dealt with as for breach of the customs laws; Provided, that this section shall not apply to the export, under such regulations as are made by the Governor in Council, of any carcase or part thereof of any deer raised or bred by any person, company or association of persons upon his or their own lands.

7. That regulations respecting the manner in which molasses and syrups shall be sampled and tested for the purpose of determining the classes to which they belong with reference to the duty chargeable thereon shall be made by the Controller of Customs; and the instruments and appliances necessary for such determination shall be designated by him and supplied to such officers as are by him charged with the duty of sampling and testing such molasses and syrups; and the decision of any officer (to whom is so assigned the testing of such articles) as to the duties to which they are subject under the tariff shall be final and conclusive, unless upon appeal to the Commissioner of Customs within thirty days from the rendering of such decision, such decision is, with the approval of the Controller, changed; and the decision of the Commissioner with such approval shall be final.

8. That in the case of all wines, spirits, or alcoholic liquors subject to duty according to their relative strength of proof, such strength shall be ascertained either by means of Sykes's hydrometer or of the specific gravity bottle, as the Controller of Customs directs; and in case such relative strength cannot be correctly ascertained by the direct use of the hydrometer or gravity bottle, it shall be ascertained by the distillation of a sample and the subsequent test in like manner of the distillate.

9. That all medicinal or toilet preparations imported for completing the manufacture thereof, or for the manufacture of any other article by the addition of any ingredient or ingredients, or by mixing such preparations, or by putting up or labelling the same, alone or with other articles or compounds, under any proprietary or trade name, shall be, irrespective of cost, valued for duty and duty shall be paid thereon at the ordinary market value in the country whence imported of the completed preparation when put up and labelled under such proprietary or trade name, less the actual cost of labour and material used or expended in Canada in completing the manufacture thereof or putting up or labelling the same.

10. That all medicinal preparations, whether chemical or other, usually imported with the name of the manufacturer, shall have the true name of such manufacturer and the place where they are prepared permanently and legibly fixed to each parcel by stamp, label or otherwise; and all medicinal preparations imported without such names so affixed shall be forfeited.

11. That packages when imported shall be subject to the payment of the following duties, viz.:

(a.) All bottles, flasks, jars, demijohns, carboys, casks, hogsheads, pipes, barrels, and all other vessels or packages, manufactured of tin, iron, lead, zinc, glass or any other material capable of holding liquids—and all packages in which goods are commonly placed for home consumption, including cases, not otherwise provided for, in which bottled spirits, wines, or malt liquors or other liquids are contained—and every package being the first receptacle or covering inclosing goods for purpose of sale—shall in all cases, not otherwise provided for, in which they contain goods subject to an ad valorem duty or a specific duty and ad valorem duty, be charged with the same rate of ad valorem duty as is to be levied and collected on the goods they contain, and the value of the packages may be included in the value of such goods;

(b.) Provided that all such packages as aforesaid containing goods subject to a specific duty only, and not otherwise provided for, shall be charged with a duty of twenty per cent ad valorem;

(c.) That packages not hereinbefore specified, and not herein specially charged with or declared liable to duty, and being the usual and ordinary packages in which goods are packed for exportation, according to the general usage and custom of trade, shall be free of duty;

(d.) Provided further, that all such special packages or coverings as are of use, or apparently designed for use other than in the importation of the goods they contain, shall be subject to the same rate of duty as would thereon be levied if imported empty or separate from their contents.

12. That any person who, without lawful excuse, the proof of which shall be on the person accused, sends or brings into Canada, or who, being in Canada, has in his possession, any bill-heading or blank capable of being filled up and used as an invoice, and bearing any certificate purporting to show, or which may be used to show, that the invoice which may be made from such bill-heading or blank is correct or authentic, is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to a penalty of five hundred dollars, and to imprisonment for a term not exceeding twelve months, in the discretion of the court, and the goods entered under any invoice made from any such bill-heading or blank shall be forfeited.

13. That with respect to goods imported for manufacturing purposes that are admissible under schedule "A" hereto appended for any specific purposes, at a lower rate of duty than would otherwise be chargeable, or exempt from duty under schedule "B" hereto appended, the importer claiming such exemption from duty, or proportionate exemption from duty, shall make and subscribe to the following affidavit or affirmation before the collector of customs at the port of entry :—

I, (name of importer), the undersigned, importer of the (names of the goods or articles) mentioned in this entry, do solemnly (swear or affirm) that such (names of the goods or articles) are imported by me for the manufacture of (names of the goods to be manufactured) in my own factory, situated at (name of the place, county and province), and that no portion of the same will be used for any other purpose or disposed of until so manufactured.

14. Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that nothing contained in the foregoing provisions shall affect the "French Treaty Act, 1894," or Chapter three of Fifty-eight-Fifty-nine Victoria, being "An Act respecting Commercial Treaties affecting Canada."

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

(a) That any question that may arise as to the countries entitled to the benefits of the Reciprocal Tariff, shall be decided by the Controller of Customs, subject to the authority of the Governor in Council.

(b) That the Controller of Customs may make such regulations as are necessary for carrying out the intention of the two preceding sections.

16. That whenever it shall appear to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council that as respects any article of commerce there exists any trusts, combination, association, or agreement of any kind among the manufacturers of such article, or the dealers therein, or any portion of them, to enhance the price of such article or in any other way to unduly promote the advantage of such manufacturers or dealers at the expense of the consumers, and that such disadvantage to the consumers is facilitated by the customs duty imposed on a like article, when imported, then the Governor in Council shall place such article on the free list, or so reduce the duty on it, as to give to the public the benefit of reasonable competition in such article.

17. Resolved, That it is expedient to cancel all Orders in Council until all departmental regulations contrary to or inconsistent with any of the provisions of the foregoing resolutions or of the schedule thereto.

18. Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that the foregoing resolutions and the alterations thereby made in the rate of duties of customs payable on goods imported into Canada shall take effect on and after the 23rd day of April instant.

19. Resolved, That it is expedient to cancel Chapter nine of Fifty-seven-Fifty-eight Victoria, being "An Act to provide for the payment of bounties on Iron and Steel manufactured from Canadian Ore," and all regulations thereunder made by Order of the Governor in Council.

20. That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may authorize the payment of the following bounties on steel ingots, puddled iron bars and pig iron made in Canada, that is to say :—

On steel ingots manufactured from ingredients of which not less than fifty per cent of the weight thereof consists of pig iron made in Canada, a bounty of three dollars per ton ;

On puddled iron bars manufactured from pig iron made in Canada, a bounty of three dollars per ton ;

On pig iron manufactured from ore, a bounty of three dollars per ton on the proportion produced from Canadian ore, and two dollars per ton on the proportion produced from foreign ore ;

21. That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may make regulations in relation to the bounties hereinbefore mentioned in order to carry out the intention of these resolutions ;

22. That it is expedient to provide that the said bounties shall only be applicable to steel ingots, puddled iron bars and pig iron made in Canada prior to the twenty-third day of April, 1902 ;

23. That it is expedient to provide that the foregoing bounties shall be payable only on iron and steel for consumption in Canada, and that the Governor in Council may at any time by proclamation impose export duties on such iron and steel, if the same shall be exported from Canada; such duties to be not greater than the amount of the bounty payable on such iron and steel.

INLAND REVENUE.

24. Resolved, That it is expedient to amend section 130 of Chapter 34 of the Act 49 Victoria ("The Inland Revenue Act"), as amended by section 1 of Chapter 25 of the Act 58-59 Victoria, by repealing such section and substituting in lieu thereof as follows :—

There shall be imposed, levied and collected on all spirits distilled the following duties of excise, which shall be paid to the collector of Inland Revenue as herein provided, that is to say :

(a) When the material used in the manufacture thereof consists of not less than ninety per cent, by weight, of raw or unmalted grain —on every gallon of the strength of proof by Sykes's hydrometer, and so in proportion for any greater or less strength than the strength of proof, and for any less quantity than a gallon, one dollar and ninety cents ;

(b) When manufactured exclusively from malted barley, taken to the distillery in bond, and on which no duty of customs or excise has been paid, or when manufactured from raw or unmalted grain, used in combinations, in such proportions as the Department of Inland Revenue prescribe, with malted barley taken to

the distillery in bond and on which no duty of customs or of excise has been paid,—on every gallon of the strength of proof by Sykes's hydrometer, and so in proportion for any greater or less strength, and for any less quantity than a gallon, one dollar and ninety-two cents ;

(c) When manufactured exclusively from molasses, syrup, sugar, or other saccharine matter, taken to the distillery in bond, and on which no duty of customs has been paid—on every gallon of the strength of proof by Sykes's hydrometer, and so in proportion for any greater or less strength, and for any less quantity than a gallon, one dollar and ninety-three cents.

Also to repeal so much of "The Inland Revenue Act" and amending Acts as determine the excise duty on vinegar, and to provide that the excise duties thereon and upon acetic acid shall be as follows :—

Vinegar, manufactured in whole or in part from spirits in bond, four cents per proof gallon ;

Acetic acid, produced by the destructive distillation of wood, four cents per proof gallon ;

Provided, that the Governor General in Council may establish regulations exempting acetic acid from excise duty in whole or in part, when used in the mechanical arts.

25. Resolved, That it is expedient that a license fee of $50 be collected in each fiscal year from every manufacturer of acetic acid.

Also, to so amend the said Act and the Acts in amendment thereof as to provide that the excise duty to be levied upon cigarettes shall be as follows :—

On cigarettes, whether the product of foreign or of domestic leaf tobacco, weighing not more than three pounds per thousand, three dollars per thousand ;

On cigarettes, whether the product of foreign or domestic leaf tobacco, weighing more than three pounds per thousand, eight dollars per thousand ;

And that in addition to the excise duty at present levied on manufactured tobacco, cigars, and as herein determined in respect of cigarettes, there shall be levied and collected the following excise duties, that is to say :—

(a) On all foreign raw leaf tobacco, unstemmed, taken out of warehouse for manufacture in any cigar or tobacco manufactory, ten cents per pound ;

(b) On all foreign raw leaf tobacco, stemmed, taken out of warehouse for manufacture in any cigar or tobacco manufactory, fourteen cents per pound.

26. Resolved, That it is further expedient to so amend "The Inland Revenue Act" and the Acts in amendment thereof, as to empower the Governor in Council to make regulations for the manufacture of tobacco, cigars and cigarettes, from foreign and domestic leaf tobacco in combination, in such proportions as may be deemed proper, and to impose duties thereon, having regard as nearly as possible to the proportions of foreign and domestic leaf used ; such duties not to exceed the excise duties now imposed on tobacco, cigars and cigarettes.

27. Resolved, That the excise duties hereby fixed and determined shall come into force and effect on and after the 23rd day of April, 1897.

SCHEDULE "A."

GOODS SUBJECT TO DUTIES.

Ales, Beers, Wines and Liquors,

Ale, beer and porter, when imported in casks or otherwise than in bottle, sixteen cents per gallon.

Ale, beer and porter, when imported in bottles (six quart or twelve pint bottles to be held to contain one gallon), twenty-four cents per gallon.

Cider, not clarified or refined, five cents per gallon.

Cider, clarified or refined, ten cents per gallon.

Lime juice and fruit juices, fortified with or containing not more than twenty-five per cent of proof spirits, sixty cents per gallon, and when containing more than twenty-five per cent of proof spirits, two dollars per gallon.

Lime juice and other fruit syrups and fruit juices, n.o.p., twenty per cent ad valorem.

Spirituous or alcoholic liquors, distilled from any material, or containing or compounded from or with distilled spirits of any kind, and any mixture thereof with water, for every gallon thereof of the strength of proof, and when of a greater strength than that of proof, at the same rate on the increased quantity that there would be if the liquors were reduced to the strength of proof. When the liquors are of a less strength than that of proof, the duty shall be at a rate herein provided, but computed on a reduced quantity of the liquors in proportion to the lesser degree of strength ; provided, however, that no reduction in quantity shall be computed or made on any liquors below the strength of fifteen per cent under proof, but all such liquors shall be computed as of the strength of fifteen per cent under proof, as follows :—

(a) Ethyl alcohol, or the substance commonly known as alcohol, hydrated oxide of ethyl or spirits of wine ; gin of all kinds, n.e.s. ; rum, whisky, and all spirituous or alcoholic liquors, n.o.p. ; amyl alcohol or fusel oil ; or any substance known as potato spirit or potato oil ; methyl alcohol, wood alcohol, wood naphtha, pyroxylic spirit or any substance known as wood spirit or methylated spirits, absinthe, arrack, or palm spirit, brandy, including artificial brandy and imitations of brandy ; cordials and liqueurs of all kinds, n.e.s. ; mescal, pulque, rum shrub, schiedam and other schnapps ; tafia, angostura and similar alcoholic bitters or beverages, two dollars and forty cents per gallon.

(b) Spirits and strong waters of any kind, mixed with any ingredient or ingredients, as being or known or designated as anodynes, elixirs, essences, extracts, lotions, tinctures or medicines, or medicinal wines (so-called), or ethereal and spirituous fruit essences, n.e.s., two dollars and forty cents per gallon and thirty per cent ad valorem.

(c) Alcoholic perfumes and perfumed spirits, bay rum, cologne and lavender waters, hair, tooth and skin washes, and other toilet preparations containing spirits of any kind, when in bottles or flasks containing not more than four ounces each, fifty per cent ad valorem ; when in bottles, flasks or other packages, containing more than four ounces each, two dollars and forty cents per gallon and forty per cent ad valorem.

(d) Nitrous ether, sweet spirits of nitre and aromatic spirits of ammonia, two dollars and forty cents per gallon and thirty per cent ad valorem.

(e) Vermouth, containing not more than thirty-six per cent, and ginger wine containing not more than twenty-six per cent of proof spirits, ninety cents per gallon ; if containing more than these percentages respectively of proof spirits, two dollars and forty cents per gallon.

(f) Medicinal or medicated wines containing not more than forty per cent of proof spirits, one dollar and fifty cents per gallon.

Wines of all kinds, except sparkling wines, including orange, lemon, strawberry, raspberry, elder and currant wines, containing twenty-six per cent or less of spirits of the strength of proof, whether imported in wood or in bottles (six quart or twelve pint bottles to be held to contain a gallon), twenty-five cents per gallon; and for each degree or fraction of a degree of strength in excess of the twenty-six per cent of spirits as aforesaid, an additional duty of three cents until the strength reaches forty per cent of proof spirits ; and in addition thereto, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Champagne and all other sparkling wines, in bottles containing each not more than a quart but more than a pint, three dollars and thirty cents per dozen bottles ; containing not more than a pint each but more than one-half pint, one dollar and sixty-five cents per dozen bottles ; containing one-half pint each or less, eighty-two cents per dozen bottles ; bottles containing more than one quart each shall pay, in addition to three dollars and thirty cents per dozen bottles, at the rate of one dollar and sixty-five cents per gallon on the quantity in excess of one quart per bottle, the quarts and pints in each case being old wine measure ; in addition to the above specific duty, there shall be an ad valorem duty of thirty per cent.

But any liquors imported under the name of wine, and containing more than forty per cent of proof spirits of the strength of proof, shall be rated for duty as unenumerated spirits.

Animals and Agricultural, Animal and Dairy Products.

Animals, living, n.e.s., twenty per cent ad valorem.

Live hogs, one and one-half cent per pound.

Meats, n.e.s. (when in barrel, the barrel to be free), two cents per pound.

Meats, fresh, n.e.s., three cents per pound.

Canned meats, and canned poultry and game, extracts of meat and fluid beef not medicated, and soups, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Mutton and lamb, fresh, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Poultry and game, n.o.p., twenty per cent ad valorem.

Lard, lard compound and similar substances, cottolene and animal stearine of all kinds, n.e.s., two cents per pound.

Tallow and stearic acid, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Beeswax, ten per cent ad valorem.

Candles, n.e.s., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Paraffine wax candles, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Soap, n.e.s.; pearline, and other soap powders, pumice, silver and mineral soaps, sapolio and like articles, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Soap, common or laundry, one cent per pound.

Castile soap, mottled or white, two cents per pound.

Glue, liquid, powdered or sheet, and mucilage, gelatine, and isinglass, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Feathers, undressed, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Feathers, n.e.s., thirty per cen ad valorem.

Eggs, three cents per dozen.

Butter, four cents per pound.

Cheese, three cents per pound.

Condensed milk (weight of the package to be included in the weight for the duty), three and one-quarter cents per pound.

Condensed coffee with milk, milk foods and all similar preparations, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Apples, including the duty on the barrel, forty cents per barrel.

Beans, fifteen cents per bushel.

Buckwheat, ten cents per bushel.

Pease, n.e.s., ten cents per bushel.

Potatoes, n.e.s., fifteen cents per bushel.

Rye, ten cents per bushel.

Rye flour, including the duty on the barrel, fifty cents per barrel.

Hay, two dollars per ton.

Vegetables, n.o.p., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Barley, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Dutiable breadstuffs, grain and flour and meal of all kinds, when damaged by water in transitu, twenty per cent ad valorem upon the appraised value, such appraised value to be ascertained as provided by sections 58, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75 and 76 of the Customs Act.

Buckwheat, meal and flour, one-fourth of one cent per pound.

Cornmeal, including the duty on the barrel, twenty-five cents per barrel.

Oats, ten cents per barrel.

Oatmeal, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Rice, uncleaned, unhulled or paddy, three-fourths of one cent per pound.

Rice, cleaned, one and one-quarter cent per pound.

Rice and sago flour and sago, and tapioca, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Rice, when imported by makers of rice starch for use in their factories in making starch, three-fourths of one cent per pound.

Wheat, twelve cents per bushel.

Wheat flour, including the duty on the barrel, sixty cents per barrel.

Biscuits, not sweetened, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Biscuits, sweetened, twenty-seven and one-half per cent ad valorem.

Macaroni and vermicelli, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Starch, including farina, corn starch or flour, and all preparations having the qualities of starch, the weight of the package to be in all cases included in the weight for duty, one and one-half cent per pound.

Seeds, viz. :—garden, field and other seeds for agricultural or other purposes, n.o.p., sunflower, canary, hemp, and millet seed, when in bulk or in large parcels, ten per cent ad valorem : when put up in small papers or parcels, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Mustard, ground, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Mustard cake, fifteen per cent ad valorem.

Sweet potatoes and yams, ten cents per bushel.

Tomatoes, fresh, twenty cents per bushel and ten per cent ad valorem.

Tomatoes and other vegetables, including corn and baked beans, in cans or other packages, n.e.s., the weight of the cans or other packages to be included in the weight for duty, one and one-half cent per pound.

Pickles, sauces and catsups, including soy, thirty five per cent ad valorem.

Malt, upon entry for warehouse subject to excise regulations, fifteen cents per bushel.

Extract of malt (non-alcoholic), for medicinal and baking purposes, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Hops, six cents per pound.

Compressed yeast, in bulk or mass of not less than fifty pounds, three cents per pound; in packages weighing less than fifty pounds, six cents per pound, the weight of the package in the latter case to be included in the weight for duty.

Yeast cakes and baking powder, the weight of the packages to be included in the weight for duty, six cents per pound.

Trees, viz.: Apple, cherry, peach, pear, plum and quince, of all kinds, and small peach trees known as June buds, three cents each.

Grape vines; gooseberry, raspberry, currant and rose bushes: fruit plants, n.e.s., and shade, lawn and ornamental trees, shrubs and plants, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Blackberries, gooseberries, raspberries, strawberries, cherries and currants, n.e.s, the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty, two cents per pound.

Cranberries, plums and quinces, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Prunes, including raisins, dried currants and California or silver prunes, one cent per pound.

Apples, dried, desiccated or evaporated; dates, figs, and other dried, desiccated or evaporated fruits, n.e.s., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Grapes, two cents per pound.

Oranges, lemons and limes, in boxes of capacity not exceeding two and one-half cubic feet, twenty-five cents per box; in one-half boxes, capacity not exceeding one and one-fourth cubic feet, thirteen cents per half-box; in cases and all other packages, per cubic foot holding capacity, ten cents; in bulk, per one thousand oranges, lemons or limes, one dollar and fifty cents; in barrels not exceeding in capacity that of the one hundred and ninety-six pounds flour barrel, fifty-five cents per barrel.

Peaches, n.o.p., the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty, one cent per pound.

Fruits in air-tight cans or other packages, the weight of the cans or other packages to be included in the weight for duty, two and one-quarter cents per pound.

Fruits preserved in brandy, or preserved in other spirits, two dollars per gallon.

Preserved ginger, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Jellies, jams and preserves, n.e.s., three and one-quarter cent per pound.

Honey, in the comb or otherwise, and imitations thereof, three cents per pound.

Tea and green coffee, n.e.s., ten per cent ad valorem.

Coffee, roasted or ground, when not imported direct from the country of growth and production, two cents per pound and ten per cent ad valorem.

Coffee, roasted or ground, and all imitations thereof and substitutes for, including acorn nuts, n.o.p., two cents per pound.

Extract of coffee, n.e.s., or substitutes therefor of all kinds, three cents per pound.

Chicory, raw or green, three cents per pound.

Chicory, kiln-dried, roasted or ground, four cents per pound.

Cocoa shells and nibs, chocolate, and other preparations of cocoa, n.e.s., twenty per cent ad valorem.

Cocoa paste, chocolate paste, cocoa and cocoa butter, n.o.p., four cents per pound.

Nuts shelled, n.e.s., five cents per pound.

Almonds, walnuts, Brazil nuts, pecans and shelled peanuts, n.e.s., three cents per pound; and nuts of all kinds, n.o.p., two cents per pound.

Cocoa nuts, n.e.s., one dollar per hundred.

Cocoa nuts, when imported from the place of growth, by vessel, direct to a Canadaian port, fifty cents per hundred.

Cocoa nut, desiccated, sweetened or not, five cents per pound.

Nutmegs and mace, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Spices, viz.: Ginger and spices of all kinds, n.e.s., unground, twelve and one-half per cent ad valorem; ground, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Fine salt in bulk, and coarse salt, n.e.s, five cents per one hundred pounds.

Salt, n.e.s.—in bags, barrels or other packages—the bags, barrels or other packages, being the first coverings or inside packages, to bear the same duty as if such packages or first coverings were imported empty, seven and one-half cents per hundred pounds.

Mackerel, one cent per pound.

Herrings, pickled or salted, one-half cent per pound.

Salmon, fresh, n.e.s., one-half cent per pound.

Salmon, pickled or salted, one cent per pound.

All other fish, pickled or salted, in barrels, one cent per pound.

Foreign caught fish, imported otherwise than in barrels, or half-barrels, whether fresh, dried, salted or pickled, not specially enumerated or provided for by this Act, fifty cents per hundred pounds.

Fish, smoked and boneless, one cent per pound.

Anchovies and sardines, packed in oil or otherwise, in tin boxes measuring not more than five inches long, four inches wide and three and a half inches deep, per whole box, five cents.

(b.) In half boxes measuring not more than five inches long, four inches wide and one and five-eighths deep, per half box, two and one-half cents.

(c.) In quarter boxes, measuring not more than four inches and three-quarters long, three and a half inches wide and one and a quarter deep, per quarter box, two cents.

Anchovies and sardines, when imported in any other form, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Fish, preserved in oil, except anchovies and sardines, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Fresh or dried fish, n.e.s., imported in barrels or half barrels, one cent per pound.

Salmon and all other fish, prepared or preserved, including oysters, not specially enumerated or provided for in this Act, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Oysters, shelled, in bulk, ten cents per gallon.

Oysters, shelled, in cans not over one pint, three cents per can, including the cans.

Oysters, shelled, in cans over one pint and not over one quart, five cents per can, including the cans.

Oysters, shelled, in cans exceeding one quart in capacity, an additional duty of five cents for each quart or fraction of a quart of capacity over a quart, including the cans.

Oysters, in the shell, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Packages containing oysters or other fish, n.o.p., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Oils, spermaceti, whale and other fish oils, and all other articles the produce of the fisheries, not specially provided for, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Books and Papers.

Albumenized and other papers and films chemically prepared for photographers' use, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Books, printed, periodicals and pamphlets, n.e.s., including books printed in two languages, one of which is English or French, freight rates for railways bound in book or pamphlet form, telegraph rates bound in book or pamphlet form ; but not to include blank account books, nor copy books, nor books to be written or drawn upon, nor bibles, prayer books, psalm books or hymn books, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Advertising pamphlets, pictorial show cards, illustrated advertising periodicals, illustrated price lists, advertising calendars and almanacs, circulars, tailors' and mantle-makers' fashion plates, and all chromos, chromotypes, oleographs or artistic work of like kind produced by any process other than hand painting or drawing, whether for business or advertisement purposes or not, printed or stamped on paper, cardboard or other material, n.o.p. ; labels for fruit, vegetables, meat, fish, confectionery and other goods, shipping, price or other tags or tickets, also tickets, posters, advertising bills and folders whether lithographed or printed, or partly printed, n.e.s., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Bank notes, bonds, bills of exchange, cheques, promissory notes, drafts and all similar work unsigned, and cards or other commercial blank forms printed or lithographed, or printed from steel or copper or other plates, and other printed matter, n.e.s., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Printed music, bound or in sheets, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Paintings, prints, engravings, drawings, building plans, blue prints, photographs, pictures, and maps and charts, n.e.s., twenty per cent ad valorem.

Newspapers or supplemental editions or parts thereof, partly printed and intended to be completed and published in Canada, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Union collar cloth paper in rolls or sheets, not glossed or finished, fifteen per cent ad valorem.

Union collar cloth paper in rolls or sheets, glossed or finished, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Mill-board, not straw board, ten per cent ad valorem.

Straw board, in sheets or rolls ; tarred paper, felt, or straw board, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Paper sacks or bags of all kinds, printed or not, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Playing cards, six cents per pack.

Paper hangings or wall papers, borders or bordering, and window blinds of paper of all kinds, n.e.s., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Printing paper and paper of all kinds, n.e.s., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Ruled and border and coated papers, papeteries, boxed papers, pads not printed, papier-maché ware, n.o.p. ; envelopes, and all manufactures of paper, n.e.s., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Chemicals and Drugs.

Acid, acetic acid and pyroligneous, n.e.s., and vinegar, a specific duty of fifteen cents for each gallon of any strength not exceeding the strength of proof, and for each degree of strength in excess of the strength of proof an additional duty of two cents. The strength of proof shall be held to be equal to six per cent of absolute acid, and in all cases the strength shall be determined in such a manner as is established by the Governor in Council.

Acid, acetic crude, and pyroligneous crude, of any strength not exceeding thirty per cent, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Acid, muriatic and nitric, and all mixed or other acids, n.e.s., twenty per cent ad valorem.

Acid, sulphuric, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Acid phosphate, n.o.p., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Sulphuric ether, and chloroform, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

All medicinal, chemical and pharmaceutical preparations, when compounded of more than one substance, including patent and proprietary preparations, tinctures, pills, powders, troches, lozenges, syrups, cordials, bitters, anodynes, tonics, plasters, liniments, salves, ointments, pastes, drops, waters, essences and oils, n.o.p.; provided that drugs, pill-mass and preparations not including pills or medicinal plasters, recognized by the British or the United States Pharmacopœia or the French Codex as official, shall not be held to be covered by this item ; all liquids, thirty-five per cent ad valorem; and all others, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Pomades, French or flour odours preserved in fat or oil for the purpose of conserving the odours of flowers which do not bear the heat of distillation, when imported in tins of not less than ten pounds each, fifteen per cent ad valorem.

Perfumery, including toilet preparations (non-alcoholic), viz. : Hair oils, tooth and other powders and washes, pomatums, pastes, and all other perfumed preparations, n.o.p., used for the hair, mouth or skin, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Liquorice paste and liquorice in rolls and sticks, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Paraffine wax, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Antiseptic surgical dressing, such as absorbent cotton, cotton wool, lint, lamb's wool, tow, jute, gauzes and oakum, prepared for use as surgical dressing, plain or medicated ; surgical belts and trusses, electric belts, pessaries and suspensory bandages of all kinds, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Cod liver oil, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Opium, crude, the outward ball or covering to be free of duty, one dollar per pound.

Opium, powdered, one dollar and thirty-five cents per pound.

Opium prepared for smoking, five dollars per pound.

Colours, Paints, Oils, Varnishes, &c.

Dry white and red lead, orange mineral and zinc white, five per cent ad valorem.

Ochres, ochrey earths, raw siennas, and colours, dry, n.e.s., twenty per cent ad valorem.

Oxides, umbers, burnt siennas, and fire-proofs, n.e.s. ; laundry blueing of all kinds, rough stuff and dry and liquid fillers, anti-corrosive and anti-fowling paints commonly used for ships' hulls, and ground and liquid paints, n.e.s., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Paints and colours, ground in spirits, and all spirit varnishes and lacquers, one dollar and twelve and one-half cents per gallon.

Paris green, dry, ten per cent ad valorem.

Ink for writing, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Blacking, shoe, and shoemakers' ink ; shoe, harness and leather dressing, harness soap, and knife or other polish or composition, n.o.p., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Putty, of all kinds, fifteen per cent ad valorem.

Turpentine, spirits of, five per cent ad valorem.

British gum, dextrine, sizing cream and enamel sizing, ten per cent ad valorem.

Varnishes, lacquers, japans, japan driers, liquid driers, and oil finish, n.e.s., twenty cents per gallon and twenty per cent ad valorem.
Linseed or flaxseed oil, raw or boiled, lard oil, neatsfoot oil, and sesame oil, twenty per cent ad valorem.
Illuminating oils composed wholly or in part of the product of petroleum, coal, shale or lignite, costing more than thirty cents per gallon, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
Lubricating oils, composed wholly or in part of petroleum, costing less than twenty-five cents per gallon, five cents per gallon.
Crude petroleum, fuel and gas oils (other than naphtha, benzine, or gasoline) when imported by manufacturers (other than oil refiners) for use in their own factories for fuel purposes or for the manufacture of gas, two and one-half cents per gallon.
Oils, coal and kerosene distilled, purified or refined, naphtha and petroleum, and products of petroleum, n.e.s., five cents per gallon.
Barrels, containing petroleum or its products, or any mixture of which petroleum forms a part, when such contents are chargeable with a specific duty, twenty cents each.
Lubricating oils, n.e.s., and axle grease, twenty five per cent ad valorem.
Olive oil, n.e.s., twenty per cent ad valorem.
Essential oils, ten per cent ad valorem.
Vaseline, and all similar preparations of petroleum for toilet, medicinal or other purposes, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Coal.

Coal, bituminous, sixty cents per ton of two thousand pounds.
Coal dust, n.e.s., imported without admixture with larger coals than will pass between parallel bars half an inch apart, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Earthenware, Cements, Slate and Stoneware.

Building brick, paving brick, stove linings, and fire brick, n.e.s., twenty per cent ad valorem.
Earthenware and stoneware, viz., demijohns, churns or crocks, thirty per cent ad valorem.
Drain tiles, not glazed, twenty per cent ad valorem.
Drain pipes, sewer pipes, chimney linings or vents, chimney tops and inverted blocks, glazed or unglazed, and earthenware tiles, thirty five per cent ad valorem.
China and porcelain ware, also earthenware and stoneware, brown or coloured and Rockingham ware, white granite or iron stoneware. "C.C." or cream-coloured ware, decorated, printed or sponged, and all earthenware, n.e.s., thirty per cent ad valorem.
Baths, tubs, wash-stands, of earthenware, stone, cement or clay, and all manufactures of cement or clay, n.o.p., and cements, n.o.p., thirty per cent ad valorem.
Cement, Portland, and hydraulic or water line, in bags, barrels or casks, the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty, twelve and one-half cents per one hundred pounds.
Plaster of Paris, or gypsum, ground not clacined, fifteen per cent ad valorem.
Plaster of Paris, or gypsum, calcined or manufactured, the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty, twelve and one-half cents per one hundred pounds.
Lithographic stones, not engraved, twenty per cent ad valorem.
Grind-stones, not mounted, and not less than twelve inches in diameter, twenty per cent ad valorem.
Flagstones, granite, rough marble, rough freestone, standstone and all building stone not hammered or chiselled, and blocks or slabs of marble sawn on not more than two sides, twenty per cent ad valorem.
Granite, flagstones, freestones, and all other building stone dressed, and marble sawn on more than two sides, n.o.p., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
Marble and granite, finished and polished, and all manufactures of marble or granite, n.o.p., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.
Manufactures of stone, n.o.p., thirty per cent ad valorem.
Roofing slate, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
Slate mantels and other manufactures of slate, n.e.s., thirty per cent ad valorem.
Slate pencils, and school writing slates, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
Mosaic flooring of any material, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Glass and Glassware.

Common and colourless window glass, and plain coloured, opaque, stained or tinted, or muffled glass, in sheets, twenty per cent ad valorem.
Ornamental, figured, and enamelled coloured glass, vitrified or painted, chipped, figured, enamelled, and obscured white glass; stained glass windows, and memorial or other ornamental window glass, n.o.p., and rough rolled plate glass, thirty per cent ad valorem.
Plate glass, not bevelled, in sheets or panes, n.e.s., thirty per cent ad valorem.
Plate glass, bevelled, in sheets or panes, n.o.p., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.
Silvered glass, bevelled or not, and framed or not, thirty per cent ad valorem.
German looking-glass (thin plate), unsilvered or for silvering, twenty per cent ad valorem.
Glass demijohns or carboys, empty or filled, bottles, decanters, flasks, phials, glass jars and glass balls, lamp chimneys, glass shades or globes, cut, pressed or moulded crystal or glass tableware, decorated or not, and blown glass tableware, thirty per cent ad valorem.
Bent plate or other sheet glass, and all other glass, and manufactures of glass, n.o.p., twenty per cent ad valorem.
Spectacles and eye-glasses, thirty per cent ad valorem.
Spectacle and eye-glass frames, and metal parts thereof, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Leather, Rubber and Manufactures of.

Dongola, cordovan, calf, sheep, lamb, kid or goat; kangaroo, alligator, or other upper leather, and all leather, dressed, waxed, glazed or further finished than tanned, n.e.s.; harness leather, scrap leather, and chamois skin, seventeen and one-half per cent ad valorem.
Skins for morocco leather, tanned but not further manufactured; sole leather, and belting leather, of all kinds, and leather tanned only, n.o.p., fifteen per cent ad valorem.
Glove leathers, tanned or dressed, coloured or uncoloured, when imported by glove manufacturers for use in their own factories in the manufacture of gloves, ten per cent ad valorem.
Japanned, patent or enamelled leather, and morocco leather, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
Leather-board, leatheroid, and manufactures thereof, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Whips of all kinds, including thongs and lashes, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Belting, of leather, rubber, or other material, n.e.s., twenty per cent ad valorem.

Boots and shoes, and slippers, of any material, n.e.s., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Manufactures of raw hide, and all manufactures of leather, n.o.p., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

India-rubber boots and shoes; and all manufactures of India rubber, and gutta percha, n.o.p., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

India-rubber clothing and clothing made waterproof with india-rubber, rubber or gutta percha hose, and cotton or linen hose lined with rubber, rubber mats or matting, and rubber packing, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Metals, and Manufactures of.

Iron or steel scrap, wrought, being waste or refuse, including punchings, cuttings or clippings of iron or steel plates or sheets having been in actual use; crop ends of tin plate bars, blooms and rails, the same not having been in actual use, one dollar and fifty cents per ton. Nothing shall be deemed scrap iron or scrap steel except waste or refuse iron or steel fit only to be re-manufactured in rolling mills.

Iron in pigs, iron kentledge, and cast scrap iron, two dollars and fifty cents per ton.

Ferro-silicon, ferro-manganese, and spiegeleisen, five per cent ad valorem.

Iron or steel ingots, cogged ingots, blooms and slabs; billets unfinished measuring in size not less than ten united inches or circumference; puddled bars, loops or other forms less finished than iron or steel bars but more advanced than pig iron, except castings, four dollars per ton.

Rolled iron or steel angles, tees, beams, channels, girders and other rolled shapes or sections, weighing less than thirty-five pounds per lineal yard, not punched, drilled or further manufactured than rolled, n.o.p., seven dollars per ton.

Rolled iron or steel angles, tees, beams, channels, joists, girders, tees, stars or other rolled shapes, or trough, bridge, building or structural rolled sections or shapes, not punched, drilled or further manufactured than rolled, n.e.s.; and flat eye-bar blanks not punched or drilled, fifteen per cent ad valorem.

Bar iron or steel, rolled or hammered, whether in coils, rods, bars or bundles, comprising rounds, ovals, and squares, and flats number sixteen gauge and thicker, n.o.p., and rolled iron or steel hoops, bands, scroll or strips, eight inches or less in width, number sixteen gauge and thicker, n.e.s., seven dollars per ton.

Universal mill or rolled edge bridge plates of steel when imported by manufacturers of bridges, fifteen per cent ad valorem.

Rolled iron or steel plates not less than thirty inches in width, and not less than one-quarter of an inch in thickness, n.o.p., fifteen per cent ad valorem.

Rolled iron or steel sheets or plates, sheared or unsheared, and skelp iron or steel, sheared or rolled in grooves, n.e.s., seven dollars per ton.

Skelp iron or steel, sheared or rolled in grooves, when imported by manufacturers of wrought iron or steel pipe for use only in the manufacture of wrought iron or steel pipe in their own factories, five per cent ad valorem.

Rolled iron or steel sheets thinner than number seventeen gauge, n.o.p.; Canada plates, Russia iron, flat or corrugated galvanized iron or steel sheets, terne plate, and rolled sheets of iron or steel coated with zinc, spelter or other metals, of all widths or thicknesses, n.o.p., and rolled iron or steel hoops, bands, scroll or strips thinner than number sixteen gauge, n.e.s., five per cent ad valorem.

Chrome steel, fifteen per cent ad valorem.

Steel, rolled or hammered, in bars, bands, hoops, scroll or strips, sheets or plates, of any size, thickness or width, when of greater value than four cents per pound, n.o.p., fifteen per cent ad valorem.

Swedish rolled iron and Swedish rolled steel nail rods under half an inch in diameter, for the manufacture of horse-shoe nails, fifteen per cent ad valorem.

Iron or steel railway bars or rails of any form, punched or not punched, n.e.s., for railways,—which term for the purposes of this item shall include all kinds of railways, street railways and tramways, even although the same are used for private purposes only, and even although they are not used or intended to be used in connection with the business of common carrying of goods or passengers, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Railway fish plates and tie plates, eight dollars per ton.

Switches, frogs, crossings and intersections for railways, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Locomotives for railways, n.e.s., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Iron or steel bridges, or parts thereof; iron or steel structural work, columns, shapes or sections, drilled, punched or in any further stage of manufacture than as rolled or cast, n.e.s., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Forgings of iron or steel of whatever shape or size or in whatever stage of manufacture, n.e.s., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Iron or steel castings, in the rough, n.e.s., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Stove plates, stoves of all kinds, for oil, gas, coal or wood, or parts thereof, and sad or smoothing, hatters' and tailors' irons, plated wholly or in part, or not, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Springs, axles, axle bars and axle blanks, and parts thereof, of iron or steel, for railway or tramway vehicles, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Springs, axles, axle bars and axle blanks, and parts thereof, of iron or steel, including cart or wagon skeins or boxes, n.e.s., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Cast iron pipe of every description, n.e.s., eight dollars per ton.

Wrought iron or steel boiler tubes, including flues and corrugated tubes for marine boilers, five per cent ad valorem.

Tubes of rolled steel, not joined or welded, not more than one and one-half inches in diameter; and seamless steel tubes for bicycles, fifteen per cent ad valorem.

Wrought iron or steel tubing, plain or galvanized, threaded and coupled or not, over two inches in diameter, n.e.s., fifteen per cent ad valorem.

Wrought iron or steel tubing, plain or galvanized, threaded and coupled or not, two inches or less in diameter, n.e.s., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Other wrought iron or steel pipe tubing, plain or galvanized, riveted, corrugated or otherwise manufactured, n.o.p., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Iron or steel fittings for iron or steel pipe, of every description, and chilled iron or steel rolls, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Iron or steel cut nails and spikes (ordinary builders) and railroad spikes, n.o.p., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Wrought and pressed nails and spikes, trunk, clout, coopers' cigar box, Hungarian, horse-shoe, and other nails; horse, mule, and ox shoes, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Wire nails of all kinds, n.o.p., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Composition nails and spikes and sheathing nails, fifteen per cent ad valorem.

Iron or steel shoe tacks, and ordinary cut tacks, leathered or not, brads, sprigs, and shoe nails, double pointed tacks, and other tacks of iron or steel, n.e.s., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Screws, commonly called "wood screws," of iron or steel, brass or other metal, plated or not, including lag or coach screws, and machine or other screws, n.o.p., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Coil chain, chain links, and chain shackles, of iron or steel, five-sixteenths of an inch in diameter or over, five per cent ad valorem.

Barbed wire and other wire for fencing, until January 1, 1898, fifteen per cent ad valorem; thereafter to be free, and all articles upon which duties are levied which enter into the cost of the manufacture of the said barbed or other wire shall for this purpose then be free. The whole subject to regulations to be made by the Controller of Customs.

Buckthorn, and strip fencing, of iron or steel, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Wire, single or several, covered with cotton, linen, silk, rubber or other material, including cable so covered, n.e.s., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Wire, of all metals and kinds, n.o.p., twenty per cent ad valorem.

Wire rope, stranded or twisted wire, clothes line, picture or other twisted wire and wire cable, n.e.s., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Wire cloth or wove wire, or netting, of iron, steel, brass, copper or other metal, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Needles, of any material or kind n.o.p., and pins manufactured from wire of any metal, n.o.p., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Lead, old, scrap, pig and block, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Lead, in bars, and in sheets, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Lead pipe, lead shot and lead bullets, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Lead, manufactures of, n.o.p., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Brass and copper nails, tacks, rivets and burns or washers; bells, n.e.s., and all manufactures of brass and copper, n.o.p., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Zinc, manufactures of, n.o.p., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Nickel anodes, ten per cent ad valorem.

Iron or steel nuts, washers and rivets, including tubular rivets, bolts with or without threads, and nut and bolt blanks, n.e.s., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Builders', cabinet makers', upholsterers', harness makers', and saddlers', and carriage hardware, including butts, hinges, locks, curry combs or curry cards, horse-boots, harness and saddlery, n.e.s., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Skates of all kinds, roller or other, and parts thereof, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Gas meters, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Safes, doors for safes and vaults; scales, balances, weighing beams, and strength-testing machines of all kinds, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Carvers, knives and forks of steel, butcher and table steels, oyster, bread, kitchen, cooks', butcher, shoe, farrier, putty, hacking, and glaziers' knives, cigar knives, spatulas or palette knives, razors, erasers, or office knives, pen, pocket, pruning, sportsman and hunters' knives, manicure files, scissors, trimmers; barbers', tailors' and lamp shears, horse and toilet clippers, and all like cutlery, plated or not, n.o.p.,—When any of the above articles are imported in cases or cabinets, the cases or cabinets shall be dutiable at the same rate as their contents, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Knife blades or blanks, and forks of iron or steel in the rough, not handled, filed, ground or otherwise manufactured, ten per cent ad valorem.

Celluloid, moulded into sizes for handles of knives and forks, not bored or otherwise manufactured; also, moulded celluloid balls and cylinders, coated with tin-foil or not, but not finished or further manufactured, and celluloid lamp shade blanks, ten per cent ad valorem.

Bird, parrot, squirrel and rat cages, of wire, and metal parts thereof, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Files and rasps, n.e.s., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Adzes, cleavers, hatchets, saws, wedges, sledges, hammers, crow-bars, cant-dogs and track tools; picks, mattocks, and eyes or poles for the same; anvils, vises; and tools, hand or machine, of all kinds, n.o.p., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Axes, scythes, sickles or reaping hooks, hay or straw knives, edging knives, hoes, rakes, pronged forks, snaths, farm or field rollers, post-hole diggers, and other agricultural implements, n.e.s., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Shovels and spades, iron or steel, n.e.s., and lawn mowers, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Britannia metal, nickel silver, Nevada and German silver, manufactures of, not plated, and manufactures of aluminum, n.o.p., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Sterling or other silverware; nickel platedware, gilt or electro platedware, wholly or in part, of all kinds, n.e.s., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Telephone and telegraph instruments, electric and galvanic batteries, electric motors, dynamos, generators, sockets, insulators of all kinds; and electric apparatus, n.e.s., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Electric light carbons and carbon points, of all kinds, n.e.s., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Carbons over six inches in circumference, fifteen per cent ad valorem.

Lamps, side-lights, and head-lights, lanterns, chandeliers, gas, coal or other oil fixtures and electric light fixtures, or metal parts thereof, including lava or other tips, burners, collars, galleries, shades and shade holders, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Lamp springs; and glass bulbs for electric lights, ten per cent ad valorem.

Babbit metal, type metal, phosphor tin and phosphor bronze in blocks, bars, plates, sheets and wire, ten per cent ad valorem.

Type for printing, including chases, quoins and slugs, of all kinds, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Plates engraved on wood, steel, or other metal, and transfers taken from the same, including engravers' plates of steel, polished, engraved

or for engraving thereupon, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Stereotypes, electrotypes and celluloids for almanacs, calendars, illustrated pamphlets, newspaper advertisements or engravings, and all other like work for commercial, trade or other purposes, n.e.s., and matrices or copper shells for the same, two cents per square inch.

Stereotypes, electrotypes and celluloids of newspaper columns, and bases for the same, composed wholly or partly of metal or celluloid, three-eighths of one cent per square inch ; and matrices or copper shells for the same, two cents per square inch.

Clothes wringers for domestic use, and parts thereof, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Buckles of iron, steel, brass or copper, of all kinds, n.o.p. (not being jewellery), thirty per cent ad valorem.

Guns, rifles, including air guns and air rifles not being toys, muskets, cannons, pistols, revolvers, or other fire arms ; cartridge cases, cartridge primers, percussion caps, wads, or other ammunition, n.o.p. ; bayonets, swords, fencing foils and masks ; gun or pistol covers or cases, game bags, loading tools and cartridge belts of any material, n.e.s., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Agate, granite, or enamelled iron or steel hollow ware, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Enamelled iron or steel ware, n.e.s. ; iron or steel hollow ware, plain black, tinned or coated ; and nickel and aluminum kitchen or household hollow ware, n.e.s., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Tin ware, plain or japanned, and galvanized iron or steel ware, and all manufactures of tin or of galvanized iron or steel, n.o.p., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Signs, of any material, framed or not ; and letters of any material for signs or similar use, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Fire engines and fire extinguishing machines, including sprinklers for fire protection, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Brass pumps of all kinds, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Printing presses, printing machines, lithographic presses and type-making accessories therefor ; folding machines, bookbinders' book-binding, ruling, embossing and paper-cutting machines, and parts thereof, ten per cent ad valorem.

Sewing machines, and parts thereof, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Steam engines, boilers, derricks, cranes, portable engines, horse-powers, threshers, separators, fodder or feed cutters or machines, potato diggers, farm wagons, grain crushers, fanning mills, hay tedders, wind mills, pumps ; and all machinery, stationary or portable, and parts thereof, composed wholly or in part of iron or steel, or other metal, n.e.s., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Machine card clothing, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Mould boards or shaves, or plough plates, land sides, and other plates for agricultural implements, when cut to shape from rolled plates of steel, but not moulded, punched, polished or otherwise manufactured, five per cent ad valorem.

Mowing machines, harvesters, self-binding or without binders, binding attachments, reapers, cultivators, ploughs, harrows, horse-rakes, and seed drills, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Trawls, trawling spoons, fly hooks, sinkers, swivels, and sportsman's fishing bait, and fish hooks, n.e.s., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Mr. FIELDING.

Patterns of brass, iron, steel or other metal (not being models), thirty per cent ad valorem.

Manufactures, articles or wares not specially enumerated or provided for, composed wholly or in part of iron or steel, and whether wholly or partly manufactured, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Vehicles.

Freight wagons, drays, sleighs and similar vehicles, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Buggies, carriages, pleasure carts and similar vehicles, n.e.s.; including cutters, children's carriages and sleds, and finished parts thereof, n.o.p., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Railway cars (or other cars), wheelbarrows, trucks, road or railway scrapers and hand carts, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Bicycles and tricyles, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Manufactures of Wood, Cane, Cork.

Cane, reed or rattan, split or otherwise manufactured, n.o.p., fifteen per cent ad valorem.

Corks, and other manufactures of cork wood or cork bark, n.o.p., twenty per cent ad valorem.

Lumber and timber, manufactured ; sawed boards, planks and deals planed or dressed on one or both sides, when the edges thereof are jointed or tongued and grooved, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Shingles of wood, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Pails and tubs of wood ; churns, brooms and whisks, washboards, pounders and rolling pins, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Veneers of wood, not over three thirty-seconds of an inch in thickness, ten per cent ad valorem.

Mouldings of wood, plain, gilded or otherwise further manufactured, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Wood pulp, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Manufactures of wood, n.o.p., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Fishing rods, walking sticks and walking canes, of all kinds, n.e.s., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Picture frames and photograph frames, of any material, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Umbrella, parasol and sunshade sticks or handles, n.e.s., twenty per cent ad valorem.

Coffins and caskets, and metal parts thereof, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Show cases, of all kinds, and metal parts thereof, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Billiard tables, with or without pockets, and bagatelle tables or boards, cues, balls, cue racks and cue tips, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Vulcanized fibre, kartavert, indurated fibre, and like material, and manufactures of, n.e.s., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Lead pencils of all kinds, in wood or otherwise, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

House, office, cabinet or store furniture, of wood, iron or other material, in parts or finished ; wire screens, doors, and windows ; cash registers ; window cornices and cornice poles of all kinds ; hair, spring and other mattresses, bolsters and pillows, including furniture and springs ; carpet sweepers ; blinds of wood, metal or other material, n.o.p., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Window shade or blind rollers, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Jewellery, Material therefor, &c.

Watch cases, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Clocks, watches, watch glasses, clock and watch keys, and clock movements, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Watch actions and movements, ten per cent ad valorem.

Precious stones, n.e.s., polished, but not set, pierced or otherwise manufactured, and imitations thereof, ten per cent ad valorem.

Composition metal for the manufacture of jewellery and filled gold watch cases, ten per cent ad valorem.

Jewellery for the adornment of the person, including hat pins, hair pins, belt or other buckles, and similar personal ornamental articles commercially known as jewellery, n.o.p.; and all manufactures of gold and silver, n.e.s., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Fancy writing desks, cases for jewellery, watches, silverware, platedware and cutlery; glove, handkerchief and collar boxes or cases, brush or toilet cases, and all fancy cases for similar fancy articles, of any material; dolls and toys of all kinds; ornaments of alabaster, spar, amber, terra cotta or composition; statuettes and bead ornaments, n.e.s., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Gold, silver, and aluminum leaf, Dutch or schlag metal leaf; brocade and bronze powders and gold liquid paint, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Minerals.

Asbestos in any form other than crude, and all manufactures thereof, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Plumbago, not ground or otherwise manufactured, ten per cent ad valorem.

Plumbago, ground, and manufactures of, n.e.s., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Musical Instruments.

Pianofortes, organs and musical instruments of all kinds, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Parts of pianofortes and parts of organs, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Textiles, Hats, Furs, Etc.

Cotton batts, batting and sheet wadding, cotton warps and cotton yarns, dyed or not, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Cotton fabrics, white or gray, bleached or unbleached, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Cotton fabrics, printed, dyed or coloured, n.o.p., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Damask of linen, stair linen, diaper, napkins, doylies, tray cloths, table cloths, sheeting and sheets, blankets and quilts, towels, and like articles of linen or cotton, or of linen or cotton combined, made up or not, n.o.p., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Embroideries, laces, braids, fringes, cords; elastic, round or flat; garter elastic, tassels and bracelets, n.o.p.; braids, chains, cords or other manufactures of hair, n.e.s.; handkerchiefs of all kinds; lace collars and all similar lace goods; lace nets and nettings of cotton, linen, silk, or other material; shams, curtains, when made up, trimmed or untrimmed; belts of all kinds, n.o.p.; corsets; linen, silk and cotton clothing, bed coverings, and all other articles made up by the seamstress from linen or cotton fabrics, n.o.p., thirty five per cent ad valorem.

Jeans, sateens and coutils, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Collars, and cuffs, of cotton, linen, xylonite, xyolite or celluloid, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Shirts of any material, and ladies or misses blouses, and shirt waists, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Crapes, black, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Velvets, velveteens, plush fabrics, silk velvets, and all manufactures of silk, or of which silk is the component part of chief value, n.e.s., and ribbons of all kinds and materials, thirty five per cent ad valorem.

Cotton sewing thread in hanks, three and six cord, fifteen per cent ad valorem.

Cotton sewing thread and crochet cotton, on spools or tubes, or in balls, and all other cotton thread, n.e.s., twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Silk in the gum, spun, not more advanced than singles, tram and thrown organzine, not coloured, fifteen per cent ad valorem.

Sewing and embroidery silk and silk twist, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Jute cloth, not otherwise finished than bleached or calendered, ten per cent ad valorem.

Horse clothing of jute, shaped or otherwise manufactured, thirty per cent ad valorem.

All manufactures of hemp, flax or jute, n.e.s., or of flax, hemp and jute combined, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Bags or sacks of hemp, linen or jute, and cotton seamless bags, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Felt, pressed, of all kinds, not filled or covered by or with any woven fabric, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Hair-cloth of all kinds, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Sails for boats and ships, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Cloths, not rubbered or made waterproof, whether of wool, cotton, unions, silk or ramie, sixty inches or over in width and weighing not more than seven ounces to the square yard, when imported exclusively for the manufacture of mackintosh clothing, under regulations to be adopted by the Governor in Council, fifteen per cent ad valorem.

Oiled silk and oiled cloth, and tape or other textile india-rubbered, flocked or coated, n.o.p., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloths, alpacas, orleans, cashmeres, henriettas, serges, buntings, nun's cloth, bengalines, whip cords, twills, plains or jacquards of similar fabrics, composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the camel, alpaca, goat, or like animal, not exceeding in weight six ounces to the square yard, when imported in the gray or unfinished state for the purpose of being dyed or finished in Canada, under such regulations as are established by the Governor in Council, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Socks and stockings of all kinds, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Knitted goods, n.e.s., undershirts and drawers, and hosiery of all kinds, n.e.s., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Shawls of all kinds; railway or travelling rugs and lap dusters of all kinds, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Wool, viz.:—Leicester, Cotswold, Lincolnshire, South Down combing wools, or wools known as lustre wools and other like combing wools, such as are grown in Canada, three cents per pound.

Yarns, woollen and worsted, n.e.s., thirty pef cent ad valorem.

Yarns, composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat or like animal, costing twenty cents per pound and under, fifteen per cent ad valorem.

Fabrics, manufactures, wearing apparel, and ready-made clothing, composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat or other like animal, n.e.s.; blankets and flannels of every description, cloths, doe-skins, cassimeres, tweeds, coatings, overcoatings, and felt cloth, n.e.s., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Mats, door or carriage, n.e.s., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Carpeting, rugs, mats and matting of cocoa, straw, hemp, or jute ; carpet linings and stair pads, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Turkish or imitation Turkish or other rugs or carpets ; and carpets, n.e.s., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Enamelled carriage, floor, shelf, and table oil-cloth, linoleum, and cork matting or carpets, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Window shades in the piece or cut and hemmed or mounted on rollers, n.e.s., thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Webbing, elastic and non-elastic, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Umbrellas, parasols and sunshades of all kinds and materials, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Gloves and mitts, of all kinds, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Hats, caps and bonnets, n.e.s., and hat, cap and bonnet shapes, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Braces or suspenders, and metal parts thereof, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Boot, shoe and stay laces, of any material, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Fur skins, wholly or partially dressed, fifteen per cent ad valorem.

Caps, hats, muffs, tippets, capes, coats, cloaks and other manufactures of fur, n.o.p., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Church vestments of any material, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Sundries.

Ships and other vessels, built in any foreign country, whether steam or sailing vessels, on application for Canadian register, on the fair market value of the hull, rigging, machinery and all appurtenances ; on the hull, rigging and all appurtenances, except machinery, ten per cent ad valorem ; on boilers, steam engines and other machinery, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Canoes, skiffs, or open pleasure sail-boats, of any material, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Canvas and sail twine of hemp and flax, when to be used for boats' and ships' sails, five per cent ad valorem.

Blasting and mining powder, two cents per pound.

Cannon, musket, rifle, gun and sporting powder and canister powder, three cents per pound.

Nitro-glycerine, giant powder, nitro and other explosives, three cents per pound.

Torpedoes, firecrackers, and fireworks of all kinds, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Fertilizers, compounded or manufactured, ten per cent ad valorem.

Lamp wicks, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Photographic dry plates, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Emery wheels, and manufactures of emery, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Foundry facings of all kinds, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Magic lanterns and slides therefor, philosophical, photographic, mathematical and optical instruments, n.e.s.; cyclometers and pedometers; and tape lines of any material, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Tobacco pipes of all kinds, pipe mounts, cigar and cigarette holders, and cases for the same, smokers' sets and cases therefor, and tobacco pouches, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Trunks, valises, hat boxes, carpet bags, tool bags or baskets, satchels, purses, portmonnaies, pocket-books, fly-books, and parts thereof, n.o.p., and baskets of all kinds, thirty per cent ad valorem.

Buttons of hoof, rubber, vulcanite or composition, horn, pearl or vegetable ivory, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Shoe buttons, n.e.s., and all other buttons, n.e.s., not being jewellery, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Combs for dress and toilet, including mane combs of all kinds, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Brushes, of all kinds, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Hair, curled or dyed, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Artificial flowers, twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Twine and cordage of all kinds, n.e.s., twenty per cent ad valorem.

Rove, when imported for the manufacture of twine for harvest binders, five per cent ad valorem.

Binder twine or twine for harvest binders of hemp, jute, manilla or sisal, and of manilla and sisal mixed, ten per cent ad valorem, until January 1st, 1898 ; thereafter to be free ; and all articles upon which duties are levied which enter into the cost of the manufacture of the said twine shall for this purpose then be free, under regulations to be made by the Controller of Customs.

Hammocks, lawn tennis nets, sportsman's fish nets, and other articles manufactured of twine, n.o.p., thirty per cent ad valorem.

Sugars, Syrups and Molasses.

All sugar above number sixteen Dutch standard in colour, and all refined sugars of whatever kinds, grades or standards, one cent per pound ; sugar, n.e.s., not above number sixteen Dutch standard in colour, sugar drainings, or pumpings drained in transit, melado or concentrated melado, tank bottoms and sugar concrete, one-half cent per pound ; the usual packages in which imported to be free.

Glucose or grape sugar, glucose syrup and corn syrup, or any syrups containing any admixture thereof, three-fourths of one cent per pound.

Sugar candy, brown or white, and confectionery, including sweetened gums, candied peel, and pop corn, thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Maple sugar, and maple syrup, twenty per cent ad valorem.

Syrups and molasses of all kinds, n.o.p., the product of the sugar cane or beet root, n.e.s., and all imitations thereof or substitutes therefor, three-fourths of one cent per pound.

Molasses produced in the process of the manufacture of cane sugar from the juice of the cane without any admixture with any other ingredient, when imported in the original package in which it was placed at the point of production and not afterwards subjected to any process of treating or mixing, the package in which imported, when of wood, to be free.

(a.) Testing by polariscope forty degrees or over, one and three-fourth cents per gallon;

(b.) When testing by polariscope less than forty degrees, and not less than thirty-five degrees, one and three-fourth cents per gallon, and in addition thereto, one cent per gallon for each degree or fraction of a degree less than forty degrees.

Tobaccos and Manufactures of.

Cigars and cigarettes, the weight of the cigarrettes to include the weight of the paper covering, three dollars per pound, and twenty-five per cent ad valorem.

Cut tobacco, fifty cents per pound, and twelve and one-half per cent ad valorem.

Manufactured tobacco, n.e.s., and snuff, forty-five cents per pound and twelve and one-half per cent ad valorem.

Indian corn for purposes of distillation, subject to regulations to be approved by the Governor in Council, seven and one-half cents per bushel.

All goods not enumerated in this Act as subject to any other rate of duty, nor declared free of duty by this Act, and not being goods the importation whereof is by this Act or any other Act prohibited, shall be subject to a duty of twenty per cent ad valorem.

SCHEDULE "B."

Free Goods.

Articles for the use of the Governor General.

Articles when imported by and for the use of the army and navy, viz.: Arms, military or naval clothing, musical instruments for bands, military stores and munitions of war.

Articles imported by or for the use of the Dominion Government or any of the departments thereof, or by and for the Senate or House of Commons, including the following articles, when imported by the said Government or through any of the departments thereof for the use of the Canadian militia:—Military clothing, musical instruments for military bands, military stores and munitions of war.

Articles for the personal or official use of Consuls General who are natives or citizens of the country they represent and who are not engaged in any other business or profession.

Travellers' baggage, under regulations prescribed by the Controller of Customs.

Carriages for travellers and carriages laden with merchandise, and not to incude circus troupes or hawkers, under regulations prescribed by the Controller of Customs.

Apparel, wearing and other personal and household effects, not merchandise, of British subjects dying abroad, but domiciled in Canada; books, pictures, family plate or furniture, personal effects or heirlooms left by bequest.

Settlers' effects, viz.: Wearing apparel, household furniture, books, implements and tools of trade, occupation or employment, musical instruments, domestic sewing machines, typewriters, live stock, bicycles, carts and other vehicles and agricultural implements in use by the settler for at least six months before his removal to Canada, not to include machinery, or articles imported for use in any manufacturing establishment, or for sale; provided that any dutiable article entered as settlers' effects may not be so entered unless brought with the settler on his first arrival, and shall not be sold or otherwise disposed of without payment of duty, until after twelve months' actual use in Canada; provided, also, that under regulations made by the Controller of Customs, live stock, when imported into Manitoba or the North-west Territories by intending settlers, shall be free until otherwise ordered by the Governor in Council.

Animals brought into Canada temporarily and for a period not exceeding three months, for the purpose of exhibition or of competition for prizes offered by any agricultural or other association; (but a bond shall be first given in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Controller of Customs, with the condition that the full duty to which such animals would otherwise be liable shall be paid in case of their sale in Canada, or if not re-exported within the time specified in such bond).

Horses, cattle, sheep, swine and dogs for the improvement of stock, under regulations made by the Treasury Board and approved by the Governor in Council.

Menageries, horses, cattle, carriages and harness of, under regulations prescribed by the Controller of Customs.

Admiralty charts.

Typewriters, tablets with movable fixtures, and musical instruments, when imported by and for the use of schools for the blind, and being and remaining the sole property of the governing bodies of the said schools and not of private individuals; the above particulars to be verified by special affidavit on each entry when presented.

Globes, geographcal, topographical and astronomical; maps and charts for the use of schools for the blind; pictorial illustrations of insects or similar studies, when imported for the use of colleges and schools, scientific and literary societies; manuscripts, and insurance maps, and album insides of paper.

Philosophical instruments and apparatus—that is to say, such as are not manufactured in Canada, when imported for use in universities, colleges, schools, scientific societies, and public hospitals.

Botanical and entomological specimens; mineralogical specimens; skins of birds, and skins of animals not natives of Canada, for taxidermic purposes, not further manufactured than prepared for preservation; fish skins; and anatomical preparations and skeletons or parts thereof; and specimens, models and wall diagrams for illustration of natural history for universities and public museums.

Books, viz.:—Bibles, prayer-books, psalm and hymn, and books printed in any language other than the English or French languages.

Books, embossed, for the blind, and books for the instruction of the deaf and dumb and blind.

Books printed by any government or by any association for the promotion of science or letters, and official annual reports of religious or benevolent associations, and issued in the course of the proceedings of the said associations, to their members, and not for the purpose of sale or trade.

Books, not printed or reprinted in Canada, which are included and used as text books in the curriculum of any university or incorporated college in Canada for the use of students thereof; books specially imported for the bona fide use of incorporated mechanics' institutes, public free libraries of any duly organized law associations or society for the use of its members, not more than two copies of each book, under regulations made by the Governor in Council.

Books, bound or unbound, which have been printed and manufactured more than twelve years.

Newspapers, and quarterly, monthly and semi-monthly magazines, and weekly literary papers, unbound.

Paintings, in oil or watercolours, by artists of well known merit, or copies of the old masters by such artists; and paintings in oil or water colours, the production of Canadian artists, under regulations to be made by the Controller of Customs.

Clothing and books, donations of, for charitable purposes, and photographs not exceeding three, sent by friends and not for purposes of sale.

Life boats and life-saving apparatus specially imported by societies established to encourage the saving of human life.

Coins, cabinets of, collections of medals and of other antiquities including collections of postage stamps; gold and silver coins, except United States silver coin; medals of gold, silver or copper and other metallic articles actually bestowed as trophies or prizes and received and accepted as honorary distinctions, and cups or other prizes won in bona fide competitions; and medals commemorating the Diamond Jubilee of Her Majesty Queen Victoria until the thirty-first of December, 1897.

Locomotive and railway passenger, baggage and freight cars, being the property of railway companies in the United States, running upon any line of road crossing the frontier, so long as Canadian locomotives and cars are admitted free under similar circumstances in the United States, under regulations prescribed by the Controller of Customs.

Models of inventions and of other improvements in the arts,—but no article or articles shall be deemed a model or models which can be fitted for use.

Aluminum in ingots, blocks or bars, strips, sheets or plates; alumina and chloride of aluminum, or chloralum, sulphate of alumina and alum cake; and alum in bulk only, ground or unground.

Ambergris; ammonia, sulphate of, sal-ammoniac and nitrate of ammonia; arsenic; bromine; Burgundy pitch; cinnebar, cochineal, cyanide of potassium and compounds of bromine and potassium; iodine crude, kryolite or cryolite, mineral; oxalic acid; quinine, salts of; saltpetre; calcareous tufa; alizarine and artificial alizarine; aniline oil, crude; aniline salts and arseniate of aniline; annato, liquid or solid; aniline dyes and coal tar dyes in bulk or packages of not less than one pound weight.

Antimony salts; antimony, or regulus of, not ground, pulverized or otherwise manufactured.

Asphalt or asphaltum; bone pitch, crude only; and resin or rosin in packages of not less than one hundred pounds; and resin oil.

Anchors for vessels.

Bees.

Bells, when imported for the use of churches only.

Bismuth, metallic, in its natural state; blood albumen and tannic acid.

Blast furnace slag.

Blanketing and lapping, and discs or mills for engraving copper rollers, when imported by cotton manufacturers, calico printers, and wall paper manufacturers, for use in their own factories only.

Bolting cloth not made up.

Bones, crude, not manufactured, burned, calcined, ground or steamed.

Bookbinders' cloth.

Boracic acid, and borax, ground or unground, in bulk of not less than twenty-five pounds.

Bristles and broom corn.

Brass, and copper, old and scrap, and brass or copper in bolts, bars and rods in coil or otherwise, not less than six feet in length, unmanufactured, and brass or copper in strips, sheets or plates not polished, planished or coated, and brass or copper tubing, in lengths of not less than six feet in length, and not polished, bent or otherwise manufactured, and copper in ingots or pigs.

Britannia metal in pigs, blocks or bars.

Buckram, when imported for the manufacture of hat and bonnet shapes.

Bullion, gold and silver, in ingots, blocks, bars, drops, sheets or plates unmanufactured; gold and silver sweepings; and bullion or gold fringe.

Burr-stones, in blocks, rough or unmanufactured, not bound up or prepared for binding into mill-stones.

Caplins, unfinished Leghorn hats, and manilla hoods.

Casts as models for the use of schools of design.

Cane and rattans, not manufactured; osiers or willows; and bamboos, unmanufactured, and bamboo reeds not further manufactured than cut in suitable lengths for walking sticks or canes, or for sticks for umbrellas, parasols or sunshades.

Cat-gut or worm-gut or gut cord, or strings for musical instruments and clock or whip cord gut, unmanufactured.

Celluloid, xylonite or xyolite in sheets, and in lumps, blocks or balls in the rough.

Chloride of lime, in packages of not less than twenty-five pounds weight; cobalt, ore of; oxide of cobalt, oxide of tin and oxide of copper, copper, copper precipitate of, crude; dragon's blood; gypsum, crude (sulphate of lime; lava, unmanufactured; magnesia, oxide of; phosphorous; litharge; saffron, saffron cake, saf-flower, and extract of; sulphate of iron (copperas); sulphate of copper (blue vitriol); sulphur and brimstone, crude, or in roll or flour; tartar emetic and gray tartar; cream of tartar in crystals and argal or argols; verdigris, or sub-acetate of copper, dry; zinc, salts of.

Chronometers and compasses for ships.

Citron, lemon and orange rinds in brine.

Clays, including China clay, fire clay and pipe clay; gannister and sand.

Coal, anthracite and anthracite coal dust; coke.

Coal and pine pitch, and coal and pine tar in packages of not less than 15 gallons.

Coir and coir yarn; cotton wool and cotton waste, not dyed, cleaned, bleached or otherwise manufactured; cotton yarns, number forty and finer; and mohair yarns.

Communion plate, when imported for the use of churches.

Crucibles, clay or plumbago.

Curling stones.

Cups, brass, being rough blanks, for the manufacture of paper shells or cartridges, when imported by manufacturers of brass and paper shells and cartridges, for use in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories.

Diamonds, unset, diamond dust or bort and black, for borers; and diamond drills for prospecting for minerals, not to include motive power.

Domestic fowls, pure-bred, for the improvement of stock, homing or messenger pigeons and pheasants and quails.

Drugs, crude, such as barks, beans, berries, flowers, roots, balsams, buds, bulbs, fruits, insects, grains, gum and gum resins, herbs, leaves, nuts, fruit and stem seeds,—which are not edible and which are in a crude state and not advanced in value by refining or grinding or any other process of manufacture and not otherwise provided for; egg yolk; fuller's earth, in bulk only, not prepared for toilet or other purposes; lead, nitrate and acetate of, not ground; litmus and all lichens, prepared or not prepared; musk, in pods or in grain; roots, medicinal, viz.:—alkanet, crude, crushed or ground, aconite, calumba, foliæ digitalis, gentian, ginseng, jelap, ipecacuanha, iris, erris, root, liquorice, sarsaparilla, squills, taraxacum, rhubarb and valerian, unground; vaccine and

ivory vaccine points ; gum chicle or sappato gum, crude ; platinum and black oxide of copper, for use in the manufacture of chlorate ; potash, chlorate of, not further prepared than ground, and free from admixture with any other substance.

Duck for belting and hose, when imported by manufacturers of such articles for use in the manufacture thereof in their own factories.

Dyeing or tanning articles, in a crude state, used in dyeing or tanning, n.e.s.; berries for dyeing or used for composing dyes ; tumeric, nut galls and extracts thereof ; lac, crude, seed, button, stick and shell ; indigo, indigo paste and extract of, and indigo auxilliary or zinc dust ; persis, or extract of archil and cudbear ; terra japonica ; gambier or cutch, extract of logwood, fustic, oak and of oak bark ; camwood and sumac and extract thereof, tanners' bark, hemlock bark and oak bark ; ground logwood, ground fustic, and ground oak bark ; iron liquor, solutions of acetate or nitrate of iron for dyeing and calico printing ; madder and munjeet, or indian madder, ground or prepared, and all extracts of ; red liquor, a crude acetate of aluminum prepared from pyroligneous acid, for dyeing and calico printing.

Emery in bulk, crushed or ground.

Felt, adhesive for sheathing vessels.

Fertilizers, uncompounded or unmanufactured, including kainite or German potash salts, German mineral potash, bone dust, bone black or charred bone or bone ash, fish offal or refuse, guano and other animal or vegetable manures.

Fibre, Mexican, natural, and tampico or istle and vegetable fibres ; fibrilla, flax fibre and flax tow ; grass, manilla, esparto or Spanish, and other grasses, and pulp of, including fancy grasses, dried but not coloured or otherwise manufactured ; moss, Iceland, and other mosses, seagrass and seaweed, crude or in their natural state, or cleaned only ; and kelp.

Fire bricks, for use in process of manufacture.

Fillets of cotton and rubber not exceeding seven inches wide when imported by or for the use of manufacturers of card clothing in their own factories.

Fish hooks, for deep sea or lake fishing, not smaller in size than No. 2/0 ; bank, cod, pollock and mackerel fish lines ; and mackerel, herring, salmon, seal, seine, mullet, net and trawl twine in hanks or coil, barked or not—in variety of sizes and threads—including gilling thread in balls, and head ropes, barked marline, and net morsels of cotton, hemp or flax, and deep-sea fishing nets or seines, not to include hooks, lines or nets commonly used for sportsmen's purposes.

Flint, flints and ground flint stones ; felspar, cliff, chalk, China or Cornwall stone, ground or unground ; gravels ; precious stones, in the rough.

Florist stock, viz.: Palms, orchids, azaleas, cacti and flower bulbs of all kinds ; seedling stock for grafting, viz.: Plum, pear, peach and other fruit trees ; seeds, viz.: Annato, beet, carrot, flax, turnip, mangold and mustard ; aromatic seeds which are not edible and are in a crude state, and not advanced in value or condition by grinding or refining, or by any other process of manufacture, viz.: Anise, anise star, caraway, cardamom, coriander, cumin, fennel, and fenugreek ; Beans, viz.: Tonquin, vanilla, and nux vomica, crude only, locust beans and locust bean meal, and cocoa beans, not roasted, crushed or ground ; Fruits, viz.: Bananas, plantains, pine-apples, pomegranates, gauvas, mangoes and shaddocks ; and wild blueberries, wild strawberries and wild raspberries ; and trees, n.e.s.

Fossils ; shells, tortise and mother of pearl, and other shells, unmanufactured.

Foot-grease, being the refuse of cotton seed after the oil has been pressed out, but not when treated with alkalies ; and grease, rough, the refuse of animal fat, for the manufacture of soap and oils only.

Fur skins of all kinds not dressed in any manner.

Gold-beaters' moulds and gold-beaters' skins.

Gums, viz.:—Amber, Arabic, Australian, copal, dammar, elemy, kaurie, mastic, sandarac, Senegal, shellac ; and white shellac in gum or flake, for manufacturing purposes ; and gum tragacanth, gum gedda and gum barberry.

Hair, cleaned or uncleaned, but not curled, dyed or otherwise manufactured ; and horse-hair not further manufactured than simply cleaned and dipped or dyed, imported by manufacturers of hair-cloth for use in the manufacture of such article in their own factories.

Hatters' furs, not on the skin, and hatters' plush of silk or cotton ; and hatters' bands (not cords), bindings, tips and sides, hat sweats and linings both tips and sides, when imported by hat and cap manufacturers for use in the manufacture of these articles in their own factories.

Hemp, undressed.

Hemp paper, made on four-cylinder machines and calendered to between ·006 and ·008 inch thickness for the manufacture of shot shells ; primers for shot shells and cartridges, and felt board sized and hydraulic pressed, and covered with paper or uncovered, for the manufacture of gun wads, when such articles are imported by manufacturers of shot shells, cartridges and gun wads, to be used for these purposes only in their own factories, until such time as the said articles are manufactured in Canada; Provided always that the said articles, when imported, shall be entered only at such port or ports as are named by the Controller of Customs, and at no other place ; samples of such articles to be furnished to the collector of the said port or ports by the Customs Department for the guidance of the officers when accepting free entries of such materials.

Hides and skins, raw, whether dry, salted or pickled, and raw pelts.

Hoofs, horn strips, horn and horn tips, in the rough, not polished or otherwise manufactured than cleaned.

Hoop iron not exceeding three-eighths inch in width and being twenty-five gauge and thinner used for the manufacture of tubular rivets.

Ice.

Indian corn, n.e.s.

Ingot moulds, iron sand or globules or iron shot and dry putty for polishing glass or granite.

Iron or steel masts, or parts thereof, and iron or steel sheets, plates, beams, angles, knees, and cable chain ; and iron, steel or brass manufactures which at the time of their importation are of a class or kind not manufactured in Canada, when imported for use in the construction or equipment of iron, steel or composite ships or vessels.

Ivory and ivory nuts, piano key ivories and veneers of ivory unmanufactured.

Junk, old.

Jute and jute butts ; and jute cloth, as taken from the loom, not coloured, cropped, mangled, pressed, calendered nor finished in any way.

Jute, flax or hemp yarn, plain, dyed or coloured, jute canvas, not pressed or calendered, when imported by the manufacturers of carpets, rugs and mats, jute webbing or jute cloth, ham-

mocks, twines and floor oil cloth, for use in the manufacture of these articles only, in their own factories.

Lamp black and ivory black.

Lastings, mohair cloth, or other manufactures of cloth, when imported by manufacturers of buttons for use in their own factories, and woven or made in patterns of such size, shape or form, or cut in such manner as to be fit for covering buttons, exclusively. These conditions to be ascertained by special examination by the proper officer of customs, and also certified on the face of each entry.

Leeches.

Lime juice, crude only.

Locomotive and car wheel tires of steel, in the rough.

Meerschaum, crude or raw.

Metal glove fasteners ; papier-maché shoe buttons, shoe eyelets, shoe eyelet hooks, and shoe lace wire fasteners.

Mineral waters, natural, not in bottle, under regulations prescribed by the Controller of Customs.

Machinery of a class exclusively used and required for mining, smelting or refining purposes, and also all materials for the construction of such machinery in Canada to be free for that purpose—the whole to be subject to regulations to be made by the Controller of Customs.

Nickel ; and ores of metal of all kinds ; and silex or crystallized quartz.

Oakum.

Oils, viz.:—Cocoanut and palm, in their natural state ; and carbolic or heavy oil ; oil of roses and ottar or attar of roses, and olive oil for manufacturing soap or for canning fish.

Oil cake and oil cake meal, cotton seed cake and cotton seed meal, and palm nut cake and meal.

Oysters, seed and breeding, imported for the purpose of being planted in Canadian waters.

Oleo-stearine and degras, when imported by manufacturers of leather and binder twine for use in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories.

Palm leaf, unmanufactured.

Plaits, plain, not to include braid or fancy trimmings, composed of chip, manilla, cotton, mohair, straw, Tuscan and grass.

Platinum wire and platinum in bars, strips, sheets or plates ; platinum retorts, pans, condensers, tubing and pipe, when imported by manufacturers of sulphuric acid for use in their works in the manufacture of concentration of sulphuric acid.

Potash, muriate and bi-chromate of, crude, caustic potash, and red and yellow prussiate of potash ; also pot and pearl ash, in packages of not less than twenty-five pounds weight.

Prunella.

Pumice and pumice stone, ground or unground.

Quicksilver.

Quills in their natural state or unplumed.

Rags of cotton, lines, jute, hemp and woollen, paper waste clipping and waste of any kind except mineral.

Rennet, raw and prepared.

Ribs of brass, iron or steel, runners, rigs, caps, notches, ferrules, mounts and sticks or canes in the rough, or not further manufactured than cut into lengths suitable for umbrella, parasol or sunshade or walking sticks, when imported by manufacturers of umbrellas, parasols and sunshades for use in their factories in the manufacture of umbrellas, parasols, sunshades or walking sticks.

Rubber and gutta percha, crude, caoutchouc or india-rubber, unmanufactured ; powdered rubber and rubber waste ; hard rubber in sheets but not further manufactured, and recovered rubber and rubber substitute.

Rolled round wire rods in the coil, of iron or steel, under three-eighths of an inch in diameter, when imported by wire manufacturers for use in making wire in the coil, in their own factories.

Rubber thread, elastic.

Reeds, square or round, and raw-hide centres, textile leather or rubber heads, thumbs and tips, and steel, iron or nickel caps for whip ends, when imported by whip manufacturers, for use in the manufacture of whips in their own factories.

Rollers, copper, for use in calico printing, when imported by calico printers for use in their factories in the printing of calicoes and for no other purpose (such rollers not being manufactured in Canada).

Saddle trees, saddle jiggers and stirrups.

Salt, imported from the United Kingdom or any British possession, or imported for the use of the sea or gulf fisheries.

Sausage skins or casings, not cleaned.

Scrap iron and scrap steel, old and fit only to be re-manufactured, being part of or recovered from any vessel wrecked in waters subject to the jurisdiction of Canada.

Silk, raw or as reeled from the cocoon, not being doubled, twisted or advanced in manufacture in any way ; silk cocoons and silk waste.

Silver, nickel and German, in ingots, blocks, bars, strips, sheets or plates, unmanufactured.

Steel rails, weighing not less than forty-five pounds per lineal yard for use only in the tracks of a railway which is employed in the common carrying of goods and passengers and is operated by steam motive power only ; provided that this item shall not extend to rails for tracks of a railway which is used for private purposes only, nor shall this item extend to rails for use in the tracks of any electric railway, street railway, or tramway.

Soda, sulphate of, crude, known as salt cake, barilla or soda ash, caustic soda ; silicate of soda in crystals or in solution ; bichromate of soda, nitrate of soda or cubic nitre, sal soda, sulphide of sodium, nitrate of soda, arseniate, binarseniate, chloride, chlorate, bisulphite and stannate of soda.

Spurs and stilts, used in the manufacture of earthenware.

Steel bowls for cream separators, and cream separators.

Steel, when imported for the manufacture of files, saws, skates, hammers, augers and auger bits, straw cutters, mower and reaper knives, corset steels and dress stays, shoe shanks and tubular bow sockets and wind mills, not further manufactured than cut to size or shape, when imported for use in the manufacture of such or any of such articles by the manufacturers thereof in their own factories.

Steel strip and flat steel wire when imported into Canada by manufacturers of buckthorn, plain strip or other fencing, and safety barb wire fencing, for use in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories.

Stereotypes, electrotypes and celluloid of books, and bases and matrices and copper shells for the same, whether composed wholly or in part of metal or celluloid.

Surgical and dental instruments and surgical needles (not being furniture).

Tagging metal, plain, japanned or coated, in coils, not over one and a half inch in width, when imported by manufacturers of shoe and corset laces for use in their factories.

Tails, undressed.

Tea and green coffee imported direct from the country of growth and production. This item shall include tea and coffee purchased in bond in any country where tea and coffee are subject to customs duty, provided there is satisfactory proof that the tea or coffee so purchased in bond is such as might be entered for home consumption in the country where the same is purchased.

Teasels.

Tin, in blocks, pigs, bars and sheets, tin plates, tin crystals, tin strip waste, and tin foil, tea lead.

Timber or lumber or wood, viz.:—lumber and timber planks and boards of amaranth, cocoboral, boxwood, cherry, chestnut, walnut, gumwood, mahogany, pitch pine, rosewood, sandalwood, sycamore, Spanish cedar, oak, hickory, whitewood, African teak, black heart ebony, lignum vitæ, red cedar, redwood, satin-wood and white ash, when not otherwise manufactured than rough sawn or split or creosoted, vulcanized or treated by any other preserving process; Sawed boards, planks, deals and other lumber, when not further manufactured than dressed on one side only or creosoted, vulcanized or treated by any other preserving process; pine and spruce clapboards; timber or lumber, hewn or sawed, squared or sided or creosoted; laths, pickets and palings; staves not listed or jointed, of wood of all kinds; fire wood, handle, heading stave and shingle bolts, hop poles, fence posts, railroad ties; hubs for wheels, posts, last blocks, wagon, oar, gun, heading and all like blocks or sticks, rough hewn or sawed only; felloes of hickory wood, rough sawn to shape only, or rough sawn and bent to shape, not planed, smoothed or otherwise manufactured; hickory billets, and hickory lumber, sawn to shape for spokes of wheels, but not further manufactured; hickory and oak spokes, rough turned, not tenoned, mitred, throated, faced, sized, cut to length, round tenoned or polished; the wood of the persimmon and dogwood trees; and logs and round unmanufactured timber, ship timber or ship planking, not specially enumerated or provided for in this Act.

(D) shovel handles, wholly of wood.

Corkwood, or cork bark, unmanufactured.

Sawdust of the following woods:—Amaranth, cocoboral, boxwood, cherry, chestnut, walnut, gumwood, mahogany, pitch pine, rosewood, sandal-wood, sycamore, Spanish cedar, oak, hickory, whitewood, African teak, black heart ebony, lignum vitæ, red cedar, redwood, satin wood, white ash, persimmon and dogwood.

Treenails.

Tobacco, unmanufactured, for excise purposes, under conditions of "The Inland Revenue Act."

Tubes, rolled iron not welded or joined, under one and one-half inches in diameter, angle iron, nine and ten gauge, not over one and one-half inch wide, iron tubing, lacquered or brass covered, not over one and one-half inch in diameter,—all of which are to be cut to lengths for the manufacture of bedsteads, and to be used for no other purpose,—when imported by or for manufacturers of iron or brass bedsteads to be used for such purposes only in their own factories, until such time as any of the said articles are manufactured in Canada.

Turpentine, raw or crude.

Turtles.

Ultramarine blue, dry or in pulp.

Varnish, black and bright, for ships' purposes.

Whalebone, unmanufactured.

Whiting or whitening, paris white or gilders' whiting, blanc fixé and satin white.

Wire, crucible cast steel.

Wire rigging for ships and vessels.

Wire, of brass, zinc, iron or steel, screwed or twisted, or flattened and corrugated, for use in connection with nailing machines for the manufacture of boots and shoes, when imported by the manufacturers of boots and shoes to be used for such purpose only in their own factories.

Wool and the hair of the camel, alpaca, goat and other like animals, not further prepared than washed, n.e.s.; and worsted tops and noils, being the short wool which falls from the combs in worsted factories.

Wool or worsted yarns, when genapped, dyed or finished and imported by manufacturers of braids, cords, tassels and fringes to be used in the manufacture of such articles only in their own factories.

Yarn spun from the hair of the alpaca or of the angora goat, when imported by manufacturers of braids for use exclusively in their factories in the manufacture of such braids only, under such regulations as are adopted by the Controller of Customs.

Yellow metal, in bolts, bars and for sheathing.

Zinc spelter and zinc in blocks, pigs, sheets and plates; and seamless drawn tubing.

Molasses, second process, or molasses derived from the manufacture of "molasses sugar," testing by polariscope less than thirty-five degrees, when imported by manufacturers of blacking, for use in their own factories, in the manufacture of blacking, conditional that the importers shall, in addition to making oath at the time of entry that such molasses is imported for such use and will not be used for any other purpose, cause such molasses to be at once mixed in a proper tank made for the purpose with at least one-fifth of the quantity thereof of cod, or other oil, whereby such molasses may be rendered unfit for any other use, such mixing to be done in the presence of a customs officer at the expense of the importer, and under such further regulations as may, from time to time, be considered necessary in the interest and for the protection of the revenue, and that until such mixing is done and duly certified on the face of the entry thereof by such customs officer the entry shall be held to be incomplete and the molasses subject to the usual rate of duty as when imported for any other purpose.

SCHEDULE "C."

Prohibited Goods.

Books, printed paper, drawings, paintings, prints, photographs or representations of any kind of a treasonable or seditious, or of an immoral or indecent character.

Reprints of Canadian copyright works, and reprints of British copyright works.

Coin, base or counterfeit.

Oleomargarine, butterine or other similar substitutes for butter.

Tea adulterated with spurious leaf or with exhausted leaves, or containing so great an admixture of chemical or other deleterious substances as to make it unfit for use.

Goods manufactured or produced wholly or in part by prison labour, or which have been made within or in connection with any prison, jail or penitentiary.

SCHEDULE "D"—RECIPROCAL TARIFF.

On all the products of countries entitled to the benefits of this Reciprocal Tariff, under the

provisions of section 15, the duties mentioned in Schedule "A" shall be reduced as follow:—

On and after the twenty-third day of April, 1897, and until the thirtieth day of June, 1898, inclusive, the reduction shall in every case be one-eighth of the duty mentioned in schedule "A" and the duty to be levied, collected and paid shall be seven-eighths of the duty mentioned in schedule "A."

On and after the first day of July, 1898, the reduction shall in every case be one-fourth of the duty mentioned in schedule "A," and the duty to be levied, collected and paid shall be three-fourths of the duty mentioned in schedule "A."

Provided, however, that these reductions shall not apply to any of the following articles, but such articles shall in all cases be subject to the duties mentioned in schedule "A," viz.:—Ales, beers, wines, and liquors; sugar, molasses, and syrups of all kinds, the product of the sugar cane or beet root; tobacco, cigars and cigarettes.

Mr. FOSTER moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.05 a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 23rd April, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PETITIONS FOR PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. LANDERKIN moved:

That all the petitions for private Bills presented on Thursday, the 22nd instant, together with those presented this day, be read and received forthwith.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 48) respecting the Dominion Building and Loan Association.—(Mr. Cowan.)

Bill (No. 49) respecting the Richelieu and Lake Memphremagog Railway Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Bill (No. 50) respecting the Atikokan Island Range Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment.)

Bill (No. 51) respecting the Langenburg and Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Richardson.)

Bill (No. 52) respecting the James' Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Lount.)

Bill (No. 53) to revive and further amend the Act respecting the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company, and to change the name of the company to the Saskatchewan and Pacific Railway and Mining Company.—(Mr. Lount.)

Bill (No. 54) respecting the North American Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. Lount.)

Bill (No. 55) to incorporate the Minden and North-western Railway Company.—(Mr. Lang, for Mr. McHugh.)

Bill (No. 56) respecting the Medicine Hat Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Lount.)

Bill (No. 57) to amend the Act authorizing the granting of pensions to the North-west Mounted Police Force, chapter 26, 52 Vic.—(Mr. Davin.)

REPORT.

Report of the Minister of Agriculture for the Dominion of Canada for the calendar year 1896.—(Mr. Mulock.)

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the laborious efforts of yesterday have had the effect, for the present at least, of keeping my two hon. friends, brave coadjutors in presenting the long tariff disquisition to this House yesterday, from taking their accustomed places in the House. However, I shall hope that perhaps a little later in the afternoon we may be favoured with their presence; and if we are not, we have at least the presence of our hon. friend who, on a memorable occasion in one of the Ontario counties, in a burst of confidence to certain persons who were more than friendly to him, and before a certain set of other persons who, in about his own words, were trying to stab him in the back, declared that when the Liberal party got into power he had little doubt that he would be asked to take the position of Minister of Finance. So, if the present Minister of Finance and his coadjutor are absent, I have the great pleasure of presenting my remarks to the Finance Minister in esse. The House was no doubt a good deal amused as well as interested in the performance of yesterday. From four o'clock until near midnight, with

the exception of the dinner hour, we were treated to a succession of kaleidoscopic variations—dissolving views, as is suggested by an hon. friend behind me—which certainly had the effect of keeping us awake; because at no one particular point in the address was any person able to conclude what would be the next step in the programme. The arguments certainly did not lack in diversity. True to themselves and to their party history, the Government of my hon. friend the Prime Minister carried into their tariff to the very end that same delightful love of change and variety, that same indefiniteness and uncertainty, which in the last six years, to go no further back, has been one of the chief characteristics of the party then in Opposition, and now occupying the Treasury benches; and to-day I doubt if there is a single man sitting on those benches who up to this hour has any definite idea of what is either the scope of that tariff or what its effect will be upon the industries of this country. I have to confess candidly that I have not been able to make up my mind yet on these particulars, either of them. I know I am at a disadvantage in attempting to criticise the tariff presentation of yesterday; for up to the present time I am without a sight of one single resolution or item which was brought down yesterday by the Finance Minister. Neither in manuscript nor in print have I been able to see it where I could authoritatively place my fingers upon it and know that I would be certain in directing criticism upon any one item. Contrary to all precedent in this House, and I believe in any other constitutionally governed British assembly, the items were not even all read. They were slurred over, some parts given, and some not given, some read in part and some allowed to go without reading, until, as I say, it is practically utterly impossible for any one at this present time to say what is the tariff, what are the different items and rates, and what are the tendency and scope of the changes that have been made. Under these circumstances I must certainly direct my criticism to the general lines—I will not call them principles—which underlie this tariff revision.

But before I go to that, I have a word or two to say with reference to the first part of the speech yesterday, in relation to the finances of the country. I fear that there will be a little divergence of opinion between the Minister of Finance and myself with reference to the outcome of the current year and of the succeeding year. I am happy to know that we agree pretty closely upon the outcome of 1895-96. There is a reason for that. The figures were all down and in hand and printed, and speculation was practically outside of the question. With reference to the year 1895-96, there is nothing at all that I can find fault with, if I were disposed to do it, in the presentation given by the hon. Minister of Finance. Barring a little item with reference to the $2,394,000 of the Quebec subsidies, and which, after a question from myself, the hon. gentleman and myself agreed in, across the floor of the House, there is nothing I would have the least disposition to find fault with, and I am happy to know that the Liberal-Conservative Government, which was in power in this country from 1878, went out of power with a record on its financial side so well-grounded and favourable as that which has been given to us by the Finance Minister of the day himself with reference to 1895-96. As if he intended to knock himself over in order to have the pleasure of picking himself up, he gave his own answer to all that rather long and tedious discussion about the utter failure of the National Policy and the bitter disappointment that it had been to the country, by showing, under the testimony and seal of the public documents, that in its eighteenth year of work, after a period of great depression extending from 1890 to 1895, the state of the revenue, the state of the finances, the state of the country were, in every respect, what a conservative and honourable Finance Minister could characterize as being firm and as showing both buoyancy and expansion, so far as the revenue and the progress of the country are concerned. What does that show, according to the statements of the hon. Finance Minister himself? First, that an expenditure was made in that year of $50,000 less than I had estimated for in the Budget of the preceding year, $900,000 less than the Estimates which were brought down and passed and placed into my hands to expend, and $1,200,000 less than was expended by that same Government in the year preceding, giving for ever a quietus to the argument, which has been over and over again advanced by hon. gentlemen opposite, that the Liberal-Conservative party had played with the finances of the country recklessly when political contests were coming and political support had to be called upon. In that last year, 1895-96, the revenue came to within $330,000 of what I had estimated it, and would have reached my estimate if it had not been for the unfortunate apple of discord which hon. gentlemen opposite, by the stand they took in the elections which terminated in June, 1896, threw into the business arena, causing uncertainty, causing men to be cautious in their business oprations, and which diminished the revenue by the fear of an eventuality which might occur. Sir, it showed more than that. It showed a deficit which, in the lean and depressing years, at first amounted to $1,200,000 and then to $4,100,000, a deficit, be it remembered, which was only possible by the fact that large reductions were made upon raw sugar, and that consequently the deficit to the public was represented by a corresponding gain to the pockets of the people through the non-imposition of the heavy

duties upon sugar. And that deficit of $4,000,000 in 1894-95 was brought down to almost an equilibrium, leaving but $330,000, or less than a third of a million, on the wrong side of the account in the year 1895-96. And what my hon. friend might have said but did not say, probably because it escaped him, or was not germane to the work then in hand, which is the better supposition, is that whereas the Liberal-Conservative party, with that much-abused National Policy which accompanied its birth and which was held by it just as firmly in 1896, had increased the exports of this country which had been lowered in 1878 to $71,500,000 under the old tariff policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, and raised them in 1896 to $121,500,000, high-water mark in the trade history of Canada, and $7,500,000 over the preceding year. He might have said that that same policy and party, now so much abused, had increased the imports of the country, which had been lowered to the paltry sum of $80,000,000, under the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite, to $110,500,000 in 1896, $5,500,000 over the increase in the preceding year. So that the increase in trade amounted to $80,500,000 from 1878 to 1896, and in 1896 showed a total gain of $13,000,000 over 1895, and left the trade of Canada at the highest point it has reached since 1867. He might have said also that the Liberal-Conservative party, when it went out of office, left the credit of this country unimpeached and unimpaired and standing in the great money markets of London at high-water mark. He might have added that the customs taxation, which has been so much and so ignorantly talked about, was, under the Liberal-Conservative party and its policy, in the year 1895-96, but 18 per cent upon all goods entered for consumption in this country, and the average from 1892 to 1896 was but 17½ per cent. He might have equally added that the customs quantum paid in per head by the people was, in 1895-96, $3.94, and in the period of five years, which I mentioned before, $3.95 per head, bearing in mind that in 1875, when hon. gentlemen opposite were in office, it reached $3.95 per head, and in the average of their regime was $3.45 per head. That, Sir, I think, is a very good showing and a very good record for a much-abused party and a much-abused policy.

But I might go just a step further and point out some of the items with reference to which the trade of this country made an excellent showing in 1895-96. It has been said that the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party was a bad one for the farmer and bad for agricultural products. Who does not recollect having heard that indictment out of the mouths of hon. gentlemen opposite? To-day we have our vindication. The agricultural schedule stands. That policy worked so well that the exports of agricultural products under it continually increased, and without going back to ancient history—taking the period of 1895 and 1896—we find that cheese, bacon, hams, apples, wheat, flour, horses, sheep and cattle were exported to the amount of $37,600,000 as against an export of $22,000,000 in 1890. We find that agricultural products and the products of animals taken together were raised from an export in 1890 of $37,000,000 to an export in 1896 of $50,500,000, or pretty nearly 40 per cent of an increase.

In the export of manufactured articles the year 1895-96 shows a very large increase. In 1890 the exports of these articles amounted to $5,741,000, and in 1895 they had risen to $7,768,000, while in 1895-96 they increased to $9,365,000, showing a very great and notable increase. Now, these are what I mentioned, taken together, as proofs that the National Policy, as carried out by the Liberal-Conservatives, was worthy of its conception, worthy of the maintenance the Liberal-Conservatives so firmly and strongly gave to it, worthy of the confidence it maintained in this country from 1878, and which, aside from all other issues, and in the face of my hon. friend opposite, it maintains on both sides of this House and among both political parties in this country to-day. So much for the record of 1895-96, on which between my hon. friend and myself there was a most delightful harmony, so far as the financial statements were concerned.

But I fear that that harmony must be subjected to a slight discord when we come to speak of the financial outcome of the year 1896-97. My hon. friend estimated the revenue for this year to be $37,296,655. My estimate is different. I propose to place it on the record, and, at the end of the year, time, the great arbiter, will decide which of the two is nearer the fact. Up to April 20th, 1897, $30,254,403 had been gathered in. From April 20th to July 1st last year $7,892,251 had been collected. If we add these two together, we get something like the estimate that my hon. friend made of what he would probably receive during the current year. But my hon. friend seems to forget that he has been borrowing from the future within the last six weeks, and borrowing very largely. If he had made his Budget speech on the 1st of March this year, he would have had to show a loss of $700,000 during this as compared with the same period of last year. But on the 20th of April he can show an excess of $1,528,000. Thus there has been a gain up to April 20th, 1897, and the whole of it accruing within March and April, of $2,228,065. Does my hon. friend think that he can eat the hare and have it running around at the same time? Now, I am not going to be so cruel as to say he will have to pay back all that borrowing, but I am going to say that he will have to pay back the most of it, and that the months that are to come between this and July 1st will be lean months for his revenue. The conclusion I come to is that

while you have to deduct the borrowing from the amount which last year accrued between April 20th and July 1st, and which would leave $5,564,000. I am willing to concede that possibly the conditions of uncertainty being removed, there will be a betterment of three-quarters of a million dollars. Adding that you make, for the remainder of this year, $6,414,000, which added to what has already been received would give, in round numbers, a revenue of $36,600,000. So that my estimate is that the hon. gentleman will receive, not $37,296,000, but—and I think he will be happy and fortunate if he does receive that—about $36,600,000. So much for revenue.

On the other side of the account, my hon. friend estimated that he would expend $37,857,000. Well, Sir, he must remember that, up to April 20th, in his expenditure of $25,463,830, he is about a million dollars ahead of the same period for last year. If he goes on expending in the same ratio—and I do not think he will find his hands strong enough to repress the exuberant ideas of some of his colleagues, notably the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) and the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair)—he will find that the ratio of increase will go on for the remaining term. So I add for increase $750,000, and so make up my estimate of the expenditure for the year, which is $38,600,000. Now there appears an important difference in calculation. On the calculation of my hon. friend, his deficit would be about half a million, which he was good enough to say might be doubled—not a very close estimate. On my calculation the estimated deficit is $2,000,000 instead of $500,000. So, when we come to calculate the addition to the debt, my estimate is that the capital expenditure going up to $4,300,000, the deficit and sinking funds balancing each other, there will be a net addition to the debt, not of $1,750,000, as my hon. friend said, but of over $4,000,000. Now, he ridiculed the idea that he would have to borrow in the money markets of the world during the current year $10,000,000. He declared that I had said that he would have to borrow $10,000,000 and spend the most of it for current expenditure, and not on capital account. If I said that, I strained the point. I could not have meant that the whole $10,000,000 would be spent in that way, for I had just made the calculation as to consolidated fund expenditure and capital expenditure, upon which I based that estimate, and, in the face of my own calculation, I could not have thrown the whole expenditure upon consolidated fund. If the statement was made it was to that extent an error. But, if my calculations are right, what my hon. friend will have to borrow in the markets of the world is at least $10,000,000 during the current year 1896-97. Thus there is a very great disparity between our calculations. There is no need for us, I suppose, to recriminate. Both estimates will have to go before the great arbiter time, to see which is correct.

Now, I do not think it is necessary or wise for me to follow my hon. friend further than the year 1896-97. Conditions change so rapidly with our friends opposite, that I would not like to trust myself upon that shifting sand and make any calculation. He has given us his estimate that he will have a net debt increase of $3,750,000, that he will have expenditure of $38,250,000 for 1897-98. If so, he will have to cut down the estimates very considerably, and he will have to be much more repressive, much more coercive than the doctrines of gentlemen opposite, who believe in sunny ways and conciliation, would lead me to suppose he would be.

So much, then, with reference to that point. I want to pass on now for a moment to the next, and ask a question by way of introduction: What pledge that my hon. friends gave to the country during the last year aye, or the last seventeen years as to their action on the finances and on the tariff, up to the present moment, has been carried out? That is a fair question for discussion; I will not discuss it in a heated manner, but so far as I can, I will take a cool and analytical method, premising what I am going to say by this remark, that the only safety republican institutions have, and constitutional government has, in a country like this, is the safety to be found in the perfect honesty with which political parties will keep the pledges which they make. Sir, if it be admissible in this country for the leader of a party, or a party, to take its stand upon certain pronouncements which it calls its principle, to nail those principles to the masthead, to carry them through the country, and get the reins of government confided to them on the contract implied between their pledges and the people who trust their pledges, and afterwards, by stress of partisan necessity, deliberately and utterly to go back upon those pledges, and then to look into the face of the electorate, saddened and outraged by the deception which they see has been practised upon them, with an impudent leer, or the smart remark: "Ah, well, we got ahead of you fellows, anyway, by it"—if that is to hold in the public life of this country, then I have not understood, and do not not to-day know, the temper of the freemen of Canada. More than all, Sir, if the man who is chosen by his fellows as their leader and mouthpiece, either through ignorance of the conditions that prevail inside the country or out of it, or from a thoughtlessness in asserting what he does not know that he can carry out, poses before the public on a line of policy which he declares is immutable and firm, and will be put into practice if he is intrusted with the reins of power, and if he then fails to do it, how can the electorate of this country continue confidence to the leader of a party under those conditions? I simply premise these

things. They are true, my hon. friend knows they are true. Now, I proceed to the analysis as to whether these pledges have been made, and whether they have been kept.

First, Sir, with reference to the expenditure of this country. Has there been a time within the last fifteen years when my hon. friend opposite, the leader of the Government has not taken his stand on the ground of condemning the party opposed to him, the then Government of the day, taken his stand upon the bed rock principle that the expenditures of the Liberal-Conservative Government were heavy, were too heavy, and ought not to increase; and that if the Liberal party came into power, they would be cut down? Can there be any dissent to that? If one gentleman on that side rises to dissent, I have simply to place before him the statement of his leader, who, in the last campaign, put the top stone upon it, in that canvass that he made through this country from one end of it to the other, in speeches that he made in the city of Toronto and in Montreal, and in two of which he made statements that I will read. But first, I will give the statement of the convention of 1893, with reference to it:

Moved by Mr. Gibbons,—We cannot but view with alarm the large increase of the public debt and of the controllable annual expenditure of the Dominion, and the consequent undue taxation of the people under the governments that have been continuously in power since 1878, and we demand strict economy in the administration of the Government of the country.

Now, Sir, in Brantford, and in Toronto, the present leader of the Government, standing then for his party, the impersonation of the principles of the party, so far as it had principles, standing as the bright and special impersonation, chivalric and brave, of those principles, declared:

Do you imagine there is any justification for this extraordinary expenditure? The Conservatives tell us there is a justification. Population has increased, they say. O yes, it has increased 9 per cent, but the expenditure has increased 100 per cent. There can be no justification for such an expenditure when, as has been stated, the great bulk of it is a corrupt expenditure.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. I knew you would emphasize that with a good cheer:

Moreover, they tell us that, if we were in power, we could not retrench and economize. But I do not believe that it will be a difficult task. It would not be a very difficult task to economize to the extent of one, two, three—and Mr. Mills told his constituents, a few days ago, that it was possible to retrench to the extent of four millions a year.

In Toronto he said:

Has the expenditure gone down? No, it has gone up. It went up two, three, five, ten millions, and more, until it is now thirty-eight millions; and the Conservatives do not shrink from it, but swallow it all. If we come into power, we will follow the example of Mr. Mackenzie, and I say that, although we may not be able to bring back the expenditures to what they were under him, we can reduce the amount two, yes, three million dollars per year.

That is the statement of the impersonation of the principles of the Liberal party on the question of expenditures. And, Sir, there were good honest people, farmers, artisans, business men, all through this country, who looked up into the face of the leader of the Opposition, lauded by his followers as the chevalier sans peur et sans reproche, and said: That is what we want, that is what we want, an honest man to head an honest party, to bring down the expenditures of this country. Those were the terms of contract, the people signed the contract, it has been repudiated by the leader, and faith is outraged, and confidence is slain, and the political life of this country is degraded.

Mr. McMULLEN. We do not have thieves, anyway.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for North Wellington, as I understood him—he will correct me if I did not—said: We do not have thieves, anyway. He does not deny it, Mr. Speaker. He means that we had thieves on our side of the House. Let me tell him that his leader herded with thieves, took thieves' money and placed it in deposit to keep his men from being turned out at election courts; took thieves' money, knowing afterwards that it was thieves' money, allowing his party to profit by it, sitting there to-day and not making any proposition to restore it to the impoverished Quebec treasury. He slept with Pacaud, and Pacaud tolled the public contracts for his party benefit. Does my hon. friend want to know anything more about thieves? The hon. gentleman had better not appeal to time. Time passes, and time will make some revelations yet.

But, Sir, I have a political primer here, a primer of tariff reform, published in the "Prince Edward Islander," which bears the ear marks,—shall I call them,—of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It is a primer of tariff reform, a primer which shows the Liberal policy, and says:

The Liberal party says that several millions may be lopped off the present expenditure without injury to the public service; Hon. David Mills estimates the probable saving at $4,000,000, et cetera, et cetera.

Now, Sir, has this been done; has the expenditure of the country been reduced? Let us see. The estimates brought down for 1895-96, and for 1896-97, were yesterday laid before this House. The estimate brought down by my hon. friend for 1896-97, consolidated fund, was $39,698,935. That is what has been brought down—that is not all the hon. gentleman should have brought down. My hon. friend omitted, purposely,

so that the amount should not seem so much larger at first, to provide last year, as he should have provided, for the parliamentary session which we are at present holding, like an ostrich hiding its head in the sand and thinking its body does not obtrude. Everybody knew that that money must necessarily be expended this year. In the parliamentary history of Canada such a thing has never before been done: it was called to his attention, but he did not estimate for it. That amount has to be added. An estimate of $39,698,925 was brought down. This year my hon. friend has brought down an estimate for $38,111,663. But my hon. friend has not brought down any Supplementary Estimates whatever yet, and in order to show a saving in the Estimates, he compares the amount brought down, not taking into account any Supplementary Estimates, which will be a large amount, with the previous estimate submitted by himself, and the hon. gentleman attempts to show that the Government are making a saving.

But the point of contest is not as to what saving the hon. gentleman will make next year as compared with himself during the present year, but it is as to what saving this party is going to make as compared with the party that has gone out of power. That is where the contest lies. And it will be found that for the current year there will be added to the $39,698,925 by way of Supplmentary Estimates certainly half a million, three-quarters of a million or one million of dollars—certainly half a million must come down—and I think the estimate for the current year will exceed $40,000,000.

The hon. gentleman may say, we will not spend it all. If he does not—and I do not suppose he will spend it all—he cannot save so large a margin as to save himself and his hon. friends from this position, that the Liberal party, through its leader and responsible advisers, declared they would cut down the expenditure by one, two or three or four millions of dollars, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite are going to incur an expenditure which will be at least $2,000,000 in excess of the expenditure during the last year of the Liberal-Conservative party's administration. I will not follow the hon. gentleman into the details of this estimate, because it is impossible to do so satisfactorily until the Supplementary Estimates are down, and they are not before the House at the present time.

If hon. gentlemen will take the expenditure from 1887 to 1896, a period of ten years, under the head of consolidated revenue fund, they will find that the expenditure of the Liberal-Conservative Government averaged $36,850,000, and last year's expenditure was $36,950,000. So that the Liberal-Conservatives' record of expenditure is this: That in ten years the average has been $36,850,000, and during the last year of their administration the expenditure was within that average up to a paltry sum of fifty thousand or sixty thousand dollars. On capital account, the average expenditure of the Liberal-Conservative party was $3,639,427, and in 1895-96 it was only $3,781,311, or about the average, and one million of that amount was due to an extraordinary expenditure on militia, which if it had not been incurred, would have left the ordinary expenditure on capital account at about $2,700,000, or $1,000,000 less than the average for the years from 1887 to 1896. That is the record of our expenditure.

What will hon. gentlemen opposite probably expend? The Finance Minister has submitted for the current year an estimate of $39,698,925. To that estimate he will add about $800,000 by Supplementary Estimates yet to be brought down, and that will make the total Estimates in round figures, $40,500,000, or $2,700,000 in excess of the Estimates for 1895-96. For next year the hon. gentleman estimates the expenditure at $38,111,663 without any Supplementary Estimates. I think the hon. gentleman will find before he gets through that he will have to ask for $1,900,000 in Supplementary Estimates, which, added to the amount I have stated, will make a total estimate of $40,000,000, which will be $2,200,000 over the estimate of which I spoke a moment ago. When the hon. gentleman comes to capital expenditure he will find that whereas our estimate was $3,936,220 for 1896-97, his estimate already down is $4,528,469, and adding about $200,000 in Supplementary Estimates, will give a total $4,750,000 on capital account before the current year is through. For 1897-98 hon. gentlemen opposite have already on the Table of the House Estimates for $6,386,696, which I venture to say will be raised to $7,000,000 when the supplementaries are brought down. What do we find? The estimates on capital account for 1896-97 are $800,000 higher than 1895-96, and for 1897-98 $4,000,000 higher than that. Adding consolidated fund and capital together will give on my calculations, an estimated expenditure for 1896-97 of $44,000,000; and for 1897-98 of $45,500,000. Take off the usual percentage for lapsed balances, and these gentlemen are going to expend on both these branches, from $42,000,000 to $44,000,000 per year, against $40,000,000 which we spent in 1895-96.

In the light of those facts, am I correct or not in stating, that my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier), his pamphlets, and his speakers, and his platform, have not carried out the faith they pledged to the honest electorate when they led them to believe by actual English words, made as strong as the English language could put them that if the party of the Conservatives were turned out and the party of the Liberals were put in, the expenditure would drop by one, two, three or four millions per year.

Well, Sir, have they kept their pledge with reference to taxation? With reference to taxation, they led this country to believe

that the rate of taxation was very high, and that if they got in it would be diminished. What have been the customs duties raised by the Liberal-Conservative Government from 1891 up to 1896 ?

In—	
1891-92	$20,550,000
1892-93	21,161,000
1893-94	19,379,000
1894-95	17,887,000
1895-96	20,219,000
Total for the five years....	$99,198,000

Or an average over the five years of $19,800,000 per year.

That is a percentage of 17½ per cent upon all goods entered for consumption in the country, and, as I said before, the average per capita customs rate is $3.95, as compared with an average of $3.44 from 1874 to 1878, and which rose in 1875 to $3.95.

The whole question as to whether my hon. friends opposite are going to reduce the taxation, hinges upon their expenditures. If you gentlemen expend more than we did on your consolidated revenue fund account, you must raise more revenue ; and if you raise more revenue you cannot reduce the per capita rate. You are already preparing to spend millions more each year, and you must raise the per capita of expenditure in order to meet it—unless the present Finance Minister, with a light heart and a jaunty air is going to sail out upon the financial sea for the next three or four years, thinking that he can spend millions over what he receives, and pay current expenses out of loans. But I cannot think so poorly of hon. gentlemen opposite as to think they will introduce and carry out that system. Then, if they pay their way as they go on consolidated fund account, they will have to raise the per capita rate of the customs, and consequently raise the taxation. Therefore, that pledge falls to the ground.

What, Sir, about the pledge as to the debt ? I do not know but that I ought to read something of the hon. gentlemen's announcements with reference to the debt, but they are fresh in their memory, and I am inclined to believe that our friends here have not forgotten them, so that I do not think it is any use warming up old porridge. Let us take it for granted, that one of the strong indictments against the Conservative party which they made was, that the debt was increasing rapidly and too heavily, and that a stop ought to be put to its increase. I appeal to my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who sits opposite me, whether he has not tuned on that minor key many and many a time in this House of Commons. But, Sir, what are they going to do about the debt ? Are they going to stop it growing ; are they going to reduce it ; are they going to keep it from leaping up by bounds ? Their own actions answer. Sir, the net debt in the following years was :

Net debt in 1890.....	$237,533,000
do 1896.....	258,497,000
Increase in that term.....	20,964,221

Less $2,394,000, which was a liability incurred in 1884—if it were ever incurred—and which by a method of book-keeping has now been transferred to the year 1895-96. Deducting that, it gives $18,570,000 as the increase in the net debt from 1890 to 1896, or an average of $2,652,900 each year.

Now, Sir, with the statement that I have made as to expenditure, and the statement I have made as to revenue, which are within sight in the year 1896-97, these hon. gentlemen will come out, not with a debt increase of $1,750,000, as my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) stated yesterday, for this present year, but they will come out with a debt increase of nearer $4,000,000, and with a deficit, not of $500,000, but of nearer $2,000,000. Therefore, the debt must be increased.

And as to the debt for 1897-98, with $6,000,000 and odd for capital expenditure already estimated, and more to come, and a deficit by the acknowledgment of the Finance Minister which you must add to that, deducting only the sinking fund, there will be an increase of many millions of debt in 1896-97. So that, if there were any contract made between the people of this country and hon. gentlemen opposite, on the ground of the pledges of hon. gentlemen opposite that they would decrease the debt of this country, or at least would prevent it from rolling up, then that contract so signed by one party has been ignored by the other, and they are going on the straight road towards piling up millions of debt each year.

And, Sir, what else can we expect from the various hints that come to us from different quarters ; from certain things that have transpired in the province of Nova Scotia ; from certain things that have transpired in the province of Prince Edward Island ; from certain things that are transpiring, not only as to old claims of provinces which now, when their friends are in power, they think ought to get recognition, but of the multitudinous claims rushed upon hon. gentlemen opposite to the amount of more than $50,000,000 (by the statement of the Prime Minister himself) asked for public expenditure in this country. I am afraid, Sir, when I consider the weakness that hon. gentlemen exhibited when that hungry rush was made upon them by the back benches for offices filled by honourable men, when instead of holding themselves firm against that indecent rush they gave up their better and more matured opinions, and made of the civil service of this country a sink of distrust, and spying, and general discontent and uncertainty. If they could not hold themselves firm against that rush from the back benches to turn honest

men out of office and put their own followers and partisans in, can they hold against that infinitely greater rush from the back benches, aye, and from benches very close up to the front benches, which sees millions in the public works and contracts of this country, and which is already organized and coming from near and far to exploit the public treasury? Can they hold themselves against that, and keep down the expenditure and keep down the public debt? Their actions so far say, no; their actions hereafter will, I believe, as emphatically say, no.

Now, Sir, leaving the financial side of the question, let us go a step further and ask, with reference to this tariff presentment which we had yesterday: Have they kept their pledges? Did they make any pledges when in Opposition, and when canvassing the electorate?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hardly. No, no.

Mr. FOSTER. Did they make any explicit promise?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. We promised to turn you out.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has struck the key; he strikes it true and straight every time: he says "We promised to turn you out." That was their policy; that is as much as they care, so far as the country is concerned; and it was well summed up by my hon. friend the Premier in the early part of this session, when we put his pledges right before his face and eyes, and he saw them, and saw that he had broken them, he had no other retort than to say: "Well, we are on this side, and you are on that; we are in, and you are out."

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is what the country wanted.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend struck the key, and I can depend on his doing that every time. The outs wanted to get in—that was all. Did they make any promsie with reference to the tariff? Had they any principle on which they declared they would revise it? Did they in explicit English words say what they were going to do?

An hon. MEMBER. They said it in French.

Mr. FOSTER. I believe they said it in both languages. My hon. friends opposite will say that I am going to be tedious if I am going to read some of those pledges; but my public duty impels me so strongly that I must brave even their displeasure for about half an hour.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Read the prohibition pledge.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I never heard anything more appropriate than that piteous request of my hon. friend. He knows himself better than I do, and out of the depths of his tempted heart there comes the piteous beseechment: "Read the pledge to me." If my hon. friend, after the sitting of the House, will come into a private room with me and tell me all his necessities and temptations, I will administer the pledge.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am afraid you have lost the password, and could not take me outside.

Mr. FOSTER. I never had that password; mine was another one. These pledges, Sir, are found in the sayings of prominent members of the party outside of the Premier as well as in those of the Premier himself. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), in 1890, declared:

I say, our protective system was a huge mistake, in so far as it was honest at all,——

Now, I want to pin my hon. friend. They have adopted our tariff, and I presume it is honest. So he has no leg to stand on even there.

—and in so far as it was not honest, it was a huge scheme of robbery. A small ring, clique of combiners and protected manufacturers, have, as I have told you, been permitted for years past to make a prey and plunder of the people of Canada.

Again, he said:

I stand by the declaration I have made, that protection is nothing more or less than deliberate, legalized and organized robbery; and, more than that, if you do not stamp it out,——

Is he stamping it out?

—it is the very high road to political slavery first, and industrial slavery afterwards.

Here we go, on that high-road, under the leadership of my hon. friend himself, who had adopted nine-tenths of the high protective tariff. He declares:

Our policy, from first to last, has been to destroy the villainous system of protection by free trade, revenue tariff, or continental free trade.

But it is a new doctrine that the hon. gentleman is going to destroy it by giving it a dose of itself. He says again:

They demand our policy. Well, Sir, they shall have our policy, and here I believe I speak for my hon. friends beside me. Our policy is death to protection and war to the knife to corruption.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. I knew my hon. friend would strike the key again. My hon. friend joined protection and corruption together; where are they to-day?

Sir, we strike, and we will strike, for liberty and freedom from this system of protective taxation; and I tell hon. gentlemen, that we will not rest until the slavery that has been imposed upon us has become a thing of the past, and until Canadians are as free as Canadians ought to be free, to make the most they can of the opportunity God has given them.

Again:

Our policy, from first to last, has been to destroy this villainous system of protection which has been grinding out the vitals of this country.

The Minister of Finance said last night that no Liberal had ever declared that they were going to destroy protection all at once —that it was only Liberal-Conservatives who said that. Well, Sir, at one time the present Premier was a protectionist, and to that extent a Liberal-Conservative. But the present Premier declared in 1893, after the convention :

I will not be satisfied until the last vestige of protection has been removed from the soil of Canada. Our great reform is to put away from the soil of Canada the last vestige of protection.

He declared in Victoria :

If the Liberals were successful, they would cut off the head of protection at once, and trample on its body.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies), in that mild and dulcet tone that he often assumes, declared :

We have been attacking this policy year by year. This is an accursed system, a system accursed of God and man.

And now the party that was elected to curse it, who were led out on to the mountains and shown the whole enormity, and were bidden to lift up their voice and curse, have lifted up their voice, and behold ! they have blessed it. In 1895 the Minister of Marine and Fisheries said :

Call it protection, call it feudalism, call it slavery—I care not ; it is the same thing. It differs only in degree ; it is bondage.

We are under it still ; they have adopted nine-tenths of our tariff.

The system of protection has been the bane and the curse of Canada—the bane and the curse of Canada, I repeat.

And so on, all through and through. But there was one remark of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce which is instructive. He felt that he was going to have difficulty if his party came into power ; he knew that some of them would not be for carrying out their pledges ; he felt that there was a battle of Armageddon straight ahead, and he felt constrained to warn his internecine opponents of what would come. Drawing his warning from the defeat of the Democratic party in the United States, he said :

There are two lessons which, I think, the Reformers of Canada should learn. One is presented for our example and warning in the fate that has befallen the Democratic party in the United States. It shows to all who choose to read the signs of the times, that when a party places itself at the head of a great popular movement, if that party tenders the people a stone instead of bread, it is half-hearted in the prosecution of the great aim it sets before it, and will be deservedly swept out of power by the very people who have sustained and advanced it.

Now, I do not know that I can avoid the temptation of reading something from my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies). He made a tour of the maritime provinces, he spoke in St. John to the faithful assembled, and the faithful reported him. I catch now the eye of the hon. gentleman who is editor of one of the papers in St. John (Mr. Ellis), who is a staunch Grit down there, and to-day in his heart feels that his party leaders have not quite come up to his expectations. But anyway that did not prevent him from giving a fair report, and the "Telegraph" newspaper had another, and the two reports are exactly in agreement. My hon. friend, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, there declared :

This country cannot be made poor ; it must continue in wealth and prosperity. But he was not satisfied to be contented with a mere existence, but desired to see Canada take the fullest advantage of its great resources. This could only be accomplished in one way, by means of free trade. This was the key with which they would unlock the golden door of prosperity. * * *

The Liberals maintained that any trades which required subventions to keep them alive, not only do not contribute to the natural wealth, but actually hinder the prosperity of a country. What has been the fate of some of these bounty-fed industries here? Where are the tall chimneys that were promised under the National Policy? * *

Our policy is to eradicate every vestige of protection from the revenue, so as to take nothing from the people but what is absolutely necessary for the purpose of revenue. Every dollar of protection is to be eliminated, for the evil of the protective system lies not merely in the money that is paid to the Government for its revenue, but in the enormous sums which the protected manufacturer is enabled to extort from the people. The manufacturer will keep the prices up to the margin of the cost of the imported articles with the duty added, so that for every dollar of duty that goes to the Government for revenue, two dollars or more finds its way into the pocket of the protected manufacturer. Under the system which the Liberals will inaugurate, this robbery will come to an end, and our people will be permitted to buy their goods in the cheapest markets.

Yet there is the tariff of 35 per cent, in case after case and case after case, as brought down by this Government. Taking up the question of the tariff, the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), who spoke at that meeting, said :

He said that in a job like the Curran Bridge affair, $200,000 or $300,000 might be lost, but one turn of the tariff screw and millions were lost. Where hundreds were corrupted in the Curran Bridge matter, the present tariff system corrupted thousands. * * *

In the Conservative party there was a large number whose minds were not settled on the tariff question. In the old days, when there was no tariff, there were better times. The policy of to-day was sucking the life-blood of the country, and especially the maritime provinces. (Applause.) There were thousands of men in the Conservative party who are looking at the lost factories, the destroyed industries, &c., and we say to them : You have not accomplished anything by hanging on to this old nag of National Policy. If the citizens went on in the Liberal

principles, St. John will be hailed as the free trade centre of the country.

In this Prince Edward Island "Primer," which was given out by the faithful for the conversion of that tight little island, what did they say:

The Liberal policy is to so adjust the customs tariff that all the taxes paid through it shall go into the Treasury, and not into the coffers of a few favoured industries.

Where is my hon. friend to-day with his rice protected? Now, I touch a sore point in the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), with his sugar protected, with his 35 per cent upon hundreds of articles, with his tariff raised from 5 to 10 and sometimes 15 per cent over the old tariff. Where is my hon. friend's argument? Does he not feel a twinge of conscience that he ever edited a production of that kind and sent it out to the people of Prince Edward Island, and then so soon go back on the policy he there announced:

The Liberals further say, that while all citizens, according to their means, should be taxed for the support of the national Government, to tax them for the support of private enterprises, and under cover to take money from one citizen's purse to enrich another, is a gross injustice and legalized robbery.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend and his Government perpetuate that gross injustice and robbery by the very tariff they ask this Parliament to assent to to-day. I do not know whether I ought to or not read the part in this "Primer" which refers to coal oil—kerosene oil—which used to be a pet subject of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It is in his St. John speech, it is in every speech made on every platform, everybody who has heard him knows of the coal oil outrage and robbery. Why, he calculated the percentages. He put them in at 125 to 145 per cent. Coal oil—yes; when we were in power, we reduced it 11-5 cents. My hon. friends struggled awfully and reduced it 1 cent.

But I have better evidence than that. I have what is the most formal pledge a party can make—a resolution which, when in Opposition, they submitted to the House. In 1894, anticipating an election, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved this resolution:

That while recognizing in the reductions proposed an admission, to that extent, of the evils inflicted upon the people by the system of high protective duties, this House is, nevertheless, of the opinion that the amendments suggested, being based upon the principle of protection and not solely upon the requirements of the public service, are inadequate to afford satisfactory relief from the burdens of excessive and unfair taxation;

That the highest interests of Canada demand the adoption of a sound fiscal policy, which, while not doing injustice to any class, will promote domestic and foreign trade and hasten the return of prosperity to our people;

Here follows the point:

That, to that end, the tariff should be reduced to the needs of honest, economical and efficient government;——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Be ready now:

—should have eliminated from it the principle of protection to particular industries at the expense of the community at large, and should be imposed for revenue only.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) says that is good gospel, and my hon. friend voted for it then, and in his heart believed in it and believes in it to-day. Will he have the courage, when the vote is called on this tariff, to stand up and pour out his heart or will he truckle to political exigencies? Will he blindly follow the leaders who are betraying the party faith in this matter of protection?

That it should be adjusted so as to make free, or bear as lightly as possible upon, the necessaries of life, and to promote freer trade with the whole world, and particularly with Great Britain and the United States.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friends are eclectics. They belong to that peculiar school that when they subscribe to an article of faith which has five clauses, they satisfy their consciences if they keep one clause and drop or break all the others. I do not know but that I ought now to read a statement by the leader at the convention when they were arranging their platform, which statement is published in a brochure issued for campaign purposes. It is quoted from Hon. Wilfrid Laurier's convention speech:

There is taken out of the people of Canada over $20,000,000 every year in customs taxes. If every cent collected through the operation of the protective policy went into the Treasury, it could be borne, but for every one dollar that goes into the public coffers, two dollars or three dollars go into the pockets of the protected manufacturers. I, said Mr. Laurier, object to this. I say that not a cent should be collected beyond what is required to meet the country's necessities. We will tax for revenue, but not one cent for protection. Taxation is an evil that nothing but the requirements of the Government can justify. When we are in power—and I don't want to sell the skin of the bear until the bear is shot; yet I think the Tory bear is about to be skinned—we will free the people from protection, which is a fraud, a delusion and a robbery. For it is robbery to take money from one man and give it to another.

There can be nothing stronger than that in the English language, and having read that, it is not necessary for me to read more.

Now, Sir, these were the pledges of the Liberal party up to and down to the elections of June, 1896. Then, what do we find?

These gentlemen, having obtained power, and having obtained it on these pledges, began to feel less virtuous. There were evidences of shakiness. These evidences came to the ears of some of the faithful, men who honestly believed in the pledges that were made. I know some of these men, and I could look at them at this moment in the House, who declared that they had heard such rumours but they did not believe them, that if the Liberal party betrayed their rank and file in that way, they would hear from them. And I am expecting to hear from them within the next four weeks. Evidences of shakiness began to be seen. The first was that hon. gentlemen opposite refused to define the principle upon which they would ultimately base their tariff. They said, and with some reason: We cannot arrange this tariff in the heat of a session and just after we have come into power. Most of it had already been arranged by resolution; they had already declared that they knew all about it. But you must make some excuses for men when they come to the practical test of doing, and we could not press them too much as to the actual detailed definition of their tariff. But if they had been honest in their pledges, if they had honestly meant to carry out those pledges, they would have had no hesitation in saying to the people's representatives assembled here last July: We propose to revise the tariff; it will take us some time to get the details in order, but we are going to revise it on the principle of a revenue tariff, pure and simple—or of free trade, pure and simple—or whatever principle they chose. That they were not prepared to do that is an evidence that they began to waver the very moment they had attained what my hon. friend so ardently hoped for—power. Well, Sir, this wavering was seen in something more, it was seen in the issuing of a tariff commission. For seventeen years, these gentlemen knew all about it. According to them the Liberal-Conservatives could not gauge public opinion, but they themselves knew public opinion, knew it very well. The Liberal-Conservatives, they said, were not in touch with the business currents of Canada, but they, then in Opposition, were business men and knew the drift and set of that current accurately. But when they were placed in power, to gain delay, and for other purposes, they issued a tariff commission. That was evidence number two. They deferred the session. That was evidence number three. There were hints of betrayal of the policy in the leading papers to such an extent that the Montreal "Witness," which has fits of sturdy independence—and I wish that the fits were more chronic—and the "Farmer's Sun," the organ of the Patrons of Industry, with whom the Liberal party made a contract, began to mutter with discontent. Said these papers: They talk of betraying their pledges. Let them beware. We will not believe that the Liberal party will be untrue to their pledges. Does my hon. friend wish me to read some of these statements? I think I must do so.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Dispense.

Mr. FOSTER. I have not any of that beverage to dispense. My hon. friend will have to pay his own way. What says the "Farmer's Sun"?

> The McKinley tariff was in full blast when the Liberals met in convention at Ottawa. They declared, nevertheless, for a revenue tariff for Canada, and, to quote a resolution moved by Mr. Fielding, denounced "the principle of protection as radically unsound and unjust to the masses of the people," and maintained "that any tariff changes based on this principle must fail to afford any substantial relief from the burdens under which the country labours."
>
> A tariff almost identical with the McKinley tariff is before Congress. But, because their party is now in power and wants the support of manufacturers, a great many Liberals have come round to the Tory view, and say that in consequence of the high protection proposed in the States, we must have high protection in Canada. Hence the tariff the Government are going to make this session, these people argue, are going to be based on the principle of protection; in other words, Mr. Fielding must proceed with the tariff on the lines which he condemned in 1893, and we shall get no substantial relief from the burdens under which the country labours.
>
> The Liberals who talk in this strain, are apostates from the faith. If the Dingley Bill were ten times more restricted than it is, why should we keep up our high duties to still further injure the Canadian farmers? If I am to be prevented by Act of Congress from selling my cattle, barley, beans, wool and eggs in a free American market, is that any reason why the Canadian Government should make me pay exorbitant prices for coal oil and barbed wire, cotton goods, implements, wall paper, harness or stoves? It is, or ought to be, a first-class reason why Parliament should deliver me from the home combines and let me buy the necessaries and conveniences of life and production as cheap as possible, whether in the United States or in England. Such was the Liberal doctrine from 1878 until last June.

It goes on to say:

> To tell the Canadian farmer that, inasmuch as Laurier has failed to get reciprocity, which the party had hoped to get, and as the Americans intend to restore the McKinley on his produce, therefore it is advisable that he should continue to pay an extortionate sum for anything he has to buy, especially if he buys in the States, is the last sort of language we expected to hear from men who professed to be free traders.

Sir, that sounds very much like language I have heard used by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce. The article goes on:

> If his Bill should be unsatisfactory as a measure of tariff reform, the Government will at once begin to go down hill in this province. The notion prevalent among trimming Liberals that "our friends will swallow anything," is a mistaken one. The Liberal farmers, as men like Dr. Landerkin and Mr. James McMullen must know, are not in the humour to put up with a

deliberate breach of faith, whilst the independent element cannot be expected to do so.

What said the Toronto "Globe" before it got the tip to go slow upon the matter of the tariff revision?

The repeal or reduction of the raw material duties will, no doubt, be one of his first acts. * * * Notwithstanding the terrific tariff and the bounties, therefore, we are still an almost infinite way from the protectionist ideal of making all our own iron and steel goods at home, while the tax that was to give Ontario coal from Cape Breton as cheap, or cheaper, than the foreign, turns out to be a fine of $800,000 a year on the manufacturers in this province. That Ontario can flourish as a seat of industry under these cruel imposts on the two fundamental articles of all industry, can be believed by no one, unless he allows his partisanship to put out the eye of his understanding.

A very picturesque phrase, indeed. Well, Sir, not only are these papers so talking and so thinking, but as I said, the "Witness" has been for the last ten days calling to the mind of its leaders the pledges which they made, and refusing to believe the dubious hints that are going about the streets of Montreal that after all the protective element will be taken into the tariff, refusing to believe what they had heard, declaring that:

With all this we are in agreement; and we earnestly hope, and have faith, that the Liberals will not betray the cause of free trade and tariff reform and play into the hands of the protectionists, though we are not certain that it would not be politic to cease for a time to urge reciprocity with the United States.

And its final article on "No Surrender," winds up with this:

If the readers of the Liberal journals which published this plank of the party in June last so frequently, voted for the Liberal candidates in reliance upon the word of these journals that the party would be true to its pledges, they must feel sadly betrayed as they read the editorials of these same journals to-day, excusing and defending in anticipation an expected surrender to the protected interests. For our part, we confidently expect the Government to carry out the policy outlined in the above tariff plank of the Liberal platform.

Well, Sir, the final act came, as it must in every case take place, and yesterday we had the Budget brought down to the House. I forgot to mention one other episode, however, which showed that same spirit of wavering, and gave hints of a betrayal of pledges, the celebrated coal episode, but as that has been so well discussed and so thoroughly, I simply mention it as one of others, and will not further transgress upon the patience of the House with regard to it. At last, Sir, the eventful day comes, and the Finance Minister of the Liberal party, which has been out of office and subject to that fiery discipline which makes for principle and purity of motive for eighteen years, finds itself in the position of coming before Parliament and the electorate, and being judged as to its worth, judged as to its faith and honesty, judged as to whether it meant to do anything more than simply canvass, judged as to whether it ignorantly did what it did, and will now frankly confess that it did it ignorantly. For there are but two horns to the dilemma; either the hon. gentlemen made these pledges on principle, and believing that they understood the conditions of this country and foreign countries sufficiently well to tell us unmistakably that they knew what was right and what was wanted by this country—either that, or else they simply were catering for public support irrespective of what they would do after they came into a position of power and responsibility. Will they admit the plea of ignorance; they discredit themselves as statesmen and public men. Will they admit the other, which they are practically doing by going back on their pledges? then they must confess that they are putting themselves in the position of breaking faith and betraying confidence, and that they were not worthy of the support of the Canadian electorate. Yesterday, then, we had the announcement, and yesterday we had a spectacle in this House which, I am quite certain, was never seen before in this Dominion Parliament, and which it will be very difficult ever to put upon the boards a second time in this same Parliament. There was, first, Sir, an elaborate historic reminiscence, which had nothing to do with the principle of the question at all, the sum and substance of that reminiscence being that in 1867 there was a tacit agreement that at that time, at least, the duties should be moderate—an unwritten treaty, my hon. friend characterized it. Well, whatever may have been the thoughts which statesmen may have communicated to each other and which they carried out in practice afterwards, whether you call it an unwritten treaty or a private understanding, no man has any right to make that an argument for the absolute maintenance of that status for all the years of progress of the great Dominion which at that moment was being founded. What pertinence, then, had that argument to the question in point? To-day we are twenty-seven years of age, then we were but in our infancy, then we were four provinces, and now we are this broad Dominion. In 1867 the conditions surrounding us were as widely different from the conditions of to-day as light is from darkness. In 1867 the conditions internally were as different as possible from the conditions of this country internally to-day. That to change a tariff, in rate or principle, which was thought to be the best for the opening years of confederation implies that there is a breach of faith if that change is made in the years of progress and development, is an argument which I think my hon. friend will scarcely adopt at another presentation, and which is scarcely worthy of being brought into the financial utterance. Then, Sir, he says that

there were certain causes why protection was pushed up over this unwritten law, and brought into the arena of fruitful discussion. Yes, there were. My hon. friend would not have to go far to find them, he would find a number of them sitting close to himself. If my hon. friend will reach out his left hand about two feet from himself, he will find one of those disturbing causes, for I believe it is on record that in 1877, Mr. Joly, M.P., declared :

> The admission of grain free of duty is against the interests of the farmer of Canada, and I am decidedly in favour of protection for the home markets of this country.

Now, if my hon. friend will reach out his right hand about two feet he will strike another one of those impelling motives of that early time, for at that period, in 1871, the Hon. Mr. Laurier declared :

> It is humiliating to have to admit that after the existence of three hundred years, this country is not able to supply its own wants. Although nature has been marvellously prodigal in her gifts, and has done so much to make this a manufacturing country, we are yet dependent on foreign countries. It is our duty to foster our national industries.

And in 1876 another impulse was given by the same Mr. Laurier who declared :

> It is asserted by many, and assumed by others, that free trade is a Liberal principle and protection a Conservative principle. If I were in Great Britain, I would be a free trader ; but I am a Canadian born and a resident here, and I think that we require protection. We have within ourselves the ability to create an industry. If it is shown that we cannot maintain it, unless by legislation, either in the way of premium or prohibitory tariff, then I should be ready to take that into consideration.

And if he will turn to the seat behind him he will find another one of those impelling causes, who, in 1876, in the person of Mr. Wm. Paterson, M.P., declared :

> The Administration should protect our agricultural interests. Such a duty would not bear in any way upon the consumers and would be of great advantage to the interests concerned. The small duty upon grain would benefit the farmers of this country. It is well known that we pay a bonus to the inhabitants of other countries to come into Canada and settle in our midst. I believe, by a defensive tariff that you would not have to pay to bring those men here. Adopt it, and you will find that the steam whistles of our factories will be the call for them to come. The other year, the Finance Minister, in revising our tariff, gave some encouragement to one industry which it never had before. The result was that one thousand men who were engaged in that industry in Germany, were literally transported by the change in the tariff to Canada and set to work here. The cost of the article was not increased one iota, and Canada got all the benefit.

He will find another of those impelling causes sitting over to his right several seats away, in the person of Mr. John Charlton, M.P., who, in 1876, declared :

> I believe the agricultural interests would be benefited by protection. I would make a market by bringing the manufacturer to the door of the farmer. The home market is of the greatest value.

How often it happens that an historical reminiscences flies back into one's family and plays mischief therein. My hon. friend thought he was contributing something for the information of the Liberal-Conservative party. What was he doing ? He was giving an opportunity to show that the brightest minds in his own party at that time were impressed with the National Policy, the intellectual and moral element which take their ground and tone from the trend of public opinion and in the halls of Parliament represent the quality of that trend. I have not the least doubt in my own mind that the National Policy victory of 1878-79 was due to the help the old line Liberal-Conservative party got, if not from the votes of those men, from their teachings and their followers in the Liberal party. And yet, we, forsooth, are to be lectured by this new Minister of Finance because there were certain conditions from 1871 to 1876 which operated to impel the people of Canada and the statesmen of Canada on to that ruinous road of protection to our home industries.

Well, Sir, after that reminiscence was over, the hon. Minister of Finance went on to declare that the National Policy had resulted in bitter disappointment and in utter failure. I noticed when he made that statement he received no cheers from the back benches, and I felt such a throb of sympathy in my heart for him that I made an appeal to some hon. gentlemen to cheer, and we had to keep up the spirits of the Finance Minister as best we could by applauding him on the other trends of his argument. He then went on to show the reasons that had acted as an inducement to the adoption of the National Policy, and how illusory they were. First, it was that infant industries should be for a time temporarily assisted. But he declared that the argument was without force because when the infants grew up they still called for the bottle as lustily as when they were at the mother's breast. The hon. gentleman does not seem to have grasped the idea of the changed conditions. The National Policy in the methods of its working, in giving protection at the start, gave a protection which was sufficient to afford our industries vantage ground against competition whatever it was at that time. If ten years afterwards the competition were ten times as keen the very principle of protection would demand that the vantage ground should be a little stronger entrenched in order to keep the industry, grown up or not, on the same vantage ground as regards the strong and merciless competition of trade from other countries all over the world. The second inducement was with a view to secure reciprocity with the United

States. I will invite my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) to fight this matter out with the Finance Minister. With respect to this subject both political parties have met with some disappointments. We have been hopeful at times, afterwards we have been depressed, but I have no hesitation in subscribing to this, that there is not on the political horizon, and has not been for the last fifteen years, any very strong indications that reciprocity was a boon likely to be granted to Canada for anything she could give in return, anything she could fairly and advantageously give. And although the statesmen of both parties have tried and have had hopes, and have put those hopes along the line of action, yet it has been in every case to meet with disappointment. The disappointment of hon. gentlemen opposite who made the pilgrimage to Washington a little while ago, is I think, just as keen as was the disappointment of some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who made former visits to Washington on the same business.

But the hon. gentleman's great argument was that there had not been an increase in our population. He showed that the National Policy had been discredited and proved a failure, because when it was supposed that our industries would employ labour, our people had nevertheless left, and our immigration had not been as large as had been confidently expected. I want to put the obverse. Suppose there had not been the National Policy and none of the industries and employment furnished from 1867 to the present time, would we have got as large immigration, and would we have retained as many of our people as we have retained? People do not leave this country because it is not a free country, because the climate is not good and the soil productive, because its institutions are not excellent, or because of any disability in the country naturally, but when men leave this Dominion and go to the United States they go to seek employment or a wider life in some respect than they can secure here. Reduce the employment offered, and would there be a less number of people going to other countries? And the hon. gentleman's argument is not fair when he says he is disappointed with respect to increase in population and the tide of immigration, and that these are due to the National Policy. That is a perfect non sequitur, an argument which is without logic. It may be that certain things happen, that many other things happen, but it takes logic to make one apply to the other in the relation of cause and effect, and the hon. gentleman has failed to do that.

But the hon. gentleman indulged in another reminiscence, and that was about the good old way—when a man established himself at cross-roads, people came to his shop, when he had sons they joined him in the business, the people had confidence in his work, his business increased, and he lived and prospered without a bonus. The hon. gentleman regretted that that is not the method to-day. The hon. gentleman may deplore this fact, but he may rest assured that he will never bring back the old cross-road methods of manufacturing. In Germany, France and England, where there are free trade, protection and revenue tariffs, you will find the old method of business going out of date, and combinations of capitalists prevailing, under which labour is divided into departments so as to insure cheapness in the manufactured product.

That is the tendency of to-day. Free trade does not change it; protection does not change it. Take any basis you like and frame a tariff in a country, and you will never bring back the old cross-road methods of doing manufacturing business. To-day we have changed conditions, and we have to suit ourselves to these changed conditions. But, my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) went on to prove that there was protection enough without protection. Now, I do not wonder that his free trade friends yonder should feel a little sore because protection has been kept. Why is it kept? Why do you want 35 per cent on anything, when the Finance Minister told you yesterday that there was sufficient protection in Canada in three things: First, the convenient market, second, the cost and charges of transport, and third, patriotism. Well, Sir, that leads me to remark on the first of these, that convenience has not the same meaning now that it had 25 years ago. The range is very widely spread. To-day it is a fact, that you can send products a thousand miles and land it for less money than you can send it for 200 miles from the interior of the country. Can we change all those conditions? We have not changed them, and so the argument of convenience does not amount to so much as at first sight it would seem. Neither does the argument with reference to transport, which is about the same. Nay more, does not my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) know, that if he attempts to ship a cargo of something, we will say from the western part of Ontario and bring it to Toronto, that he will pay more for the carriage of it than his competitor in Chicago will pay for having it brought from Chicago to Toronto? Can he change all these things? Is he trying to change them? He must change them before his argument on transport amounts to much. But what does transport and convenience both amount to, when you are putting the raw muscle upon the raw material, and making it into the manufactured article, and sending it a thousand miles or two thousand miles across the ocean to market, if you pay one-half for the amount of labour there that you have got to pay to the yeomen labourers of this country. What does it amount to? It amounts to naught,

and that, acting as a protection simply does not protect, and the yeoman labourer of Canada must have his industry closed down, or he must work for the starvation wages of the competing country.

But, Sir, as I said, my hon. friend cannot make much of this. Now, can he make much of his argument for patriotism ? I am afraid that he brought up a family matter there again. My hon. friend is not asleep.

The PRIME MINISTER. I might.

Mr. FOSTER. I dare say he might. I dare say that sometimes he would like a gentle opiate to sooth the pangs of conscience which must often come to him when he hears of broken pledges. My hon. friend (Mr Laurier) had a phrase which he used in the city of Boston ; it was one of his nicely turned phrases. In short it was this : the mistake, the fatal mistake, is to think that allegiance, British allegiance, is the basis of trade. He was speaking to his Boston audience. He was declaring, that what he intended to do when he came into power, was, to give them a free road into this country and to get a free road into that country as far as he could. He wanted reciprocity with the United States of America, and he was willing to give them unrestricted reciprocity. He was combatting the argument, that may be, in Canada the loyal sentiment would set into trade channels towards the mother country. He declared it was a fatal mistake to think, that allegiance, British allegiance, was the basis of trade. But what else did he say ? Here, in this House, in the country, over and over again, he said : I would just as soon have an American sixpence as an English shilling. That is the way he put it, although I never could tell what he meant by it. What he probably did mean to say was, that he would just as soon have American as English money. How often has he said, that he is loyal but his loyalty does not ooze out of his fingers, and that when it comes to Canadian interests he is going to look after them, and let Lord Salisbury look after British interests. Patriotism under that calculation, will never bring the Canadian people to buy Canadian goods. I grant, to some extent, that Canadian people in certain cases, would rather have foreign than Canadian-made goods. There are natural causes for that. Men buy what they have been accustomed to buy ; that is one reason, and it is hard to switch them off from that custom. Men buy for fashion sake, men buy in other cases for the name's sake, and for one reason or another, English goods, foreign goods, will be brought in, and higher prices will be paid for them even though they are no better than Canadian goods. But to say that that was a result of the National Policy, as my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) argued, was another complete non sequitur. He tried to base an argument against the National Policy, because for instance, people were not patriotic enough to buy Canadian goods. Well, Sir, there is one thing which has been done in the last ten years, and that is, that the National Policy has removed nine-tenths of that prejudice against Canadian goods. The National Policy and the Liberal-Conservative administration of it, has at least given Canadian capital, and Canadian labour, and Canadian enterprise, an opportunity to show to the Canadian people, that just as good things can be made in their own country as can be made in other countries. Well, Sir, up to this time during the speech of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding), there was noticeable a blank look of sullenness on hon. gentlemen opposite. Just a few countenances were a little irradiated, but most of his friends began to think : well, after all, we believe they are going to carry out their pledges. They felt that they must have been mistaken when the whole trend of the argument was so irresistibly conclusive against, not only the inception but the continuation of the National Policy. Then gloom settled down upon these Tory-Grits that the Montreal "Witness" speaks of, who are about to betray their party, and a light and cheerful countenance was discernible only in the case of my hon. friend yonder (Mr. McMillan), and two or three others of his kindred spirits.

The Minister of Finance was wonderful in resources last night. He could argue straight and dead against a thing, and he could turn around when he saw that his followers were becoming depressed and argue just the other way. And, so he took a different trend and the kaleidoscopic changes cames swift and fast ; red, and green, and black, and scarlet, and then a sort of a dazzling combination that no man on earth could fitly characterize. To use a classical phrase :

> He wiggled in and wiggled out,
> With many a twisting turn and bout,
> And kept the hunters still in doubt
> If he were in or he were out.

I cannot state the authorship, and I do not know whether it is a rhyme or not, but at all events it suits the subject.

Then the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) came to the crucial point. After having demonstrated that the National Policy in its inception was a failure, and in its carrying out was a failure, and after showing reasons why there was sufficient natural protection here without putting on any more protection, my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) at last came down to the point, and he asked : How is this to be brought about ? Well, he had to buoy himself up. He went over to London and got a writer from the "Times" who declared, that you must not be too pedantic in your theories ; you must bring about changes slowly. He then got hold of Lord Farrer, who evidently is a thinker on a parity with himself, and who

declares: That it is quite sufficient if he will just disown the theory,—never mind the practice. And, Lord Farrer was lifted to the seventh heaven, because he had private information that the Liberals of Canada had got so far that they had disowned the theory of protection, but the practice of protection they intended to sustain.

Having buoyed himself up on these two erudite and far-distant authorities, he came to his own reasons. He argued that the National Policy men had no vested rights —"The Liberal-Conservatives say they have, but we say they have not, and we have a perfect right to shut down on them here and now, and they have no right to say a word against it." He made the astonishing assertion that the trade of this country, based on parliamentary enactment, was simply speculation and gambling, and that if the people of this country, constitutionally governed as it is, issue their fiat, and through the Government of the day, enact it into law, no more attention is to be paid to their action than you would pay to the throw of a gambler's dice. The National Policy man, he says, goes into the business as a gambler; if he wins, the gain is his; if he loses, let him pay up and look pleasant. I hope, Sir, that doctrine will never mark the statesmanship of this country. I hope that whenever this Parliament of Canada lays down a basis of action, and invites capital and labour to go in on that basis and build up their industries, and in the course of time a change of opinion comes, it will never even be argued that the Government of that time is not to take account of what the view of the commonwealth was at a preceding time. I hope my hon. friend will not persist in that doctrine. It is a doctrine which, as applied to this case, cannot be sustained by argument or by reason, and will not be sustained by the country.

Then he puts in a plea for keen competition. He said that manufacturers ought to have keen competition; they were lazy in their methods, behind the time, not up to date, and it would be well to let in the keen air of free trade competition. Then, my hon. free trade friend began to look pleasant, and said to himself, "It is coming our way this time; they are really going to carry out their pledges." But there came another turn. The hon. gentleman invoked the platform of 1893, reading it in a Delphic double sense, so that in one sense it was principle or death, and in the other it was expediency and life. And so, proceeding and ringing the changes on it as he did, when he got through I noticed that the face of my hon. free trade friend was a perfect brown study—he did not know on which end he was standing. At last, after all this going in and coming out, all this strong and conclusive argument, and all this fulmination as to the wickedness and the wrong of the protective tariff, it came out that what the hon. gentleman proposed to do was to adopt, to all intents and purposes, the tariff of the Liberal-Conservative party, which was put on the Statute-book in 1894. How many changes have been made in it? Go through it and read them. Leaving out wines, spirits and tobacco, take the articles in the tariff, item by item; read over and count up those that are changed and those that are unchanged, and you will find that nine-tenths of the tariff remains exactly as we left it in 1894. my hon. friend took nearly two hours of argument yesterday to show was bad in its inception and worse in its action.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 40) to incorporate the Maritime Milling Company (Limited).—(Mr. Fraser.)

Bill (No. 41) respecting the River St. Clair Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. Ingram.)

Bill (No. 42) to incorporate the St. Mary's River Bridge Company.—(Mr. Dyment.)

Bill (No. 43) respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Ingram.)

Bill (No. 44) An Act respecting the Welland Power and Supply Canal Company (Limited).—(Mr. Sutherland.)

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

Mr. FOSTER. What then is the result, when we come down to absolute action on the part of the Government of the day, as announced to the House through the Finance Minister? There are two results. First, that the Liberal party, headed by my hon. friend, the First Minister, has declared, through its Finance Minister, to this House and the country and the world its deliberate adoption of the principle of protection. It has embalmed that principle in its tariff; and if it has, in some few cases, lightened the duties upon special articles, in other cases it has added to the protection which was upon these articles under the old tariff. Whatever may be said in palliation, or excuse or extenuation, that fact is one which remains from this time forward on the statute-books of the country, that there is to-day in this Parliament, as between the two sides, practically no difference upon the expediency of the principle of protection as the guiding principle of our fiscal system. Not only is their principal and main tariff schedule founded avowedly, founded absolutely on the principle of protection, and comparatively high protection, but the only novel feature which they have about their tariff of to-day, and it is certainly a novel feature, is one which is only possible because of the

adoption of the principle of protection. If my hon. friends had taken free trade and embalmed its principles in their tariff, they could have had no second tariff schedule. If they had adopted the principle of a revenue tariff on free trade lines, they could have had no reciprocal or second column in the tariff which they ask this House to pass to-day. From the time that protection was born in this country until to-day, there were two purposes it had in view. The first was to stimulate the industries of this country, in the competition, becoming every day more merciless, with foreign countries,—an outside competition added to the inside competition which has always been growing keener; and the second was to enable this country, when the opportune and proper time came, by lowering to a certain extent some of the items in her protective tariff, to gain for herself reciprocal trade privileges with other countries which are willing to give something in return for something we are willing to give them. Without a protective tariff no such reciprocal commerce could take place between this country and any other country, so that the very purpose for which a protective policy was adopted by the Liberal-Conservative party and maintained by it for eighteen years is to-day, in its entirety, swallowed whole by the Liberal party. After eighteen years of virulent denunciation and abuse of that policy, to-day they embalm it upon the statute-books of this country as their own.

My hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, thought it was necessary for him to make some excuses why they did that, and I wish the House to attend carefully to these excuses. The House will see what his reasons, if we can dignify them by that name, were. What was his first statement? It was that in 1893 things were different from what they are now, referring to the United States of America. What was his next statement? It was this. In 1893 it looked like tariff reform in the United States, and so the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, while it looked like tariff reform in the United States, was what? Either one of principle or one of speculation. If it were one of speculation they built up their platform upon the mere supposition that may be the United States of America was going to relax its protective duties and so grant reciprocity. The speculative principle is strong in my hon. friend the Finance Minister. All trade is a speculation. If this was a matter of speculation, their idea was: It looks as if we might get reciprocity with the United States; things are not quite so hard as they were, and we may gain reciprocity by proclaiming ourselves a free trade or revenue tariff party. That was the reason, if there was any reason. But did you hear the Finance Minister, five minutes afterwards, declare that it looks to-day as if reciprocity might be got from the American Congress, and so they are going to keep up the tariff walls instead of taking them down? When it looked as if reciprocity were possible of attainment in 1893, they declared for the lowering of the tariff walls in order to get reciprocity. When it looks like reciprocity coming in 1897, they keep up the tariff walls in order to get reciprocity. Where is their consistency, where is their argument, where is their reason? But I take higher grounds than that; I do not put it down as low as the Finance Minister. I am one of those who believe that in 1893 the Liberals founded their policy on what they called and believed to be a principle. If the principle was good in 1893 under the McKinley tariff, it is equally good to-day under the Dingley Bill proposed, which is only 5 or 6 per cent more on the average than the McKinley Bill of 1893. Is it possible that what I stated the other night by way of rejoinder to an hon. gentleman on the other side, is true—that a principle with hon. gentlemen opposite is not sacred if it has had a day or two to cool, that they change with the passing days? Whichever horn of the dilemma the Finance Minister takes, whether he says it was on a speculative basis that their policy was framed in 1893, or whether he says it was a matter of principle, his argument is lame. If it was a question of principle then the principle remains; if it was a question of speculation, then the action of to-day should be exactly the same as the action of 1893, which was to lower the tariff walls in order to get reciprocity. Now, Sir, what is there in the excuse that the United States have changed? What was the state of things ever since the Liberal party have been denouncing protection in Canada? High tariff in the United States. Did gentlemen opposite ever stop in their denunciation, because, for instance, under the high tariff in the United States we would not throw down our tariff wall? Never. And the hon. gentleman who leads their party to-day introduced his illustration of Chinese duelling as his reply to an argument of that kind, that because the United States chose to hurt themselves, we should hurt ourselves in like manner. In 1893, when they sat in convention and formulated their party policy on the tariff, the McKinley Bill was in operation, and the McKinley Bill put an average duty on dutiable imports of 49·58 per cent, or nearly 50 per cent in round numbers. To-day, when they are deciding as to what they shall do, the Wilson Bill is the law of the land in the United States. If it is to be the law of the land no longer, its place will be taken by the Dingley Bill, which, under the proposition sent to the Senate is only a little more than 50 per cent on the average of dutiable goods. Does that make a difference in principle sufficient to completely change the foundation upon which the tariff policy of hon. gentlemen

opposite shall be based? Are they so much affected in their policy by a difference of 4 or 5 per cent in the protection of the United States, when at least it will go to 50 per cent? Hon. gentlemen must answer that question, if not here, to the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite must recollect that there are sensible, honest, intelligent people in this country who are watching them, who cannot believe up to this day that it can ever be said in a British country that a great party would spend its whole life-time in opposition in support of a certain policy, and the very moment it came into power would take up the exact converse which it had been opposing for eighteen years. "I am a Liberal of the old Liberal school," is the boast my hon. friend the leader of the Government has often made, the boast he makes nearly every time he gets upon the platform. Can he point out to me an English Liberal of the old Liberal school who would put himself in the position that the hon. gentleman and his party have taken? An English Liberal of the old Liberal school has the sturdy love of principle and honour which would prevent him doing that, which would prevent him from leading his party along a line which means the repudiation of every promise given to the electors when the party making the promise stood in front of them asking them for their votes. But there is one phase of this matter as to the keeping of pledges—no, I beg pardon, as to the breaking of pledges—which demands special notice, and that is the compact made between the Liberals through the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the Patrons of Industry. The Patrons of Industry, without going into their history, without saying a word as to the basis of their organization, as to the objects they had in view, or as to the means they adopted to achieve those objects, at the opening of the contest between the Liberals and the Conservatives were a large and important organization in Ontario. The present Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) catered for the Patron vote. He catered for it by bringing in proposals and trying to make them legislation in this House, knowing that he could not make them legislation, knowing exactly what he was doing and the purpose for which he was doing it. In this seat or hereabouts, in tones of virtuous indignation, he railed against the Governor's General's salary. The Patrons do not want Government House here at all, so their platform said. It was monstrous, he thought, that a salary of $50,000 should be paid by the poor people of Canada to the Governor General. That salary ought to be reduced, and the hon. gentleman introduced a Bill to reduce it. Why? Was it a good thing to do then? Then it is a better thing for him to do now, when he has got the power to do it. Will he do it?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. FOSTER. He has accomplished his purpose. He is where he is. What cares he for the principles of a month or a year or two years ago. The Postmaster General catered to the Patrons in another point. He was not going to have any passes used by members of Parliament. A man could not be independent who took a pass. Oh, it was a terrible thing to take a pass. The very fact that you had it in your pocket made you a slave of the railway company. Whether all your brother members had them or not, it affected your independence, and it was wrong. He is where he can prohibit it now, if he has any influence with his Government. Will he, has he, attempted it? He has gained his purpose; he is where he is, and the Patrons are where they are. The Patrons have an abhorrence of the Senate, they want it abolished. Has any Liberal behind the Government benches yet moved to abolish the Senate, or are they diligently appointing their friends to vacancies, and praying for other senators to die that they may appoint other friends? You have heard of that Bashaw with three tails. The Minister of Trade and Commerce made a song thereon and applied it to my late friend, Sir Leonard Tilley; and he thought that a Bashaw with three tails was nothing to a Cabinet Minister with a son-in-law. How does he think it is now? Is it better to be a Bashaw with three tails and sporting in Turkey, or to be a Minister with a son to whom he gives an office?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Or a cousin.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, but I never sang the song of the Bashaw. The Minister of Trade and Commerce is a remnant of a bright historic period which had much of virtue and worth about it. He is, where he is; but he has a fraction of Tory principles in him yet. He has failed in this respect, and he feels his failure; but my impression is yet, that his seat is not comfortable to him when, as an English gentleman and a knight, he passed his word to the electorate of this country and to-day sits there without dissent and goes back on his word. The Postmaster General was so virtuously indignant that there should be some members of this Parliament so lost to all sense of independence as to accept from the Government an office if one were to be vacant, or as to contemplate, when their seats become vacant by effluxion of time, going into the position of a judgeship or something else—so virtuously indignant was he that he introduced first, a resolution, and then a Bill, to make it a high crime and misdemeanour for a single member of Parliament to take an office within a year after he had actually resigned, or ceased to become a member of this House. He is to-day a member of a Government that can make that principle law if they like, or if he likes. Has he done it? No,

Sir. But hon. gentlemen opposite have bought off men who supported them, to the mutual pleasure of the man who was salaried and to their own comfort as well; to the pleasure of the man who was salaried because otherwise he would have had to take his seat in the House, and, as a true gentleman and a man of honour, to have found fault with the Government on a line consistent with the pledge he made in this House years ago. But where is the Postmaster General? Where is he? Sadly the echo answers: Where is he? An important member of a Government committing the very sin and crime that he denounced when he was on this side of the House and introduced his Bill. But all the time the Postmaster General had an eye to the windward of the Patrons of this country. Everything of this kind was catering to the Patrons. But other men catered. Sir Richard Cartwright, the present Minister of Trade and Commerce, as I have an item here to show, wrote a letter to the Patrons. He loved them—so far as love is possible in his somewhat austere composition, and he poured it out right royally. He loved them most of all when he was up west in a certain constituency when he declared:

As for the Patrons of Industry, their platform and that of the Liberal party were identical as regards Dominion issues; and he counselled that no division of the vote that opposed great abuses and wrongs, should be permitted. Do not allow divisions to creep in and imperil the great cause of an aggrieved people by dividing the vote that should be massed against the common enemy.

And the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) loved the Patrons, and declared:

All its principles were identical with those of the Liberal party, and for every one of them Mr. McMullen had stood a staunch supporter and defender during all of his parliamentary career.

My hon. friend was giving a helping hand to the hon. member for North Wellington:

No good reason could be given for withdrawing from him the support of a single Patron elector in North Wellington, and he desired to raise a voice of warning against permitting a division of that portion of the electorate which stood opposed to existing abuses.

Sir Richard Cartwright is said to have spoken—at least he is reported in the "Globe" of January 29th, 1895—at Kingston, and amongst other things he said:

He desired, above all things, that there should be no quarrel with those who had joined the Patrons of Industry. Their platforms were the same; their cause could only be made doubtful by division. That was what the Conservatives were praying for.

And a Mr. Schell, called upon after the hon. gentleman had ceased speaking, also thought that:

It would be a misfortune if the Liberals and Patrons should be divided. Their platforms were identical, and their objects the same. He believed the majority of the Patrons of South Oxford would be willing, as he was himself, to stand by the nominee of the Liberal Convention.

Now, I think that shows pretty well a close degree of consanguinity, so far as political relationship can go. What is the platform of the Patrons? In 1895, January 23rd, the Grand Board of Patrons of Industry issued a manifesto outlining the demands made by the Patrons in connection with Dominion affairs. I am not going to read it all, but I will read some of it, for it is very instructive:

No member of the House of Commons shall receive a free pass from any railroad or steamship company; any member accepting such a free pass to be disqualified for membership in the House of Commons or for any position in the gift of the Government for a space of five years.

The present Postmaster General was at one with them on that.

The Government House at Ottawa shall be abolished.

He did not quite go so far as the abolition of Government House, but he wanted to abolish a very considerable portion of the salary of the incumbent of the Government House, which would probably have had the very same effect.

The system of superannuation, gratuities and pensions, except for military service, should be abolished.

There is a Bill for its abolition, but, strange to say, it is a Bill that does not abolish superannuation.

The Mounted Police of the North-west Territories should be abolished, except for unorganized districts.

We have no intimation that the Government is preparing that programme.

The Military College at Kingston shall be abolished, and the expenditure on the militia force of the Dominion in times of peace shall be limited to $300,000.

That, I believe, is not contemplated by my hon. friend, at least, it did not appear in the Queen's Speech.

The granting of subsidies and bonuses to railroad and steamship companies and other corporations shall be abolished.

I have not heard that that is in contemplation. The Crow's Nest Pass business is, I believe, not quite settled, a grave struggle is taking place. A very prominent member of that Government, when in the North-west, promised everybody that the Government would take hold and build it.

Mr. DOMVILLE. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, it was my hon. friend who promised it, with the significant remark——

Mr. DOMVILLE. Don't make any charges.

Mr. FOSTER. With the significant and patronizing remark which he made upon the platform: My hon. friend the Minister of Railways, in his official position, cannot make these promises, but I am here to make them for him.

The entire number of civil servants at Ottawa will be reduced.

I believe the statutory increases have been taken off, and some officers have been dismissed. How far it is to go, I do not know.

The High Commissioner in Great Britain will receive a stated salary, without any addition for assistants, or perquisites.

I have not heard and do not gather from the Estimates that this plank in the platform is being carried out:

The number of Cabinet Ministers will be reduced, and the Canadian Senate will be abolished.

My friend the Postmaster General was strong on that, and the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), whom the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) thinks deserves well of the Patrons of his county who should stand by him, was also at one time strong on that plank. A noble pair of brothers, they stood side by side in the House, and their voices were lifted up together in sweet unison in a prayer for Parliament to do that same thing, to reduce the number of Cabinet Ministers and at the same time the salaries of those Ministers. But since the Postmaster General draws the salary, and my hon. friend is drawn by the Postmaster General, we hear nothing of these things.

But, Sir, we come a little further on to something more explicit still in the Patron platform:

Liquors should be taxed to the fullest revenue producing extent, and the following be admitted free into Canada:—cottons, tweeds, woollens, workingmen's tools, farm implements, fence wire, binder twine, coal oil, iron and corn; and, in addition, the tariff will be for revenue only, and so adjusted as to fall as far as possible on the luxuries and not on the necessaries of life.

Now, Sir, what have the Patrons been given by my hon. friend? They asked that cottons should be made free. The cotton schedule is made higher. Does any hon. gentleman deny it?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Most assuredly we do.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman denies that they have raised the duty on white cottons and gray cottons.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman may deny it. I must take his denial, but it is written in the tariff presented last night.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman stated at the commencement of his speech that he did not understand what he was talking about.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, we get a little of that undiluted chivalry of the good old Tory in the depreciation of everything else that does not centre in the possessor's own brain. The Minister of Trade and Commerce feels sore—I know it, he knows it.

An hon. MEMBER. Not so sore as you do.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman had the reversion of the Finance Ministership. At least he is authority for my statement; he said so, it was reported in the public prints. He will not deny it. I have been told on very good authority that he came down all harnessed and ready to take it, that at the last moment it was thought better, on account of certain qualities of the hon. gentleman, that he should remain a little in the background and that a new and younger man should take the place. But the cotton schedule is made higher.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is not.

Mr. FOSTER. The cottons known as white and gray, bleached and unbleached, which under the old tariff were at 22½ per cent, have been raised to 25 per cent. That is the answer given to the Patrons. Tweeds and woollens—have they been made free? No. They have been changed somewhat, but they have been kept at what the Finance Minister described as the highest rate in his tariff, 35 per cent. The Patrons asked that they be free. By the way, why was 35 per cent put upon woollens and a specific duty taken off, and why was the duty on cement increased? Can any one tell the reason?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The duty on cement is not increased.

Mr. FOSTER. There speaks another hon. Minister who is incorrect. The duty on cement was 40 cents per barrel. The standard barrel is 450 pounds.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It does not say standard barrel.

Mr. FOSTER. It is every barrel. It applies to small barrels as well as large; but in the course of competition, with the duty at 40 cents per barrel, the trade soon "got on" and used a large barrel. The standard barrel is 450 pounds. Some barrels have come into Montreal with 475 pounds in them. A duty of 12½ per cent makes on a standard barrel very nearly 20 per cent advance, and on a barrel containing 475 pounds 25 per cent advance.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Rubbish.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member from King's elegantly says it is "rot."

Mr. DOMVILLE. Not ex-King's, but for King's.

Mr. FOSTER. The Patrons ask that workmen's tools should be made free. They have not been made free—they are taxed. They also asked that farm implements be made free. They have been kept at the same rate. The only reduction the farmers have obtained on farm implements was the large reduction we gave in 1894, when the duty was reduced from 35 to 20 per cent, and it is kept at 20 per cent to-day despite the request of the Patrons of Industry. But while they have kept the tax up on farm implements, they are taking good care to look after those "scoundrels great, and scoundrels small," by giving them reduced iron and reduced raw material. Fence wire, they have made free. It did not bear a protective duty; it bore simply a revenue tariff rate. Hon. gentlemen opposite have, therefore, not gone against the principle of protection; they have simply dropped a revenue tariff item. As regards binder twine, the same remarks apply. Twelve and a half per cent was the lowest possible special rate that could be put on under a revenue tariff, for unenumerated articles bore 12 per cent. It has been thrown out, but this did not include the principle of protection. It was a low revenue tariff rate, and hon. gentlemen opposite have given the farmers exactly the reduction we gave in 1894, a reduction of 12½ per cent.

Mr. TAYLOR. Not until Hobbs of London has unloaded what he has on hand.

Mr. FOSTER. You must always take care of the boy. Coal oil was to be free. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries stumped the country from one end to the other on a coal oil can, and on the top of it he has elevated the percentage of the protection away up in the hundreds. He has gained many Patrons and farmers' votes, because they put confidence in him, that when he became a powerful member of a powerful Government, his pledge would be carried out and coal oil would be made free. Is it made free, and how much of the high percentage have they shaved off? They have taken off one cent a gallon, and coal oil is left very high still.

Iron was asked to be free by the Patrons. It has not been made free. It has been lowered, but for every dollar that has been lowered on the basic irons, there has been a bounty by the Liberal party endorsing a policy which for all these years they have fulminated against; and they have made the bounty on iron higher. That bounty system, which, if anything, is gall and wormwood to absolute free traders, is the system which they have adopted.

Corn they have made free. Seven and a half cents per bushel has been taken off, and whilst they have pleased some of the Patrons and some of the feeders, they will find that they have not benefited others who look to the coarse grains which they grow for a large proportion of the income from their farms, and who will find that free corn very largely interferes with it.

And finally, the Patrons asked for a tariff for revenue only, and so adjusted as to fall upon the luxuries and not upon the necessaries of life. The answer of the Government has been given to them in the tariff. Every line and word of it is, first, a protection tariff, nearly as high on the average and higher on some items than the tariff of the Liberal-Conservative party. Now, Sir, have the Patrons a cause against my hon. friends opposite? The Liberals have in the campaign curried favour with the Patrons, subscribed to their doctrines, flattered them that they were at one in the carrying out of their aims; and, when they came into power, when the very first opportunity is afforded them of carrying out their pledges, not one single pledge that was asked by the Patrons and in reference to which the present Government stated that the platform of the Patrons and the Liberals were alike; not one single pledge has been honoured, not one important abatement of the protective tariff asked has been given, and the only thing that has been done to drop three revenue tariff items to a low rate.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Carried.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Domville) has all he can carry.

Mr. DOMVILLE. The hon. member for York has more than he can carry.

Mr. FOSTER What else has been done in this tariff? It was asked by the Patrons, and it was a plank of the Liberal platform, through and through, that luxuries should be taxed to the utmost limit, and that they should be the first thing upon which a revenue tariff should be levied. What has happened? I have been speaking up to this time of the principle of the main tariff that these hon. gentlemen have made the tariff of this country. It will be moderated in so far as they can get reciprocity treaties with countries unknown, or with countries which to-day do not have them. But the tariff is a high protective tariff, according to the thinking of hon. gentlemen on the other side. They have raised by a very slight amount the duties upon luxuries, but in their proposition for a reciprocal tariff which they declare they hope to carry out to perfection, they have made a piece of machinery which will take one-fourth the duty off these luxuries. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, shakes his head in dissent, but let me tell him this. To-day, upon silverware we have 25 per cent. It was increased by hon. gentlemen opposite in the main tariff to 30 per cent. But if they are honest in carrying out the reciprocal idea, they have made a provision for taking one-fourth

of that duty off, which will reduce silverware to 22½ per cent, or 2½ per cent less than it was under the old tariff.

Jewellery in the old tariff is 25 per cent, they advanced it to 30 per cent, but they have arranged a piece of machinery, which if it means anything will drop one-quarter of that duty, and make jewellery 22½ per cent.

High-priced linens were 25 per cent under the old tariff, but they have arranged a piece of machinery which if it is carried out, will reduce that to 22½ per cent. Silks under the Conservative tariff are 30 per cent, but they have arranged for a reduction of one-quarter, if they are honest in it, which will make the duty on silks 26¼ per cent.

Therefore, the demand of the Patrons, that the duties should be raised on luxuries, and the pledges of hon. gentlemen opposite that they would raise the duty on luxuries, have not been carried out. My hon. friend the Prime Minister chuckles as he sits there, because the pledge has not been carried out. Has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) one word to say against the fact that I state: that if he is honest in getting reciprocity with any country which produces jewellery, his machinery will reduce jeweliery one-fourth, and bring it down to 22½ per cent. No, Sir, the hon. gentleman cannot answer it.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is mistaken about my chuckling. I laughed at the manner in which the hon. gentleman answered himself about cotton.

Mr. FOSTER. I quite see that my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) is chuckling because he thinks I have involved myself in a difficulty. It is the hon. gentleman that has involved himself in a difficulty, not myself, as I will show him a little later on.

Have they made any change in the classification, against which they had many hard things to say when in Opposition? No. The first word the Finance Minister uttered last night, was, that the classification would remain practically the same as in the old tariff Act.

Have they made any change upon principle in specific duties? None. Is it a principle with hon. gentlemen opposite that ad valorem duties shall take the place of specific duties? They have said so. If it is, why they have left six-tenths of the specific duties that were in the old tariff, perhaps nine-tenths of them. They had a principle in Opposition, namely, ad valorem vs. specific duties. No man was keener in it than my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, but to-day they have shown that they have no principle, and that they are simply rigging the tariff on expediency. Here a specific duty, there an ad valorem duty, and here a specific duty again. Principle does not rule; it is simply a patch up and make up of an expediency tariff.

If there was any principle that hon. gentlemen opposite held in Opposition, it was the principle of the good old English school: that bounties were an abomination. To-day, they take up the system of bounties, and they heighten the range of the bounties of the old Government and of the old policy.

Such are some of the leading characteristics of that tariff. Now, I have one word to say, and only one, with reference to the increases in the duties on spirits and tobacco. The duties that existed on these articles were, in my mind—I may be wrong—up to the highest point of revenue production. Whenever you get beyond a certain point in a rate of duty on liquors or on cigarettes, cigars or fine tobacco, you get to a point where you lose revenue instead of gaining. No man would have been more willing than myself to have made tobaccos and liquors bear a stronger proportion of the services of this country; and in both of my tariff revisions, I went into that matter most thoroughly, and I came to the conclusion—I may have been wrong—that we had on liquors, cigars and cigarettes the highest revenue-producing duties. To add 15 cents a gallon to the duty on liquors, to add dollars to the cigarette duty, and to add largely to the tobacco duty, is not, I think, going to add to the revenue. If it does not, what is the purpose of putting on these increases? If they will give an impetus to smuggling, to which there is already a sufficient impetus, and will not help the revenue, why put them on? I am afraid my hon. friends have made a mistake in that, and will find by experience—which, after all, is the only thing that can teach—that when they come to make up the revenue and so put against it the added cost of watching the borders, their expected increase of revenue will prove imaginary.

My hon. friends have kept the principle of protection in the tariff, but they have made some interference with it which I am afraid will be fatal to the industries themselves. If they are going to adopt the principle of protection, and keep sixty cents a ton on coal for a large interest in one province, why should they imperil the great and widely-distributed woollen industries of this country, which are spread from British Columbia to Cape Breton—which come nearer to that cross-road development of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance than any large industry we have? These small woollen mills are everywhere scattered throughout the country, a market for the farmers' wool, and a supply for the farmer's wear. I reduced the duty on woollens by 5 cents on the pound, keeping 5 cents a pound on 25 per cent; and under that reduction of duty some mills have been closed and the industry has been hard put to it. My firm belief is that with 5 cents a pound off, and simply a 35 per cent left on we may bid adieu to the greater part of the widely distributed woollen industry of this country.

I hope not, but I fear that such will be the case.

About buggies, carriages, pleasure-carts, and the like of that: there is an article of manufacture which has to-day in this country a hard struggle to maintain itself against American competition; and it has found it impossible successfully to maintain itself against that competition without the imposition of specific duties on the low-priced article. That specific duty has been cut off; and with simply the ad valorem duty on I must express the fear that the business of carriage, buggy and pleasure-cart making in this country, so far as honest making is concerned, is a thing of the past, and that what will be done hereafter will be the assembling of parts or the importation of the made article.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Bicycles.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has something the matter with him. I do not know what. I would take it very kindly, Mr. Speaker, if you would try to find out. The same remark applies to carpets, although the duty on yarns has been reduced, which may mitigate the reduction on carpets to a certain extent. A similar remark applies to confectionery, a large interest in this country. Thirty-five per cent was sufficient protection for the confectionery business when sugar was free; but when half a cent a pound is put on sugar, and only the ad valorem duty is kept on confectionery, and what applied as a specific duty upon it to counterbalance the rise in the duty on the raw material is taken off, I fear that that industry will fall a prey to the confectionery industries of others than Canadians.

The manufacture of shirts, collars, and cuffs forms an industry in this country which my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) may smile at; but I can take him down to the French constituencies in and around Montreal, and I can show him one of the most widely spread home industries you will find in Canada, which is to-day distributed amongst hundreds and thousands of habitants' houses where the women add to the daily fare and the keep of their homes by working on these articles at a moderate rate. I say that with simply an ad valorem duty that business goes to Troy or to Germany and Belgium, or to England. This may be a small thing, but it is the multiplicity of these small industries which constitute the comfort and well-being of the masses of the people; and if we are to keep a protective tariff at all, no man in this country feels the impost added to the cost of his shirts and collars and the like of that, compared at all with the derangement and destruction of an industry which goes into the homes of hundreds and thousands of people in the rural districts around the cities and villages of this country.

I might go on particularizing, but I simply make these statements with regard to these few things. But when the duties on these are being reduced, when out of these homes the means of livelihood have been taken, when the hundreds of small woollen mills are put to it in the fight with merciless competition, with small vantage ground, what excuses the keeping of 60 cents a ton on coal, which the Toronto "Globe," relying on the word of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), relying on the pledged word of the Minister who leads this Government, declared should as a raw material come in free? What can be said to these other maimed and maybe destroyed industries, when this great industry, which Mr. Hardy, in the presence of the Prime Minister on the platform in Brantford, declared was run by a New York or Boston syndicate, is left untouched? Did we expect that the coal duties would be taken off? Yes, and why? Because we had faith in the pledged word of the Prime Minister of to-day, the leader of the party, who a few months ago said:

> We are told we must not destroy the manufactories of Montreal. I say we are not going to destroy the industries of Montreal.
>
> I contend, on the contrary, that an application of the ideas of the hon. Minister of Finance will inaugurate an era of prosperity such as Montreal has not seen since the inauguration of the National Policy. The present system raises the maximum of taxation, not only on the consumer, but also on the producer. They have a tax on iron, which is also the raw material of every industry, and a tax on coal, which is also a raw material of every industry, of 60 cents a ton; and, although I have not the latest quotations in coal, I am afraid that this tax is equivalent to 40 per cent. Now, I am asked, What are you going to do? I have just told you. We are going to have a tariff for revenue and to abolish the duties on raw materials. I say that, if we were to have a revenue tariff, raw materials would be free. Raw materials are not free to-day under the protective system. There are certain raw materials which are free. Wool is free; thank heaven, they have not thought of taxing it, and cotton is free also. But iron is not free, nor is coal; and while cotton and wool are the raw materials of some industries, coal and iron are the raw materials of them all. If you have a revenue tariff, these will be free.

Had not Mr. Hardy a good right to expect, when he promised free coal to the people of Brantford, that his promise would be implemented? But the hon. First Minister had an able coadjutor, who sits beside him to-night in the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), who has been looked upon as the strong man of the Cabinet, and he declared standing in this House:

> Now, if there be a principle of political economy clearer than another, it is the principle that the worst tax which could be imposed is a tax on a necessary of life like coal. Moreover, it is a tax exceedingly partial and unjust in its effects. It is one which will fall specially on the poorer-

class of the community in the depth of winter, and it is absolutely sectional, pressing heavily on the people of Ontario, and not at all on the great mass of the people in the other provinces. While in that province it is a standing grievance, it is a most doubtful benefit to Nova Scotia.

And the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries declared :

Protection is false and delusive, and if the coal industry cannot live without being propped up by protection, then we say it is as well for the country that the coal industry should go.

Had not Mr. Hardy proper ground for believing that, under those pledges, he was perfectly right in saying to the people of Brantford, on the eve of one of the most strongly contested elections they ever had : Elect our man, support our party, and coal will be free ; $800,000 of a tax will be taken off, which the Toronto "Globe" says is nearly all paid by Ontario.

To-day what have we ? These gentlemen have not only not taken off the duty on this necessary of life but have commissioned their own man to declare that not only will he keep the duty on coal which is now dutiable, but that, under certain contingencies, he will add a duty on anthracite coal, of which one and a half million of tons are brought into the country yearly and are consumed mostly by the farmers of the country, especially of Ontario. But coal has not been reduced by these gentlemen who pledged themselves to reduce it, and who to-day, when in power, sit calmly there and see their broken pledges brought before them and feel within their inmost hearts that they have not kept faith with the people who trusted them and voted for them on the pledges they gave.

And rice—how shall I harrow up the soul of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) by bringing up this matter of rice ? 17½ per cent was on the uncleaned, and I brought that duty up to three-tenths of a cent, and kept the protection on the finished article the same as it was, and I received Hail Columbia from my hon. friend. It was an outrage that the food of the poor people should be taxed 1¼ cents. Why is it taxed now ? I asked that question of the hon. Minister of Finance, and he replied : We must have revenue. Why, that is what I said in 1894. I was getting more revenue by bringing it up from 17½ per cent to three-tenths of a cent, and the answer of my hon. friend —it is down in the "Hansard"—was : I can show you how you will get much more revenue than that—put a lower duty on the cleaned rice ; so many millions of pounds are used in the country, you will get cheap food for the people and four or five times the revenue. Does not the same answer apply to-day, or is a principle just three days old no longer a principle ? Now, I come for a moment to that second phase of the question, but before I touch that, I wish to read to you Resolution No. 16, which is as follows :—

That whenever it shall appear to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council that as respects any article of commerce there exists any trust, combination, association or agreement of any kind among the manufacturers of such article, or the dealers therein, or any portion of them, to enhance the price of such article or in any other way to unduly promote the advantage of such manufacturers or dealers at the expense of the consumers, and that such disadvantage to the consumer is facilitated by the customs duty imposed on a like article, when imported, then the Governor in Council shall place such article on the free list, or so reduce the duty on it, as to give to the public the benefit of reasonable competition in such article.

That is a power which, I humbly submit, no Government ought to ask in its own interests, in the interests of clean and pure Government, in the interests of satisfactory justice in this country. Who is to be the judge ? A partisan body of men are to be the judges in each case. Should they put themselves in that position ? Now, I am not arguing from any partisan point of view.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Of course not.

Mr. FOSTER. There are some hon. gentlemen, I suppose, who will not believe me, but I make the assertion conscious of its truth. I, as a member of the Government, would not have that power put in my hands because it is not a proper power for the peace of a Government, for the good of a Government, or its standing in the country. The very moment the Government begin to work on that, what happens ? Here is a large manufacturing industry which is run by persons who are of an opposite political faith from the Cabinet which sits as the judge. Now, we may have all the faith possible in human nature, but we know that there is partisanship in Canada as between two parties, and strong partisanship. And what is the first effect of that ? It is that a man who is charged feels that he is going before a prejudiced jury or a prejudiced judge, and that is not well for the body politic and the commonwealth. There is in it, if the Cabinet is willing to be corrupt, the most powerful engine for corruption that could possibly be devised. The simple threat by an unprincipled member of the Government to a large corporation that he is pretty well convinced that they are in a combine and that it had better be settled, would have a magic effect. No Government ought to court that power, and no Government ought to be given that power. I am just as strongly opposed to wrong combines as any man. And I will tell hon. gentlemen opposite, and they must know it when they look into the matter from a business point of view, that it is a pretty difficult thing to judge when a combine is really a combine. The ways of business are wonderfully complicated.

But if you have not, by means of the law and a penalty put down combines, what is the reason that you cannot? Provide that the judges who try the case shall, as a penalty, wipe off what duty they think would cure the difficulty. You then have a non-partisan body which commands the respect of every body, and to whom any party may appear with an idea that they will get justice. Surely the law is that which is to be invoked in these matters, and not the partisan decision of a Cabinet Council, no matter what side of politics may be in power. And so I want to ask hon. gentlemen opposite to think whether they cannot attain the same end and avoid these two great difficulties that I have spoken of. I think they can be avoided by making the judges of the land the judges and not a partisan body such as the Cabinet of the day. Now, and lastly——

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. I see that my hon. friend is loath to have me stop. Lastly, I wish to say a word with reference to this reciprocal business—just a word or two, for I will leave the main body of the discussion to be taken up by my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) who sits by my side and who is thoroughly conversant with it. I want to draw attention to the extreme indefiniteness of this resolution:

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

That any question that may arise as to the countries entitled to the benefits of the Reciprocal Tariff shall be decided by the Controller of Customs, subject to the authority of the Governor in Council.

And so on. Now, I call the attention of the House and the country to that as the most extraordinary provision that I ever knew to go into the tariff of any constitutionally governed country. What does it do? It constitutes the Controller of Customs on his report to the Governor in Council the arbiter of the tariff-making and treaty-making power, so far as commercial matters are concerned, of this country, without reference to Parliament at all. The disturbance caused would be complete. No one would know how trade would stand, no one would know what would be the conditions of trade six months ahead. No conditions are definitely stated, but it is simply provided that if the Controller of Customs believes and so reports that a certain country should be put on the reciprocal list, that country goes on the reciprocal list, by the simple proclamation, I suppose, of the Governor in Council. Is this Parliament convened for anything or not? Is the tariff-making power and consequently the revenue-collecting power a right which Parliament should most jealously conserve? Are we to give it over to the control of a Controller of Customs on his report to the Cabinet of the day? Surely this Parliament has not fallen so low as to do that. Can you conceive of the British Parliament so legislating or of the British Government proposing, such legislation? Why, Sir, not even in France, and they have a great deal of latitude in matters of tariff, is such latitude allowed. The Government there are bound strenuously by a minimum tariff every rate of which is given, and they have, even then, to submit to Parliament what they make as a reciprocal arrangement with other countries. I am not going to follow this line further. I call the attention of the House to it, and I say that so long as we sit here as the representatives of the people, we cannot concur, and it is not for the interest of trade, outside entirely of the rights of the House, that we should delegate the whole question of trade arrangement and reciprocal treaty-making to the hands of the Government upon the report of the Controller of Customs or any other member of the Government.

But, Sir, what does all this amount to? I have here a very interesting little extract which shows again the facility with which opinions may change. It will be remembered that in 1893, Mr. McCarthy introduced a resolution, in which amongst other things, he affirmed:

That in the opinion of this House, the tariff ought to be at once amended in respect of the matters herein indicated, and also by the substantial reduction of customs duties in favour of the United Kingdom, in whose markets all Canadian products are admitted duty free, and of those nations which, under treaty obligations with Great Britain, would be entitled to the same advantages granted; however, so as not unnecessarily to prejudice the business of the country, nor to do wrong to those who have imported and paid duties in accordance with its provision.

That was brought to a vote. Mr. McCarthy in drawing his resolution, drew it on the line of existing treaties. When he spoke of reducing duties in favour of the United Kingdom, he included those nations having favoured-nation treaties with Great Britain. What was the attitude of my hon. friend the Prime Minister of to-day on that question? His attitude was this:

I know that for many years we must raise our revenue by customs duties; but I tell the Finance Minister that the difference between him and us is this: That whereas he forms his tariff for protection and with revenue as merely an incident, we will frame our tariff, not for protection, but for revenue, and we will impede and interfere with freedom of trade only so far as it is absolutely necessary for the purposes of revenue, and for nothing else.

I know that for a great many years to come the American people will continue to levy their revenue by a customs tariff; but I say this to the hon. gentleman: That henceforward, not only as long as the Democratic party are in power, but I believe also, that when the Republican party comes back to power, that no more shall revenue be levied for the purpose of protection, but it shall be levied only for the purposes of a revenue, and for nothing else; because, as I have said to the hon. gentleman, the tariff of protection has been denounced by the American people as a fraud and a robbery.

I tell hon. gentlemen opposite, that when they take up that question of discrimination against England, they are raising against reciprocity an objection which England long ago abandoned.

In which the hon. gentleman was not correct.

I do not intend to be bound by the proposition which follows, and to which I must take exception.

He voted for it, but he took occasion before he voted for it, to say: If the Government is turned out, I will not be bound by it.

The proposition which follows is this: That the tariff ought to be amended also by the substantial reduction of customs duties in favour of the United Kingdom, in whose markets products are admitted free of duty, and of those nations which, under treaty obligations with Great Britain, would be entitled to the same advantages.

The hon. gentleman said he was not prepared to be bound by this resolution:

But if the proposition of the hon. gentleman were to carry, we would create a state of things such as it would be impossible to negotiate a treaty with the United States of America. I will say at once to the hon. Minister of Finance—and he can take what advantage he pleases from my words—that, if this motion were to carry, and if the Government were to be defeated on it, the Opposition would not be committed to the proposition that the duties should be reduced on goods from Britain and countries with which Britain has commercial treaties.

What change! Then he would not be bound by it, it would hurt the prospects of getting reciprocity with the United States. To-day his Finance Minister gravely tells us that there is a prospect of getting reciprocity from the United States. To-day the Prime Minister has bid adieu to all his fears, and is ready to vote and place upon the Statute-book a measure which he condemned in 1893. But, Sir, there is one thing that this Government has not done. This Government has not taken the House into its confidence, and to-day this House is utterly in the dark as to the scope of this latter proposition of the Government, and consequently as to the bearing upon the tariff upon any industry outside of wines, liquors, cigarettes, tobacco and snuff. The same fatal uncertainty and change which have followed these gentlemen through all their course of Opposition, so that one never knew, from day to day, what they would advocate next or where they would be when they came to act—the same fatal uncertainty is embodied in this tariff to-day. No man in this House or in this country knows where the Government stands in regard to it. I ask the Prime Minister to-night if he will tell this House, before we are called upon to vote, whether he considers that if this resolution passes and becomes law, he is bound to give the same treatment to Belgium and Germany and to other countries that have with Great Britain most-favoured-nation treaty clauses. It is of the utmost importance to the action of this House to know it; it is of the utmost moment that the country should have a clear idea upon this subject. The Finance Minister last night did not give that clear idea; is the Prime Minister willing to give it to-night before we are asked to come to a vote upon this? In all honesty he should do it, we should have the conditions fairly before us.

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

Mr. FOSTER. Then we are glad that we have now an authoritative statement. I hold in my hand a return which was brought down to the British Parliament as a return to an address of the English House of Commons. The return asked for was:

A return of the treaties of commerce in force between the United Kingdom and foreign nations which preclude preferential fiscal treatment of British goods in the colonies and dependencies of the British Crown, showing when such treaties were concluded, what notice is necessary for their termination.

That is accompanied by a report of Sir Edwards Hertslet, an authority, and he reports as follows:—

The following treaties between this country and foreign powers expressly "preclude preferential fiscal treatment of British goods in the colonies and dependencies of the British Crown":—

Treaty with Belgium, 23rd July, 1862, article XV.

Treaty with the Zollverein, 30th May, 1865, article VII.

The treaty with Belgium of 1862 contains this stipulation:

"Article VII. Articles the produce or manufacture of Belgium shall not be subject in the British colonies to other or higher duties than those which are, or may be, imposed upon similar articles of British origin."

This treaty is terminable after twelve months' notice.

The treaty with the Zollverein of 1865 contains this stipulation:

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

This treaty is also terminable after twelve months' notice.

While these two treaties remain in force, the express stipulations above quoted are extended to all countries whose commercial treaties with Great Britain contain a most-favoured-nation clause, and apply to British colonies.

Sir, that matter was brought up in the British House of Commons, brought up for an authoritative answer, and the answer made by Sir E. Grey on the 30th of June, 1895, was the Government's answer. He says:

These treaties (1) Do not prevent differential treatment by the United Kingdom in favour of British colonies. (2) They do prevent differential treatment by British colonies in favour of the United Kingdom. (3) They do not prevent differential treatment by British colonies in favour of each other.

My hon. friend, if he wishes to inquire further into this, can read Lord Ripon's despatch which deals with this question exhaustively. I then put the case as to whether he is right in his assumption, or whether I am right that these two treaties carry with them the same rates in Canada as are given to Great Britain, and that being an Imperial treaty, it is a treaty that must be carried out. Sir, I think that includes the countries that have most-favoured-nation treaties, of which Canada forms a part with Great Britain, and there are some eight or ten of those. But it goes wider than that. There is an Act upon the Statute-book here called the French Treaty Act, and one of the articles of that Act reads this way:

Any commercial advantage granted by Canada to any third power, especially in tariff matters, should be enjoyed fully by France, Algeria and the French colonies.

And the Commercial Treaties Act passed in 1895, declares that:

These advantages granted by that treaty of 1894 to France should extend to foreign powers with most-favoured-nation treaties with Great Britain, including Canada and also Great Britain herself, and British colonies.

My contention is, therefore, that when the hon. gentleman makes his assertion that what he proposes to do is to make a treaty —no, not a treaty but to give preferential treatment.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is the gist.

Mr. FOSTER. And a very small gist—to give preferential treatment with Great Britain in this colony of Canada, without its carrying the duty to make that same to Belgium, Germany, France and the allied countries, so far as the most-favoured-nation treaties are concerned—I say that my hon. friend's position is wrong. He must be prepared to say, that in this jubilee year he will signalize it by refusing, as an integral part of the Empire, to be bound by an Imperial treaty. These Imperial treaties are strong and binding, they were made by Britain, the mother power, for herself and her colonies, and so long as they remain, that is not a well-grounded loyalty which will refuse to be bound by them. My hon. friend has either to repudiate these Imperial treaties or he has to act in accordance with them. What will he do? Repudiate them with the light and jaunty air of the Minister of Finance, who said: Well, the world still moves, you know? Will he repudiate them, or will he loyally be bound by them? I carry this no further, except simply to state this, that my hon. friend either has hung a pretense upon the pole of impossibility, and with it is carrying out the programme of prolonging that policy which he has put before this country successfully for a number of years, of holding up promises to the eye which are not realized in performance. He is either doing that, or he is prepared to repudiate, in this jubilee year, Great Britain and her Imperial power as a treaty maker. Sir, I do not count loyalty on that score. It may be that this Dominion of Canada, if it could make preferential terms with Great Britain and with her alone, would be willing to do it to an extent which might press hard upon the industries of Canada itself, but whilst from the warm blood of loyalty that courses in her veins, she would make that sacrifice for Britain, it is another thing when we are asked to place our industries at the competition and mercy of a number of nations, some of them the largest manufacturing nations of the world, getting no benefits for them at all, compared with the benefits which Great Britain gives us. Before my hon. friend launched on legislation of this impossible kind, he should have raised the principle and settled the principle as to whether we can do that or not. Then his legislation would follow. Did I hear the Finance Minister say last night that when the offices here opened this morning British goods would come in at ⅛ per cent reduction on the main tariff from British Columbia to Cape Breton? Has this been done?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). It has.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the hon. gentleman has done a thing which he has not the slightest power in the world to do. In the first place, that resolution is not passed.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. When was it put to the vote—when did it pass? I say it has not passed. There is no authority to act under that resolution until it becomes law. It is different from the agreement for convenience we have made with respect to items of the tariff for the purpose of protecting the revenue. This, Sir, is the mak-

ing of a preferential arrangement with Great Britain, and it demands the assent of this House before it can be put in operation. But suppose the hon. gentleman has the power, and the resolution passed, has the hon. gentleman issued the order to the Customs-house officers? If so, by what right has he done so? Has the Governor General in Council, on a report of the Controller of Customs submitted to Council, set his sign manual to an order authorizing the issuing of a proclamation for this to be done? If he has not, hon. gentlemen have no power on earth to do it. Who is to decide? It is to be on the report of the Controller of Customs, submitted to the Governor General in Council, endorsed and put into legal form, and not in a hole-and-corner notice given by the Controller of Customs, but by proclamation.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Not at all; this is the same as any other tariff resolution.

Mr. FOSTER. If I concede the point that under an agreement respecting changes in duties this may be so, and may have the force of law, constitutionally this change proposed has not the force of law. But if I admit that under the agreement under which we have heretofore acted in regard to changes in duties and concede that that has the force of law, I press the second point, namely, that there is only one mode by which effect can be given to this proposed change, and that mode is by Order in Council on the report of the Controller of Customs. I will ask my hon. friend if that has been done?—if with respect to this matter there has been a report made by the Controller of Customs to the Governor General in Council, and if it has been acted upon?

The PRIME MINISTER. The tariff has been applied as it always has been applied in these matters. The tariff comes into force now, and the hon. gentleman knows it as well as I do. I am surprised at hearing him speak in this way. This course has been taken time and again. The tariff resolutions are brought here, and they go into force by executive action at one.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman does not meet my second point at all. There is the rule laid down. Action must be taken on the report made by the Controller of Customs, and assented to by the Governor General in Council. I ask if this has been done?

The PRIME MINISTER. I say the tariff was brought down and applied as all tariffs are. The hon. gentleman has done it time and again.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman knows he has not passed an Order—he has confessed it, and at all events he has not denied it. If the hon. gentleman has given orders through one of the officers to the Customs-house officers of this country to-day to let in British goods at one-eighth per cent less than the regular tariff, he has made an order which he has no authority to give.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the kind attention with which you have listened to my remarks, which have been somewhat lengthy——

Mr. CHARLTON. And the House too.

Mr. FOSTER. Now I ask the hon. gentleman, who will probably reply, to excuse me from the great pleasure of listening to him as I have to go to the city of Toronto to-night.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). If the hon. gentleman is really obliged to go, all I can say is that he carries with him my most sincere sympathy. Before the hon. gentleman rose I knew how hardly hit he had been, but he need not have shown it quite so plainly in his speech. But as the hon. gentleman must go. I will wait until he has an opportunity to return, and I therefore move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 26th April, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 58) respecting the Temiscouata Railway.—(Mr. Domville.)

MOUNTED POLICE PENSION ACT.

Mr. DAVIN moved:

That the order for second reading of Bill (No. 57) to amend the Mounted Police Pension Act be discharged, and the Bill withdrawn.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. DAVIN. The Bill of which this is an amendment, as the House knows, was originally prepared by myself and adopted by the Government of Sir John Macdonald. That is the Bill dealing with pensions in the North-west Mounted Police. I had a Bill

dealing with this subject, and saw on the paper a notice of that kind in my name. It was on for a long time, and when the Speaker, from day to day called my name, I raised my hat, and said "stand." I thought that I had given a memorandum to the Clerk of the House, and thereupon I put in my Bill: but the notice was really given by my hon. friend the member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) although my name was put down for it. I wish now to have the order discharged, so that my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) may be able to place his Bill on the paper, and have the precedence to which he is entitled.

Motion agreed to.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON BILLS.

Mr. CASEY moved:

That the report of the Special Committee to whom were referred Bills No. 2 and No. 3, be now adopted.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). What is the tenor of that report?

Mr. CASEY. The report merely asks that the quorum be reduced from six members to five, and that we shall have authority to employ a shorthand reporter to record such evidence as we desire to take.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the hon. gentleman say what number of members are on the committee?

Mr. CASEY. Ten.

Mr. FOSTER. That seems a small quorum.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE BILLS—REFERENCE TO COMMITTEES.

Mr. FRASER moved:

That the order of this House of Friday, the 23rd instant, referring to Bill (No. 40) to incorporate the Maritime Milling Company (Limited), to the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce, be rescinded, and that the said Bill be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SUTHERLAND moved:

That the order of this House of Friday, the 23rd of April, instant, referring Bill (No. 44) respecting the Welland Power and Supply Canal Power Company (Limited) to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, be rescinded, and the said Bill be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would like to mention to the House that it would be very convenient if hon. members would make up their minds, when moving for the reference of Bills to committees, which committees they should be referred to. The question is usually left in the hands of the Chair, and I can only judge from the title of a Bill to which committee it should go. So that if hon. members will be good enough to make up their minds in the first instance as to what committee each Bill should be referred to, it would save a great deal of trouble of this kind.

Motion agreed to.

MOUNTED POLICE PENSION ACT.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 59) to amend the Mounted Police Pension Act, 1889. He said: This is the Bill to which my hon. friend from Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) referred a few moments ago. I gave notice of this Bill, and, as the hon. gentleman has told you, he introduced a Bill on my notice. I cannot understand this, and I consider it a very serious matter. Had it been a new member of the House who had made this mistake, I could have understood it; but I cannot understand a gentleman of the long parliamentary experience of the member for Western Assiniboia making a mistake of that kind. I have heard the hon. gentleman rise in this House and quote authorities on parliamentary procedure, and yet we find him doing something which even a new member, probably myself, would not have done. I beg to move for leave to introduce this Bill.

Mr. DAVIN. I am very much obliged to my hon. friend for his reference; but I may say that if the hon. member would write his name plainly, the Clerk above stairs would not probably make such a mistake as has been made in this instance; and if the hon. member had been in his place, from day to day, when the Bill was called, and had seen me lift my hat and say: "Stand," then the mistake would not have happened. The very moment the matter came to my knowledge and I reflected over it, I went to the Clerk, and asked him how it could be put right, and how Mr. Davis could best be placed in a position of precedence. I think the moral is that gentlemen should either take care or learn to write their names plainly, and also that they should be in their places.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I would like to explain to the hon. gentleman——

Mr. DAVIN. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. If it is a matter of personal explanation, the hon. member may speak.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). The hon. gentleman has referred to the way in which I wrote my name. I wish to draw his attention to the Notice of Motion as printed on the 13th of April:

Mr. DAVIS—On Thursday next—Bill intituled: "An Act to amend the Act authorizing the granting of Pensions to the North-west Mounted Police Force, Chap. 26, 52 Victoria."

If the hon. gentleman could not read my writing, he could probably read print.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would like to say to the House that I am very glad that the misunderstanding which occurred in reference to this Bill has been set straight—that the hon. member for Assiniboia took the first opportunity in his power to withdraw from the mistake which he had made, and that the hon. member who gave notice of the Bill has had an opportunity to introduce it.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I observe that this is a public Bill, and, therefore, the motion is not regular, as the necessary notice of it has not been given ; but, as the Bill has already been moved once, we can receive the motion with the consent of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. It can only be done with the unanimous consent of the House.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DOMINION LANDS ACT.

Mr. DOUGLAS moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 60) in further amendment of the Dominion Lands Act. He said : The chief object of this Bill is to relieve the settler from the burden of actual residence in obtaining a second homestead. The application of the Bill is limited to this class of settlers. Parties who performed their homestead duties and received homesteads in 1889 are entitled by the Act to receive a second homestead. As the law now stands, they are compelled to reside on the second homestead, which obliges them to abandon the improvements they have made on the first. This is a very great hardship. Again, homesteads are often taken up by the sons of the settler, and this provision has led many to evade the law by spending six months of the year on the homestead, not in actual residence, but simply sleeping on it, making the improvements, and then applying for their patent. I may say that this provision has always been a fruitful source of insanity in Manitoba and the Territories imposing upon people the necessity of living alone for six months each year for three years. In many other respects the results have been very injurious. Therefore, it is sought by this amendment to remove this difficulty. It does not involve any loss to the Government, financial or otherwise, but is simply to relieve settlers of this burden of actual residence under such circumstances.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DOMINION LANDS ACT.

Mr. DAVIN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 61) further to amend the Dominion Lands Act. He said : The object of this Bill is different from the object of the Bill which my hon. friend has just introduced. Its object is to still keep on the Statute-book certain privileges that were taken away by the Act of 1891 as to homesteading affecting what is called the two-mile limit ; to continue for a few years more the two-mile limit which was abolished by the Act of 1891. Clause 6 of the Dominion Lands Act enabled a homesteader, when residing two miles from his homestead, to fulfil his duties and then enabled him, by cultivating a little more, to get a homestead. They cultivate a little more than was required from the ordinary homesteader—15 or 25 acres more, making altogether 40 acres. This also provides certain privileges for the ranchers. At present a rancher, no matter how much cattle he has, no matter what the size of his herd, and what number of sheep he may have in his flock or what may be the number of his band of horses, cannot, under the construction placed on the Dominion Lands Act, get a homestead entry unless he cultivates a certain number of acres. Some of these gentlemen have their ranches on lands not capable of arable cultivation at all, and it would be useless for them to fulfil these conditions. Therefore what I provide is this, and it is a new provision ; but I may say that although the construction which has been placed on the Dominion Lands Act has been adverse to those gentlemen getting a patent, my own belief always has been that no difficulty need necessarily have been found in arriving at the conclusion that under that Act, a patent might have been given. However, the ruling has been that these men cannot get a patent, and some of the best men in the Territories, men of wealth, men who have improved our stock, men who have been living in the country fourteen or fifteen years do not own an acre of land. That is a condition of things which ought to be got rid of. This Bill provides that he will be entitled to a homestead if he has resided on the quarter section which was the subject of his entry for three years prior to his application for a patent :

> That within the first of the three years and in each of the two succeeding years he has cultivated not less than one acre for garden purposes;
> That he has fenced sufficient land to be considered a bona fide settler ;
> That he has fifty head of stock ;
> That he has erected stables and outhouses sufficient to winter fifty head of cattle.

If he has fulfilled these conditions, though he may not have ploughed an acre, he is clearly a settler. That is not asking very much, and I may tell the hon. First Minister, who is a lawyer himself, that if he should turn his attention to the clause he will come to the same conclusion as I have reached, that under existing clauses probably a patent might be given. Those ranchers might be able to have it as a

matter of right and not as a matter of favour.

The second section deals with, what I have spoken of, the two-mile limit, and the third section provides :

In the case of a homesteader who has served in the North-west Mounted Police Force, five years' service in the said force may be counted as equivalent to one year's residence on his homestead.

My object is to encourage men leaving the force to go into farming. I think that that will be an inducement to them. If it fails as an inducement, it will do no harm ; if it succeeds, it can do nothing but good.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE MOUNTED POLICE ACT, 1894.

Mr. DAVIN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 62) to amend the Mounted Police Act, 1894. He said : The first section provides for filling the vacancies in commissions, and it provides that promotions shall be from the ranks or else that the man appointed an officer in the force shall be a graduate of the Royal Military College. This view is one which everybody familiar with the North-west and those interested more closely in the Police force hold, and I know that when I happened to mention this subject in other years in the House my views found an echo on both sides. A part of this clause is redlined because unless the Government adopt this Bill I cannot go on with it as it is one a private member could not carry. The second section provides that the Civil Service Superannuation Act shall apply to all commissioned officers of the force and their service shall be computed from the time they enter the ranks. I believe the Superannuation Act at present applies to the officers of the force, but it is only based on a calculation founded on their service from the time they became commissioned officers. It is palpable that if a man has served twelve or fourteen years in the force and is Sergeant-Major and retires, his retiring allowance will be very much better than, should he become an officer, anything he can get for his superannuation allowance after serving three, four, five, six or seven years, so that I think it is only a matter of justice, and it is a logical sequence from the previous clause. If the previous clause commends itself to the Government, this clause also will.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS.

Mr. SPEAKER. An error has been made in the printing of the routine proceedings and strictly speaking, under the order of the House passed on the 12th of April, private Bills and questions put by members should come before Government orders. If the House wishes we will go on with private Bills, and if the Government has not been misled by the printed notice, we will go on with questions. But if the Government have not the replies to questions at hand, we had better leave them alone on account of the error.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). If agreeable to my hon. friend, we will go on with public Bills. With regard to the questions, I would ask to have them put over until to-morrow, because we did not take them up to-day.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 48) respecting the Dominion Building and Loan Association.—(Mr. Cowan.)

Bill (No. 49) respecting the Richelieu and Lake Memphremagog Railway Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Bill (No. 50) respecting the Atikokan Iron Range Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment.)

Bill (No. 51) respecting the Langenburg and Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Richardson.)

Bill (No. 52) respecting the James' Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Lount.)

Bill (No. 53) to revive and further amend the Acts respecting the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company, and to change the name of the company to the Saskatchewan Pacific Railway and Mining Company. —(Mr. Lount.)

Bill (No. 54) respecting the North American Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. Lount.)

Bill (No. 55) to incorporate the Minden and North-western Railway Company.—(Mr. McHugh.)

Bill (No. 56) respecting the Medicine Hat Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Lount.)

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I am very much pleased to see that the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) is once more in his seat. When he vanished into space on Friday night, I had almost begun to fear that he would deprive us of his presence on this interesting occasion. I am very glad to welcome him back. The hon. gentleman's speech was like himself—clever, but disingenuous. He resurrected dead issues and distorted living facts to a degree unusual even for him. But, Sir, I am not disposed to criticise the hon. gentleman too severely. I think every allowance should be made for him on this occasion—every al-

lowance. In the first place I am aware that it is a severe trial for any one, even a very well-conditioned person to find himself outflanked and outgeneralled, and, for a person of the temperament of my hon. friend, I admit it was a peculiarly severe trial. Now, it is not for me to pry into the secrets of hon. gentlemen opposite, I do not know what their domestic arrangements are, but for the sake of old acquaintance, I would say to the Opposition Cæsar that he had better take care of his hon. friend.

"Yon Cassius is a lean and hungry man.
Trust him not, Cæsar, he is dangerous."

And while I know, as every one knows, that the leader of the Opposition, like his great prototype, is so compact that he is not readily accessible to fear, yet I think that if I could hypnotize that hon. gentleman, if I could do a little thought-reading and get at his inner thoughts, that hon. gentleman is pretty often saying to himself:

Would he were fatter! But I fear him not:
Yet, if my name were liable to fear,
I do not know the man I should avoid
So much as that spare Cassius.

Now, if I were so disposed and if time were no object, I think I could repay the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) in his own coin; and it might possibly amuse the House, it might even possibly do him some good. But I am not so disposed, and so for the present, I purpose to part with my hon. friend with this one remark. Sir, if it be true that the sight of Satan reproving sin is a thing which causes wise men to reflect, what can be said of such a spectacle as the hon. gentleman presented to us the other evening? Surely, Sir, the spectacle of a gentleman of the character and antecedents of the hon. member for York, gravely rising in his place to lecture this House on loyalty, on consistency, on the high standard of honour which should mark the dealings of one public man with another, is a spectacle which, as Mr. Thomas Carlyle was wont to say, is of a sort to make, not merely angels, but the very jackasses weep. However, Sir, I have more important work in hand, work of far greater weight than to analyse the character and proceedings of the hon. member for York. I recognize, Sir, and I think by this time that, far and wide, it has been recognized by all men who are capable of forming an opinion, whether on this side of the Atlantic or the other, that a crisis and a turning point have arrived in the history of Canada. Mr. Speaker, the task which lay before the Government when they undertook to revise the present tariff was, as I think every man on both sides of this House will admit, one of very great difficulty and very great delicacy. I do not for one moment admit that I or my hon. friends have been false to the pledges that we have made; but I do admit that there was before us a divided duty. We were bound by every declaration that we had made, we were bound by our oath of office, to devise and bring down a tariff which should give, in due degree and in due time, substantial relief to the great bulk of our fellow-countrymen; we were bound, likewise, by the same obligation in bringing down that tariff, to exercise our utmost care and skill so as not violently to disturb existing interests; and I trust before I take my place again, to be able to show to this House and to show to this country that this Government has made at least an honest endeavour to redeem both pledges.

Mr. Speaker, it was inevitable from the nature of the case that there should be some disturbance if we were to give any substantial relief at all. It was also inevitable, I fear, from the nature of the case, that we should give some dissatisfaction, particularly to those of our friends whose anticipations had been raised perhaps a little higher than circumstances warranted, and who thought that it would be possible, by one stroke of the pen, to wipe away the evil doings of eighteen years and to start exactly from where we had been in 1878. Sir, that was not possible; but I think I may say to those of our hon. friends, and there are some of them, I know, who think that the Government has not moved fast enough or far enough, that if they will carefully and calmly study this tariff they will find that we have advanced a good deal further than at first they supposed. Now, I am not particularly anxious to defend this tariff in the abstract. I do not pretend to say, nor did my hon. friend the Finance Minister pretend to say, in introducing it, that this was an ideal tariff; I do not pretend to say, nor did he pretend to say, that this was the sort of tariff which we would have liked to present to this House if he were acting, so to speak, tabula rasa, if we had an absolutely free field before us, if we had not to consider existing conditions which necessarily hamper and retard our progress towards the end we have in view. Sir, I do not pretend to say the tariff which we had the honour to submit for the consideration of this House, was a tariff which could be compared, nor would it be fair to compare it with such a tariff, as exists in the mother country. It is hardly as favourable a tariff as that which existed for many years in Canada, from the commencement of confederation in 1867 down to the present day. I do not pretend it is, we do not say that we have introduced an absolutely perfect tariff; and although I must warn my hon. friends that a very clear, and a very strong, and a very plain case must be made out to warrant any alterations in the tariff resolutions once brought down, yet I am free to say, and I am sure my hon. friends beside me will endorse it heartily, that if it be made plain to the Government that in dealing with four or five hundred different items, we may have possibly made a mistake, or that, still more, we may have committed an injustice, we will not be too

proud to rectify the mistake and correct the injustice.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. But don't let hon. gentlemen deceive themselves; they won't find many mistakes, they won't find many injustices, and it is with that knowledge that I make this offer. Sir, I do not mean to say that from an abstract point of view there may not be something, possibly a good deal, to be said against the tariff now in your hands; but I submit that the question at issue is not, is this the best possible tariff in an ideal point of view; the question is, is it, under existing circumstances and conditions a fairly good tariff? Does it fairly redeem the pledges which the Government and their followers have made to the country? Sir, I undertake to say, for my part, that whatever may be said against this tariff, it is a vast improvement on what I may call, without breach of parliamentary rules, the Foster tariff, which was in existence previously. Now, let me ask the House: What was the position in which we found ourselves when we undertook this task? Sir, we found the ship of state, to a great degree, water-logged and dismasted; we found her drifting on the rocks of civil discord, and in the hands of a crew in almost open mutiny. Well, Sir, it is no small thing for us to be able to say that we have made salvage of the ship, we have weathered the rocks, we have driven the mutineers overboard or under the hatches, and there we mean to keep them; and lastly, what my free-trade friends will remember and lay to heart, we have turned the ship's head in the right direction, and toward the open sea. More than that, Sir, and a very important thing it is, they will find when they come to study the tariff, that after you have deducted the taxes on the articles of food which we specially reserve for a special purpose, for the purpose of enabling us at a future day to deal, and I hope to deal successfully, with the people of the United States to establish better trade relations with them—they will find that in this tariff we have purged the late tariff from those monstrous iniquities, from those 40, 50, 60, 70 and 80 per cent duties which were found in it, disguised under the mask of specific and ad valorem duties. That in itself is a declaration of principle, that in itself is a great improvement, that in itself is an evidence that we are determined to carry out the pledges that we have made, the first of which pledges was that, so far as we could do so, taxes should be imposed in a fashion which would be just between man and man, and that the rich man in Canada should not be permitted to pay less than the poor man, which was the inevitable effect of many of the specific duties that we have abolished. I am perfectly well aware that, as a matter of business in collecting the revenue, and still more am I aware that for another and not so estimable a purpose, for the purpose of disguising and concealing from the public at large the real weight and burden of the taxes laid upon them, specific duties are always preferred.

Now, Sir, under our tariff the people will have at least that advantage; they will all know what they pay, they will be able to know what the tax amounts to; and let me say, speaking from experience, that it is a far harder thing to inflict a heavy protectionist tariff under ad valorem than under specific duties, and therefore it is a matter of some practical importance that we have succeeded in purging the present tariff to a large extent from specific duties, which had the pernicious effect to which I have alluded. We have paved the way for further reductions, no insignificant advantage. We have given a very substantial advantage to England and English trade. We have materially lightened, or at all events measurably lightened, the burdens of the people, and I think in these respects at all events, we are perfectly consistent with the motions moved by myself, by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies), and with other motions which at various times were submitted by us in former Parliaments.

In some respects the speech of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) was, though he did not see it, an exceedingly severe condemnation of the National Policy at large. What was one of his contentions? I will deal with others later on. The hon. gentleman assailed us, in the latter part of his speech at all events, for lowering duties from 40, 50 and 60 per cent. I should like to know whether the hon. gentleman ever seriously reflected what the maintenance of duties of 40, 50 and 60 per cent means to the Canadian public and to Canadian consumers. Sir, in the first place, this was a confession that after eighteen years those industries which required so monstrous a protection had proved utterly incapable of supporting themselves; it was a confession that if they were to exist at all, they could only exist as perpetual pensioners on the people of this country. Let us consider what a duty of 40 per cent and upwards really means. Every one knows that in the great majority of cases of manufactured articles the cost of raw material averages something like one-half of the total cost of the finished article; and if that be so, when you grant a duty of 40 per cent and upwards, it follows that the state says in effect to the manufacturer, or perhaps I should say the manufacturer says to the state: if you are willing to pay all the wages of my workmen, if you are willing to pay the interest on the capital and plant invested in establishing the business, I will conduct the business and be content with the profits derived from the sale of the manufactured article. That is

in effect what hon. gentlemen opposite have been doing—not certainly in the cases of all Canadian industries, but in the cases of those particular ones which owe their existence to the monstrous scale of duties to which I have alluded. What would the ex-Minister of Finance have said to my friends the Patrons of Industry or other farmers of Canada if a deputation of farmers had waited on him to say that if he and the Government of which he was a member could see their way and were willing to give the farmers a fair interest on the value of their farms and buildings, and were likewise willing to pay fair wages to the farm hands they employed, including themselves when they were doing manual labour, they on their part would be perfectly willing to pay for the seed and to undertake all the labour of supervising the farm, and to be at the expense of marketing, and be content with the proceeds as their reward? And that in effect is an exact parallel to the results in the case of those industries to which I have alluded, and which alone are likely to be injured by the reforms we have introduced. Sir, I should like to ask the ex-Minister of Finance whether, in his judgment, it is more meritorious to produce a pound of iron or a pound of sugar or a yard of cloth or cotton than it is to produce a pound of beef, a pound of cheese or a bushel of wheat; and if he is not prepared to lay down that rule, then I say there was no excuse for the policy he and his friends established and continued with respect to a certain knot of manufacturers. I say a certain knot of manufacturers, because I am perfectly aware there were always a large number of manufacturers who were not existing owing to the protection afforded by the protective tariff, and who were far better off twenty years ago—and they know it now—under the revenue tariff which existed from 1867 to 1878. It might be asked in this connection: When you establish such enormous duties as those, who is it that pays? Money does not drop from the heavens, it has to be extracted from the consuming population of Canada; and, so far as the possible advantage to be derived from increasing the home market is concerned, it is my deliberate conviction that as regards that class of highly protected manufacturers, so far at all events as the matter can be regarded from a purely economical standpoint, it would pay the people of Canada better, if they wanted to increase the home market, to have employed an equal number of men in digging post-holes and filling them up than to have protected industries under a 50 per cent tariff; at all events, in that case we would have had all the benefit of the home market for the simple payment of wages, instead of paying interest on capital and plant sunk as well.

The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) began his speech by declaring that he did not understand the tariff, and he was rather ill-tempered with me because I ventured to say that the hon. gentleman's remarks proved the truth of his statement. The hon. gentleman proceeded to allege that we had raised the duties, and he did that with full knowledge of the effect of the reduction under the second schedule of our tariff. When he thought, on the other hand, that he had a point to make at our expense, the hon. gentleman was perfectly capable of referring to the second schedule as showing a reduction. With one breath the hon. gentleman declared that our tariff was highly protective, and scarcely were the words cold on his lips before the hon. gentleman gave a long list of industries which we had destroyed by our tariff. Now, I never did think very much of what I may call National Policy arithmetic; but I thought the ex-Finance Minister was capable of solving this abstruse arithmetical problem: if you add 2½ per cent and you take away 6½ per cent, there is not a material increase in the duty.

Mr. FOSTER. But if you cannot take it away.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We have taken it away.

Mr. FOSTER. How?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It was taken away on the morning of the 23rd of April, if the hon. gentleman wishes to know the date, and will continue to be taken away. Sir, the hon. gentleman on the article of cottons, I think, had entirely overlooked the fact that the great bulk of cottons now imported into Canada come under the operation of schedule No. 2, and in all probability, after the present time they will all come under its operation. When the hon. gentleman talked of the operation of this tariff as regards cottons, I think he forgot this important fact, that we imported four and a half millions dollars of dutiable cottons last year, and of those it may be interesting to know that three and a half million dollars' worth came from England, as against one million dollars' worth imported from the United States. And I altogether mistake the quality and temper of English manufacturers if free trade England, with from six to ten points in her favour, will not be able to drive American cotton manufacturers out of the market.

Turning away from the alleged increase of our duties, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) dilated upon another triumph of the National Policy. It was, he stated, buoyant and expansive; or perhaps he said "expensive," and these were the proofs of it. It had made a most creditable showing—its last dying speech and confession, I suppose, was going to be quoted to its credit.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will allow me to correct him. I did not use these

words with reference to the National Policy. I quoted them from the Minister of Finance, who applied them to the revenues. The hon. gentleman can use them if he likes. I would be willing to maintain them.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I accept the correction, but most assuredly, the hon. gentleman claimed it as a great triumph of the National Policy, that when he left office in 1896 he was only $360,000 short; although he had cooked accounts to bring that about. I cannot be mistaken in that. If I am, my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) who holds the speech in his hands will correct me.

Mr. FOSTER. Neither of you can prove that.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Now, Sir, what are the actual facts of this triumph of the National Policy? In 1894 they had a deficit of about $1,250,000; in 1895 they had a deficit of $4,000,000, or thereabouts; which, by certain methods and means which I propose to enlarge upon a little later, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) had succeeded, he says, in reducing to $360,000 in 1896.

I will give the House a brief history of what the National Policy did for us, and I advise the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) to remember it and ponder on it. When I last had the honour of addressing this House as Finance Minister in 1878, the total expenditure of Canada was $23,500,000, and in 1895, after seventeen years of the National Policy, the total expenditure of Canada was $38,100,000, in round numbers. In other words, we had added very nearly $15,000,000 to our annual expenditure and taxation in the period of seventeen years. During that same period, as the hon. gentleman well knows, the total increase of the population of Canada was scantly 40,000 per annum. Forty thousand people a year with all the immigrants thrown in was added to our population, and $1,000,000 a year nearly were added to our public expenditure under the fostering influence of the National Policy from 1878 to 1895. I purposely exclude the year of 1896 and for good reasons, and I desire to call the attention of the House to the justice of the statements made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) with respect to 1896. That hon. gentleman claimed great credit because the expenditure was reduced to $36,950,000 in 1896, and I shall call the attention of the House to two or three important facts in that connection. For a very considerable period anterior to 1896, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) had been gradually creeping up with the expenditure at the rate of something like half a million dollars a year. Here are the figures:

Expenditure in—	
1890	$36,343,000
1891	36,705,000
1892-93	36,814,000
1894	37,580,000
1895	38,132,000

Then, he suddenly drops to $37,000,000 in 1896. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) for 1897, as it may be remembered, brought down main estimates to this House involving an expenditure of $38,300,000, and he had besides in his desk supplementary estimates chargeable to consolidated fund, to the tune of $3,180,000, making altogether $41,500,000 between supplementaries and main estimates. The hon. gentleman, when it suits him, is fond of averages, and let him take these three. First, the actual expenditure for 1895, second, the actual expenditure for 1896, and third, his own estimates with supplementaries included for 1897; and what do we get? Sir, we get an average annual expenditure for the three years of $39,150,000.

Now, I would like to ask this House: what would they say to a railroad manager who in bringing down the accounts of a great company for the year 1895 should have brought down charges to the tune of $38,100,000; for the year 1896 to have brought down charges of $37,000,000, and for the succeeding year, charges to the amount of $41,500,000. I certainly do not want to hurt the feelings of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), but I would say, that most of his shareholders would regard this as a very dexterous specimen of the art of cooking accounts. That is precisely what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) did. If you choose to analyse his expenditure for 1896, you will see that he did not effect an honest reduction on the expenditure of 1895. What he did was this. He saved nearly half a million on militia estimates by the very simple expedient of giving the militia no drill that year, and thus making the bulk of the expenditure on that branch of the service very nearly useless. He saved another half million dollars by starving the public works of the country, by refusing, and by ordering—as I am informed by my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte)—the people in the Public Works Department not to spend any money.

Now, if those had been genuine savings; if they had been savings that could have been maintained, I would give the hon. gentleman all the credit for them. But they were savings that could not be maintained, and he knew it. He himself had spent nearly $1,550,000 for militia in 1895, and he was going to spend $1,600,000 for militia in 1897, according to his own main estimates. What right has anybody to pretend, that it is an effective and permanent saving to spend $1,100,000 less in 1896? Sir, it was simply a case of carrying over for political reasons, to the year 1897, expenditures which should properly have been charged to 1896.

And in the case of public works, I would just present to the House a short sketch of what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) did. Five years ago he required $1,927,000 for his public works; four years ago he required $2,000,000 (and I am giving the actual

expenditure); the succeeding year $1,750,000; and then he comes down for 1896 to $1,250,000.

There is no mistake as to the cause; no mistake as to the reason, but it may interest the House to know what the practical results of this misplaced and false economy are. Everybody knows that we have in Canada a great number of public works, particularly on our various sea coasts, which require constant attention to keep them in a proper state of repair; and if the Minister, for a political reason, chooses deliberately to starve the public works in any particular year, he runs the risk (which my hon. friend has found to be more than a risk, to be a very serious fact for him), he runs the risk for the sake of saving a few thousands or a few hundreds of dollars in one year; of unnecessarily incurring the expenditure of many hundreds of thousands of dollars in the succeeding year or two.

Sir, I lay stress upon that because the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) laid great stress upon it. I wholly deny his right to treat the expenditure for 1896 as a true and fair statement of the average annual expenditure to which the Dominion had attained, and I hold him responsible—for reasons I have given before—not merely for his main estimates, but for the supplementary estimates, part of which were indeed rendered necessary by the false economy of 1896, and a large part of which were brought down and placed in the hands of members all over the country for the purpose of enabling them to say, that the Government of the day had placed large sums in the supplementary estimates for the benefit of particular constituencies, and that they were only prevented from giving full effect to their good intentions, by the obstinacy of hon. gentlemen now on this side of the House.

The hon. gentleman likewise entered into a long calculation, with which I have not the slightest intention of wearying the House, as to the average additions to the debt, and he dwelt upon the iniquity of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) in demanding nearly twice as much as he did. For what purpose has my hon. friend been demanding these large sums? For the purpose, and no other, of fulfilling obligations which the late Government had entered into, and left unfulfilled in our hands. For the purpose, and no other, of completing works which they had commenced, which are in process of construction, and which could not possibly be suspended. What is the crime of my hon. friend whom he specially denounced as a dangerous person? The crime of my hon. friend is that, instead of dawdling over the work for ten years more, as would have been done by hon. gentlemen opposite if they had remained in power, he proposes to complete the canal system in two years, and to give to Canada and the North-west and this continent, a magnificent system of internal navigation which will make the rest of the money that has been expended a source of real profit to the people of Canada. It is for the purpose of carrying out that sound, judicious and genuinely economical policy, that my hon. friend has to ask for four or five millions instead of the two millions or thereabouts which the hon. gentleman expended in his time.

Sir, the hon. gentleman was good enough to quote the language which I have heretofore used on the subject of protection. I stick to every word of it. I am not ashamed to stand up in this House and say that I hold protection to have been a curse to this country. I have said so before, and I say so now; and I have to add, what I have stated in my place before, that I am prepared to take any lawful and honourable means of extirpating protection. I am not going to be too particular whether we do it by a revenue tariff, a reciprocity treaty, or by a substantial preferential treatment to the mother country. It may be an interesting bit of history for the hon. leader of the Opposition to know that when this tariff has attained its full maturity, when it is fully developed—if you make allowance for the special reservations which we have made for the purpose of enabling us to treat on fair terms with our American friends, and if you bear in mind the slightly important fact that we have to provide about $40,000,000, instead of $24,000,000, as in 1878—I break no seal of official secrecy when I say that this tariff, when it will emerge, will be to a very great extent,—in fact, substantially—on lines which it is perfectly well known I was prepared to recommend to the Cabinet of the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie in 1876: and that certain political exigencies—to the great injury, I believe, of the country as well as the Reform party—prevented my then intentions being carried into effect.

Now, I come to a vastly more important matter than any of what I must call the hon. gentleman's somewhat picayune criticisms of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals. The hon. gentleman could not rise to the situation. He found it necessary to criticise very severely the offer we have made to grant to those governments who treat with us on fair terms a large reduction in the taxation schedule. Now, Sir, I am not going to speak dogmatically or ex cathedra on this subject. I recognize fully that this is a complicated question. We have to deal, if not with a mixed issue of law and fact, at any rate with a mixed issue of law and public policy. I know that jurists and statesmen of the highest repute have differed, and differed very widely, as to the interpretation that is to be put on the most-favoured-nation clause when dealt with on the basis of reciprocity; and, unless my memory is at fault, I think that in the course of the

discussion which took place in this House—as to whether the most-favoured-nation clause had anything to do with a reciprocity treaty, the view I took—which was that it had nothing to do with it, but that the two were wholly apart—was subscribed to by the late Sir John Thompson. Sir, it will interest the House, I think, to know what has been said by persons whose positions undoubtedly entitles them to very considerable respect, as to the proper interpretation to be given to the favoured-nation clause. Quoting from Wharton's "International Law Digest," the first thing I find is this definition :

A covenant to give privileges granted to the "most-favoured nation" only refers to gratuitous privileges, and does not cover privileges granted on the condition of a reciprocal advantage.

Now, that is plain and straightforward, and common-sense ; and it is further fortified by a despatch of the American Secretary of State in 1884 on the same subject, which reads as follows :—

Your despatch of the 8th ultimo has been received. You report that Mr. Carter, the special envoy from Hawaii to England and Germany, had succeeded in inducing the German Government to yield the point assumed by those governments, that the most-favoured-nation clause in their treaties with Hawaii entitled them to equal privileges in regard to imports with those obtained by the United States by the reciprocity treaty with the same country, and that no definite understanding had been reached with England, although it was probable that the proposition made by that government would be accepted.

If that statement be correct—and I see no reason to doubt it—it would follow that under closely analogous circumstances the German Government having possessed a favoured-nation clause withdrew their claim after a remonstrance from the proper authorities. Then, Mr. Evarts, a fair authority on matters of that kind, in speaking in reference to the claim made that nations possessing the most-favoured-nation clause should be entitled to the same privileges as were conferred on the United States Government by Hawaii, proceeds to say :

This is the precise thing the treaty does not intend. Its intention is to secure exclusive benefits to both contracting parties through special privileges granted by each to the other. To admit the claims of a third party to come in and enjoy all the benefits conceded by both principals, without any payment in equivalent special privileges to either, would be an unprecedented thing.

There are numerous other statements to the same effect, bearing on this particular contention that the most-favoured-nation clause necessarily confers the right to share in the benefits of a reciprocity treaty.

Sir, I need not say that we are not disposed to admit that this view can be conceded without long debate and without full trial. Now, the fact is, that the hon. member, if he will excuse me for saying so, did not see the point at issue. I will waive, for argument's sake, the underlying question whether reciprocity has anything to do with the most-favoured-nation clause. But I submit two points to both of which he will do well to address himself. I take the point, in the first instance, that when Great Britain, in 1862 and 1865, made a treaty such as she is reported to have done with the Zollverein and Belgium, Great Britain obviously meant that treaty to apply to those colonies dependent on the mother state, and which had not been conceded self-governing powers, and the right entirely to regulate their own fiscal policy. That would be a natural and fair construction, but I will not insist too much upon that, though the question requires discussion. But I say, with respect to the offer we now make, that it is not a preferential offer at all in the true, legal sense of the word. That offer is open to all the world. The Americans may avail themselves of it and so may the Germans and the Belgians. The whole world are welcome to avail themselves of it on the same terms and the same conditions on which England may take advantage of it. Where is the preference there ? The hon. gentleman may tell me : Legally you may be correct, but in fact you do give a preference, for England is the only country, except one or two small colonies, that admits your goods on these terms. Be it so. It may be true that, under our policy, preference is really and effectively given to England just as it was true that, under the tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite, England and the importation of England's goods was discriminated against to an extraordinary degree. I have here the Trade and Navigation returns which show the practical working of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. These returns show that, in the very last year of their term of office, we exported to England apparently $66,000,000 worth of our products, we exported to the United States $44,000,000, we bought from England $32,000,000, and from the United States $58,000,000 worth. There, if you will, is a genuine practical discrimination to an enormous extent, against England and in favour of the United States, under the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. I have always said that the National Policy was a Yankee device, imitated from the Yankees, and in fact a benefit to them chiefly, and there is the proof of it.

Mr. HUGHES. What was the hon. gentleman's proposal at Washington ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It was that if the Americans were willing to give us full and fair reciprocal advantages, I would recommend trading with them for the benefit of Canada and the Empire too ; and I think the hon. gentleman may find out, before he is many years older, that very probably—although, I admit, it is a little roundabout way—this is not a bad way to get it. Sir, I contend

that the construction which I have just laid before the House as to the real bearing and meaning of our offer is the true and legal construction, although I leave it to my legal friends to elaborate that point more in detail.

I submit that reason, equity and common sense are on our side in making that contention.

Sir, it is a well known fact that it is a fundamental principle of law that "he who seeks equity must do equity," and a nation that seeks to avail itself of the reduction offered in our tariff should be prepared to grant us corresponding advantages. We exclude no nation, and I call again the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to what I have read to the effect that the Germans have admitted substantially the truth of that position with regard to the treaty between Hawaii and the United States. The hon. gentleman is terribly exercised as to what we are going to do in case the English Government do not see things exactly as we do, and it would be a pity to keep the hon. gentleman in suspense. We mean to fight this point by all legal and constitutional means until we get a decision; and after we have done that, if the decision should go against us, we mean to appeal to the British Government and nation to do us justice by repealing this clause and denouncing these treaties which should never have been enacted to our manifest detriment.

Mr. SPROULE. Would it not have been better to find that out first?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. With all due deference to my hon. friend, he will find that we were not born yesterday, and know what we are about. Perhaps that truth is dawning on the minds of some hon. gentlemen opposite, and if not, they will learn it very shortly, unless I am entirely mistaken. I now quote, not from the "Times," but from an article in the "Blackwood Review":

Lord Salisbury publicly stated his opinion, a short while ago, "that before a very long time has elapsed some means will be found of mitigating this evil," that is, the evil inflicted by what he calls "those two unlucky treaties."

Again the hon. gentleman is in trouble. He fears we will be defeated on the legal question. He is afraid that Great Britain, with a magnanimity certainly unparalleled, will insist, 'coute qui coute,' on our admitting German goods, goods from a country which gives us no advantage, on the same terms as her own. Well, if the worst comes to the worst, if Great Britain does insist, and we, as loyal subjects, have to obey, in what will the consumer be worse off? We import at present $5,000,000 of German goods, and we will have given these to our consumers at a half a million dollars cheaper than at present.

Mr. FOSTER. Then if Great Britain refuses to do otherwise than call for the treaties being carried out, you will exceed your offer to Canada.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I do not say that. I say that Great Britain may extend it to Germany. Great Britain may compel us, in her capacity of suzerain and sovereign state, to give to Germany and Belgium the same privileges which we offer to her, and we may not be able to resist her sovereign will, unless the hon. gentleman is prepared to head a rebellion on that issue. I have known gentlemen of his persuasion may years ago, when they did not get their own way, demonstrate in Montreal and elsewhere the value of their loyalty when it came in conflict with what they supposed was their interests. I do not believe that the practical and probable results of the hon. gentleman's contention, if it be correct, will be so serious to the people of Canada.

But it may interest hon. gentlemen to know how these disloyal and traitorous proposals of ours have struck the average English mind. I am happy to be able to enlighten him. I have recently had placed in my hands some rather interesting reports of the way in which journals, such a journal as the London "Times," for instance, looks upon the proposal made by Canada that the goods of these countries, and notably the mother country, which gives us special advantages in trading with them, should be admitted at a reduced rate. It is a pity these journals had not an opportunity of consulting the hon. gentleman before they penned the following articles:—

The London "Times" stated that the new departure is most gratifying to all who desire to see the Empire knitted more closely together, that it is the most remarkable step yet made towards the fiscal confederation of the Empire. While it would be premature to pass judgment upon the most-favoured-nation clause, we have no hesitation——

Will the hon. gentleman mark this—

—we have no hesitation in saying, that if such stipulations stand in the way of a free and fair arrangement of duties between this country and Canada, the earliest opportunity should be taken to relieve us of such obligations.

"The earliest opportunity should be taken to relieve us of such obligations."

We regret to see the attitude of Mr. Foster. It is unfair to attempt to discredit the proposals as a refusal to be bound by Imperial treaty. There is much doubt whether these treaties have any bearing on the proposals. But even so, the Imperial Government has an undoubted right to alter the fiscal arrangements with foreign nations which appear obsolete and inexpedient. Immediate enforcement of the new tariff, when the parliament resolutions passed, subject to statutory sanction afterwards, is in accordance with the established rule of the House of Commons,——

Although it was not necessary to pass any resolution. Here is some good advice. Is

my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) here ?

We cannot believe that the old followers of Sir John Macdonald will, on merely partisan grounds, endeavour to obstruct the adoption of this plan for a closer union with Great Britain. They should rather welcome the conversion of a Government to their ideas.

Well, it was not a conversion, it was my hon. friend's (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) idea. Besides, it was the idea of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). But that is a pardonable error.

No doubt, it is unpleasant to politicians to see a policy they claimed (very improperly) as theirs, suddenly made effective by their rivals.

Mr. FOSTER. Part of that was parenthetical, was it not ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No, I am honestly reading.

An hon. MEMBER. Read it again.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I will read it again.

No doubt, it is unpleasant to politicians to see a policy that they claimed——

It was my interjection that they claimed it without any reason :

No doubt, it is unpleasant to politicians to see a policy they claimed as theirs, suddenly made effective by rivals. We trust that, when the momentary chagrin is forgotten, there will be no desire to prolong carping criticism or carry out the threat of strongly opposing the new tariff, which is the most striking step as yet made towards commercial union between the mother country and the colonies. Of no little significance is the fact that it is taken by the first French Canadian statesman, the Liberal and Catholic Prime Minister of the Dominion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. May I ask my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright), in order to give the House the benefit of being able to form a judgment as to the statement that he has just read from the London "Times," if he will be kind enough to favour the House with a transcript of the communication to the London "Times," or the London press on which that was based ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am not aware what communications passed, but I take it for granted that the London "Times" is tolerably well advised. It has two or three correspondents here, and I think it is tolerably well advised.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I beg to say, on behalf of the Government, that no transcript whatever went from the Government to the press.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Gentlemen opposite seem to be very anxious to prevent any light being thrown upon this important question. I did not assume that the Government had sent any transcript. But, if the information forwarded to the London "Times" by its correspondent here on that question is as inaccurate as on other important questions it is impossible for us to form a judgment on the question without having it before us.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think I can relieve the hon. gentleman's mind. I think he will find that the opinion of the "Times" is pretty unanimously echoed by the English press.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not confine it to the "Times." I assume that what went to one newspaper went to the others. But, to know the value of any statement of the London press we must know on what it is based.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I assume that it was based on the resolution introduced in this House. I will read the hon. gentleman, if he will allow me, an extract from another London paper, the "Daily News :"

The "Daily News" regards the new tariff as the outcome of American legislation. Mr. Fielding spoke out manfully and accurately upon the relations between this country and the colonies. Too many colonists have hitherto failed to appreciate the fact that, while receiving colonial goods free, we have allowed our colonies to tax our goods. The new policy is advantageous and likely to lead to development in the direction of free trade. The new Canadian tariff is not avowedly and in terms a measure for the benefit of Great Britain, but England will profit more than any other nation. As free traders, we rejoice in this consequence of the Dingley tariff ; as patriots, we welcome this significant display of attachment from the greatest of our colonies, and as Liberals, we congratulate the leader of the Liberal party of the Dominion.

And here, Sir, is from a special article of the "Times :"

If every British colony should follow suit, and the day comes when free trade exists from one frontier of the Empire to another, it will be a mutual satisfaction to recall the circumstances of the first step in the initiation of that policy.

Now, Sir, it is always well to hear from all sides, and I have got an interesting quotation from another "Times." This is from the London correspondent of the New York "Times." I do not think he will be accused of wishing to alter facts to suit us in particular. And he is a man of long experience and great opportunities of forming a conclusion :

For the first time in my experience, England and the English are regarding Canadians and the Dominion with affectionate enthusiasm. When the net benefits to England of the Premier's tariff come to be figured up, I do not know that they will bulk very large ; but the spirit of preference for the mother country directly appeals to the imagination here. Englishmen have always been peculiarly sore on this point of her colonies rearing protection walls against British trade, and nobody can blame them for it. This

change, therefore, will make Mr. Laurier, when he comes here in June, far and away the most conspicuous and popular of all the visiting Premiers of the Empire.

Sir, I have more, but I spare my hon. friends. However, I think that I have said enough to show that it is not likely that our proposals will be regarded as highly traitorous and disloyal when they come to be laid before the English Parliament and public.

Now, Sir, a word or two with regard to the true inwardness of this tariff of ours. I beg to point out, and I particularly point it out to our friends who think that we have not gone fast enough or far enough, that its effects are going to be considerably more far-reaching than may at first appear. Now you will remember that up to the present time many of the duties have been absolutely prohibitive. You could not import many things from other countries in the teeth of the tariff which we have modified. Those duties, as I have pointed out, were concealed in most cases under specific or mixed specific and ad valorem duties. Those have gone by the board altogether with the solitary exceptions which I alluded to in the early part of my speech. I want the House distinctly to understand that when tariff schedule No. 2 comes to be applied, although there is a nominal maximum of 35 per cent, and although a fair time is given to all parties concerned to adapt themselves to the change so that no man may be rashly harried or disturbed by our changes, still when you make the deduction of 25 per cent the practical result is that you have a maximum of about 25 or 26 per cent, and that a very large portion of our imports will come in under a reduced schedule of something like 20 per cent. Now I venture to say that although that is attained by easy stages, and with due caution, so as not to cause a commercial crisis, this is substantially a revenue tariff, and the Government have redeemed their pledges which they made to the electorate of this country. Sir, let me say to my hon. friends that I have advocated reciprocity. And why? Because I knew that after protection had prevailed for a certain time, reciprocity was the easiest half-way house to a revenue tariff, and, in the long run, to free trade. I know and recognize the need of giving milk to babes and meat to strong men; and if some of the infants opposite squall a little in anticipation, they must take their dose all the same. I do not deny that to those who merely glance at the outside of our tariff, there is room for criticism. I am perfectly willing to admit that I was mistaken in one respect. I do not think that anybody who has heard me in this House would contend that I have willingly or unintentionally minimized the injury those gentlemen have done to the country; but I am bound now, after full consideration, to admit that I have since discovered that they did even more mischief than I had ever accused them of doing. Sir, this National Policy has proved a most broken reed for our people to lean upon, and they know; and I believe, and it came out at every turn in the course of the tariff investigation held by my colleagues and myself, that the manufacturers of Canada never made a greater mistake than when they turned their backs on the revenue tariff of my honest and hon. friend the late Alexander Mackenzie. I believe that had we continued to go on under that revenue tariff, the growth of manufactures in Canada would have been wholesomer, sounder and larger than it is to-day, and the population of Canada would have been greater by many thousands of people. Not one but many have admitted to me that they regretted exceedingly that they had ever departed from the standard of a revenue tariff established in 1878. Sir, I must say that I cannot understand how any man who sits down and reads our public accounts, I cannot understand how any man who considers the returns of our census, I cannot understand how any man who has examined the evidence given before our tariff commission, can fail to come to the conclusion to which I came, that of all the mistakes, and they have been many and colossal, which those hon. gentlemen opposite committed, the greatest, so far as the interests of Canada were concerned—though perhaps not as concerned their own interests—was their adhesion to the protective tariff of 1879. But, Sir, that protective system left its fruits. Now in this, as in many other cases, the secondary consequences are even more injurious to the public than the immediate consequences. Up to that time there was a wholesome abhorrence of taxation on the part of the bulk of the people, but after being misled by sophistical leaders, it came to be supposed that the more we taxed ourselves the richer we were going to be. That removed every safeguard and every barrier which stood between us and extravagance and corruption, and verily we had our reward.

Now, Sir, I want to call the attention of the House to a few brief facts bearing on some of the remarks made by that hon. gentleman. I do not pretend to say that it will not be found possible to exercise still more judicious economy than we have yet been able to exercise in several departments. But I want to call the attention of this House to a few matters affecting the present financial condition of Canada in a very remarkable degree. We are confronted to-day with the fact that if our obligations were discharged, if we expend the various sums that we must expend in order to complete our unfinished public works and to fulfil the statutory obligations these hon. gentlemen have placed on the Statute-book, the annual expenditure of Canada can hardly be less than about

$40,000,000, in my judgment an inordinate sum for a country of our age, and circumstances, and population, to be called upon to raise or to spend. But I want to call attention to this other important fact, that of the total expenditure, about three-fourths is interest on mortgages, to all intents and purposes. If hon. gentlemen will take up the ordinary estimates, they will find that the very first item that strikes them is a charge of $19,320,000 for sums authorized by statute, almost all of which are absolutely beyond our control. If they carry their eyes a little further, they will see that there is a further charge of about ten millions rendered necessary for what is called collection of revenue, that is for the maintenance of our railways, of our post offices, of our customs and of our excise and other similar services. Now, practically it would be equally true to say that in the small remaining amount of nine or ten millions, a large percentage is for services over which we can exercise very little control. We cannot afford to disregard treaty obligations that we have entered into with the Indians, we must provide for the proper government of the North-west Territories; we cannot allow our lighthouse service to get into disorder; and we are obliged to maintain and to keep in proper repair the public buildings from one end of this Dominion to the other. The consequence is that we find when we sit down to the task of retrenchment, that our retrenchment must be exercised not on an expenditure of thirty-nine or forty millions, but on an expenditure of about eight or nine millions. Sir, these are important facts, these are disagreeable facts; I would, with all my heart, that it were otherwise. But I am bound to tell the House, and I speak with some knowledge of the subject, that although I believe some considerable reductions may be made, still in a general way, what the House has to look for is better government and better results, rather than any great decrease in the expenditure of eight or nine millions in a country like this. I want the House to understand, I should like the country to understand when they talk of a revenue and expenditure of $40,000,000 they would be more correct if they talked of a revenue and expenditure of $9,000,000 or $10,000,000. If they will bear that simple fact in mind, they will understand some of the difficulties with which the Finance Minister and my hon. friends have to contend. I may add, however, that if we had a true statement of the expenditures hon. gentlemen opposite have incurred, and a true estimate of all they proposed to incur, the estimates made by some of my hon. friends so far as regards possible reductions would have been fulfilled to the letter. I may ask, and ask fairly, who is, after all, to blame for this state of things? When we left office in 1878 the total annual expenditure was less than four and twenty millions. When we returned to office it had grown to $40,000,000 without any corresponding growth—and I say it advisedly—not merely in population but in wealth and resources, for most assuredly what we have gained in one direction has been almost entirely taken from us in another. The truth is that hon. gentlemen opposite gambled on a growth that did not come. They incurred expenditures which they were not warranted in making; they imperilled our whole future for the purpose of gratifying their immediate political interests, and we are obliged to pay the creditors. They lost population we might have had here. If this growth on which they counted did not come, I tell them now and here that it was largely on account of their own deliberate misconduct. It was necessary, if Canada was to compete fairly in the markets of the world, that our farmers should produce cheaply. All hon. gentlemen opposite did was to make Canada a country in which production was dear. It was necessary if Canada was to prosper, to bring more people here, and especially have more people in the North-west, and it was necessary to concentrate them when there. The result of their policy was to drive people out of the North-west and scatter those they did bring in, not in one strong province, but along a line of many thousand miles. Sir, briefly, the whole result is this, we had a huge outlay and a very insignificant return.

Now, I do not at all mean to say that perhaps some items of this huge debt and expenditure were incurred for purposes that might have been good in themselves on certain other conditions. My point is this, that those hon. gentlemen blundered, and blundered uniformly and frightfully in endeavouring to carry out what, if carried out, under other conditions and by better methods might have resulted to the advantage of Canada. I will not hold hon. gentlemen opposite responsible for our first mistake when, in 1867, we let slip one of the most grand opportunities given to any country, a chance which, if used and handled properly would have enabled us to have greatly reduced the burdens and taxes of the people, and greatly augumented our revenue at the expense of the neighbouring country, and, at the same time probably it would have done more to bring the Americans into a situation and disposition in which they would welcome a reciprocity treaty than anything that could have been done.

I note that the hon. gentleman before me (Mr. Foster) demanded what precedents we had for our action, particularly what precedents we had for our action, I suppose, in regard to the offer we are about to make to Great Britain. I have to say to the hon. gentleman this, that our position is in most important respects utterly unprecedented, and we had a perfect right to make our own precedent in this matter. Canada is not, and it is well to remember it, not in a normal position at all. Sir, we are called

and spoken of sometimes as a self-governing dependency. We are that, and we are much more. The Canadian confederation is of vastly more importance as regards the Empire than any single colony can possibly be. It has greater duties, and to those duties, as I contend, are and must be attached greater rights. We have to maintain peace and order throughout half of the continent, as other colonies have to do in other portions of the Empire; but we have also to deal wisely and prudently with a neighbour which represents one of the most powerful nations on the face of the earth. Again, I say that the duties imposed on us give us corresponding rights, and we have a right to ask for a much freer hand as representing the confederation of Canada, in the peculiar position we occupy in North America, than any other ordinary colony of Great Britain can ever fairly demand. We have a duty to ourselves, we have a duty to the Empire, and to the adjoining nation to fulfil.

The hon. gentleman alluded to the mission to Washington, undertaken by myself and the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Sir, I have to say to hon. gentlemen opposite that we returned from Washington perfectly convinced of two things. We returned from Washington perfectly convinced of the fact that the foolish conduct—I use the word advisedly—perhaps not so much on the part of the leader of the Opposition as of some others of our predecessors, had placed immense difficulties in the way of an immediate and honourable settlement with the United States. But I do not want on this occasion to introduce, unnecessarily, what may be called contentious matter, and therefore I forbear going into details of the various methods and ways in which those hon. gentlemen had created bad blood between ourselves and the United States. If there be any hon. member who wants to know the extent to which they went, I recommend him to peruse a certain very interesting speech, which he will find delivered in the year of grace 1888, and recorded in "Hansard" at pages 690-92, delivered by the present leader of the Opposition, to show to his followers how near we had gone to the very verge of actual war with the United States. But, as I have said, it is not my present intention to dwell on that point. We returned from Washington seeing and feeling that great mistakes had been committed, but seeing and feeling likewise that it was not impossible, if a more prudent and statesmanlike course were adopted, by showing the Americans that we are willing to trade with them on fair terms, by showing that we desired to be good neighbours of theirs, that we had no wish in the slightest degree to irritate and annoy them, to obtain at a little later day and under more favourable circumstances a treaty which would be honourable to both parties. In regard to the United States, I hold, as I have always held, that it is the duty of the Government of Canada to be both courteous and firm. I am not going to advise yielding unnecessarily to the United States, but I have not the slightest hesitation in asserting and declaring here that both in our interest and in the interest of the British Empire, it is of the highest possible moment to cultivate feelings of good neighbourhood with the United States, and while I hold office and while I have a word to say in our affairs with the United States, I shall advise our friends and our press, and I would bring to bear any influence I possess to ensure that in our dealings with the United States we should deal with them as a people with whom we are very closely connected, and whom we desire to reunite, if possible, if not on friendly trade relations, at all events on friendly terms with the rest of the British race. Sir, we are glad, we desire to trade with the United States on fair terms. We welcome them if they choose to accept our offers; but, Mr. Speaker, if the United States see fit to refuse—and they have the right to refuse, if they see fit to frame their tariff in a way which makes it impossible to trade with them, all I can say is, that we will frame our tariff as we believe the interests of Canada require.

We do not, and we have not yielded to the popular clamour to the extent of retaliating on the United States. We do not retaliate on the United States. Where it is in the interests of the people of Canada to admit United States goods at a lower rate, as in the matter of corn and of iron, we have dared to do it. Nor have we raised the duties against the United States. We have undoubtedly offered better terms to these countries who trade with us fairly, but that offer has been made to the United States just as freely as it has to any other country; even to Great Britain herself. Sir, I say that in dealing with the United States, above all other peoples, good sense and good temper are needed on our part. We will not cringe nor snarl, but we will do our best—without underrating the great value of the trade with the United States—we will do our best, if we must do so, to enable ourselves to develop our own trade and our own resources, utterly and completely independent of any other power.

As to England, I submit that the case is very different. Our Government intend to bring the matter of our relations with Great Britain to a head, and if the Opposition in this House possess real courage and patriotism, they will accept the advice tendered to them by the London "Times." I say, Sir, that instead of carping at the proposal, they should be glad to help it forward. Sir, in time past these hon. gentlemen have made every hustings ring, have made the floors of Parliament ring with their professions of loyalty and devotion to the old flag. They have a chance to prove their loyalty now. They have repeatedly declared their desire to show independence of the United States.

Sir, here is their chance if they wish to show independence of the United States. They have declared, some of them, that they wished that Canada should assert herself. Canada is asserting herself now. Let them stand by us, shoulder to shoulder, and help us to assert ourselves in the eyes of the world.

Mr. HUGHES. We do not know how long you will stick there.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Does the hon. gentleman want to know how long we will sit here?

Mr. HUGHES. I asked, how long you would stick to your present policy.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. If my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) had taken the trouble to examine the various speeches delivered in this House, he would find that this was the line formerly adopted by us, the Liberal party, and endorsed by us as a party, and voted for by us as a party, and voted down by hon. gentlemen opposite as a party, four, or five, or six years ago.

Now, Sir, let me ask one question which arises out of some of the remarks which I have addressed to the House. What is possible if this appeal of ours is responded to, as I have reason to believe it will? Well, many things are possible. There is not a little reason to believe that our example will be responded to in other quarters, and it may well be, that the United States, after a while, after second, sober, better thought, will consent to treat with us (and maybe with England) on better terms than they have heretofore treated. Sir, I do say that it is a great step, if our proposition is responded to, toward making the British Empire a reality as well as a name.

I say that it is a great step toward the federation of all the countries that owe allegiance to the British Crown, and I repeat, even at the risk of some misconstruction, that I am not without hope, that in its ultimate issue it may lead to a practical alliance between all the members of the English race. I will grant, that all this may not be in accordance with the declarations of certain of what I must call, extreme free traders; but even so high an authority as John Stuart Mill will be found declaring in many places throughout his works, and notably in his chapter on Navigation laws; that while it is true, all other things being equal, and were a condition of profound peace possible to be maintained, it might be desirable to utterly disregard the navigation laws; still, he for his part admitted, that there were other considerations for nations and statesmen than the mere bare consideration: where you can buy in the cheapest market and where you can sell in the dearest.

And it may be that the English Government, rising to the magnitude of the position, rising to the weight of the Imperial cares which are flung upon them; it may be that they will respond in a manner yet unthought of or unknown, to the offer which we have lately made to them. Of one thing I am sure, and it is, Sir, that it is time that we should know exactly where we are and where we stand in this matter. As I have said, if British statesmen respond, it is well. If not, it is well too. We have shown our good-will towards them and we are not going to be frightened at the notion of a deluge of cheap German goods, and the direful necessity of compelling the Canadian consumer to pay a few cents less per yard or per pound for them than he does at present. For my part I think that better results are likely to follow. I grant it will require some time to develop these results. I am prepared to be misconstrued, I am prepared to be misrepresented—I have an abiding faith that hon. gentlemen opposite are equal to that task at any rate. I say, Sir, that these hon. gentlemen will find before they are much older, that we have struck a chord which will re-echo from one end of the country to the other. They will find, and others will find, that the Dominion of Canada is a factor to be recognized. We demand only what is just. We demand what is advantageous to the whole Empire, and I well believe that we will speedily obtain it. The proposal may possibly be modified in some respects, but in one shape or other, I think that you will find that that proposal will prevail. You will find, that that proposal will lead us further on, and with patience and statesmanship, if the people sustain us, I believe that great and important issues will be found to depend on our action of last week.

More, Sir, for my part, I think that it will be found that in the passage of that tariff, we have at one and the same time rung the death knell of protection and rung in the chance of federating the Empire on a solid and secure basis.

Lastly, Sir, and it is not the least important portion of our scheme, there is a reasonable chance of delivering Canada from the dead-alive condition in which Canada was till very lately. I can understand how a native of Ontario, or how a native of Quebec, could possibly, honestly advocate protection. But with the facts of the last census staring us in the face, I cannot understand how an inhabitant of the maritime provinces can possibly believe that there is any good value in protection for their people. What is the condition there? How do hon. gentlemen opposite account for the facts which were stated by my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) the other night? What is the matter with the maritime provinces? Has the cradle ceased to rock in the regions by the sea; have the inhabitants attained

that state of beatitude in which there is no marriage or giving in marriage; are the people of the maritime provinces too good to live; what on earth can the cause be? Sir, it was not always so. If all tales be true, it was not so when good Sir Charles was young, but I fear that he has been succeeded by a more effete generation. I would like to ask the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), how he explains that in spite of all the beneficent effects of the National Policy, and the vigorous exertions of the great Liberal-Conservative party in New Brunswick, the total addition to the population of that province in ten years, is barely six and thirty souls; and I am credibly informed, though I will not pledge myself to the fact that more than that number have been during that interval been added to the inhabitants of the principal lunatic asylum in the city of St. John.

Sir, in sober seriousness, let me ask this House whether they consider a state of things that now exists creditable or honourable to Canada? Here we stand five millions strong, with half a continent at our disposal, and we have scarcely at this moment one single family to the square mile of habitable land under our control. Our population has been increasing during these eighteen years at a much lower ratio than the populations of older and more densely peopled European countries. In this very House I can look round on over 200 representatives from various parts of Canada, and I doubt if you could pick out twenty men in this assembly who have not at this moment some near and dear relative living in the United States. I ask if that state of things should continue. I say it should not; and I believe that it will be proved shortly that we have turned over a new leaf, that we have taken a new departure, and that the 23rd of April will be marked in the Canadian calander as doubly a red-letter day—as being first of all, the day on which my hon. friend introduced his tariff—and most appropriately it came into force on St. George's Day—the day on which Canada awoke from an evil trance, and shook the scales from her eyes and the fetters from her limbs—the day on which Canada set her face towards higher aims and a nobler destiny, towards honest government, towards the true development of her resources, towards placing the relations of the Empire upon a sounder basis, and towards a fiscal policy which, whatever its faults may be, honestly aims at fair play and equal justice to all classes in this Dominion.

Mr. McNEILL. As my hon. friend mentioned my name and suggested that perhaps, for party reasons, I might be inclined to support a policy of which I did not approve, or to oppose a policy of which I did approve, would he be kind enough to tell me whether he considers this offer to England an offer of preferential trade?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I tell the hon. gentleman that this is an offer of preferential trade to all countries that are qualified to come in—that it is, in fact, a preferential offer to England, because that is the country of all others which will profit most by accepting the offer; and a remarkable contrast to the practical result of the National Policy, which succeeded in almost destroying our trade with Great Britain, or at any rate, in reducing it from $60,000,000 to $30,000,000 in a very few years.

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

After Recess.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I entirely agree with the statement made by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) in his speech delivered this afternoon, that this is a very grave crisis in the history of Canada, and I do not think he at all over-stated the importance of the measure that is now placed before the House. I confess, Sir, that I listened with the most profound astonishment to the speech delivered by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). I did not suppose it possible, whether in one section of the Empire or another, for a great Parliament such as that which the Dominion of Canada possesses, to have presented for its consideration a Bill of such an entirely illegal and unconstitutional character. I have no hesitation in saying that you will search the history of parliamentary government throughout the British Empire in vain to find any parallel for the position in which we find ourselves in relation to the Budget speech of the hon. Minister of Finance. Unfortunately, this country has been suffering in the most severe manner for a year in connection with the change of Government. This country has had its commercial and financial transactions seriously hindered and embarrassed by the fact that a year ago it was known that we were on the eve of a general election, and that it was quite possible that a party pledged to destroy every vestige of protection, to radically change the fiscal policy of Canada, might be brought into power. The result of that election more than accounts for the small deficit with which the last year closed. The uncertainty that existed was abundantly sufficient to account for that deficit. But, Sir, the long-suffering people of Canada——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, I say that those who for the last twelve months have been on the tenter-hooks of expectation, those who felt that their dearest interests might be imperilled, those who felt that the means of sustaining themselves and their families might be swept away, looked forward with confidence and hope and expec-

tation to the hour when the Finance Minister of Canada should terminate all this uncertainty, which was producing such a paralysis of the trade and industry of the country—paralysis of trade, because the importer was afraid to import until he learned whether the articles that he was going to import would be subject to a higher or a lower duty. He was afraid to import, with the prospect before him that every vestige of protection being swept away, a lower duty would be imposed on the goods that he would place on the market, and that he would be undersold by those who competed with him under a lessened tariff. Those engaged in carrying on the great manufacturing industries of this country were afraid to carry on those industries with their wonted vigour, for fear of this threat to tear up, root and branch, the fiscal policy of this country under which their moneys were invested and their works carried on. But, as I say, those who have suffered long and patiently for the last twelve months, believed that when the Finance Minister rose in his place in this House and delivered the Budget speech, then, at all events, all uncertainty would be at an end. They would know the worst, they would know what the fiscal policy of Canada was, and they would be in a position to govern themselves accordingly. Sir, that hope has been disappointed. We have had the Budget speech, and I do not believe there are any two Ministers on the Treasury benches, to say nothing about the rest of the House—I do not believe that there are any two gentlemen who have been engaged in concocting this extraordinary Budget who, taken separately, would give you the same statement as to what this tariff really is to-day. I have had some little experience myself. I have had the honour of holding the high position of Minister of Finance in this country, and, as I say, after having had forty-two years' experience in public life, since I have been connected with the examination of these questions, I confess that when the hon. Minister of Finance sat down, I had no idea as to what the fiscal policy of Canada was to be. My hon. friend beside me (Mr. Foster), whose career as Minister of Finance is well known as that of one of the most able and successful Finance Ministers who have ever held office in this country—my hon. friend, looking at this tariff, reading it as I read it, naturally supposed, when he found a proposal utterly at variance with the law, diametrically opposed to the constitution of the country, and impossible of execution, that the hon. Minister of Finance and his colleagues had concluded to get over the difficulty of their free trade promises by holding out this delusive expectation that, under these extraordinary clauses, the former tariff would not be changed materially and a free trade policy introduced. While speaking from that standpoint, my hon. friend was perfectly right, and he addressed himself to the discussion—as I would have done—in the light of the declaration that the tariff was to remain practically the same as it was before. To use the words of the Finance Minister, there was to be no material change in the tariff. My hon. friend was warranted in accepting that statement and in treating these absurd and unconstitutional clauses, as clauses placed there for a purpose, and to be abandoned and relinquished by the Government because they knew they were impossible of execution. Judging from that standpoint, my hon. friend dealt with this question in the light of the adoption by the Government of practically, to a large extent, the policy that had been previously pursued.

Had my hon. friend no other ground for coming to that conclusion? I think, Sir, you will agree with me that he had. He saw opposite to him the First Minister of the Crown who had pledged himself as solemnly as ever man did to the people of this country that there should be no material injury inflicted upon the manufacturing interests of Canada: and unless that statement was to be falsified, my hon. friend was perfectly right in assuming that there was to be no material change in the tariff, and that the statement of the hon. First Minister to that effect was to be accepted as correct. Now, I find that we are not alone in arriving at that conclusion. Those who will take the trouble to look at the "Globe" newspaper which, I need not tell the House is one of the ablest journals in this country, than which there is no paper better informed on these questions and in a better position to judge of the character of statements of this kind, will find that in its issue of April 23rd, it said as follows:—

> The tariff resolution is everywhere discussed. While here and there one may find a Liberal member who thinks the duty on some article in which he is interested has been kept too high or kept too low, the great bulk of the supporters of the Government are enthusiastic in favour of the new tariff.

Just as they would be in favour of anything that comes from hon. gentlemen on the front benches. But the "Globe" went on to say:

> Last night the full significance of the new scheme had not been grasped by those even intimately acquainted with the workings of the tariff.

There is the declaration of the leading organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, given to the public of Canada, that when the hon. Minister of Finance resumed his seat after his long Budget speech, no one in this House or out of it was able to say what the tariff of this country was really to be. That demon of incertitude which has pursued the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite throughout the electoral campaign still holds them in its grasp, and even these supporters of the Government most intimately acquainted with

fiscal questions were not able to arrive at any satisfactory conclusion as to what was intended.

Now, I listened to this most remarkable address with the most profound astonishment, because it violated the most plain, clearly understood and well known laws governing the Parliament of Canada. It was in antagonism with the constitution of the country and in violation of everything that hon. gentlemen on either side of the House had a right to expect from a Minister of Finance. The hon. gentleman treated us to the usual jeremiad on the policy of protection. Only that the vigour and the spirit were lacking with which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) used to deal with this question, we could imagine that, in a diluted and weaker state, he was giving to us again his oft-told tale of the blue ruin and destruction caused by the National Policy. The hon. gentleman undertook to give us the history of protection and was not altogether accurate, as he must have learned to-day from listening to the speech just delivered by his predecessor (Sir Richard Cartwright). The hon. gentleman told us that in 1876 the question of protection to Canadian industries was first raised. In that the hon. gentleman was right. If he will go back to the "Hansards" of 1876 to 1878, he will find that the Opposition to the Government of which Mr. Mackenzie was then leader and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was Finance Minister, were imploring that Government, from day to day, to come to the rescue of a sinking and impoverished country and give sufficient protection to the industries of Canada. The hon. gentleman ventured to say the other night, and I have no doubt that he believed what he said, that Mr. Mackenzie was approached by the manufacturers of Canada and begged to raise the tariff, but that he heroically resisted. What did that hon. gentleman think of that statement in the light of the declaration made from that seat a few moments ago by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) that the tariff as it has now been tabled in this House was practically the same tariff that he wished to introduce in 1876, but was prevented by political considerations. Why, Sir, that was not news to me. I knew that in response to the urgent appeal from this side of the House and the universal demand of the dying industries of this country, that the Mackenzie Government had made up their minds to increase the tariff and come to the rescue of these suffering and ruined industries, but that they were prevented by Hon. Mr. Jones's arrival in Ottawa just before the tariff was brought down, who threatened that if they did not abandon the proposal to which they had all agreed and which has been declared to-night by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) as the tariff he was prepared to introduce but for political considerations, the whole Nova Scotia brigade on the Liberal side would go into opposition and turn them out. That is the history of that event which the hon. gentleman seemed to be quite ignorant of. The fact is that from 1867 to 1873 Canada was fairly prosperous. And the reason was to be found not in a high tariff, but in the fact that the industries of the great republic to the south of us were completely paralyzed and disorganized by a civil war, and this afforded us as ample a protection for our industries as any person could desire. That internecine struggle came to a happy close, and the industries of that great republic resumed their wonted condition. But, oppressed with a gigantic debt which the war had imposed upon them, the United States immediately resorted to high protection as the means of meeting their national engagements and wiping out their debt. Thus Canada found itself with a Chinese wall of protection raised against it, shutting out everything from this country, while the low tariff that we then possessed left this country a slaughter market for the industries of the United States, and everything in the shape of Canadian industry was practically paralyzed or driven out of existence. It was under that condition of things that the cry for fair, legitimate and necessary protection to Canadian industries was raised by the Liberal-Conservative party. And, Sir, those who will read the speeches delivered on the floor of the House in criticising the Budgets of the Minister of Finance, will find that steadily, year by year we advanced in that direction. We pointed out the absolute necessity of adopting a protective policy and we pledged ourselves in the face of Parliament and the country that if we were entrusted with the administration of public affairs we would take the earliest opportunity of carrying out that policy. I need not tell the House that a more deplorable condition of things, perhaps, never existed in any country—from fiscal causes certainly than Canada presented. I need not tell the House that hon. gentlemen then in power found themselves utterly unable to obtain the means from the low tariff that was then in existence, though they increased it by 2½ per cent. to find the necessary money for the ordinary expenditure of the country. They were obliged year after year to face huge deficits, rolled up not for the purpose of carrying on public works or for any expenditure of that kind, but occasioned by the lack of means to carry on the ordinary business of the country. There was a condition of universal stagnation, a condition in which all the progress that had been exhibited under Liberal-Conservative rule disappeared, and, from one end of this country to the other, stagnation and poverty and decay were present. Under these circumstances it is not to be wondered at

that the Liberal Government which brought into power by one of the most overwhelming majorities that any party has ever had in this country, or relatively, perhaps, in almost any other country, found itself, at the end of its term in 1878 driven from power by one of the most unanimous verdicts that any Government in any country ever was subjected to. If I remember aright, the journals will show a majority of from eighty to ninety taking the place of the overwhelming majority with which the Liberal Government had been brought into power in the general election of 1874. I can give no better evidence to the House of the deplorable condition in which Canada was and the determination of the free and independent and intelligent electorate of this country to drive from power men who had shown themselves so utterly incapable of discharging their duty to the country. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) knows well that in 1879, as soon as Parliament could be convened, the Liberal-Conservative Government brought down the policy of protection and placed it upon the Statute-book of the country. And, Sir, our opponents did us the justice to say on the floor of the House that we had honourably and faithfully redeemed our promises, at all events. I was astounded when I heard the hon. member for South Oxford, who cannot have forgotten that deplorable condition of Canada during the five years during which he filled the position of Finance Minister, regret that he could not go back to the tariff in existence in 1878. Did he wish that once more the deplorable spectacle should be presented in this country that was presented during that period when he held office before? Great objections were raised to our policy. The first was, instead of increasing your revenue you will decrease it, because the goods will be manufactured in the country instead of being imported and paying a duty. I need not take the time to contradict that statement, because the facts prove that we had a buoyant revenue and were enabled to deal with the public service of this country in a manner that had never been hoped for by our predecessors under their low tariff. The next objection was: Oh, but the people will have to pay so enormously for this protection that you are going to give to the manufacturers. The answer was: The policy will bring capital into Canada, it will bring people into Canada, it will have the effect of producing competition among the manufacturers at a very early day; that will regulate itself, and we will enjoy the advantage of having Canadian work done on Canadian soil without the people having to pay any more, or even as much; because, as I need not tell you, Sir, who have been conversant with the facts, under the policy of making Canada a slaughter market for the United States, the moment an industry was crushed out, and they had the field to themselves, they put up the prices, consequently the people had to pay higher. I can give no better illustration than sugar. Under the Liberal policy sugar refining was closed down, the vast machinery was rusting and going to ruin, and labourers were standing idle. But as a result of such protection as was necessary to put those industries on their feet, everybody knows that in addition to the benefit of large expenditures of money among our people, they had sugar at a rate less than it had ever been before. Now, I do not intend to take up the time of the House with reference to that further than to give a brief and admirable résumé of what occurred for the benefit of hon. gentlemen who, like the Minister of Trade and Commerce, have forgotten what occurred so recently as 1895. For the benefit of that hon. gentleman and of others troubled with short memories, I will read a comparison laid upon the Table of this House by my hon. colleague the late Finance Minister, who took the period from 1874 to 1879, and compared it with the period from 1889 to 1894, the latter period of four years covering the greatest depression that Canada has experienced from 1879 down to the present time. Sir, the showing is replete with information at a crisis like the present, and it ought to sink deep into the minds and memories of the people of this country:

1874-79.

Exports fell	$18,000,000
Imports (H.C.) fell	46,000,000
Decreased duty collected	1,500,000
Taxes increased by tariff	1,500,000
Percentage of duty increased	4 p.c.
Debt increased	40,000,000
Net interest on public debt increased.	1,500,000
Net per capita interest increased	$1.34 to $1.59
Credit, index per loan at 4 p.c	4·75
Net deficits	5,500,000
Average of failures	22,100,000
Increase in failures, liabilities	210 p.c.
Remission of taxes	Nil.
Savings decreased	4·5 p.c.

1889-94.

Exports rose	$28,000,000
Imports (H.C.) rose	3,500,000
Decreased duty collected	4,400,000
Taxes decreased by tariff	6,000,000
Percentage of duty decreased	4·5 p.c.
Debt increased	8,650,000
Net interest of debt increased	100,000
Net per capita interest decreased	$1.86 to $1.79
Credit, index per last loan at 3 p.c	3·16
Net surplus	7,500,000
Average of failures	15,500,000
Decrease in failures, liabilities	2¼ p.c.
Remission of taxes: sugar, coal, glass.	18,000,000
Savings increased	40 p.c.

I give that to the House as an unanswerable evidence of what this country experienced under the two 5-year periods of the greatest depression that existed from 1874 down to the present time. Now, I can give you no better evidence of the increased credit of the country under Liberal-Conservative

legislation than the fact that when the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, at that time Finance Minister, went out of office in 1878, the last loan that he put on the market was a four per cent loan at 96½; and when the late Government went out of power I need not tell the House that our 3 per cents had touched 107, or a premium of 7 per cent. Now, the hon. the ex-Finance Minister dealt so fully and exhaustively with the financial portion of the question that it is not necessary that I should refer to it at any length upon this occasion. But I may remind the House that the exports of last year, after eighteen years of the National Policy, reached the highest figure that they have ever done in the history of Canada; I need not remind the House that the increase in trade over the previous year was no less than fifteen millions. Our trade with Great Britain increased over that of 1895, by $6,640,995; the increase of trade with the United States over that of 1895, was $2,302,225. Now, if you turn to the exports, you will find that the exports to Great Britain increased in the last year $4,822,353 over those of 1895; while our exports to the United States were $1,547,475 less in 1896 than in 1895. Sir, the Minister of Finance ventured to say to this House that many Conservatives looked back with regret at the departure made in 1879. Why should they? On what ground, I ask him, does he venture in this House and in the hearing of the intelligent people of the country to say that Conservatives look with regret on the departure in the fiscal policy of this country made at that time? Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman knows that if ever there was a record of which every Liberal-Conservative may be justly proud it is the record of those eighteen years. He knows that the country passed out of the depths of poverty into a condition of the greatest prosperity. He knows that the country instead of being in that stagnant and impoverished condition which it occupied during the five years regime of the Liberal party, the country presented evidence from one end to the other of the tremendous value of the policy of protection. But, Sir, I require no further evidence of the triumph of the Liberal-Conservative party than that which the hon. gentleman himself presented to the House when he gave truthfully and fairly the statement he did give as to the financial condition of Canada when the Government was handed over to the hon. gentlemen. There are the figures to speak for thmselves. Every evidence that can carry conviction to a mind open to conviction shows that no Government ever had greater reason for satisfaction than the late Government as regards the condition in which they handed over the affairs of this country to hon. gentlemen. But the hon. gentleman was fair enough to say that not only was the country vigorous and prosperous, but the trade was in a condition of buoyancy and expansion. There are no terms in the English language by which stronger testimony can be given as regards the position of the Liberal-Conservative party than those used by the hon. gentleman.

The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), true to the extravagant denunciations which he has been so long accustomed to make in regard to the Liberal Conservative party, said that they found the ship of state water-logged, running upon the rocks and the crew deserting her. I did not know we had been charged with showing any very great activity in deserting the ship.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). It was a mutiny, I think.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was rather new to me to learn that hon. gentlemen opposite complained that we were too ready to give up the ship of state. But when we did surrender the ship she was in a condition of which any commander might well be proud: we handed the ship over in a condition such as any commander would be glad to receive her. I am sorry the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is not present, as I hate to criticise the statements of an hon. gentleman when he is not in his place. That hon. gentleman ventured to charge the ex-Minister of Finance with having cooked the accounts. I regard that charge as one of the gravest than can be made against a public man. Any Finance Minister who will cook accounts is unworthy to hold such a high position, and I would remind the present Minister of Trade and Commerce, that on the floor of this House I established by testimony, the most clear and incontrovertible, that he was guilty of the offence with which he improperly charged my hon. friend. For the purpose of establishing a deficit against his predecessor, when he came into office in 1874 he did an act such as I trust no Minister of the Crown would ever attempt to perform—he actually took bodily out of the estimates $500,000 voted by Parliament on capital expenditure, and transferred it to revenue account, so as to create a deficit. I am only repeating, in the hon. gentleman's absence a charge which I have again and again made in his face, and which I challenged him to take before the Committee of Public Accounts, where I would establish it by the highest testimony that could be produced. So I think the hon. gentleman forgets himself when he attempts to charge my hon. friend with that act which no man, so far as I am aware, who has ever filled the position of Finance Minister, has done, except himself.

My hon. friend stated that the tariff was going to be practically the tariff of to-day. When the hon. gentleman made that statement he made a statement which relieved

the minds and feelings of hundreds of thousands of the most intelligent and most important men in Canada. When the hon. gentleman said that the tariff was practically going to be the tariff of to-day, he said that which made those who had been inclined at times to doubt the sincerity and honesty of his leaders, who on the most important public occasion he gave his solemn word that the industries of this country would not be disturbed, and led the people to believe there was some faith to be reposed in man after all. My hon. friend accepted that statement, and based his speech on it, because he assumed this monstrosity, to use the language of my classical friend from Oxford, this "amorphous botch" on the hon. gentleman's budget was a thing not of practical utility, but put there as a little soothing panacea for free traders, who were not satisfied with the adoption of that tariff of the day by a party which had pledged itself that the moment it got in power it would wipe out every vestige of protection and give free trade to the country. It is no wonder that the "Globe" in the quotation which I have already submitted states that down to the close of the discussion on the subsequent night, even down to the time when the ex-Finance Minister rose to address the House, no one could quite satisfy himself what the tariff really was. Is it any wonder that people were unable to understand this tariff? Is it any wonder that the "Globe" says that people intimately acquainted with questions of fiscal policy and finance could not quite make out what the hon. gentleman intended? I will read for the information of the House the statement to which I refer, because it cannot too constantly be put before hon. members, as it covers the terms which the hon. gentleman calls the preferential features of the tariff. He said:

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

Does any one know what that means? Could the hon. gentleman himself tell, much less those who heard him? Could any one tell what this jumble of inconsequential words meaning nothing, was intended to represent? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) must, therefore, excuse my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) for having assumed, as I assumed, that it was impossible that a Finance Minister in the Parliament of Canada should insult—I do not hesitate to use the word—the intelligence of this House by putting such a thing as that before us. We ought to assume that hon. gentlemen opposite have at least some little respect for the intelligence of their own followers, if they have none for the intelligence of gentlemen on this side of the House. I defy the members supporting the Government to give any rational explanation of what these words mean. They can mean anything or they can mean nothing, and they were accepted evidently as a soothing syrup to the free traders, who believed in the assertions of the Cabinet Ministers as to their free trade policy. I invite the attention of the Finance Minister to what was said by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who stated: It is not a preferential tariff at all, there is nothing preferential about it. In that, the Minister of Trade and Commerce contradicts the very words of the Finance Minister. It would appear that these gentlemen had found out from some source or other that they are prohibited from giving Great Britain preferential treatment, and consequently the Minister of Trade and Commerce comes to the rescue of the Finance Minister, and tells him that he did not know what he was talking about when he put this construction on the resolution. The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) tells us, that it is not preferential, that it is open to every country in the world and discriminates against none. Which of these two hon. gentlemen are right? Their statements are as different one from the other as day is from night, and it is important that this House should know which of them gives the true meaning of this extraordinary clause. The Minister of Trade and Commerce tells us, that not only is this so-called preferential tariff open to all the world, but he hopes and expects that the United States of America will be included in it, in addition to Belgium and Germany, and all those nations which have the most-favoured-nation clause in their treaty with Great Britain. Hon. gentlemen opposite ought know, if they do not, that which every tyro knows who has given attention to the discussion of constitutional questions, namely, that they have no power to do what they propose. Is it treating this House with respect, for the Government to gravely propound to Parliament to pass a law which they know they have absolutely no power whatever to enact? Listen to what the "Globe" says, in an article headed "The position of Great Britain:"

> This is the central principle of the tariff, and upon it all the batteries of the Opposition will be brought. Already Sir Charles Tupper, with scarcely concealed satisfaction, has expressed his belief that Great Britain will be forced by her treaty obligations to refuse the concessions made.

Should the Government have waited to be told by me, that Great Britain cannot permit this to be done? No gentleman should take the position of Minister of Finance in this country, and undertake to deal with questions of such overwhelmning gravity, until he has taken the trouble to inform himself with reference to matters of this kind. The "Globe" continues:

Sir Charles does not seem to appreciate the situation. The new tariff is in force.

Sir, that makes it a thousand times worse. When you are shown that it is impossible for you to do a certain thing, that it would be a theft, that it would be a robbery, that it would be anything you like, and your answer is : Oh, but I have done it ; I do not mind that it is unconstitutional or illegal, I have done it and it is beyond recall ; when such an answer is given what are intelligent people to think ? Yes, Sir, that was the answer given me by the Finance Minister when I told him that this could not be done. He said : Oh, but it is done, and to-morrow morning every customs officer from Cape Breton to Vancouver and on to Victoria on to the shores of the Pacific, will admit British goods at a reduction of one-eighth on the general tariff. Was such an exhibition ever made in the presence of an intelligent Parliament ? I say, that if the Government of which I had the honour to be a member, had come before Parliament with a proposal of that kind, we would have been laughed out of the House, and properly so too. We would not only have subjected ourselves to the derision and contempt of our opponents, but we would have earned as well the derision of our own supporters. For a member of a government under the parliamentary system in one of the great dependencies of the British Crown, to stand in this House and say : We are utterly regardless of anything but our own sweet will and right or wrong, law or no law, treaty or no treaty, constitution or no constitution, we will carry this out ; for him to say that, is unparalleled in the history of a British colony.

There is a feeling throughout Canada, which prevails not in one party but in all parties, of the most ardent desire to do everything that will show our devotion to the British Crown. There is a feeling amongst all our people of intense satisfaction at the very suggestion of anything that will draw more closely together the relations between the mother country and this great Dominion. That feeling, Sir, is abused. It is taken advantage of by hon. gentlemen opposite, who, instead of dealing in a statesmanlike manner with this great question of the unity of the Empire, drawing this great Dominion and the mother country more closely together, take the means of defeating and preventing any such thing being done. Why, Sir, listen to this from the "Globe." It is, in short, rank rebellion on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, who are putting themselves forward on this occasion as the only exponents of loyal devotion to Great Britain. It says :

The new tariff is in force. Great Britain is getting the benefit of the minimum rates. She may object to getting this advantage over her trade competitors, but how is the objection to be enforced?

This is precisely the position the hon. gentleman himself took, and he finds that he has apt scholars.

Does Sir Charles Tupper think she will send troops to Canada to compel us to tax her goods as highly as those of the United States? The situation is somewhat ridiculous for Sir Charles Tupper. Canada controls her own customs-houses, and an order from Downing Street to increase the duties on British goods would hardly go with the collectors of the Dominion, unless countersigned by Controller Paterson.

Why, Sir, it appears, according to this great luminary of the party, from which hon. gentlemen opposite gather so much light and comfort, that it is not a question for the Governor General or for the Imperial Government, whether a British treaty is to be observed in this country, but for Controller Paterson. Well, Sir, nobody in this House has a greater respect, amounting almost to a personal regard, than I have for that hon. gentleman. I have long witnessed his independent action on the floor of this Parliament. I have long ago satisfied myself that whether he does what is right or what is wrong, he does what according, to the light he has, he believes to be right and proper. But, to say that any man in this country, I care not who he may be, from the highest to the lowest, is to be placed by the Government of this country in a position to overrule, to violate the constitution of the country, is to say that he can be guilty of an illegal act, an act which has not the force or the sanctity of law. Sir, I will read the words of the treaties which bind and govern us in this case, and if the hon. gentleman had read these treaties a little more frequently, if he had read them earlier, he would have been saved from occupying one of the most humiliating positions that I have ever seen any gentleman occupy during my parliamentary career. The treaty with Belgium says :

Articles, the produce and manufacture of Belgium, shall not be subject in the British colonies to other, or higher, duties than those which are, or may be, imposed upon similar articles of British origin.

Is that plain ? Is that clear ? Is that open to any misunderstanding ? Can any intelligent man say he does not know what that means? And yet you are saying that you have ordered every custom-house officer in Canada to violate the plain spirit of that law. We are not an independent country, thank God ; we are under the ægis of the British Crown ; and I say that the man who undertakes to flaunt his own illegal and unconstitutional acts upon this country, in violation of that sovereign power to which we all are proud to owe allegiance, is guilty of an act of as great disrespect as it is possible for a citizen of this country to exhibit towards the great parent state. The German treaty declares :

The stipulations of the preceding articles, I. to VI., shall also be applied to the colonies and foreign possessions of Her Britannic Majesty. In

those colonies and possessions the produce of the states of the Zollverein shall not be subject to any higher, or other, import duties than the produce of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, or of any other country of the like kind, nor shall the exportation from those colonies or possessions to the Zollverein be subject to any higher, or other, duties than the exportation from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

What is the result of that, Sir? Why, Sir, the moment that treaty is violated, where are the exports of Canada to Germany or to Belgium or to any one of the numerous countries that have the most-favoured-nation treatment? They are shut out, as a matter of course. They are in a position to say "You have violated the treaty." They will call on the Imperial Government to make good all the damage, all the derangement, to their trade, that has arisen in connection with that violation. These treaties with Belgium and Germany operate with equal force while they last, with reference to all the countries with which Great Britain has the most-favoured-nation treatment. What does the hon. gentleman think is to be the result of all this? As if to make assurance doubly sure, this question was asked from the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in Parliament—I am now reading from the "Hansard" of the House of Commons of England:

Sir ALBERT ROLLIT. I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, whether the commercial treaties with Belgium and Germany prevent, or not, differential fiscal treatment by Great Britain in favour of its colonies, by the colonies in favour of Great Britain, or by the colonies in favour of each other?

I may say that this matter was brought to the notice of the Foreign Office, and they stated that they had obtained the opinion of the law officers of the Crown before giving their reply; and, having taken that opinion, the reply was:

(1) They do not prevent differential treatment by the United Kingdom in favour of the British colonies.

England could to-morrow tax the products of the United States of America going into England and entering into competition with ours, giving us differential treatment without violating those treaties. But the British Foreign Office replies further:

(2) They do prevent differential treatment by British colonies in favour of the United Kingdom.

Well, Sir, the Montreal "Witness" says it believes that the law officers of the Crown in England agree with Sir Charles Tupper on this question, but it is greatly relieved to hear that the Prime Minister expressed unhesitatingly his opinion that there is no question at all about the Government having the right to pass this provision.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I suppose Sir Charles Tupper took quite a different view in July, 1892, at the meeting of the Chambers of Commerce in London.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman, I think, had better reserve any statements he has until I sit down, because I do not propose to have a grave argument of this kind interrupted by any irrelevant statements. I am inclined to think that the hon. gentleman's memory, on this as on many other occasions, has failed him. I am not saying what Sir Charles Tupper ever thought or said. I am saying what the Crown officers of England have stated; and when I say that the present Lord Russell of Killowen, one of the most brilliant lawyers that ever adorned the English bar, and who is now exhibiting equal ability as Lord Chief Justice in Great Britain, was the Attorney General of England at the time, and that he is the man who is responsible for that statement, I have probably satisfied my hon. friend that it is of very little consequence what opinion I may have ever held in view of such a high authority as I have quoted. This matter is one perfectly familiar to this House, one that has been exhaustively discussed, and concerning which there is no possible reason for doubt. The hon. gentleman must know that the Senate and the House of Commons adopted unanimously an address to Her Majesty the Queen, praying that these treaties should be modified so as to take away the obstruction which prevented Canada or any other British colony from treating the products of Great Britain more favourably than those of other countries, and the hon. gentleman cannot fail to know that Lord Ripon, who was then Colonial Minister, replied:

In regard to the third proposition, it seems clear that, under the terms of Article 15 of the Belgian Treaty and Article 7 of the treaty with the Zollverein, the British colonies cannot grant to the products of the United Kingdom any preferential treatment as to customs duties, without such treatment being extended to Belgium and Germany and other countries which have the most-favoured-nation clause with Great Britain.

The reason that that applies to all other countries is obvious. In the most-favoured-nation clause, it is provided that the most-favoured-nation shall enjoy the advantages that any other nation enjoys, and therefore, although the treaties with Belgium and Germany are the only two specific treaties that deal with this question, every other nation is in a position to say to England: What you have granted to Belgium and Germany under the most-favoured-nation clause, applies to us also. If that clause which prevents the colonies from giving a preference to the products of the United Kingdom were removed, it would also disappear from all the other treaties. That is not all. The hon. gentleman knows that I had the honour of negotiating a treaty with France, as a plenipotentiary of Her Majesty, under which Canada obtained certain concessions from France, and in return was to give France certain concessions here. The hon. Minister of Trade

and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) said that he drew a great line of distinction between a preferential trade arrangement and a treaty. He said that the fact that it was not a simple tariff revision providing for the admission of the goods of one country upon more favoured terms than another, but was a treaty under which the advantage was obtained by purchase, as it were, and not by gift, changed the whole aspect of the question and removed all the difficulty. The hon. gentleman will find that that would not help him, if it were the case, because in this case there is no treaty. Was there any treaty made with England under which this Act came into operation on the morning the tariff was announced? Not at all. There was no communication, no arrangement, no treaty, and therefore the flimsy argument of the hon. Minister, the only one he could conjure up, falls to the ground. If there were anything wanting to satisfy him of the entire fallacy of his view, it is the fact that when a treaty was negotiated for freer trade between France and Canada by the Imperial Government, the Bill which was submitted to this House did not provide for the admission of the goods of Belgium and of Germany and the other countries that had the most-favoured-nation treatment with England, and consequently Her Majesty's Government would not consent to it, and my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) was obliged to come back to Parliament and to lay before it the Bill of 1895 removing that difficulty and providing that the same rights enjoyed by France should be enjoyed by every country that had the most-favoured-nation treatment with England. Now, one would suppose that these hon. gentlemen, charged with such high and important duties, would have taken the trouble, if they did not know, to inform themselves, but it appears they were otherwise too busily engaged to consider a matter of such small import. What is the position to-day? The hon. gentleman says the law is in operation. Does he mean to say that the statement made by the hon. First Minister here a few evenings ago, that Belgium could not have the benefits that we extended to the mother country, is in force? Does he mean to say that throughout Canada to-day this Government, which professes such loyal devotion to the Crown, has actually instructed its customs officers to violate one of the plainest and most stringent treaty obligations of the mother country? The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said that this was a grave and important crisis. Sir, you cannot over-rate the importance of the position in which these hon. gentlemen have placed the Government and this Parliament in relation to this question. Their intentions may have been very good, but their absolute inability to deal with this question in the way that treaty obligations made it absolutely imperative that they should deal with it, the ignorance which they have exhibited on the whole question, has placed the Government of the country in one of the most humiliating and unfortunate positions that it has ever been placed in. But the hon. Minister of Finance, in his jaunty way, said: Suppose it is so. He did not seem to have taken the trouble to have informed himself, but confined himself to a mere supposition. Suppose Lord Chief Justice Russell has given that opinion? Why, he said, the world moves. But does the hon. gentleman want to move the Canadian world in the direction of defiant hostility to the mother country? What is the boast of England? It is that she never makes a treaty which she does not maintain in all its integrity to the last jot and tittle. England holds a transcendent position in the world because it is known that her engagements with foreign countries will always be held inviolate. Where have you placed England to-day by this extreme transcendent folly? The hon. gentleman laughs? Does he find anything to laugh at in the statement that it is transcendent folly for any Government in Canada to place itself in open, direct hostility to England. Does he think it anything but an act of transcendant folly for the Government of the day to ask Parliament to put a law on our Statute-book which they know is in the teeth of a solemn treaty made between England and all those other countries? And does he not know that every man whether he is a Belgian or a German or a Russian or a Persian, whoever he may be, belonging to a nation that is entitled to most-favoured-nation treatment by England, is in a position to demand from England—not from us they have nothing to do with us—that the rights they have had pledged, formally pledged by the greatest Empire in the world be recognized, and that this revolutionary encroachment by the Dominion of Canada shall be made good. This boast that these collectors have taken charge and are setting at defiance the treaties of England is an idle boast. Or, worse, it is one that will involve this country not only in disgrace but in most serious loss. There is not one of these countries, and I say it advisedly—if they dare to carry out this project of instructing their custom officers to discriminate between countries between which Great Britain has declared there shall be no discrimination, but may demand that the loss shall be made good, and not only that, but that all the trouble and inconvenience and embarrassment to trade that will follow as a matter of course shall be also made good. I ask this House whether, after all that Canada has suffered by reason of the long uncertainty with regard to the fiscal policy of the Government, it is not a high crime on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite now to prolong that uncer-

tainty and perpetuate that condition of things, thus inflicting further loss and injury upon the people.

The hon. Minister of Finance read to the House a part of the platform adopted at the Liberal convention of 1893. One of the statements contained in that platform was that the existing tariff—that is the tariff under the National Policy—discriminated against Great Britain. That statement I challenge as untrue. It was reiterated by the hon. member for South Oxford to-day. But I brand that statement as untrue and as one of the greatest wrongs that the Liberal party of this country has ever inflicted upon Canada. Why, from the day I took the position of High Commissioner to England, I was met all over Great Britain with the question: Why does Canada discriminate against Great Britain? I found it was only necessary to state the facts to entirely disabuse the minds of all intelligent men of the idea that there was any discrimination in the Canadian tariff against Great Britain. I was invited to deliver an address upon Canada at the great seaport, the city of Newcastle, shortly before I left to come to this country at the end of 1895. And, having delivered that lecture, I was invited by the Board of Trade of Newcastle to deliver an address to that board. On that occasion I met the first men in Newcastle, men of the highest character and standing in regard to financial and commercial matters, men of the greatest experience, intelligence and enterprise. The room was crowded to the doors and I had the pleasure of addressing them for an hour and a half; and at the conclusion of my address at a banquet they took the opportunity of expressing the great gratification they felt, that the impression that they had formed that Canada discriminated against the mother country was not well founded in fact. And on every occasion, wherever I went—and I have been in the habit of attending meetings of Chambers of Commerce and Boards of Trade all over the United Kingdom—when the facts as established by the statistics of the country were put before the people. I never met an intellignt Englishman who was not satisfied that the charge that this country discriminated against the mother country was not well founded. As this is a matter of some importance, I gave the substance of my lecture to the press, and I will read a few clauses of it in order to give the House the facts and figures upon which I undertook to make good the statement I then made. I may say that the charge of discrimination against England is embodied in an article in the Toronto "Globe" of 2nd of November, 1896, as follows:—

In 1896 we imported from Great Britain $32,979,742. We imported from the United States, $58,574,024. The duty collected on the $32,979,000 of the imports from Great Britain amounted to $7,358,514, and on the $58,574,000 of imports from the United States it was $7,767,992. British goods, therefore, paid 22·3 per cent, and American goods 13·3 per cent, or a difference of American goods to the extent of 9 per cent.

Now, Sir, this is a grave indictment, on the face of it a very plausible one and one which would naturally lead parties who do not take the trouble to investigate the question to feel that Canada did discriminate against Great Britain. Yet, when examined, the whole of these fallacies melt into thin air. Did gentlemen opposite, when they were in power from 1874 to 1879, discriminate against England? The public records show that in 1873 the imports from Great Britain were $68,523,000, and in 1879, after these gentlemen had been in power for five years, they had fallen to $30,943,000, a decrease of $37,580,000 in the imports from Great Britain in five years. Did that look like a British policy? On the other hand, in 1873, when they came into power the imports from the United States were $47,730,000, and in 1879 they had only decreased $4,110,000, and stood at $43,620,000. You had a decrease in imports from Great Britain under your free trade system in your imports of $37,580,000, and you had an apparent decrease of $4,110,000 in the imports from the United States. And even that decrease was fallacious for the reason that it was mainly in grain in transit, in bond which, since 1878 has been shown separately. Therefore while there was a decrease of 37½ millions from Great Britain there was no decrease from the United States; yet that was under a free trade system. Now, the imports from Great Britain for consumption in 1896 were $2,036,024 over those of 1879. Notwithstanding the enormous industries that had been created all over Canada, notwithstanding that the National Policy, which was intended to do the work for the Canadian people, with Canadian hands on Canadian soil, had been carried out, there was not only no decrease but an increase during the period that the National Policy was in force. Now, the answer to this is given in a few words. I will read a statement given to the press which is contained in an address I made before the Board of Trade at Newcastle:

Generally speaking, it may be stated that Canada imports from Great Britain most of her staple manufactures, and that they have increased since the higher duties have been in force, or at any rate, have maintained their volume, notwithstanding the great development of similar industries in the Dominion. Further, that while Canadian imports from the United States of raw materials and other articles which Great Britain does not export, or in the export of which she cannot compete with an adjacent country like the United States, have largely increased, United States manufactures have improved to a comparatively small extent, and the trade does not appear to be expanding. For instance, the Canadian free list contains the following articles which Great Britain does not export to Canada to any extent, for

the reasons already mentioned :—Anthracite coal, lumber, eggs, grease, hides, raw silk, broom corn, unmanufactured tobacco, florists' stocks, green fruits, cotton waste, raw cotton, gutta percha, newspapers, cocoanut and palm oil, rags, crude rubber, horses, seeds, and sugar. The imports of these articles, in addition to settlers' effects brought by immigrants into Canada, were valued in 1894 at $864,000 from Great Britain, and at the large sum of $20,427,767 from the United States, nearly $18,500,000 of which represented coal, lumber, hides, raw cotton, settlers' effects, crude rubber, and raw sugar. To this add the imports of coin and bullion, which from Great Britain were $1,681,000, and from the United States $2,288,000.

There are also many articles on the dutiable list which Great Britain does not export to any extent, or in which she cannot compete with the United States, owing to the low prices of the goods and to the favourable position occupied by the latter country for transport purposes ; for example, cattle and horses (other than for breeding), sheep and other animals, baking powder, blacking, books, breadstuffs, bituminous coal, cocoanuts, coffee, medicines, electric light apparatus, axle grease, hops, malt, marble, mineral oil, trees, provisions, bricks and tiles, clocks, fish oil, &c., fruits, post office matter, turpentine, twine, vegetables, watches, and wood manufactures. Such commodities Great Britain only sent to Canada to the value of $1,595,000, while from the United States they represented no less than $11,849,000. Adding together the goods thus mentioned, those on the free list, including coin and bullion, and those on the dutiable list, the totals are $4,050,000 from Great Britain, and $32,637,000 from the United States.

Figures which present a remarkable contrast, but which are explained at once by the fact that they are articles in which England does not compete with this country :

Deducting these amounts from the total imports from the two countries, it will be found that Canada received from Great Britain merchandise to the value of $34,697,000—chiefly manufactures—as against $20,397,000 from the United States—a balance of $14,000,000 in favour of the mother country, in regard to what may be termed competitive trade. This is a very different thing from the bald statement in the summary given in the Canadian Trade Returns, which shows that in 1894 the imports from Great Britain were $38,747,000, and those from the United States $53,034,000.

Though the moment you came to the manufacturing industries in which Great Britain was interested, you found that the balance was altogether in favour of England and against the United States :

There is another phase of the question. The duty-free imports from Great Britain——

Of which great point is made in this article which I read from the "Globe."

—are only $11,224,000, as against $27,210,000 from the United States, and this is held by some to prove discrimination against the former country. It has already been shown that most of the free imports from the United States consist of raw materials and articles which Great Britain does not export, the value of which, including coin and bullion, were $2,545,000 from Great Britain, and $22,716,000 from the United States. Of such articles as salt, hemp, jute cloth, tea and coffee, articles for use of the Dominion Government, and paintings, Great Britain sent to Canada $2,533,000, and the United States only $397,000 ; and again, in the case of metals and their manufactures, on the free list, which include steel rails, the figures are $3,362,000 from Great Britain, as against $8,291,000 from the United States. The total of these different figures are $8,439,000 from Great Britain, and $23,941,000 from the United States. The explanation given seems to dispose of the contention that the Dominion free list operates injuriously upon British trade.

Now, Sir, I hold in my hand a statement of the staple manufactures imported into this country from Great Britain and the United States :

Article.	1896.	
	From G.B.	From U.S.
	$	$
Earthenware and china...	385,586	45,572
Fancy goods.....	908,938	228,825
Flax, hemp and jute.....	1,411,243	64,128
Silk	1,896,528	121,756
Spirits and wine.....	416,050	44,010
Woollens	6,930,268	203,848
Manufactures of cotton...	3,357,008	1,067,013

These figures show a total import of staple manufactures from Great Britain in 1896 amounting to $15,305,613, as against $1,775,155 from the United States in the same year. Yet, in face of the explanations that he ought to know perfectly well, and which ought to be regarded as entirely conclusive in these matters, the hon. gentleman ventured to declare that the fiscal policy of Canada discriminated against the mother country in favour of the United States, the facts proving that there was not only no grounds for such imputation of discrimination, but that the figures completely disposed of that question. Now, Sir, I pass on to inquire whether the results show that that was a British or an American policy. While under the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite there was a decrease of 37½ millions in the imports of Great Britain to this country during the five years that they were in power, every person knows that no progress was made in this country, that nothing was done that was of value either to Canada or to the mother country. But when we by the National Policy revivified the financial position of this country, when we placed the Government in a position to expand and develop the country, what did we do ? I need not tell the House that under this National Policy, which has been declared to discriminate against England, we were enabled to secure the construction of over ten thousand miles of railway in Canada, and almost every rail used came in free from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. That was the way in which our policy was not only di-

rectly a British policy but indirectly a policy of the greatest value to the United Kingdom. Under that policy we constructed the gigantic work of the Canadian Pacific Railway. We opened up this country. When we came into power, what was the position of Canada? It was that here in the heart of the country, where Parliament meets, we were separated from Manitoba and the great prairies of the North-west by a desert extending over one thousand miles. The North-west itself was an unpeopled desert. One of the grounds of attack made on the Government when it took up the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway was this: We were asked by hon. gentlemen then in Opposition what possible utility could there be in constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway, when from Lake Nipissing for 3,000 miles to the shores of the Pacific, it would only pass one village containing a few hundred people. All the rest of the country was a desert occupied by wild animals and Indians. We were asked, how can you hope to maintain a line of communication when the earnings of the company will not be sufficient to pay the grease for the wheels, and the country would be ruined by undertaking to operate that gigantic work even if we could secure its construction. I need not tell the House how all these predictions have failed to be realized. I need not tell hon. members that the traffic created by the Canadian Pacific Railway, has caused that great enterprise to become one of the soundest and best financial undertakings in this country, and I need not point to the fact that it has not only enabled people from the older provinces of the Dominion to get access to the great North-west without going through a foreign country, as they were formerly obliged to do, by a most circuitous route in order to reach it at all, but it has opened up what will be at no distant date the great granary of the world for settlement and cultivation, and it has pierced the Rocky Mountains and opened up the enormous resources of British Columbia. The last cargo of rails I sent from England to British Columbia was seven months in reaching that province, while it can now be reached within a few days. Not only have we opened the boundless prairies of the North-west to British settlement, and developed a country that in the future will provide thousands of happy homes, over which the British flag will float, but we will be able to provide bread and meat for the mother country, which in the case of a European war she might otherwise be sorely pressed to obtain. I point to these facts to show that it was not an anti-British but an essentially British policy we adopted, and that it was attended with the best national results.

In addition, we expended during the past eighteen years no less than $36,250,000, from 1878 to 1896 inclusive, in deepening the canal system of Canada to fourteen feet, and we brought the work to a point that will enable hon. gentlemen opposite within two years—and I am happy to find they are grappling with the question—to secure fourteen feet navigation throughout the entire system of canals connecting with the great lakes. All these matters are of great importance to Great Britain, and it is of the greatest importance that the Dominion should expand, develop and become a great country. The construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway has already been shown to be of vital importance, and the time may come at no distant date when the possession of this great road which has brought Yokohama within twenty days of London, by a route which occupies only one-half the time occupied by the Suez Canal route, will be of Imperial importance and the safety of British possessions in India many depend upon that work. Yet that National Policy, which has enabled Canada to achieve that great result for herself and the Empire, is alleged by hon. gentlemen opposite to be a discriminating policy against England. Without the National Policy, that national railroad would not exist to-day: we would have had no access to our great North-west except through a foreign country, during six months of the year; and without that policy the teeming millions of mineral resources to be taken out of the bowels of the earth in British Columbia at an early day would have remained buried, or if developed, the wealth would have gone to the neighbouring republic instead of enriching the people of Canada. I hope it is not necessary for me to say more in regard to a question that ought never to have been raised, because the charge that the National Policy of the Liberal-Conservative party discriminates against England is entirely untrue.

I wish to occupy the attention of the House for a few moments on the question not of discrimination but of preferential trade. An hon. member has introduced a Bill with respect to trade marks, and under it the hon. gentleman proposes to make it a very serious offence for any person to appropriate a trade mark that does not belong to him. I heartily approve of a measure of that kind, if it can be carried into effect. But I want to know whether I shall not be in a position to come down and charge the Finance Minister with having stolen the trade mark of the United Empire Trade League. That league is a body of gentleman, a large number of whom are members of the Houses of Lords and Commons of both political parties, influential merchants and commercial gentlemen, who long ago came to the conclusion that the greatest means that could be adopted to promote the unity of the Empire was to establish preferential—not differential as the hon. member for South Oxford said—trade within the Empire. They have propounded to the country a policy of having the products of the United Kingdom sent into the various colonies on

preferential terms, on better terms than those enjoyed by any foreign country, and that England should revert to her former position of giving to the products of her colonies a preferential position in her markets. That is the policy for which the United Empire Trade League have worked with great zeal and immense success, and while England is perhaps the most conservative country in the world, yet I have never anywhere witnessed such a revolution in public sentiment as I have in England, in regard to this question of preferential trade. I need not tell the House that preferential trade would increase the population of Canada, develop our wealth and expand our resources to an extent that cannot be hoped for under any other system. A deputation from this United Empire Trade League waited upon Lord Salisbury in June, 1891, with the object of asking to have the Belgian and German treaties modified, and if they could not be modified, to have them denounced so as to remove the restrictions which made it impossible for any colony to give preference to Great Britain. In the course of his speech, Lord Salisbury said :

On this matter public opinion must be framed or formed before any government can act. No government can impose its own opinion on the people of this country in these matters. You are invited, and it is the duty of those who feel themselves to be the pioneers of such a movement and the apostles of such a doctrine, to go forth to fight for it, and, when they have convinced the people of this country, their battle will be won.

This plainly shows that Lord Salisbury was ready, whenever he was supported by public sentiment to adopt a policy of preferential trade within the Empire. Then, on the 25th April, 1892, the Parliament of Canada passed the following resolution :—

That if and when the Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland admits Canadian products to the markets of the United Kingdom upon more favourable terms than it accords to the products of foreign countries, the Parliament of Canada will be prepared to accord corresponding advantages by a substantial reduction in the duties it imposes upon British manufactured goods.

The passage of that resolution was followed by the historic conference which took place in Ottawa, and which cordially endorsed that sentiment when it passed this resolution :

That this conference records its belief in the advisability of a customs arrangement between Great Britain and her colonies by which trade within the Empire may be placed on a more favourable footing than that which is carried on with foreign countries.

The next important step in this matter was made when the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, now Secretary of State for the Colonies, declared at the Canada Club banquet, that for so important a purpose as to secure the unity of this great Empire, he would be prepared to abandon the Cobdenite view of free trade to the extent of taxing the products of foreign countries coming into England in competition with the products of the colonies.

It is true that he coupled that with the expression of opinion, that it ought to be accompanied by free trade within the Empire, or, that there should only be a revenue tariff, or, at all events, that there should be no protection within the Empire, but that the protection should be against outside countries. As I have said, the United Empire Trade League took up the question enthusiastically, and in obedience to the expressed opinion of Lord Salisbury fought for the principle, and after the last general election in England they went back to Lord Salisbury with this statement :

The greater number of the members returned to the present Parliament in support of Your Lordship's policy and Administration, advocated either in their election addresses or in their platform speeches, the policy of United Empire trade, and to this fact must be ascribed some portion of the unparalleled majority in the House of Commons by which Your Lordship is supported—especially from working-class constituencies.

The "Times" newspaper, March 10, 1896, says :

The Prime Minister has addressed a letter to Sir Howard Vincent, as honorary secretary of the United Empire Trade League, in reply to the memorial presented last month by the council of that body, praying that notice might be given denouncing the clause in the commercial treaties with Germany and Belgium preventing British colonies from levying a lighter duty upon British goods than upon foreign goods, should they elect to do so. Lord Salisbury says that "since the accession to office of Her Majesty's present advisers the question of the trade relations between the mother country and the colonies has been taken into serious consideration, and that he is in thorough accord with the views expressed by Mr. Chamberlain as to the extreme importance of securing as large a share as possible of the mutual trade of the United Kingdom and the colonies for British producers and manufacturers, whether located in the colonies or in the United Kingdom." The letter goes on to add that "while the Prime Minister fully recognizes the inconvenient character of the stipulations in question—stipulations which should never again be agreed to by this country—he is not prepared to give notice for the termination of these otherwise valuable treaties until a definite scheme has been produced offering such probabilities of increased trade within the Empire as would fully compensate for the risk involved."

Mark, Sir, Lord Salisbury observed that this question of preferential trade had made an enormous advance, but he said that before they took the serious step of denouncing these treaties, he wanted something to assure him that it was going to result in advantage to the Empire. On the 13th February, the London "Times" had an article in which it said it assumes now that the Tupper ministry had been formed a scheme would be propounded for the consideration of Lord Salisbury, and that this question would be taken up.

Sir, I have no hesitation in saying, that had the Government of which I had the honour to be the head been sustained, long ere this I should have submitted to Parliament and endeavoured to obtain its sanction to a proposal for the purpose of carrying out this policy of preferential trade between Great Britain and Canada. I have no doubt that such a policy could be formulated in such a way as to show to Her Majesty's Government that they would be consulting, not only the interests of Canada but the interests of the Empire if they gave effect to it.

But, Sir, I was greatly relieved to know that Mr. Chamberlain had followed up his statement, and had shown no lack of interest in this movement by his speech in opening the Third Congress of the Chambers of Commerce of the Empire. On that occasion, he used these somewhat memorable words :

And I admit that, if I understand it correctly, I find the germs of such a proposal in a resolution which is to be submitted to you on behalf of the Toronto Board of Trade. What is that resolution? I hope I correctly explain it. That resolution I understand to be one for the creation of a British zollverein or customs union, which would establish at once practically free trade throughout the British Empire, but would leave the contracting parties free to make their own arrangements with regard to duties upon foreign goods ; except that—this is an essential condition of the proposal—that Great Britain shall consent to replace moderate duties upon certain articles which are of large production in the colonies. Now, if I have rightly understood it, these articles would comprise corn, meat, wool and sugar, and perhaps other articles of enormous consumption in this country, which are at present largely produced in the colonies, and which might be, under such an arrangement, wholly produced in the colonies, and wholly produced by British labour. On the other hand, as I have said, the colonies, while maintaining their duties upon foreign imports, would agree to a free interchange of commodities with the rest of the Empire, and would cease to place protective duties upon any product of British labour.

If hon. gentlemen opposite wanted to promote preferential trade with Great Britain, there they had the opportunity. They had the opportunity, not only of obtaining the introduction of British goods into this country at a lower rate of duty, but of approaching Her Majesty's Government with a proposal that would secure an advantage to the great natural products of this country, such as wheat, dairy products, cattle, meats of every kind, and breadstuffs of every kind, in the markets of Great Britain upon terms as would give an impetus to Canada such as nothing else would give. He says further :

I only want to impress upon you my personal conviction that, if a proposal of this kind came to us from the colonies, backed by any considerable support on their part, it would not be met with a blank refusal by the people of this country. I say, gentlemen, if it were proposed to us by the colonies, because I do not consider that it would be either wise or practicable that a proposal of this kind should come in the first instance from the United Kingdom. We know how strenuously the colonies cling to their own independence, to their own initiative. If they desire, as we desire, and as we believe they do, this closer union—if they are willing to make some sacrifice of their present arrangements and convictions in order to secure it—let them say so. Let the offer come voluntarily from them, and I believe it will be considered in this country, not in any huckstering spirit, but that it will be entertained as part of a great policy which is intended to unite in the closest bonds of affection and of interest all the communities which are under the British flag and all the subjects of Her Majesty throughout the world.

I invite the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to that as an invitation of the most pertinent character, coming from Her Majesty's Government to Canada in relation to this important question.

The resolution passed by the Congress of the Chambers of Commerce of the Empire was in entire accord with the position of Mr. Chamberlain in that speech. That resolution, which was passed unanimously, was as follows :—

That this Congress of Chambers of Commerce of the Empire is of opinion that the establishment of closer commercial relations between the United Kingdom and the colonies and dependencies is an object which deserves, and demands, prompt and careful consideration. The congress, therefore, respectfully represents to Her Majesty's Government that, if the suggestion should be made on behalf of the colonies, or of some of them, it would be right and expedient to promote such consideration, and the formulation of some practicable plan, by summoning an Imperial conference, thoroughly representative of the interests involved, or by such other means as Her Majesty may be advised to adcpt.

I give that as an additional evidence of the position that this question has assumed.

Now, Sir, what took place during the last general election ? It is well known that from the time I came out to this country I took every opportunity, when addressing a great meeting of commercial men in the city of Montreal, as well as in the various addresses which I delivered on the floor of this House and throughout the country, of urging the great importance of this question of preferential trade. And what happened ? Why, Sir, my hon. friend the Prime Minister outbade me. Not content with going as far as I did, he put himself on record at a dozen places in similar terms to these to which he gave utterance on the 17th of May, 1896 :

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

He went on to say :—

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

That was very satisfactory. Now, I have laid my hand on the extract from the "Times" to which I have already referred, and if the House will allow me, I will read it. On February 13, that paper said:

It is believed that the accession of Sir Charles Tupper to the Ministry will lead Canada to make some kind of an effort of preferential trade with the mother country. It is probable that the united governments of Australia will make a similar effort. The recent turn of foreign affairs, especially regarding Germany and America, have given much popular impetus to this movement.

Now, Sir, that was the position in which this question of preferential trade stood; and if ever a Government desired to promote the unity of the Empire and to establish closer trade relations with Great Britain, as the hon. First Minister had pledged himself that he did, this Government certainly had the invitation tendered from Her Majesty's Government to propound a plan under which preferential trade should be established. No hon. gentleman on either side of this House would hesitate for one moment to admit that it would be an enormous advantage to Canada, it would bring millions of capital and people into our country for the purpose of developing our great resources, if the products of Canada had such a position in the markets of Great Britain, which they do not now enjoy. It is true, England receives all our products without imposing any duty upon them; but is that any favour to us? Does not England do the same thing for the United States of America, who meet her with the most hostile tariff possible? Does she not do the same thing for Germany, Russia and every other country in the world? But, while she is thus giving us no favour, she says to us in the plainest terms: "We are quite prepared to meet you half way; the public mind of this country has so changed in relation to this question that we are quite prepared to consider the propriety of giving your wheat, cattle and various other products preferential treatment in the illimitable market of the United Kingdom, where some £200,000,000 sterling are expended on various kinds of food products." She says; "We are prepared to give you a better position and better terms in our markets than we give to the outside world, provided you now develop a scheme." If ever there was an opportunity held out to a country to take advantage of a plan calculated not only to develop the resources of Canada, but at the same time to promote the unity and greatness of the Empire, it was found in the position in which this question stood when hon. gentlemen opposite came into power.

What have they done? Instead of carrying out the pledge solemnly given by the First Minister that as soon as he came into power, he would address himself to this question of obtaining, not differential trade, but preferential trade, which would give Canada enormous advantages, we find that question of preferential treatment, with all its glowing prospects and the opportunities it presented for drawing Canada and the mother country more closely together and at the same time greatly increasing the expansion and development of our country, thrust away and this miserable system of differential treatment undertaken in the teeth of treaties and obligations the mother country is bound. As Mr. Chamberlain said, this matter had received an immense impetus from the Venezuelan difficulty. The moment that England was threatened on the one side by the United States and on the other by Germany, the mind of the intelligent people of England was turned to the question of where England was to get her food. Everybody who knows anything of the question knows that, depending, as England does, on the import of such an enormous quantity of food products, a comparatively short period would bring her into the most dire straits for the want of food. The attention of public men, statesmen and publicists, was then drawn to the question as to what sources of food supply England could look to. Every one knows the boundless capacity of our North-west, every one knows that the shortest line of communication with the food supply and the most easily defended by England would be the Dominion of Canada, and calculations were made. Mr. Long published an article in the "Nineteenth Century," on our food supply, which attracted great attention. He said:

Under conditions which could be created in a few years by the co-operation of the British Government with the governments of our great colonies, all the surplus breadstuffs we require, as well as the more luxurious products of the soil, could be produced in Canada, Australasia, India and South Africa.

In the Canadian North-west 55,550 families, each occupying a quarter-section of land or more, and growing one hundred acres of wheat, would suffice for the purpose. Canada is quite equal to the occasion, and there are thousands of our sturdy sons who would gladly undertake wheat production there or elsewhere in the Empire, if it became worth their while. As a matter of fact, there are millions of acres of wheat land in Canada waiting for occupation.

What did one of the leading journals in London say at the same time? In January, 1896, the "Saturday Review," said:

As soon as America is conciliated, we must proceed to set our house in order. The greater part of the emigration into the United States comes from these islands. It would need but little to deflect the major part of it from the American North-west to the Canadian North-west. A ten-per-cent differential duty in favour of our colonies would settle up Manitoba in ten years, instead of settling up Minnesota and Dakota. This differential duty would restore prosperity to New Zealand and enrich Australia and Canada. There is a kernel of good even in things evil. Pressure from the outside, science tells us, increases the cohesion between the units that compose the body corporate. The threat of war by America will cause Englishmen to hold more closely together, and will diminish that selfishness on the

part of the mother country towards the colonies, which has hitherto been regarded as the true commercial policy of the nation, and which has never deserved the name of policy, because it makes for disunion and not for union, for weakness and not for strength.

I deplore the fact that so great an opportunity should have been lost. The Government were bound by their pledges to make an effort to secure preferential trade, and half the offer now made would have accomplished the work. The offer that is made to give to British products the advantage which this tariff will give a year hence, would, if utilized for the purpose I have mentioned, have secured such preferential trade between the mother country and the colonies as would be attended with unbounded advantage. I deplore the loss of such an opportunity the more, because if the hon. the First Minister had used all the ability and research he possesses to discover a means of preventing preferential trade from ever being obtained by Canada, he could not have adopted a better means than the one he has taken. If Lord Salisbury's Government wished to obtain the support of the House of Commons of England to preferential trade and were in a position to come down with such a proposition as was made here in this illegal and unpatriotic way, if the Salisbury Government were in a position to say to the House of Commons: Here are the terms on which Canada is willing to negotiate for preferential trade, and all we have to give in return is admission of the products of Canada into our country on more favourable terms than are given to foreign countries, such a proposition would carry an overwhelming majority of that House beyond doubt. But suppose it were possible to carry the present offer into effect and to give this advantage to England, the moment that was done, and the counter proposal made to bring Canadian products into Great Britain upon more favourable terms than those of foreign countries, such a proposal would have no chance of success. A golden opportunity has been wasted and a course taken calculated to be most injurious to this country.

As I have said, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to-day threw off all disguise. We could not learn from the Finance Minister, not even the "Globe" could, what was really the intent of this tariff, but all disguise was thrown off this afternoon as the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) declared that it was not preferential trade with England he desired. The hon. gentleman knows that all you have to do to arouse the most enthusiastic sentiment of this country is to speak of anything that will draw apparently, the mother country and this country closer together.

And advantage is taken to-day, not to obtain preferential trade with England, but to obtain free trade with all countries. That is the policy. The disguise is thrown off. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) occupied a most humiliating position. When the Mackenzie Government was in power he was the exponent of their financial policy, and in their struggle to retain power, he was ready to adopt first one expedient and then another, but when the Liberals were out of office and had long struggled to get back, it was found that one of the most serious difficulties in the way of their ambitions was the reputation that the hon. gentleman had acquired in this House and out of it as the fierce denunciator of the National Policy and of protection to Canadian industries. No words that the English language could furnish him were strong enough in the denunciation of anything and everything that was calculated to promote and develop Canadian industries. When hon. gentlemen opposite went to the country on the last occasion, they found that the hon. member for South Oxford had to be retired. It was found that the sentiment in favour of the National Policy had taken strong hold of public opinion in Canada. In four successive attempts they had been defeated on that question, and the people had shown that they were determined to stand by the National Policy. And the Liberal party came to the conclusion that it was hopeless to attempt to get into power unless the hon. member for South Oxford could be withdrawn from the field. He was virtually induced—got a hint, I suppose, that his services on the platform, instead of being a benefit to his party, were most damaging—to remain in the background. But that was not enough. When the leader of gentlemen opposite endeavoured to assure the manufacturing industries of this country that they would not be disturbed, that they had nothing to fear at the hands of the Liberal party, they were told by the representatives of those industries: That is all very well so far as you are concerned, Mr. Laurier, I dare say you mean what you say. But, Sir Richard Cartwright is to be the Finance Minister and he is pledged to tear up the National Policy, root and branch, he is pledged to treat those who have been maintaining the industries of this country as robbers and thieves, and there is no hope that any justice would be shown the manufacturers, if he is to be the Finance Minister. What was the result? Why, Sir, the most positive pledges were given again and again that if they came into power Sir Richard Cartwright should not be Finance Minister. But every person knows that there was not a man on that side of the House with the power and ability to deal with questions of that kind possessed by the hon. member for South Oxford. Every person knows that he is a giant—I will not say among pigmies, but I will say he is a giant. He was a Triton—I will not say among minnows, but he was a Triton. And so he was regarded and so he

was treated by every person interested in these industries. The hon. gentleman has had his humiliation and has borne it. He has been relegated to the back-ground. He finds another—and I am glad the compliment was paid to a countryman of mine—made Finance Minister in his place. But in doing this, the deepest injury that could be inflicted upon a man who had fought the battles of his party as the hon. member for South Oxford had, is put upon him by compelling him to take third rank in the Administration and putting him behind a young man who had not even been in the Parliament of Canada before. But the hon. member for South Oxford has had his revenge. Though he spoke about a lean Cassius at my side, he was thinking of the lean Cassius at his own right hand. While his words came here, his eye rested upon the man who, in order to get power had pledged himself and had been pledged by his friends in the most emphatic terms, that if the Liberals were returned to power Sir Richard should never be Finance Minister. Though he has been relegated to a back seat, he had the ability, the power, the influence, to treat his colleagues as a parcel of children. He has been able to inflict upon his leader the direst disgrace that one man could inflict upon another. Let me read what the hon. First Minister said to the people of Montreal and then ask what is that hon. gentleman's position here to-day. As lately as the 22nd of January, 1896, before the last election. Hon. Wilfrid Laurier, speaking at Montreal, said :

> We are told that we must not destroy the manufactures of Montreal. I say that we are not going to destroy the industries of Montreal. I contend, on the contrary, that the application of the ideas that we defend will inaugurate an era of prosperity such as Montreal has not known since the inauguration of the National Policy. The present system raises a maximum of taxation, not only on the consumer, but also on the producer. They have a tax on iron, which is a raw material of every industry. The tax on coal, which is also a raw material of every industry, is 60 cents a ton. Although I have not the latest quotations of coal, I am sure that this tax is equivalent to 40 per cent. Now, I am asked, What are you going to do? I have just told you what we are going to do. We are going to have a tariff for revenue, and we are going to abolish completely the duties on raw material.

Where is the hon. gentleman to-day ? Upon this solemn declaration of his, the manufacturers of Montreal gave him support. This declaration paralyzed the manufacturing industries all over Canada and prevented them giving support to the men to whom they owed the position they occupy. In the face of a declaration of that kind, where does the hon. First Minister stand when the hon. gentleman for South Oxford rises and declares that he has inaugurated a complete system of free trade. How a complete system of free trade ? The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) has caused them to commit themselves to this senseless, unpatriotic—I might almost use a stronger word—policy, and now they find themselves in such a position that they have but one resource. And the hon. gentleman knew it right well. I presume he was the only one who knew it. If the hon. First Minister has said what he believed and the hon. Finance Minister has said what he believed, neither of them knew it. But the hon. member for South Oxford knew it, and knew that he had them in a trap. Should not the Governor General do what he may and what, but for the past, I would have no doubt he would do, exercise the right that the Governor of any colony in the British Empire would use, and withhold the Royal assent from an Act that introduces a discriminating tariff, what will the position of hon. gentlemen opposite be ? Let the Governor General do his duty, and what happens ? Sir, the country is already thrown into inextricable confusion, and there is no resource but the disallowance of the Bill. I am not going at this late hour to take up the time of the House, but I could turn to the constitution of the country to show how the Governor General exercises the power of reservation. By turning to that eminent authority on these questions which Dr. Bourinot has placed before the country, I could show that although the absolute compulsion to withhold assent has been withdrawn, it is only because it is held that the power of disallowance retained by the Imperial Government under the circumstances renders its exercise by the Governor General a matter of less moment. But the hon. gentleman will find by referring to these authorities that if the Governor General does not reserve this Act, as every Governor, I think, throughout the British Empire would reserve it, if it came before him, he is bound by his duty to forward that Act the moment it is passed, to England for the consideration of Her Majesty's Government ; and hon. gentlemen opposite know that within twenty-four hours of that Act being laid upon the Table of the Colonial Minister, it would be disallowed, and the collection of the revenue of this country thrown into confusion. The hon. member for South Oxford knew it all, he saw it all ; and no man could listen to him standing there to-day and gloating over the position in which the Government is placed, and the party were placed, without feeling that he had his revenge. Why, Sir, what was his position ? He was able to stand on the floor of this House to-day and tell the hon. gentlemen supporting the Government, and tell this House, that he had secured free trade in all its entirety. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman knows that the only means by which the Government can now extricate themselves from the dilemma in which they are placed, is to bring down an additional clause extending all these privileges that they propose to give to England, to Belgium and Germany and to every other country that has most-favoured nation treatment. They know that when, only two years ago, it was at-

tempted to adopt even a treaty of reciprocal trade with France, the Imperial Government took the ground that everything conceded must be given to Germany and Belgium and to all the other countries that had most-favoured-nation treaties with England. What has happened now? Why, the hon. gentleman was able to say: I have triumphed, never mind the solemn declaration that the First Minister made to the people of this country, and by which he has obtained power. Not only was he prepared to enjoy this triumph, but he resumed his old tone, and declared that the work had been accomplished, that free trade had been secured, and that he was in a position to strike down and paralyse all the industries of this country by doing the only thing that remains to the Government to do, that of extending this measure to Belgium and to Germany, and to every other country with which England has most-favoured-nation treatment. Then he said: Probably after all, it will be the United States as well, and we shall have free trade. This he said in the presence of his leader, who was bound in the most solemn manner that a man could be bound to the people of this country, by his promise to protect the industries of this country, by his promise that the manufacturers should not suffer if he obtained power—the hon. gentleman was able to say in the presence and in the hearing of his leader, that protection was a curse to this country. Now, what is the result? The result is that this tariff goes into operation, and the hon. gentleman knows that the industries of this country are already paralyzed in consequence. While hon. members gloat, vindictively gloat, over the destruction of Canadian industries, I was reading the wail, the sorrowful wail, of those industries in the Montreal "Gazette" where one manufacturer after another declared that their industries were ruined, that their mills must close, and that they saw staring them in the face a return to the deplorable state of things that existed when the hon. gentleman who last addressed the House was in charge of the fiscal policy of this country. I say that a deeper wrong was never inflicted upon Canada. It would have been bad enough if the hon. gentleman had gone to the country with a frank avowal that they were in favour of what they had declared to be their policy for long years previously; it would have been bad enough if they had been able to get a majority pledged to sweep away these industries and to destroy the policy that had achieved so much for Canada; but to obtain power by the solemn declaration made publicly and privately all over this country that no harm would come to the manufacturing industries, that not a hair of their heads should be touched, that in fact their rights would be protected and their position would be improved, because they were going to have their raw material free, coal was to be made free—I say that under these circumstances I can understand how indignant the people of this country will feel at the outrage that has been inflicted upon them not by a fair, open, and manly declaration of policy, but by false pretenses, under the guise of solemn declarations that no harm would be done to the industries of this country. Now, the country is in this position, that because the Finance Minister has stupidly made a proposition that is utterly impractible, and a violation of Imperial treaties, and which will cause the whole revenue Bill to become a nullity, the only recourse the Government have now is to adopt a second measure, to apply this clause to Belgium and Germany, and all other countries having similar treaties with England. Well, I can only say that if the policy were good in itself, the mode in which it has been accomplished is calculated to condemn it. I feel that far from rejoicing at it from a party standpoint, I deplore from the bottom of my heart the ruin that is going to be inflicted upon the best interests of Canada, and upon its great industries. Still, I unhesitatingly say that from a party point of view the hon. gentlemen are doing our work; they are showing the people of this country that no reliance can be placed upon the most solemn declarations that they make, either in the House or out of it; they are showing the people of this country that, having obtained power, which was all they wished for, they are now prepared to abuse that power at the the cost of the sacrifice of the industries of Canada.

Now, I have a word or two to say in regard to the attempted explanation of the Finance Minister as to the coal question. That hon. gentleman has placed himself in a position such as no Minister of Finance in this or any other country ever placed himself. He stood up in his place in this House and declared in the presence of this House a truism, a thing that commended itself to the judgment of every man in this House—that for the Finance Minister to use his position to give the slightest intimation to any person before the Budget was brought down, of what that Budget would contain, or how it would affect any person, was an infamous act. I take the hon. gentleman's own statement as it appears in "Hansard," and I ask him how he stands in regard to that declaration. He admits that he did not receive even all the people interested, but he had a private interview with certain gentlemen connected with the great coal interest of this country, and he admits that he disclosed at that private interview, held in a private parlour, to a certain limited number of parties interested in the business, and without communicating with other parties within his reach or call, what the tariff on coal was to be. That is the position. And what excuse has he to offer? I disclosed to the House one of the basest con-

spiracies that ever was concocted by anything calling itself a Government, or by any public man calling himself a Finance Minister, in regard to Nova Scotia. The hon. gentleman wondered that I was not ashamed to name the word Nova Scotia in this House. Why should I be ashamed? Could I as one of the founders of the National Policy have a greater triumph than that at the end of eighteen years of trial of the National Policy, it had to be adopted by the leader of the local government as the means of carrying the province.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Then why did you oppose him, if he was supporting the National Policy?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Because a person chooses to steal the clothing of another person, that is no reason why he should support him. It was an insult to the intelligence of the people of Nova Scotia. But the question as regards the National Policy is, how far does coal touch it? Let the hon. gentleman read what the "Witness" says on that point, and then ask what the position is. It says:

> Mr. Fielding has assured us that there has been no collusion of any sort between him and his former colleague, Mr. Murray. If there has not, these coal constituencies are being misled.

Why did he say that? It was because Mr. Murray had declared that the great issue in the local elections in Nova Scotia was that the province would secure the retention of protection on coal by supporting the Liberal party. What does that newspaper further say:

> If Mr. Fielding has surrendered the National Policy at its pivotal point to gain Nova Scotia, he will never be forgiven.

What does the hon. gentleman think of that statement? That is not the denunciation of an opponent; that is the declaration of a most tried and enthusiastic friend and supporter of the Liberal party, which declares that the policy on which Nova Scotia was carried was a pivotal portion of the National Policy. I want to know what the House thinks of the Prime Minister publicly declaring there would be free coal, and yet without any communication being made to any person in this House or out of it, the Minister of Finance, before bringing down his Budget, on the eve of the elections in Nova Scotia, declaring to certain parties interested in the coal business that his policy was going to be the reverse. I say it is a betrayal of the duties of the hon. gentleman's position, such as no Finance Minister has ever been charged with previously in the history of the country. It is a humiliation of the gravest character as regards his leader, to make that announcement under the circumstances under which it was made, and it was adopting a course that however strongly partisan any hon. gentleman may be, I do not believe he will give his support and concurrence to any such advantage being taken by a public man for the purpose of carrying elections. But that is not all. What do the hon. gentlemen behind the Finance Minister, who thinks that Nova Scotia knows something about me, say in regard to this matter? I am glad to declare that if any public man ever had reason to be proud of his native province, I am that man. Hon. gentlemen may search the history of any portion of Canada in vain to find greater devotion and longer continued support than Nova Scotia has given to myself. The hon. gentleman prides himself very much on the defeat of the Liberal-Conservative party. Why should he, when he was compelled to do me the great honour and the great Liberal-Conservative party the honour of admitting that the only means by which the Liberal party could carry the elections was to adopt the policy and platform for which I have fought for years. What will hon. gentlemen behind him think when they know that this is not a trifling matter for them. In the Nova Scotia elections not alone was the coal question involved. It was a fact that the Liberals had stolen our policy and masqueraded about in our clothes in order to obtain the support of the people, but there was a much larger bribe than that. I hold the proof in my hand. Hon. gentlemen opposite will have to vote one million and a quarter dollars of public money in consequence of carrying the Nova Scotia elections. This is the manifesto which Mr. Murray, a former colleague of the present Finance Minister, and the present Premier of the province, issued and on which he carried Nova Scotia. I have already read the portion with respect to coal, and it continues:

> The Government of Nova Scotia has made repeated efforts to obtain from the Government of Canada certain claims which were deemed just and equitable, on account of the Eastern Extension Railway and in respect of the Western Counties Railway, as well. The claim in respect to the Eastern Extension Railway was that it had become part of the Intercolonial Railway of Canada, which had been built as a national work and out of the revenues of the whole country, whereas the portion of it between New Glasgow and the Strait of Canso had received a subsidy from the provincial revenue amounting to $671,836, which amount should be refunded to the revenue of Nova Scotia, as it can scarcely be deemed just or fair that the revenue of the province should be called upon to contribute to the construction of any part of a work undertaken and carried forward as a purely national undertaking.
>
> The claim in respect of the Western Counties Railway is based upon the fact that this province contributed the sum of $679,197 as a subsidy towards the construction of the work, and that, in 1887, the Dominion Government, by a special Act of the Federal Parliament, took this road out of the control of the provincial authorities and made it a railway for the general advantage of Canada, under the British North America Act. While not attempting to call in question the constitutional power of the Federal Parliament to

vest any public work belonging to a province in the Dominion by an Act of Parliament creating such a work one for the general advantage of Canada, yet both the letter and the spirit of the Act are entirely opposed to the idea that such a work should be taken out of the control of the provincial authorities and subjected to the legislative authority of the Federal Parliament without compensation. These claims were pressed upon the late Government steadily and persistently by every means in our power, including a special delegation to Ottawa in 1892, but no fair consideration of our claims could be obtained.

I regret to say that every effort made by the government to secure for the province the repayment of these large sums were resisted and obstructed at every stage, and with the utmost determination, on the part of our opponents in the provincial legislature, and it is difficult to conceive of any motive for such unpatriotic proceedings, apart from the desire not to embarrass their political friends in the Dominion Parliament. No such unworthy motive should have been allowed to interfere with the settlement of the just and equitable claims of the province.

I propose to again press these claims to an issue, and I have reason to believe that since the change of Administration at Ottawa they stand a better chance for recognition than at the hands of the late Federal Ministry. Before taking such a step, however, it seems to me desirable that we should go strengthened by the mandate of the people of Nova Scotia. Any considerable sum received on this account will be extremely useful in many ways, including, among others, that of making substantial repairs to certain of the public highways of the province which stand in need of special consideration.

Those two sums mentioned together amount to $1,351,033. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) has put it in the power of his late colleague, the present Premier of Nova Scotia, to say that the late Government had denied justice, and that he had reason to believe, now when the gentleman who pressed these claims occupied the position of Finance Minister, that the $1,351,033 would soon be in the treasury of Nova Scotia. When hon. gentlemen behind the Finance Minister find that they have to implement these promises, it will, therefore, not be a matter of great surprise for them.

Nova Scotia is a little fitful occasionally in reference to elections. In 1867 I came to this Parliament with eighteen, all the rest of the Nova Scotia members pledged to oppose me and to break up confederation. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) knows that in the election of 1872 the Government of which I was a member had the support of the entire Nova Scotia delegation without a single man being opposed to us. The hon. gentleman knows, that in 1874, when an election was suddenly sprung upon the country on a question that was not understood, I came back with one solitary friend at my side, Mr. McDonald, now a Senator. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) knows, that in 1878, five years afterwards, when the people had an opportunity of learning what the real position of matters was, fifteen Conservatives out of a total of twenty members were returned to this House. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding), who was in power in the province a good part of the time, knows when I resigned my position in 1888, the Liberal-Conservative party had the support of sixteen out of twenty-one Nova Scotia members in this Parliament.

I may say a single word to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) who paid a well deserved compliment to the county of Colchester, and who undertook to boast the other day, that that intelligent county would be carried for the Liberal party. Well, the man who stood at the head of the poll in that county, was a Liberal-Conservative. Notwithstanding that Nova Scotia was terrorized by the present Government with threats of dismissal from office, with this gigantic bribe of $1,300,000 and with the bribe of a promise to maintain the duty on coal; notwithstanding all these things, this Government was unable to prevent a Liberal-Conservative from being at the head of a poll in that county.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) has reference to the local and not to the Dominion election.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. As far as the Dominion election is concerned, I may say that the Liberal candidate who a year ago carried that constituency by 300 or 400 majority, at present claims the seat by a majority of eight, but I have no doubt of having the pleasure at an early date of introducing the Liberal-Conservative member for Colchester to the Speaker of this House.

I have listened in this House to a good many things with regard to which I felt that some little liberty was taken with the intelligence of the House, but I have listened to nothing so surprising as some of the statements made recently. It was a matter of amusement to us of the Conservative party, to hear the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) claiming to be the great representative of British sentiment and British loyalty. He taunted us with having been very loud-mouthed about our patriotism, and our regard for the motherland. Well, the hon. gentleman knows, that from time immemorial, loyal devotion to the Crown and admiration and affection for England, has been the cardinal principle of the Liberal-Conservative party. The hon. gentleman knows, that any measure which may be introduced into this House, calculated to draw the mother country and Canada more closely together, and to promote the unity of the Empire, will receive the spontaneous, and hearty, and enthusiastic support of every member of the Liberal-Conservative party. But, Sir, it is a little presumptuous on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to lecture us on the subject of loyalty. The Minister of Trade and Commerce knows well, that it is within the last

five years that his party have discovered his loyalty. He knows that five years ago the Liberal party convulsed this country by the advocacy of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. Does any person doubt what that would mean? We all know that it meant, Canada turning her back upon the mother country, going in for continental free trade, adopting the high tariff of the United States made at Washington as our tariff, and putting it in operation against England and all the rest of the world. That was what unrestricted reciprocity meant. And yet, these loyal gentlemen, these super-loyal gentlemen, these gentlemen who now flaunt thus boldly their new-found loyalty, were five years ago advocating a disloyal policy. For fear hon. gentlemen who may not be acquainted with the facts may think me somewhat mistaken on this point, I will take the liberty of reading to the House what the hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) said at Oshawa, on February 10th, 1891:

C. W. Scott asked: "Does the Liberal party favour discrimination against Great Britain by admitting American manufactures free and taxing the manufactures of Great Britain?"
Sir Richard Cartwright replied: "Certainly we do."

Is that not sufficient to show what the position of the Liberal party in this country was, and what they intended to do? The "Globe" of December 14, 1891, commenting on Sir Oliver Mowat's letter to the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, said:

Mr. Mowat now declares that he is in favour of unrestricted reciprocity. We infer that he countenances discrimination against British goods, without which it cannot be obtained.

That is the history, Sir, of unrestricted reciprocity.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What is the history of the unrestricted offer?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If my hon. friend is so dense as not to know the difference between an unrestricted offer of reciprocity and an offer of unrestricted reciprocity, I give him up. Now, Sir, the Hon. Wilfrid Laurier, at Toronto, on the 30th of September, 1889, at a meeting of the Young Men's Liberal Club, said:

I have read the history of unrestricted reciprocity in this way, that every reform has cost to the reformers years of labour, and those years of labour I, for one, am prepared to give; and though the Democrats may be defeated in the States, and though Canadians may grow faint-hearted in Canada, the Liberal party, as long as I have anything to do with it, will remain true to the cause until that cause is successful. I will not expect to win in a day, but I am prepared to remain in the cool shades of Opposition until the cause has triumphed, and you shall never hear a complaint from me.

The hon. gentleman changed his mind afterwards, and concluded that he would prefer to abandon the policy of unrestricted reciprocity and to take some other policy for the sake of getting into power. He went on:

I tell you, the Liberal party will never cease the agitation until they triumph and obtain continental free trade. We are asked sometimes, gentlemen, what is the programme of the Liberal party. This is the programme of the Liberal party: to obtain a continental freedom of trade.

I am not at all certain that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce had not that in his mind to-day when he intimated that he expected the United States to be brought in under this arrangement. Knowing, as he does, that the United States, through Mr. Blaine, announced years ago, and have reiterated on various occasions, that Canada shall have no reciprocity with the United States unless she discriminates against England, the manner in which the hon. gentleman gloated over his triumph over the National Policy, and his intimation that this preferential policy may be extended to the United States shows that it is likely to become a live issue at no distant day. The hon. Prime Minister concluded this speech with these words:

Success will certainly crown our efforts at no distant day. Fixing our eyes steadily upon the goal, we shall go on steadily until we reach it—unrestricted continental reciprocity.

Do hon. gentlemen feel for a single moment that I am doing injustice to their readiness to adopt continental free trade, to turn their backs upon the mother country, and to put in force in Canada the high tariff of the United States against the mother country? Do they think I am doing them an injustice? Let me remind them that the ablest man who ever stood in their ranks in this country, the Hon. Edward Blake, when that battle was fought in 1891, abandoned them, refused to have lot or part with them, and abandoned his constituency, and gave as his reason that he was not willing to fight under false colours, because he believed that the policy of the Liberal party would end in severing the connection between the Crown of England and the Dominion of Canada. And are we to be lectured on the subject of loyalty by gentlemen who, five years ago, roamed through this country endeavouring to strike down British interests and to establish continental free trade at the cost of every sentiment of British loyalty? No, Sir. We stand ready to do everything that men can do to uphold and support any and every measure calculated to draw the great parent state and this country more closely together. Proud of our connection, loyal as we have been from the first hour of our existence down to the present hour, devoted to the Crown and to British institutions, we stand to-day where we have always stood, ready to do battle as best we can in behalf of the suffering industries of Canada. Sir, if

the battle of protection and free trade is to be fought over again, we are not afraid to do battle under that banner which carried us to victory before, and under which the great Liberal-Conservative party made Canada what it is to-day. Under that banner, after having won the victory, we used that victory to lift this country out of a condition of depression and despondency such as Canada had never known before. We raised it step by step until, regarding everything that indicates the greatness, progress and prosperity of the country, we occupy the highest and proudest position that any party could ever occupy.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 27th April, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SAFETY ON RAILWAYS.

Mr. CASEY moved:

That all petitions concerning Bills Nos. 2 and 3 respecting the Safety of Railway Employees and Passengers be referred to the Select Committee on the said Bills.

Motion agreed to.

FREIGHT RATES ON RAILWAYS.

Mr. REID moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 63) to regulate freight rates on railways. He said: This Bill is similar to the inter-state commerce law of the United States. I propose that a commission be appointed, which will have power to settle all disputes that may arise between shippers and the railways. It also provides that the rates on short hauls shall not be proportionately greater than the rates on long hauls. The Bill is very lengthy, and I will explain it more fully on the second reading.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

SEIZURE OF "SILVER SPRAY" AND "MARY GROVER."

Mr. WOOD (Brockville) asked:

1. Were the tug "Silver Spray" and the schooner "Mary Grover," or either of them, seized for infraction of the revenue laws of the Dominion during the year 1883 or 1884, or either of said years?

2. If said vessels or either of them were so seized, what was the nature of the offence for which they, or either of them, were so seized?

3. What was the name of the officer who seized said vessels or either of them?

4. Were said vessels or either of them released? If so, upon what terms?

5. Was an investigation subsequently held? If so, what was the name of the officer who conducted said investigation? Where was it held? What were the names of the witnesses examined at said investigation? Was their evidence reduced to writing and returned to the department, and is the same now on the files of the department?

6. Was final disposition made of the matter?

7. What was the name of the owner or owners of said vessels?

8. By whom were the sworn entries made at Port Arthur or Michipicoten (or wherever the same were made) of the cargoes of said vessels?

9. Were the original entries and the invoices accompanying same returned to the Department of Customs, and are the same now on file in said department?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). 1. The tug "Silver Spray" and the schooner "Mary Grover" were seized for infraction of the revenue laws of the Dominion, the former on the 6th of May, 1884, and the latter on the 5th of May, 1884. 2. The "Mary Grover" was seized for having, in October, 1883, landed a cargo of goods and provisions without report or entry at Michipicoten River, cargo shipped in the United States. The "Silver Spray" was seized for having, in October, 1883, towed the schooner "Mary Grover," with a cargo of goods, &c., from Sault Ste. Marie, United States, to Michipicoten River, Ontario, where said cargo was landed without being reported or entered. 3. The officer who seized the vessels was Joseph Wilson, collector of customs, Sault Ste. Marie. 4. The vessels were released on the owners depositing $4,000 under section 204 of the Customs Act, being $500 for the "Mary Grover" and $3,500 for the "Silver Spray." 5. A reference appears on the files in the Customs Department to an examination made before the Police Magistrate at Toronto, when Captain Emmons, of the "Mary Grover" was arrested for false report, but no report of the evidence taken or witnesses examined at the investigation can be found in the Department of Customs, and the records do not appear to show that such report and evidence were received at the Customs Department. 6. Yes. 7. Messrs. Conmee & McLennan were stated to be the owners of said vessels. 8. Mr. Conmee is reported as having made a sworn entry of the cargo of the "Mary Grover" at

Sault Ste. Marie on the 10th December, 1883. 9. The original entries and invoices accompanying same cannot now be found on file in the Department of Customs, and it cannot be gathered from the record in said department whether the invoices were returned or not. Original entries are destroyed after the lapse of three years.

PREVENTIVE OFFICER AT ORWELL, P.E.I.

Mr. MARTIN asked :

1. Has a sub-collector of customs or a preventive officer been appointed for Orwell (Brush Wharf), in Prince Edward Island?
2. Is it the intention of the Government to appoint a sub-collector or preventive officer for Orwell (Brush Wharf), if they have not already done so?
3. If not, is the office at Orwell to be closed, and for what reason?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). An acting preventive officer has been appointed at Orwell, P.E.I.

TENDERS FOR INDIAN SUPPLIES.

Mr. DAVIN asked :

Will the Minister of the Interior lay on the Table copies of the schedule calling for tenders for Indian supplies in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories for the fiscal years 1896-97 and 1897-98?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Yes, here are the tenders.

TENDERS FOR DEPARTMENTAL BUILDING.

Mr. MONK asked :

Did the Government call for tenders for the temporary roof of the departmental building at Ottawa recently destroyed by fire? If not, why not?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). It was imperative, in order to allow the works of repair inside the building to be proceeded with, to build a temporary roof without any delay—that did not permit of the calling for public tenders. The Minister ordered his chief architect to prepare an estimate of the cost of such temporary roof, which that officer placed at $4,500, and Mr. Bourque, an experienced contractor, was asked whether he would be prepared to do the work for the amount of the estimate made by the chief architect. Mr. Bourque consented to do so, the work was awarded to him, and was completed by him to the complete satisfaction of the department. The rapid execution of the work entrusted to Mr. Bourque has allowed the work of repairs to be pushed with such despatch that the Department of Public Works is now into its old quarters and the Department of Marine and Fisheries will be able in a few days to move also, and thereby a saving of a considerable sum, paid for the rent of the temporary quarters occupied by both these departments, will be effected.

WORKS ON THE RICHELIEU RIVER.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Has the Government called for tenders for works on the Richelieu River at Belœil, near the Grand Trunk Railroad bridge? If not, why not ?
2. What amount has the Government spent on the above works between the 1st of August, 1896, and the 1st November, 1897?
3. What is the Government estimate of the total cost of these works?
4. Who is the local overseer of these works ? What was his occupation previous to his nomination? What was the date of his appointment ? How much a day does the overseer receive?
5. Did the Government call for tenders in connection with the timber required for said works? How were tenders called? Who were the tenderers ? To whom was the contract awarded and at what price?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. Yes, tenders were called for on the 14th November, 1894, but the contractor found it impossible to go on with the work and his contract was cancelled by Order in Council of the 25th March, 1896. 2. Nothing. 3. $6,000. 4. Mr. Avila Bernard. The department was aware that Mr. Bernard was a capable and experienced man. Mr. Bernard was appointed on the 1st February last. His salary was $2 per day, which is 50 cents less than salary previously paid for similar service. 5. The department did call for tenders for the timber, procuring quotations from different timber merchants. The persons from whom quotations were asked are the following :—Filion & Barnes, E. H. Lemay, J. C. Robert, Shearer & Brown, Jacques Bourden, Thomas Mitchell, J. & B. Grier, Louis Boucet, A. P. McLaurin, the Bronson & Weston Company, Wm. Mason & Sons, J. T. Marchand & Company, A. D. Cameron, E. Mignault, and P. Prefontaine. The contract was first awarded to A. B. Cameron of Buckingham, who subsequently failed to deliver the timber, and the order was given to Mr. Pierre Prefontaine, of St. Hilaire, at the following prices :—Square hemlock, 12 x 12, 19 cents per lineal ft. Hemlock, flatted to 10 in., 14 cents per lineal ft. Rock elm, $34 per thousand. Hemlock deals, $11 per thousand. Hemlock spars, 5 cents per lineal ft.

MR. HUGH O'LEARY.

Mr. HUGHES asked :

1. Was Mr. Hugh O'Leary, of Lindsay, Ont., employed by the present Government to inquire into the conduct of the agent to the Indians in Rama township, in the county of Ontario?
2. If so, in what capacity?
3. What were the charges against the Indian agent?
4. What was the result of the investigation ?
5. What was the cost of the investigation?

6. How much has Mr. O'Leary been paid?
7. If not paid yet, how much is Mr. O'Leary to be paid?
8. What were the special qualifications of Mr. O'Leary for the position of conductor of the inquiry?
9. What was the date of the inquiry?
10. When was the report sent in to the Government?
11. Is the same agent still in the same office?
12. Has Mr. Hugh O'Leary been in the employ of this Government in any other capacity at any time since June, 1896?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier. 1. Yes. 2. Commissioner. 3. Various charges of malfeasance and active political partisanship. 4. Investigation not yet concluded. 5. Not known. 6. $50. 7. Not known. 8. Barrister. 9. The inquiry was first entered into in the last days of December. 10. Not yet sent in. 11. Yes. 12. Not in Indian Department or any other department.

QUEBEC FORTIFICATION WALLS.

Mr. DUGAS (for Mr. Casgrain) asked:

Are the Government aware that the fortification and other walls belonging to the Dominion of Canada or under its control, in the city of Quebec, are in a very bad state of repair, and that in at least two places they have fallen over into the street and are a danger to property and life? Is it the intention of the Government to ask the House to vote a substantial sum towards repairing the said walls?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). The Government are aware that the fortification walls belonging to the Dominion in the city of Quebec are in a very bad state of repair and are taking measures to have them put in better condition. The Government have under consideration the necessity of asking the House to vote a proper sum for the repairing of these walls.

THE FISHERIES CASE.

Mr. HUGHES (for Mr. Casgrain) asked:

1. Whether it is the intention of the Government to appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council from the judgment rendered on 13th October, 1896, by the Supreme Court, in the fisheries case?
2. If so, have the Government taken any and what steps towards entering the said appeal?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). It is the intention of the Government to appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council from the judgment rendered by the Supreme Court in the fisheries case. The Government have already applied for leave, which has been granted. The case is set down for argument and will be argued during the coming summer.

Mr. HUGHES.

DR. NAP. LAVOIE AND "LA CANADIENNE."

Mr. DUGAS asked:

1. Has Dr. Napoléon Lavoie, of L'Islet, been appointed commander of the steamer "La Canadienne"?
2. If not, is it the intention of the Government to appoint him to that position?
3. Has Dr. Nap. Lavoie been appointed to another position by the Government?
4. If so, what is the nature of the position; what is the salary attached to it; what are his duties; how long has he been under pay; is he empowered to engage men to assist him in the discharge of his duties, and if so, how many?
5. If Dr. Lavoie has been appointed to a position, where is he to reside?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Dr. Napoleon Lavoie has not been appointed commander of the steamer "La Canadienne," but has been appointed inspector of the gulf fisheries to take the place of Commander Wakeham, who has been appointed to the command of the Hudson Bay expedition, and he will be commander of the "Aberdeen," which takes "La Canadienne's" place. The salary is $1,200 a year, and the duties are the same as those performed by Commander Wakeham. Dr. Lavoie is not authorized to engage men without the consultation of the Government. He is to reside at L'Islet. Most of his time will be spent aboard the "Aberdeen," as Commander Wakeham's was spent aboard "La Canadienne."

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What has become of "La Canadienne."

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. She is laid up for repairs.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY AND MONTREAL.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER asked:

Whether the hon. the First Minister can explain the contradiction contained in the Speech from the Throne where the following words were used by His Excellency:—

"I have much satisfaction in informing you that arrangements have been concluded, which, if you approve, will enable the Intercolonial Railway system to reach Montreal, and thus share in the large traffic centering in that city. The advantages which will flow from this extension of that railway are apparent, and I have no doubt you will gladly approve of the proposal."

And the statement made by the Hon. Mr. Blair, Minister of Railways and Canals, in the House, contained in the revised "Hansard" of April 7th, page 597, as follows:—

"I want to repeat what I said the other day, that the matter is still under negotiation between the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Government. It may be that these arrangements shall come to nothing; it may be that while we are finally settling the conditions they will not be agreed upon, and in that case all that has been done will avail nothing."

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). There is no contradiction between the Speech from the Throne and the remarks of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) here quoted. The arrangements with regard to the extension of the Intercolonial Railway into Montreal involve not only the Grand Trunk Railway, but another company, as the papers will show when they are brought down. So far as the Grand Trunk Railway is concerned, though the main features of the arrangements are complete, there are yet important details to be settled.

MR. F. X. SMITH, CAPE GASPE.

Mr. HUGHES (for Mr. Casgrain) asked :

1. Has F. X. Smith, lighthouse keeper of Cape Gaspé, been dismissed?
2. If so, for what reason and at whose request?
3. Was an investigation held in the case of the said Smith?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Mr. F. X. Smith has been dismissed. He was dismissed for active political partisanship, on the representations made by Mr. Fauvel, then member for the county, and, as these representations were so strong and were given on his personal knowledge and honour, no investigation was deemed necessary.

POSTMASTER, NORTHFIELD, B.C.

Mr. DAVIN asked :

Why was Mrs. Isabella R. McManus deprived of her position as postmistress of Northfield, B.C.?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The postmaster in question was dismissed because of the overbearing conduct of the postmaster and her husband towards many persons who were obliged to visit the post office.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my hon. friend's (Mr. Mulock's) attention to the question, which is :

Why was Mrs. Isabella R. McManus deprived of her position as postmistress of Northfield, B.C.?

Her husband is not now living. I would ask an answer to the question.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have given the answer.

Mr. DAVIN. Has her husband been overbearing since he died ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The term "postmaster" is applied to the occupant of the office whether male or female. In this case the postmaster was Mrs. McManus. Her husband is living. The report of the inspector was to the effect that they had both been overbearing in their demeanour to many persons who had occasion to visit the office.

CLERKS OF WORKS AND PRIVATE PRACTICE.

Mr. DAVIN asked :

Whether a clerk of works earning a large salary from the Government, is allowed to pursue his private practice as an architect and draughtsman?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). I do not know of the existence of such a case.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I would call your attention to the fact that that is not an answer to my question.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) cannot cross-examine.

CHARGES AGAINST THE POSTMASTER, COBOURG, ONT.

Mr. LANDERKIN (for Mr. Cameron) asked :

Does the Government intend to lay on the Table of the House the report of the commissioner appointed to investigate into the charges against the postmaster at Cobourg and the collector of customs there, and others implicated in such charges, and the evidence taken in such investigation?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I would suggest that a motion be made for the papers, and they will be placed upon the Table.

INDIAN SUPPLIES.

Mr. DAVIN asked :

Will the Minister of the Interior lay on the Table the letter of Mr. McColl, an officer of the Indian Department in Manitoba, in which letter he explained the reason why he ceased to deal for Indian supplies at the Hudson Bay Company's store in Winnipeg?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The department has not received any such letter from Mr. McColl.

SUPERANNUATION OF MR. CHARLES THIBAULT.

Mr. PARMELEE asked :

1. Is Mr. Charles Thibault, advocate, of Waterloo, Que., drawing a pension under the Superannuation Act?
2. If so, how much did he contribute to the fund, and how much has he drawn out?
3. What was the nature and length of his services, and did they entitle him to superannuation and a pension?
4. How much was he paid in salary while in the service?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). 1. Yes. 2. Amount contributed, $322.10 ; amount drawn from the 1st September, 1889, to 31st March, 1897, at $760 per annum, $6,143.01. 3. He was

secretary to the official arbitrators from the 22nd November, 1880, until he was superannuated on the 1st September, 1889, the length of his service having been eight years, nine months and nine days. The Order in Council, which is dated 18th October, 1889, placing Mr. Thibault on the retired list, directs that in view of the abolition of his office and the faithful and efficient manner in which he performed his duties, ten years be added to his term of service, the board finding that Mr. Thibault was eligible within the meaning of the Civil Service Superannuation Act, and that his retirement would be in the public interest. 4. Amount of salary paid Mr. Thibault while in the service, 22nd November, 1880, to 21st January, 1884, at $1,600, $5,069.75; 22nd January, 1884, to 1st September, 1889, at $2,000, $11,203.56.

THE MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked:

Was the settlement arrived at between this Government and that of the province of Manitoba about the Manitoba school question, proposed by the Government of Canada, or did the proposal come from the Manitoba Government?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Shortly after the conclusion of the last session of Parliament, the Government of Canada invited the Government of Manitoba to enter into negotiations with them with a view to that settlement; and in answer to that proposition, three members of the Government of Manitoba came to Ottawa. They had several conferences with the Canadian Government, and the result was the arrangement which is now before the country.

INFANTRY CORPS, MORRIS, MAN.

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked:

Is it the intention of the Minister of Militia to authorize the organization of an infantry corps in the town of Morris, electoral district of Provencher, in the province of Manitoba?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). This matter has not been brought under my attention, nor, so far as I know, under the attention of the Minister of Militia.

L. T. DELISLE, LIGHTSHIP KEEPER.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked:

1. Has L. T. Delisle, keeper of the Red Island Lightship, been dismissed from the service?
2. If so, for what reason?
3. Was an investigation held in the case of the said Delisle?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). 1. Yes, by Order in Council of the 2nd March, 1897. 2. From reports received from the agent of this department at Quebec, and from other sources it was proved that Delisle was unsuited for the charge of this important light station, having absented himself at different periods from the lightship, and being addicted to the use of intoxicating liquor. 3. No formal investigation was considered necessary in the case, the agent's representations being sufficient.

POSTMASTER OF CAPLAN RIVER.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The other day the hon. member for Three Rivers and St. Maurice (Sir Adolphe Caron) put a question in these words:

Has Théophile Poirier, of Caplan River, been dismissed from the office of postmaster of that place?

The secretary of the department furnished me with a negative answer. A gentleman happened to speak to me upon the subject, and upon making inquiry, I find that the hon. gentleman has made a mistake in his question. There is no such postmaster as Théophile Poirier at Caplan River; the name of the postmaster there is Solomon Poirier. There is a postmaster named Théophile Poirier at a post office known as St. Charles de Caplan. I make this explanation so that if the hon. gentleman will state which post office and which officer he desires information about, I will give him an answer. Lest he might think that my answer related to the postmaster at Caplan River, I would say that the answer is based upon the statement that there is no such postmaster at Caplan River as is mentioned in the question.

FISHERY GUARDIAN, NORTH VICTORIA.

Mr. HUGHES. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he has an answer to the question I put to him the other day about the fishery guardian in North Victoria.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I read the departmental answer the other day, and got a memorandum from the hon. gentleman saying that it was incorrect. I forwarded that to the officer in charge of the department, and have not received any reply. As there seems to be some dispute between the hon. gentleman and the officer in charge, if he will put his question formally on the paper, it will be formally answered.

THE PREFERENTIAL CLAUSE OF THE TARIFF.

Mr. McNEILL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask my hon. friend the Controller of Customs what interpretation he places upon the words "on

the whole" in the preferential clause of the tariff. Does it mean "on the average"?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). Without being in any degree desirous of treating the hon. gentleman's question slightingly, I am forced to say that I put upon them the interpretation that the words bear. I do not know any other interpretation to put upon those words "on the whole."

Mr. McNEILL. My hon. friend, I am sure, does not mean to be discourteous in any way; but as a good many hon. members have felt it a little difficult to construe those words, I thought there would be no impropriety in asking my hon. friend whether those words mean "on the average," or what they do mean.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). What other suggestion do you make?

Mr. McNEILL. I do not make any suggestion; I want to know if they mean "on the average."

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I thought you were suggesting that they had two or three meanings.

Mr. McNEILL. Would that be a fair explanation of the term?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. As applied to Great Britain?

Mr. McNEILL. Not necessarily to Great Britain alone.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Perhaps this would be more satisfactory to the hon. gentleman. I do not understand that if a country admitted one, or two, or half a dozen articles at as low a rate as those articles are mentioned in our classification, that would entitle such country to preferential treatment. Does that answer the hon. gentleman's question?

Mr. McNEILL. To a certain extent, but it does not go quite far enough. Supposing that the tariff of a country, on an average—

Mr. SPEAKER. I think this is out of order.

Mr. McNEILL. Of course, if you say so. I think this is a question of great interest to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the Collector of Customs is not ready to make an answer now, there can be no discussion.

Mr. McNEILL. I thought he was willing.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I would like the hon. gentleman to suggest the alternative meanings that he has in his mind.

Mr. McNEILL. I do not wish to make any suggestion at all; I only wanted to understand what the words mean.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. gentleman has not some alternative meaning in his mind, how can he be in doubt.

Mr. McNEILL. My desire is to know whether this condition of things would cover this case. Suppose that, on the average, the tariff of a country is as low as our tariff "D" is upon the average—would that cover the meaning of the words?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. At this moment the only country that I have decided comes practically within its meaning is the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him whether he has made any report to Council with reference to that?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). I think you will agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that, having listened with pleasure and much instruction to the four hon. gentlemen who have already addressed the House upon this subject at such great length, it will not be necessary for those who follow in the debate to go as fully into all matters connected therewith; therefore I shall content myself with touching upon a few points. I may notice, in the first place, that before the introduction of the tariff our hon. friends opposite seemed to be displeased that it was not brought down sooner and now I am bound to say, after listening to the utterances of some of them that it having been brought down, they do not seem to be pleased with it, and they do not seem to be in a pleasant mood in any respect. If I may judge from the remarks of the hon. the ex-Minister of Finance, I think he was not entirely satisfied with the tariff resolutions when they were laid upon the Table. I also think, after listening to my hon. friend the late Premier last night, when he declared those resolutions to be a jumble of a tariff, to be unconstitutional, to be a transcendent folly, that after making the usual discount for the hon. gentleman's strong language, I would be warranted in inferring that he does not absolutely endorse these resolutions in all their details. Let me notice first the charge that is made, and it seems a wrong one, that by delay of the Government in bringing down the tariff resolutions, the trade of the country has been paralyzed, that great injury had been done to the country, as if the Government, by failing to introduce it sooner, had shown themselves unfit for the management of the af-

fairs of the country. I think the ex-Minister of Finance was particularly severe upon us in that respect. I do not wish to apologize at all, I do not feel that any apology is necessary; but I think if that hon. gentleman would look back upon his own history, would look back upon what he was able to accomplish himself, he might perhaps think that the Government were not deserving of the censure which he seemed anxious to heap upon them in reference to that matter. We have had revisions of the tariff before. We had a revision of the tariff made by that hon. gentleman in 1894, and I find from the record of "Hansard" that on February 14, 1893, the hon. gentleman, in making his Budget speech, while alterations in the tariff were expected by the country, found himself not prepared to introduce those changes in the tariff, and he gave this as his reason. He said:

> What I want to state is this, that information has been gathered by the Government, particularly by myself, during the past year, and information will be gathered during the coming season; that the Minister of Trade and Commerce and myself, with the two level-headed business men who control the Customs and the Inland Revenue, propose during the coming year, not only to listen to the complaints and the pleas of people who come to Ottawa to see us, but we propose to supplement that by a personal inspection and investigation of the various industries of the country.

That was the hon. gentleman's statement, that during the past year he had been gatherhing all the information possible in order to arrive at an intelligent decision on this important question; that in addition he announced that he himself as Minister of Trade and Commerce and the two Controllers, the Controller of Customs and the Controller of Inland Revenue, were to spend the intervening time, between the close of that session and the next meeting of the House, in gathering such information as might be necessary in order to intelligently introduce a tariff in the following session. That session closed on April 1st, and from then to March 15th of the next year those four hon. gentlemen were engaged in seeking information to supplement that already gathered during the previous year by the Minister of Finance; yet the ex-Minister of Finance rises in his place and charges the Government with being unready, and lectures them, and moreover states that they had thereby paralyzed the whole business of the country.

What were the facts with respect to the present Government? The Government was only formed in July. The House met on August 19th and closed on October 5th, and from that time to the following session was the whole period available to make an investigation in order to arrive at what we thought the best conclusion, and the House met within a few days as early this year as the House met after hon. gentlemen opposite had taken more than two years to make their preparations. Their tariff was introduced on 27th March. But on 12th April the hon. gentleman proposed to amend the resolutions by adding forty resolutions to those brought down, and they were not concurred in completely until 8th June, ten weeks subsequently, and after thirty-five of the resolutions had been amended in committee. With that record the Government need not make any apology, for they have done in comparatively few months what had taken more than a year to do by the previous Government, and nevertheless their work had to be amended to the extent I have stated. I need not say more on that point, except to refer to the alleged business paralysis owing to delay. What proof has the hon. gentleman of that statement? Let hon. gentlemen opposite take the trade returns for the nine months of the present year and see if there is any evidence that a blow has been given to business interests or not. Let hon. gentlemen point out individual instances, if they can, where business has been paralyzed and industries closed and the channels of trade and commerce impeded. They have not done so yet, although, of course, other hon. gentlemen will follow. I have seen in the public press instances cited in which industries have been closed, but I have noticed that if this occurred it was for the purpose of stock-taking, and the proprietors of the establishments declared over their own signatures that they had not closed down on account of any uncertainty in respect to the tariff, but in accordance to their usual custom. Business was not paralyzed, and there was no reason why it should be, because the business community had confidence in the hon. gentlemen at the head of affairs. They realized that the Government would make no change of such a nature as would imperil any legitimate business, and business went on in its usual way, and I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to furnish any evidence that there was that business paralysis of which they have spoken.

There is no doubt that when any tariff changes are anticipated, there is more or less uncertainty, probably more or less anxiety, common to every expected revision of the tariff, and which we could not expect to be absent on the present occasion; but to say that business had been paralyzed, that business had been impeded or been called to a halt, was a statement not borne out by the facts. What did we do? Interviews were held in public, in open daylight, to which all classes of the community were invited, and they came before us. Hearings were given to all those who had representations to make. The Government made themselves aware of the business conditions of the country, of the peculiar conditions surrounding particular industries. They gave ear to all, they availed themselves of every source of information given to them, and having availed themselves of all this in-

formation, they sat down and conferred together, having in mind the promises they had made to the people, that they would reduce the tariff, that they would reduce the burdens of taxation on the people, that they would lessen the burdens of the people, and that in addition they would endeavour to carry out their promises, and in doing so they would not act unfairly to any class of the community. To-day in the resolutions laid on the Table there is a fulfilment to the letter of the resolutions adopted by the great Liberal party in this city in 1893. There is reduction of taxation. Hon. gentlemen opposite cannot deny that, though in the classification adopted certain articles that in our judgment under the old tariff should have borne a higher rate than they did, have been raised and other goods that have borne higher rates than they should have borne have been lowered; nevertheless in regard to the resolutions laid on the Table, I make bold to say that even with the additions made in that tariff, after all there has been on the whole line of dutiable articles, with exception of spirits, tobacco, ales, and a few other articles, a reduction in the whole of schedule A, comprising the dutiable articles. That, Sir, has been done, although perhaps not in every case perfectly satisfactory to men whose business might be affected by the particular item. That is not to be expected from any government. I have pointed out, that notwithstanding the time taken by the late Government in the tariff revision they made, forty amended resolutions were laid upon the Table twelve days after their tariff resolutions were submitted, and thirty or forty more were amended in committee before these resolutions finally passed this House. It is not strange if it should be found, that there are some who think that this tariff touching upon their particular line of industry, may not have been framed in such a way as to render to them the justice that they, in their judgment, think should be rendered. We claim no infallibility in this matter, and it is possible that such a contention may be true; but any gentleman or any number of gentlemen are at liberty to approach us, and we will endeavour to hear them, and to consider their case, and while we can make no promises to them, they shall have a cordial hearing and we will bring our best judgment to bear upon these matters. Therefore I say we have carried out our pledge.

We pledged ourselves to promote freer trade, if it were possible, between all countries, and especially Great Britain and the United States of America. Our American friends do not seem disposed at this present moment to enter into freer trade relations with us. We do not complain of that, and we have no right to complain; but we have done what was in our power. We have taken a course that does mean freer trade relations between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and this country, and in that we have fulfilled another pledge that was given to the people of Canada when we adopted the resolution that forms the trade platform of the Liberal party.

The ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) spent a large portion of his time in reading extracts of utterances of public men upon this side of the House, with reference to tariff matters. He read them as if they were pledges solemnly given, and gave individual instances in which they must be carried out. He read, that the First Minister had declared, that he was in favour of free trade as it is in England, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) wanted to charge, that pledges were violated unless there was at this very session an entire wiping out the customs duties upon articles upon which they are now levied, and a consequent raising of taxation in another way. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) knew full well, that while the First Minister expressed his admiration for the fiscal policy of Great Britain, and while he admired that country as leading in the van of nations, foremost for freedom of speech, foremost for freedom of the press, foremost in trade matters, and while he drew his inspiration from that grand old country; yet the First Minister said in the same breath: that recognizing the conditions that prevailed in this country, he did not expect, nor would he lead the people to expect that for many a long day we could adopt exactly the policy that prevails in the motherland. The ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) quoted, as if my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) had declared, that if we ever came into power all the manufacturing industries of Canada would be wiped out of existence. No such statement was made. True, the principle of protection was denounced; true warfare was declared against that system, but the ex-Finance Minister will look in vain for any declaration, that other than a revenue tariff was to be introduced in this House; and as a necessary consequence of a revenue tariff there is protection to a greater or less extent bound up in it as an incident of it, but not as a principle thereof.

The hon. gentlemen opposite took protection as their principle, and if any revenue came from it, it followed as an incident; but we on this side of the House take the ground, that the proper principle to act upon is, that we should raise the requisite revenues to carry on the Government of the country, and if there was any protection involved, as protection must be involved, it followed as an incident and not as a principle. There, Sir, is the distinction. The policy of hon. gentlemen opposite as defined by the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) is, that they were bound to give to industries in this country such support, by way of tariff resolutions and customs duties, as those industries demanded. The position on

this side is not that. It is not that we are bound to give them such protection as they demand, but, having regard to the interests of the country, that they should have such protection as was an incident of the revenue propositions laid before the House, and which must be enacted in order to get the necessary revenue to carry on the affairs of this country. As hon. gentlemen opposite know full well, the First Minister in reply to the Finance Minister at that time declared: that should the Liberal party come into power it was their policy to raise the necessary revenues of this country as they had been raised when the Liberals were in power before, namely, from customs and excise duties; but that they should be levied with an eye to securing the necessary revenue.

I need not go into the details of the tariff because they will be dealt with in committee, when they will be fully discussed, and when we will be able to consider their effect upon the revenue, and to point out what advantages have been secured thereby. If there should be any defects, I have not the slightest doubt that hon. gentlemen opposite, in their honest criticism, will point out these defects, and aid us, should we feel disposed, as I trust we may, to rectify any errors that may be made in the light of the principle that we hold.

But, Sir, exception has been taken to what is termed the reciprocal tariff contained in the resolutions laid before the House. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) opposite denounced it very strongly, and the hon. the ex-Prime Minister (Sir Charles Tupper) was very severe upon it. He read the resolution and he declared himself utterly unable to understand it. He told us, that the ex-Finance Minister was unable to understand it, that the "Globe" newspaper was unable to understand it, and although he himself declared he was unable to make any sense out of it, he also declared in the most emphatic terms, that it was unconstitutional. He laboured that point. Now, it is extraordinary to see an hon. gentleman with his position in the House, seeking to impress the country that we were attempting to do something unconstitutional, to insult Great Britain, to cause her to violate treaties; to think that he should have fulminated in this way, and in the same breath candidly confess that he did not know what he was talking about, because he did not comprehend the resolution.

My hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) is strong on the constitution, and always has been.

We remember that our hon. friend told us that the constitution demanded that a certain Bill should pass this House which he was anxious should pass, and it did not pass; and the constitution is there yet, and the hon. gentleman is opposite, and he has let the constitution go—he will not touch it any more. Now, I do not know what he will do with the constitution in this case. I do not know whether he will be able to ascertain before this discussion closes what the meaning of this tariff is, or what it is not. It is strange to me that gentlemen of the intelligence of the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) and the ex-Prime Minister (Sir Charles Tupper)—and I grant it to them, as the House freely grants it to them—cannot understand the resolution which is in print, which they have no doubt read time and again, when the newspapers three thousand miles away, which have got it by cable, seem to be able to comprehend it most thoroughly and completely. Who listened to the extract from the London "Times," read here yesterday, that was not convinced that the London "Times" understood that resolution fully in all its significance; and not only that paper, but all the papers throughout the United Kingdom everywhere, have understood it, and, understanding it, have approved and acclaimed it, while these hon. gentlemen have denounced it, though declaring that they do not understand it.

I need not remind the House of the strong language which the ex-Prime Minister used in reference to that reciprocal clause. I remember, when he was arguing that under that clause Canada must inevitably admit the goods of Belgium and Germany, if not those of twenty other countries—that it had been so declared and decided, that there was no other alternative, that it would be a breach of faith and a flouting of Imperial authority to refuse to admit them—a gentleman on this side of the House asked him if he had always entertained such views, and what he had said at the second congress of the Chambers of Commerce of the Empire in the year 1894. The hon. gentleman replied that it did not matter what he had said—it was what Earl Ripon had said that he had to deal with. Well, I am not inclined to place that low estimate upon the hon. gentleman that he in his humility was willing to place upon himself. I say that he does know something in reference to this matter. When, however, I call to his mind something that transpired and some utterances that were made at that meeting, it will not be for the purpose of proving that the hon. gentleman either does or does not know anything on this subject, but to bring him as a witness to the view that is held by the leading statesmen of Great Britain on the very question now before the House. What are the facts? Canada was represented at that second congress of the Chambers of Commerce of the Empire. Sir Charles Tupper, the High Commissioner for Canada, occupied, deservedly, a high place in that assembly. Some of the greatest and brightest business men from Canada and from the other colonies of the Empire, as well as from all parts of the United Kingdom, were present. Subjects of vast importance were brought up and discussed. A subject of great importance was introduced

by the High Commissioner for Canada in the following resolution :—

Whereas the British Empire, covering one-eighth of the habitable globe, with a population of 350,000,000, can amply supply the home market with the products of every clime at the lowest possible cost, and whereas a national sentiment of mutual interest and brotherhood should promote more extended commercial relations between the mother country and its many colonies and possessions, Resolved, that in order to extend the exchange and consumption of the home staple products in every part of the British Empire, a slight differential duty should be adopted by the Imperial and colonial governments in favour of the home productions against the imported foreign articles.

At a subsequent stage of the proceedings the hon. gentleman spoke to that resolution ; and before the vote was taken upon it—it was an amendment—he asked permission to amend it by inserting in it a definite amount of the mutual or reciprocal advantage that was to be given, which he fixed at 5 per cent. The hon. gentleman, in the course of his remarks on the resolution, said :

I am not prepared to advocate this policy on the ground that one or two gentlemen have mentioned to-day, namely, that it is essential to the retention of Canada by the Crown that this or any other policy should be adopted. I have no hesitation in saying that if matters were to stand as they do stand, much as I believe they could be improved and altered, we should remain, and I believe Canada would remain, true to the flag and true to the Sovereign. (Cheers.) If, at the same time, by this great Empire carrying out this policy, it will not only bind all its outlying and component parts more strongly together, but will also unite them by that powerful tie of interest which brings strength to the aid of the great sentimental tie which now unites them—if that be true, it is worth the consideration of every Imperial statesman, and I call upon every representative, whether from the United Kingdom, from Canada, or from Australasia, to say whether this Empire may not be made still greater, still grander, and still more prosperous than it is, and become united, not only for the present, but for the future. The eloquent mover of this resolution says that it would be a very difficult matter. He says you cannot advance, you cannot take a step in this direction, without abrogating the treaties which now exist between Belgium and Germany and this country, and that would involve a serious disturbance to the trade of England. I do not agree to that proposition. I say that if gentlemen present will look at the statistics, they will find that last year this country imported from Belgium £17,358,776 sterling worth, and they have only exported to Belgium £7,638,912. If they look at the trade statistics, they will find that this country imported from Germany £26,073,331 sterling worth, and they only exported to Germany £19,293,626. What follows? Why, it is perfectly apparent from these figures that if Her Majesty's Government said to Belgium and Germany to-morrow, as I am happy to say we have the pledge of Her Majesty's Government, we have the pledge of Lord Salisbury, we have the pledge of the President of the Board of Trade, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the floor of the House of Commons, that England will avail herself of the earliest opportunity of getting rid of these two properly-termed unlucky treaties—(cheers)—the result will be to draw England and her colonies more closely together than they are at present, by fiscal relations which shall place the colonies and the colonists of England in a different position from foreign countries and foreigners. (Cheers.) Why should England wish to make foreigners of her own people? Does any other country in the world do it ? Does France make foreigners of her colonists? Does Spain treat her colonists as foreigners? By no means. England stands alone in that regard, and I am not surprised to know that every statesman, Liberal and Conservative, in this country, agrees that it is most desirable to get rid of those treaties that compel England for ever to treat her own colonists as foreigners.

We have the testimony of hon. gentlemen opposite that the faith of the statesmen of Great Britain is pledged that these treaties shall not stand in the way of better trade relations between the mother country and her colonies. Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell me that he believes that while every statesman, Liberal and Conservative, in England entertains the common opinion that it is advisable to get rid of these treaties, and that while he believes the governing authorities in the old country are absolutely determined to get rid of these treaties, they will not be able to do so ? Is that the position which the hon. gentleman takes ? He then proceeded to say :

But what is the difficulty? Why, it is perfectly palpable, if you look at the much greater importance that these treaties are to both Belgium and Germany than they are to this country, that you are in a position to say to both Belgium and Germany that what England wants is to eliminate this single clause from that treaty, that prevents our treating the outlying portions of the Empire as every country in the world treats the outlying portions of their empire ; and if you do not do it, we shall be compelled to denounce the whole treaty. Does any person, looking at those figures showing the enormous import into this country of Belgian and German products over and above all that this country sends to them, suppose that, with such an enormous balance of trade in favour of both Belgium and Germany, they would not at once agree to the elimination of this objectionable clause rather than lose the enormous advantages that they gain under it?

That was the position.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Precisely, and I adhere to every word of it now.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Then if the hon. gentleman adheres to every word of it now, does he think that there will be any difficulty in that country in which, according to his own statement, the First Minister and the Chancellor of the Exchequer and every statesman, both Liberal and Conservative, is committed to getting rid of these treaties, there will be any difficulty in coming to an arrangement of this matter

even should any difficulty arise under the resolution introduced by us in this House? That is the question I put the hon. gentleman.

And while I am upon this point, I would like to ask the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster), who takes such strong ground on this point, whether in 1892 he was playing with the House and the country, when, at the close of his Budget speech, he used the language that I now beg to recall to his attention, and which he will find on record in the "Hansard" of that year. He was alluding to the fact that our neighbours to the south were not disposed to trade as freely with us as they should be, and he was looking forward to a portion of our trade with that country being stopped through the legislation that was being enacted there. If he had reason then to take that view, this Government have all the more reason now to adopt it, in view of the Dingley Bill, which has been introduced in the American Congress, and which, while we do not complain, will have the effect, if it becomes law, of stopping a portion of the trade now enjoyed by both countries. And this Government are determined by every legitimate means, acting in the best interests of the people, if one avenue is to be closed against them, to find other avenues. Now, what did the hon. gentleman say at the close of his speech, looking at the circumstances in existence then, and which are still in existence and stronger and more potent now:

> So, Sir, I say we may face towards the old country, and for our varied products exploit those markets which are sure to prove profitable from their constant, and indeed, growing demands. And it may also be that, in the near future, considering this war of tariffs which is taking place the world over, considering the discriminating benefits which are given by some countries and denied by others, it may be worth the careful and thoughtful attention of the Government as to whether or not the time is not approaching, if it is not near at hand, when it will become the duty of this Government to hold out the hand of help to those that help us, to repay favour with favour, and interest with interest, and to give the best treatment in our markets to those countries which afford to us the best treatment in their markets.

Sir, there is nothing in that about a preferential tariff. I can remember the cheers with which it was greeted when the hon. gentleman sat down, and yet that same hon. gentleman stood up and denounced as unconstitutional, as something that should not be entertained in this House, the proposition put in force by us, which he himself was able to see would be beneficial, but never had the courage to adopt. Sir, the difference between the two parties is this. It is not a question as to whether we have done the right thing or not, because we are both agreed upon that. The difference is simply this, that he, knowing it to be right, dared not do it, while we, knowing it to be right, did it.

The hon. gentleman who last addressed the House (Sir Charles Tupper) spoke as if we had done something that was injurious to the best interests of our country. He said we had by our proposition thrown away the great advantage that was ours. He said that if this resolution, instead of being couched in the terms in which it was, contained an offer of preferential trade, stipulating that if Great Britain would put a tax upon the products of other countries and give us free access, while we lowered our duties somewhat in return, such a resolution proposd by Lord Salisbury in the House of Commons would carry immediately, and we would have preferential trade over the entire country. He did not then seem to see any difficulty in the German and Belgian treaties at all. What ground had he for this statement? Every one will admit that if Canada can obtain a preference in the markets of Great Britain, Canada would be very glad to receive it, and every legitimate means put forward to secure that would be hailed with pleasure by both sides. But I entirely deny that the course recommended by the hon. gentleman was the best. He proposes that we should not manifest any feeling, that we should awaken no enthusiasm, that we should excite no sympathy in the people on the other side, but should merely propose a cool and deliberate bargain, and say to the British Government: we will do nothing for you until you are prepared to do something for us. Sir, what will be the effect of this resolution, let me ask the hon. gentleman? What has been its effect upon the English people? We have not gone to them demanding the pound of flesh in return for what we concede; we have recognized the fact that this is a good step in our own interest, and we have recognized it all the more gladly because it is in consonance with our feelings to trade with the mother country. We have, of our own motion, said to the English people: We will give you advantages, though they are given to all nations that come within the provisions of that resolution—it applies, as they know, and as English statesmen know, directly to them in its operation. And what has been the result? Why, Sir, I venture to say that nothing has ever transpired in the history of Canada that has touched the English heart as has this very resolution which is denounced by the hon. gentleman. Who can read the expressions of their papers, when the very words I have made use of are to be found in their leading prints, without seeing that England has been more profoundly touched and moved than ever before, by this Act and its operation. No one can tell how far-reaching its effect may be. The hon. gentleman would make the country believe that we had weakened our position for receiving treatment from England

that we would be glad to receive. But I say that by this Act the heart of the English people has been touched, their sympathy has been enlisted; and I make bold to say that to-day, any statesman from Canada going over there would be able to reach the ready ear of the Englishmen with the arguments that can be advanced on our side of any question, and that they might yield concessions to this country in matters of trade, because of the effect which has been produced by this resolution. Who can say that, if the Minister of Agriculture were to go over there and speak to the statesmen of that country with reference to the legislation placing an embargo upon Canadian cattle, he would not be in a stronger position, that he would not be more readily listened to, than he would have been before this resolution was introduced? And so, in respect of everything. The English sympathy has been enlisted, and Canada has been advertised as she never was advertised in her history before. The far-reaching effects of this no one can tell at this moment. While we rejoice in that fact I, for one, am free to admit that I am looking for the interest of Canada as well. If it be true, and we have reason to believe that possibly it may be true, that the Bill introduced in the American Congress will pass in its present form, thus bringing in the rates of duty that are now proposed, we recognize the fact that our great agricultural and lumbering industries, will, in a measure, perhaps, be injured through that legislation. But, as I said before, we do not complain; we have no right to complain. It is not the spirit of the men who compose the Government of this country to complain. Our duty as the Government of Canada is to look after the interests of the people of Canada; and if the markets of our people, were in a measure, stopped on one direction, the bounden duty of this Government was to use every legitimate means to secure advantage in other directions. And we have done so. I have no doubt that this House, representative of the people of Canada, will vote the money necessary to deepen our canals, and to do that work quickly, that we may have cheaper transportation and bring the different provinces of this country closer together. Canada will cheerfully afford the means to promote cold storage and other facilities so that the products of our farms may be transported in better condition to the markets of the mother country. And, with these facilities afforded and availed of and with the sentiment that is aroused in Great Britain today, I have reason to believe, and I think hon. gentlemen will agree with me there, an impetus will be given to the trade in the natural products of Canada in the markets of Great Britain that will redound to the marked benefit of the great agricultural and manufacturing industries of this country. That is the point, I think, that must commend itself to all those who sit as representatives of the people in this House.

I do not wish to detain the House longer. It is not necessary to go into a consideration of the different items that compose the tariff and the changes that have been made. These will be subject to review when the House goes into committee. I can only say, in conclusion, that in the resolutions as they are laid upon the Table are embodied the results of the best thought we have been able to give to these questions, in the limited time at our disposal. While some may think that we have not gone far enough, and others that, in some lines, we have gone too far, yet I am rejoiced to know that those resolutions meet with the approval of the people of this country. And I am rejoiced to believe, as I do believe, that this country will go on prospering and increasing under the benefits of the measure that has been introduced for the consideration of this House. And, should this House adopt it, I believe an era of greater prosperity is about to dawn upon Canada, and that from ocean to ocean, every province and every portion of every province will feel the quickening and reviving influence of the resolutions that have been submitted for the consideration of this Parliament.

Mr. DAVIN. I think, Mr. Speaker, you will agree with me that the new role of enthusiastic Britishers does not sit very easy on hon. gentlemen opposite. The position of the Government at the present time is a triumphant illustration of the victory of Conservatism. For eighteen years hon. gentlemen opposite have been fighting the Liberal-Conservative party; they have been denouncing the principles of the Conservative party; they have been eulogizing the United States, and have laid at the door of their opponents the fact that reciprocity could not be had from Washington. Sir, they are not warm in their seats when we find them, but with somewhat the exaggeration of new converts, adopting the shibboleths, adopting the principles, adopting the catch-words of the Conservative party. We had a long speech, the longest I think on record, from the Finance Minister, and what did he do? Did he expound his Budget? No; he spoke two or three hours before dinner, and three or four hours after dinner, and then he sat down, overcome by his own efforts, and without having given the House any information about this tariff that would help us to understand it. The Controller of Customs then went on for a considerable time, and he sat down without having expounded the tariff to us, or helped us to understand it. Then we had a speech from the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Did he explain it? He attempted to explain it, but what did his exposition consist of? In telling us that it might be this, and it might be the other thing, and it might be something else.

Now we have a speech from the Controller of Customs, and of him the same must be said, that he has not helped us in any way to understand the tariff. I suppose he has had a good deal to do with the preparation of the tariff; at all events, he ought to have had as much to do with it as any of the other skilful hands which manipulated it. But are we one whit enlightened by the speech to which we have just listened? Has there been a ray of light thrown upon this difficult tariff?—because it is an unprecedented tariff. We might worship it, without idolatry, without breaking any of the commandments, for it is like nothing in Heaven above, or on the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth. We have had speeches from three authorities on that tariff, and not one word of light or exposition has come to us. When my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill) rose up and asked the Controller of Customs to tell him what was the meaning of "on the whole," was there ever a plainer or a more rational question? Here is an hon. gentleman a member of a Government who have placed a resolution before this House and before the country in which occurs a certain phrase "on the whole"; and he is asked to tell what the meaning of that is, and he dares not attempt to tell. But what does he do? He gives us a platform speech of about an hour in length, and he does this with such energy that I thought a drumhead must have been boiled in his broth. But there was no instruction, there was no enlightenment whatever. Now that question of the hon. member for Bruce was a very important one; and the hon. Controller of Customs let fall a few words at the close of his speech which seemed to glance in the same direction as the clear indication of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, that when this tariff becomes law, other nations, in fact some twenty-three nations, I suppose, will be able to come in on the same footing as England without making the least change in their tariffs. Has the hon. gentleman looked at the tariff of Germany? Has he looked at the tariff of Belgium? Is he aware that those who have looked at those tariffs know, or think they know, that whatever course may be taken by the Government—suppose the impossible course should be taken, which I think myself is out of the question, of confining the operations of this preferential clause to England unless the other countries modify their fiscal policies—suppose that was done, German goods could come to us not merely through England but direct, and this country could be deluged with German goods. I think if the hon. gentleman will look at those tariffs he will find that once this goes into operation, this country may be deluged with German goods and with Belgium goods. Does he wish it? Because if he wishes it, then the people of Canada ought to know it. I am not now discussing whether it is desirable or not, but the people of Canada should know what the facts are.

I want to confine myself for a few moments to what fell from my hon. friend the Controller of Customs. He described this tariff with a great deal of enthusiasm. I see that the Toronto "World" says that it is a picturesque tariff. I also see that the "Globe," in one of its illustrations of my hon. friend the Prime Minister, places him before us in the position of a theatrical manager. Well, Sir, this tariff I must confess to you, seems to me to be a piece of tariff skirt dancing—that is the best description I can give of it. My hon. friend who has just spoken, got enthusiastic about the heart of England having been touched; and we have had a great deal of what is high-falutin about the sentimental aspect of this tariff. But what has touched the heart of England is clearly not this tariff, is clearly not these resolutions. These resolutions can hardly have been before the eye of England, or before the good sense of England, or both would have seen that they contain no special favour for her. My hon. friend talks about the "Times." He does not appear to know that in the history of that great journal, the "Times" has taken the wrong view on hundreds of questions. He speaks as though we did not know that the "Daily News" is the mouthpiece of the commercial world, and of the Radical party in England; as though we did not know that it was the organ of the Cobdenites, and these journals clearly thought that this tariff does something for them which these hon. gentlemen do not attempt to say it does, or that they intend it shall do. When the "Times" or the "Daily News," or other journals have had time to consider just what is done for England in this tariff, probably the dythrambics we have heard from across the Atlantic, will be changed to another tune. I know something of the way journalism is conducted in London, and let me ask the House, how do they think an article like that is written in the "Times," or in the "Daily News"? I will tell them. The editorial writer who is in charge, specially of the colonies, comes down about nine o'clock in the evening to the office; he calls upon the editor in the editorial sanctum, and the editor hands him a telegram that he has received from Canada, a brief sketch of what has taken place, in which it is stated that Canada has proposed something special for England. They discuss it for a few minutes; the editorial writer goes into a neighbouring room and writes his leader. What is that leader which we shall see in the "Times," or in the "Daily News," the next morning? It is a brief essay of a clever man who has gone to Printing House Square, or Bouverie Street, from his club. But in two weeks from now when they shall have seen the tariff, and

shall know what it means, the same young gentleman will go down and discuss the subject with the editor, and the next morning you will see a leaded column wholly different tone. Sir, I attach no such importance as hon. gentlemen opposite affect to do, to the opinion of the "Times" or the "Daily News," written on such meagre data as they have received; I would attach a great deal more importance to a deliberate opinion from a Canadian journalist. What is the standpoint from which this matter will be looked at in England? It is the standpoint of the English manufacturer; it is not the standpoint of Canada, or of the progress of Canada. No doubt the account that has been sent over to England has indicated that something special has been done for her; but when it is found that the name of England does not occur in the resolution, that there is no real preference for England, their opinion will change.

What happened this evening when my hon. friend was defending the Ministerial position? He quoted a speech of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition in order to buttress the position taken by the Government. That speech was, indeed, like all the speeches of the leader of the Opposition, thoughtful, statesmanlike, a speech strong in its enthusiasm for preferential trade, and for the unification and the consolidation of the Empire.

But surely it is one of the most extraordinary things in the world that this should have been quoted by my hon. friend: for what the leader of the Opposition advocated on that occasion was something wholly different from what has been done by the Government. The leader of the Opposition quoted Lord Salisbury and other statesmen as in favour of denouncing the treaties with a view to securing preferential trade which would confer advantages on Canada. What hon. gentlemen have done is as far as they could, to violate those treaties, and thus make it impossible that the statesmen of England should denounce them until whatever controversies arise over them are settled. Now that this has been done, if any complications have arisen, no matter how trifling they may be, the statesmen of England can not denounce those treaties until the controversies have been settled. Thus at every step, instead of precipitating denunciation of the treaties, they have for the moment any way made it impossible.

A word as to what my hon. friend (Mr. Paterson) said about delay. The hon. gentleman said the delay caused no inconvenience whatever, that it did not paralyze trade, that there was no evidence that such was the case. The hon. gentleman is very strong in pinning his faith on newspapers when it suits his purpose, and he is willing to quote the "Times" and the "Daily News" as indicating English public opinion, although there has not been time for the facts in relation to the tariff to percolate through the minds of the people of the United Kingdom; but the hon. gentleman apparently does not know that the monetary and commercial newspapers of this country, the "Monetary Times," for instance, have declared that our business was paralyzed in consequence of this delay. And we know as a fact it was so. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) last night, said that the ex-Minister of Finance had been disingenuous. If I were as frank, I would say that the attitude taken to-day by the Controller of Customs, that taken on Thursday by the Minister of Finance, that taken subsequently on Monday by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, of standing up and saying that they had fulfilled their promises, that their promises had been carried out and their pledges redeemed, was one of the most impudent acts in the history of parliamentary effrontery. There never has been such a spectacle as that presented by this Government, which is simply an organized perfidy. They have come into power, having made promises and pledges and having given their political note of hand to do certain things. What have they done? They promised to give free trade as it is in England, that we should get reciprocity with the United States, that they would abolish protection and not leave a shred of the curse in the tariff. But hon. gentlemen laugh at the people now. They laugh: We have bamboozled you at the elections, and we are going through with it. Never was a more cynically impudent attitude taken by any Government.

What were the pledges we had west and east? Did not the Prime Minister visit Winnipeg and promise that the Liberals would give us free trade as it is in England? Did not he go to Montreal and tell the people that he would give them free raw material? Did not the Minister of Trade and Commerce at Morrisburg and from a hundred platforms declare that not a single element of that scandalous principle of protection would be found in the tariff which the Liberal Government would give to the country. Were not specific pledges given respecting lumber and coal? The Prime Minister went to Montreal and promised free coal, and that promise went all over the west. Were we not told by leading members of the party that we should have free implements in the North-west? Is there any lowering of the duties on implements by this tariff? Hon. gentlemen opposite have given, as I will show a tariff which is not even a square protectionist tariff, because it is a higledy-pigledy, which Dr. Johnson defined as a conglomerated mass of heterogeneous matter. They have given the country a tariff, which has more marked protectionist features in it than any tariff which has heretofore been seen in Canada. Take its preferential element. That is a strictly protec-

tionist principle. But there is the principle of the high bonusing of industries. Is that free trade as they have it in England? That is a strong protectionist principle. Hon. gentlemen who promised a tariff in which there should not be a vestige of protection have brought down a tariff that has the strongest protectionist features; high duties; bonuses: retaliation; preferential trade; anything but the tariff which was promised. What they have done is to try and please everybody. The speech of the Finance Minister was as extraordinary as the tariff he heralded, because he devoted the greater part of it to eulogizing free trade and denouncing protection, and he ended with announcing a tariff which is the reverse of a free trade tariff. I was reminded of an incident in one of the letters of Dr. Russell. Shortly after the Crimean war, he was travelling between Versailles and Paris and met an old woman with handkerchiefs over her left arm. It was summer time. He asked her what her business was, and she replied, "To blow the noses of invalid soldiers who have lost their arms; but at the present time, it being summer, I am a little short of employment." The Minister of Finance had on his arm a lot of free trade rags, remnants of free trade principles; but he finished by telling the House that the demand for his free trade rags was at a low point just now.

Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about the preferential element in the tariff as though they had discovered it, when the fact is, that it is and has been one of the planks in the platform of the Conservative party. But, the Conservative party would never think of trying to bring about preferential trade by a course which would compel England, if she sanctioned it, to violate treaties. We ought to be informed by this time, whether or not hon. gentlemen opposite have had a communication from the Home Government on this subject. I have been assured by a person very well informed, that a despatch has arrived from one of the Secretaries of State to the Prime Minister, saying, that the Government of England was gratified at the manifestation of Imperial feeling in Canada and the desire to give England a preference, but that the English Government could not sanction this legislation. I ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if that be so?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I do not see why the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) wishes to ask me. He says he knows all about it, and he has given to the House the substance of what he thinks it is.

Mr. DAVIN. That, Mr. Speaker, is a sample of the kind of thing we have had ever since the Government got into power. They take upon themselves to negotiate, and they receive information, and so long as they dare they keep this House without the knowledge. That is not a proper answer to give to a member of Parliament speaking from his place in this House. The proper answer was, either to deny that the Government had received such a despatch or else to acknowledge its receipt.

Both the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and the Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson), who have been for ten months incubating this tariff, indicate that the brood is not perfect, and that it is not a hatch they are ready to stand by.

Mr. BENNETT. They change the eggs every day

Mr. DAVIN. I suppose they do. They say that changes may be made, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce bowed that they were not too proud to make changes. Well, from this side of the House, and from the North-west Territories, pressure will be brought upon them to change their minds and to carry out their pledges to the North-west, and not to leave the farmers there, worse treated than they could possibly have feared. The hon. the Minister told us that England will avail herself of the earliest opportunity of getting rid of these treaties, and he seemed to think that she would do so now, because her heart had been touched. But we ought to know whether the Government have any ground for saying that England will get rid of these treaties. We should have the facts on the Table of this House before we proceed further to consider the tariff. The Minister of Trade and Commerce read an extract from a speech of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) delivered in 1893, and we were told that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), because of legislation then passing through Congress, expressed himself as likely to inaugurate a retaliatory policy. At the time my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) spoke in that way, how were hon. gentlemen opposite speaking and how were their journals writing? When this legislation was being promoted in the United States in 1893, the "Globe" had an article in which we read:

> But a more enlightened public opinion is abroad, and the people have learned that the freedom of their own is more important than the freedom of other markets. * * And it is evident that a majority of the farmers of Canada have learned to clearly analyse the situation. This belief is strengthened by the result of the Winnipeg election, that city being dependent, to a great extent, on agricultural prosperity. The real demand of the Canadian farmers is not for more duties on farm produce, but for relief from duties now imposed for the benefit of manufacturers. The existence of the American tariff has been used as an argument in favour of retaining protection in the Dominion. Of course, such an

argument is entirely without reason, as a policy of tariff reduction and abolition would be the best for the Dominion, no matter how high the American tariff might be.

And, what was the Prime Minister's declaration at Winnipeg? He said: "We are told that if the Americans put up a high tariff that we must put up a high tariff too; that is equivalent to saying that if they are fools we must be fools also." When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) said that, he was not Prime Minister, and now when he is Prime Minister, because the people of the United States are fools, witness the Dingley Bill, we must be fools too, and thus in regard to that as to every other promise, they have turned their back on it. There is not a shred of the principles which they advocated when in Opposition left. And in regard to the Dingley Bill, gentlemen opposite do not seem to be aware, as statesmen should be, that it is the Senate of the United States settles the tariff. It is not what the House of Representatives does, as the Finance Minister seems to think, it is what the Senate does that fixes the tariff, and if gentlemen opposite are anxious to get that reciprocity upon which they set so much store, then they should not have jumped because of any action of the House of Representatives, but should have waited until they had the decision of the Senate of the United States. We were also told, that if the Minister of Agriculture went across the water, then because of this preferential tariff he would be able to make a powerful argument in favour of raising the embargo against our cattle in England. This shows complete ignorance of the reason why our cattle were scheduled. Sir, that embargo was placed upon our cattle because the farmers of England wanted to have protection, and because the Government determined to give the farmers that protection for which they were asking. Anybody familiar with the facts knows that. The Finance Minister also told us, that one of the subjects upon which the people pronounced upon the 23rd of June, was, this fiscal policy. He told us that the people decided between two parties, one party believing in protection and the other party believing that protection was a curse to the country and that free trade was the great panacea for all our ills. If the Finance Minister believes this, he believes that on the 23rd June the people of this country declared that they were in favour of free trade, or at least, that they were in favour of a revenue tariff pure and simple, a tariff in which there would not be no evidence of consideration for manufacturers. Why is it you do not give the people what they pronounced in favour of? Let me lay down this proposition, that from a constitutional point of view, when an appeal is made to the people of the country, and they decide in favour of a given policy, it is a grave and serious evil to that country if that policy is not carried out by the party which comes into power. This appeal is the great wheel in our constitutional system. We believe in an appeal to the public mind at recurring intervals. We go to that public mind and ask for its verdict, and it is of the utmost importance to the constitutional working of our system that that great wheel should be allowed to turn, and that whatever the people have decided on should be carried into effect. That is the only possible way in which our public men can preserve their character before the world. To-day, so far as the Government could bring it about, all confidence in the public men of Canada has been destroyed. If we were to meet the Prime Minister or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or any of their colleagues in private, and they gave us their word, we would believe it; but is there a man who has heard their promises and pledges within the last twelve months who would now believe one word of theirs uttered in public? There is not a syllable of their promises that they are not ready to forswear, not a pledge that they are not ready to break. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) referred to my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) as "that lean and hungry Cassius." That was a most appropriate application on the part of the hon. gentleman, and I will tell you why. The application was stolen, as all his acts and principles at this hour are stolen. I have read of an elephant in India which on a certain gala occasion stole all the clothes of the Rajah's greatest enemy, and went around in the stolen apparel. That is the position of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce. That application to my hon. friend was made in 1893 by the late Sir John Thompson when in the city of Toronto. Even the hon. gentleman's Shaksperean quotation is stolen, like his policy. But there is a quotation which the Minister of Trade and Commerce, in rummaging through his Shaksperean memory, might have used. If, instead of going to "Julius Cæsar," he had gone to "Hamlet," he would have found there expressive language descriptive of another great statesman who had come to ill-gotten power of whom Hamlet says:

> A cut-purse of the empire and the rule,
> Who from a shelf the precious diadem stole,
> And put it in his pocket—
> A king of shreds and patches.

There is a quotation which he might appropriately apply to his leader and himself. He has stolen his policy and the tariff before us is a thing of shreds and patches. It is edifying to hear him talk of their principles; we all know him so well. We remember him going about the country trumpeting against

protection, and almost eulogizing union with the United States; singing pæans over the blessings of reciprocity; and groaning over the poor, wretched people who were destroyed by a scoundrelly tariff. And no sooner has he changed from one side of the House to the other than all that is forgotten. We have the Minister of Finance, also a great free trader, before he sat on the Treasury Bench, uttering an occasional free trade sentiment as by the force of habit, or by a trick of memory, and in the next breath coming out with an opposite opinion. In fact the mosaic of the Finance Minister's speech furnishes a most interesting study of the inconsequential. I fear that in making it he was haunted by the memory of the free trade leaders which he has written. We hear him giving utterance to a sound free trade doctrine, and then whipping out a strong protectionist idea. It is quite an interesting study: these gentlemen advocating principles and views which they entirely repudiated up to yesterday, but it is depressing when we think that a deadly blow has been struck at confidence in public men. If you ask how this tariff is received in Montreal, you are told that the Liberals do not like it, that they feel that they have been betrayed, while some Conservatives like it. You ask how it is received elsewhere, and you are told something similar. Well, Sir, there are four forces that put these gentlemen in power: the Liberal party, in which there are a large number of free traders; the Patrons; a certain number of farmers who believed that they would get advantages from a new Government, and some discontented Conservatives. But the great force which put them in power was of course the Liberal party, which contains a large number of free traders. But where are those free traders to-day? Where are the Patrons to-day? Written on their foreheads are the plain words, "Sold, but not paid for." They have been sold. This betrayal has dealt a mortal blow to constitutional government in Canada.

I spoke about the character of this measure. It is a thing of monstrous and portentous birth. Mr. Bengough, who did good service to Canada in other days, was accustomed, before and shortly after the Prime Minister came into power, to depict him in the "Globe" as a good Samaritan, lifting a drowning man out of the water or knocking the manacles off the ankles of a captive, and the drowning man and the captive were always represented as the western farmer; but since the feat of my hon. friend the Finance Minister, a change has come over the spirit of Mr. Bengough's dream. Here is what we have now. We have the new tariff horse with his pedigree described—sire, British Policy; dam, Protection. This is an extraordinary animal for a Liberal and free-trade Government to rear. Here is the leader of the Opposition depicted and the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) looking on, and here is the Finance Minister, in the guise of a sporting man, with his pocket handkerchief protruding in a jaunty way out of his side pocket. He is a sporting man, a horsey man, and we know what is the character of such gentlemen. We know we have to keep our eyes open and our eye-teeth skinned in order not to be done by them. Beneath we read the inscription: The new tariff foal—a sure winner; and we have Mr. Fielding, addressing the leader of the Opposition and the ex-Minister of Finance, saying: Out with it, gentlemen; do not be backward; say you never saw such a glandered, broken-winded, string-halted, ill-shaped, ill-actioned and ill-bred colt in your lives. But don't you wish you owned him?

But the answer of these gentlemen is not given. "Why, you impudent thief, you have stolen him out of our stable and have put a little whitewash on his hind legs to try and conceal the theft, and you have given him a new name and call him yours." What is the pedigree they put forward? The dam Protection and the sire British Policy. I would like to find where in British policy and free trade as it is in England, you get the principle of a bonus or retaliation or preferential trade—all of them highly protive.

How is this policy likely to affect the country generally and the North-west Territories in particular? As to how it will affect the country, we have not had any calculations from hon. gentlemen opposite. We have had the great speech, as it is described in the "Globe," of the hon. Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding); we have heard from the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright); and we have just now listened to the thundering tones of the Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson), but from none of these hon. gentlemen have we had a syllable to inform us how this tariff is going to affect the trade of the country, and we are compelled to make these calculations ourselves. The revenue from customs last year was, roughly speaking, $20,000,000, and the year before it was between $17,000,000 and $18,000,000, and you will find that the customs revenue which we receive from the United States is something over one-third of the whole. Take $7,000,000 from the $20,000,000, and we have $13,000,000 that will be affected by this tariff, because the favoured-nation clause will not only let in Belgium and Germany, but twenty-two other countries. But suppose we have not all these countries to reckon with, the great bulk of our customs income comes from England and the United States. Well, what will be the result? One-eighth off the $13,000,000 will give you about $1,750,000 for the first year, and then, when you take one-quarter off, you will have lost over $3,000,000. How are you going to make that up? By customs? Then you will

have to add to the importation of dutiable goods from those countries something like $13,500,000. Does anybody realize what an enormous addition to dutiable imports that would be? One of two results must follow. You must either get rid of these goods across the line, or if you consume them yourself, your own manufactures must disappear. Yet we have not had in the discussion one word on that question from hon. gentlemen opposite. Then what good will it do the farmer? The goods he is most interested in, agricultural implements, the goods which are classed as his raw material, and continually used on the farm, come from the United States, and these will pay their 35 per cent, while the silks of the fine ladies and gentlemen and their diamonds and precious stones will come in under the reduced tariff. And how much shall we lose? On silks alone, we shall lose a very large sum. What is the object? Those who indulge in these luxuries are not asking for this reduction. Nor have the Patrons of Industry asked for it. What they asked for was an increase in the duties on luxuries. Nor have those wealthy people who wear precious stones asked for it. But you will find that while salt is heavily taxed, much of which we get from the United States, while the implements of the farm are heavily taxed, you are lowering the duty on silks and precious stones and on articles of vertu and luxury.

Mr. MACDONALD. Do you mean to say that we get the greater part of our salt from the United States?

Mr. DAVIN. I think most of the fine salt.

Mr. MACDONALD. I will send you over the Trade and Navigation Returns.

Mr. DAVIN. I have them here. We do not get most of our fine salt from England.

Mr. MACDONALD. Yes we do, we get 100,000 tons of salt from England.

Mr. DAVIN. We get none dutiable. To show the inconsistency of this tariff, let me point out that the Finance Minister said, as did the Minister of Trade and Commerce, that they kept in their hands some means whereby to influence other countries to give us advantages. And what does the Finance Minister do? He lowers the duty on wheat and takes away the duty entirely from corn. The taking away of that duty from corn removes a powerful lever by which we might get reciprocity from the United States. Not only that, but it is a blow at the farmers of the west and most of the farmers throughout Canada. Take even Quebec. I was reading the other day one of the agricultural papers of the province of Quebec, and it declared that it was not in the interest of Quebec that the duty should be taken off corn. Yet you have done that wantonly, and why I do not know. I am afraid if we inquired, we should find an explanation not very creditable to the Government. Let me go over the things on which we shall have to pay 30 and 35 per cent. The duty on boots and shoes remains the same. The duty on india-rubber clothing remains the same. The duty on seamless bags is the same. Builders' hardware bears a duty of 30 per cent. Gray and bleached cotton fabrics, which were 22½ are charged 25 per cent. Flannels are charged 35 per cent, and ready-made clothing, 35 per cent. Buggies are 35 per cent. Wagons are the same as before—25 per cent. Nails and spikes are the same, composition nails and spikes and sheating nails the same; wire nails, 35 per cent.

Screws of all kinds, 35 per cent.

Wrought iron and steel nuts and washers, 35 per cent.

Picks, mattocks, grub hoes, adzes, hatchets and tools of all descriptions, 30 per cent.

Wedges, crowbars, sledges, track tools, 30 per cent.

Shovels and spades, lawn mowers, 35 per cent.

Files and rasps, 30 per cent.

Adzes, cleavers, hatchets, wedges, sledges, hammers, crowbars, cant-dogs and track tools; picks, mattocks, and eyes and poles for same; anvils, vises, and tools, hand or machine, of all kinds, 30 per cent.

Axes, scythes, sickles or reaping hooks, hay or straw-knives, hedging knives, hoes, rakes, prong forks, snaths, farm or field rollers, post-hole diggers, and other agricultural implements, n.e.s., 25 per cent.

Shovels and spades, iron or steel, and lawn mowers, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Needles, of any material or kind, n.o.p., 30 per cent ad valorem.

Brass and copper nails, tacks, rivets, and burrs or washers; bells, n.e.s., and all manufactures of brass or copper, n.e.s., 30 per cent ad valorem.

Zinc, manufactured, n.o.p., 25 per cent ad valorem.

Iron or steel nuts, washers or rivets, including tubular rivets, bolts, with or without threads, and nut and bolt blanks, n.e.s., 25 per cent.

Builders', cabinetmakers', upholsterers', harness makers', and saddlers' and carriage hardware, including butt hinges, locks, curry combs or curry cards, horse-boots and harness or saddlery, n.e.s., 30 per cent ad valorem.

Carvers, knives and forks, of steel, butchers' and table steels, oyster, bread, kitchen, cooks', butchers', shoe, farrier, putty, packing and glaziers' knives, cigar knives, spatulas or pallet knives, razors, &c., 30 per cent.

Iron or steel cut nails and spikes (ordinary builders'); and railroad spikes, n.o.p., 30 per cent ad valorem.

Wrought and pressed nails and spikes, trunk, clout, coopers', cigar-box, Hungarian, horse-shoe and other nails; horse, mule and ox shoes, 30 per cent.

Wrought iron or steel tubing, plain or galvanized, threaded and coupled or not, two inches or less in diameter, n.e.s., 35 per cent.

Other wrought iron or steel pipe or tubing, plain or galvanized, rivetted, corrugated or otherwise manufactured, n.o.p., 30 per cent.

Iron or steel fittings for iron or steel pipes of every description, and iron or steel rods, 30 per cent.

It will be seen that all these things in which the farmers are particularly interested remain as high as ever, although these gentlemen were to have given us a much lower tariff. One of the things we attach great importance to in the North-west is coal oil. We expected to get coal oil free. Is there any chance of it being free? We have a reduction of a cent a gallon, and my hon. friend who represents one of the constituencies in Manitoba says in his paper that the arrangement about tanks means practically the cutting of the duty in two. The hon. gentleman must know better than that; for it means nothing of the kind. The former duty on coal oil was about 100 per cent, according to the calculation of one of the hon. gentlemen opposite, I think the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey). On that basis, five cents per gallon is equal to 83 per cent at least. And this is a duty on what? On what the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) and the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) declared to be a necessary of life. Then, Mr. Speaker, the duty on lumber remains. When I was advocating, in 1895, that the lumber duty should be reduced, I had the support of the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards). This is what that hon. gentleman said:

The last item, sawed boards, was discussed, I think, last session. At that time, if I remember rightly, lumber, tongued and grooved, was put on the free list, because it was considered desirable, in the interests of the settlers in the North-west that it should come in free. I do not think that condition has since changed, and I see no reason whatever why the duty should now be imposed because of the construction the Americans have placed upon their tariff in this respect.

And he goes on to say, further:

I hold that it is for the advantage of the consumers of lumber in Manitoba and the North-west Territories that tongued and grooved lumber from the United States should come in free of duty. The arguments that were used last session were in favour of lumber planed on one side or on two sides, coming in free of duty, but not lumber tongued and grooved. It is true, the importer makes a small gain from the less amount of freight he pays when he imports that class of lumber; but the lumber, after it comes to this country, has to be sent to a planing mill to be tongued and grooved, and it costs the consumers about as much to have it tongued and grooved as to have it planed and tongued and grooved also.

And the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said on that occasion:

It seems to me, Sir, that the people of the North-west ought to be considered a little in this matter, as well as my hon. friend, Mr. Speaker, or any other parties who are engaged in the manufacture of lumber, and the view taken by my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Edwards), is both more politic and more generous. We have spent enormous sums of money to promote settlement in the North-west, and everybody knows that this will only be taken advantage of practically by the settlers in Manitoba or in the North-west, where lumber is, or used to be, sold at a very heavy price. I doubt extremely whether any revenue will be derived from it, and I also doubt the wisdom of bringing any alterations in the tariff at this period of the session.

When my hon. friend the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) was up west, and the hon. Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson), I think, with him, the farmers went before them in the city of Winnipeg and laid bare their claims. They asked to have the duty taken off coal oil; they asked to have the duty taken off implements; and they asked to have the duty taken off lumber. But one farmer went before the commission who seemed to understand them. I think his name was Fleming.

Mr. HUGHES. Where was he? Was he one of those who were paid to go?

Mr. DAVIN. I do not know about that. He said: I think I understand what you are going to do. I have been a Liberal all my life and have always supported you, but I may never support you any more; I will not if you do what I think you are going to do. You are going to act very much like two young surgeons when it was decided to amputate a leg. But the patient hollered so much that the young surgeons said: They would have to take off the leg in detail and would begin with the big toe; they would not dare to take off the leg. The most that these gentlemen have done so far, in the way of removing the gangrened leg they talk so much about, is to cut off one of the toes. Another thing that was asked for was that the duty should be taken off iron. I have always been in favour of iron being free.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. I have always been in favour of it. Some hon. gentleman says "Hear, hear." I may say that I was in favour of a course that was consistent in regard to this matter. In the Bill before us, you have protection by tariff and protection by bonus. That is inconsistent. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce quoted John Stuart Mill. There is a quotation he might have made from Mill. Mill said of a certain measure, that "it made a false profession of nice adaptation to political economy." This Bill if it makes any profession of that sort makes a false profession. In 1879, when Sir Leonard Tilley had proposed his tariff, after the House had risen he went around to visit the manufacturers of this country. I wrote a letter to him,

and at the same time a letter to the Toronto "Mail," which, with the permission of the House—and I hope it will not be misunderstood—I will read. This is the counterfoil of the letter, dated October 30 1879:

THE TARIFF.

To the Editor of the "Mail":

Sir,—The practical action of Sir Leonard Tilley, in visiting the manufacturers of Canada, will probably result in some changes in the tariff. Permit me, through your columns, to suggest to the Finance Minister that an improvement might be made if iron were protected, not by a tariff, but on the bonus or bounty system. This form of protection was the form which, so far as young communities are concerned, commended itself to the mind of the late John Stuart Mill, and its advantages in the case of an industry like the manufacture of iron, and in our actual circumstances, cannot be doubted.

(1.) The manufacture of iron is the key to all other manufactures. Unless we can manufacture iron successfully, we may throw up the sponge. But the manufacture of iron requires large capital. The capital to work our iron mines must come from outside. Englishmen, accustomed to see strong governments overthrown by a gust of popular feeling, cannot understand how a manufacturer or iron smelter might have calculated with certainty on our present tariff for five years at least, and even could he grasp the rationale of our politics in this particular, he might well think it would take more than five years to turn a profit on a vast outlay. His fears under both heads would have been, and may yet be, relieved by voting a bonus to be given for the next ten years for every ton of iron manufactured in the Dominion. History proves that this policy is always successful, even in the face of adverse natural conditions.

(2.) The result of such a policy would be that vast streams of capital would flow across the Atlantic, and from below the line, stimulating commercial activity and enriching the whole population.

I venture to throw out these suggestions in the hope that the Finance Minister may consider them, together with those which his own energetic observation will have brought before him.

Yours truly,

NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN.

Toronto, October 30, 1879.

Well, Sir, that, if I may venture to say so, is in accordance with sound views of political economy; that is also, if I may venture to say so, a logical and a rational proposition. But what have we here? We have the Finance Minister taking off part of the moderate duty on iron, and putting on a bonus. That I hold to be inconsistent, because the bonus does not do away with the objections to the tariff that John Stuart Mill saw. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that iron enters into every manufacture throughout the country, iron is that without which we cannot succeed in becoming a great manufacturing country, and if protected at all, it ought to be protected by bonus. But what does this Finance Minister do but protect it at once by bonus and by customs duty?

One word as to a feature of this tariff which has not been much discussed. The 16th clause provides that their shall be a Star Chamber established in Canada, that there shall be a court of politicians to try men who are suspected of going into combines. Now, Mr. Speaker, what would that be? It would be a tribunal composed of party politicians, and a tribunal composed of party politicians will inevitably be a partial tribunal, it will inevitably look with more favour on those who belong to their party. I say this is open to the remark that it bears the character of a scheme to get hold of an enormous power for terrorizing the people of this country, prior to an election, into supporting the Government. We have some indications how this could be worked. We were told that iron was to be placed upon the free list by the Prime Minister. We have the hon. member for Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Frost) in this House, who is a manufacturer of agricultural implements; we have the Massey-Harris Company who worked hard to help this party to get into power. We have at St. Hyacinthe at present a Mr. Boas, a manufacturer of knitting goods, and he contributed largely, as I am assured, to the campaign funds of the hon. gentlemen on the eve of the last election. Well, we have a bonus given for the manufacture of iron, we have the duty lowered on iron, and, therefore, a great change as to raw material in favour of the Massey-Harris Company and the hon. member for Leeds and Grenville; but nothing of their protection is taken from the manufacturers of agricultural implements. Then, Sir, this Israelite indeed at St. Hyacinthe, Mr. Boas, who employs some 665 men, and who goes largely into the manufacture of knitting goods, he is benefited; knitting goods are highly protected, and the hon. gentlemen have lowered the yarns that he imports to 15 per cent. With these facts before us, we have a flood of light on that 16th clause. Can hon. gentlemen expect us not to make every opposition we possibly can to a clause like that? I may say that, properly speaking, it has nothing to do with fiscal matters, which are the sole property of this House, and if it should be forced through this House by a cast-iron majority, I certainly would hope that that portion of these resolutions would never be passed, and never became law in this country.

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

After Recess.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend for London (Mr. Beattie) has requested me to ask a question of the Government.

and as I see the Ministerial benches are now pretty well filled, I will do so. There is a telegram published in the Montreal "Gazette," dated London, Ont., which states :

A new telegraphic order was received by the customs-house authorities here, this morning, to continue working under the old tariff.

I should like to ask some member of the Government who is present how that is. Is the Postmaster General aware of it ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I know nothing about the telegram, nor do I know as a matter of fact what instructions may have been sent by the Controller of Customs to his officers ; but speaking of the policy of the Government, interpreting it in the light of the tariff introduced, I am quite satisfied no such instructions have been sent to any officer in Canada. It is quite inconsistent with our tariff policy.

Mr. DAVIN. The only thing is this, it would be hard to find anything inconsistent with the tariff policy, because it is consistent only in its inconsistency.

I should like to show the House what were the expectations of the people of this country. In the autumn session of 1896 a committee of this House printed a very important report. On that committee were the hon. member for Eastern Assiniboia, the hon. member for Simcoe, the hon. member for South Huron, the hon. member for West Bruce and the hon. member for Bellechasse ; and this is what they said :

The fall in prices in articles which the farmer has to buy has not kept pace with what may be described as the slump in prices in the products of the farm on which the farmer has to depend for his living, nor with the decline in other parts of the world, where legislative and artificial means have not been enforced to maintain high prices. Nor is this result to be wondered at, for, while the agriculturist—the price of whose products is regulated by the price at the port of export—is thus brought into competition with the rest of the world, the classes he has to purchase from have been protected against foreign competition and been thus enabled to maintain their prices unaffected by that which, after all is said and done, is the ultimate factor in settling values.

The committee, therefore, trusts that, while every regard consistent with the principle of reforming the tariff on a revenue basis may be had to existing industries, commercial and manufacturing, yet the mistake of suffering things to remain as they are, fearful of the consequences that a reform on the lines indicated may entail on established industries, should not be made.

I call the attention of the House to this very important statement made by the committee, and I think all the hon. gentlemen I have named sit on the Government side of the House. The report continues :

If such a policy be pursued, it will, as the committee thinks, be at the expense of, and a great disappointment to, the agriculturists of Canada, who, while desiring no unnecessary harm to other classes or interests, are yet anxious that their rights and claims should not be lost sight of in the anxiety, perhaps not unnatural, not to interfere with the so-called vested rights of industries established under a system of tariff legislation that on the whole has been productive of ten-fold more injury than of benefit to the community. In a word, the committee think that the tariff should be readjusted, notwithstanding the loss inevitable that must follow from the recurrence to a wiser system.

Will the House note this statement ? That is the opinion of the member for Simcoe and the hon. member for South Huron and those other hon. gentlemen. They go on to say :

This, and this alone, is all that the committee can suggest as a means of lowering the price of the commodities which the agriculturist has to buy.

The hon. Prime Minister after he was raised to his present high position, speaking in one of the constituencies of Quebec, said : We cannot raise the prices of the commodities you have to sell, but we can lower the prices of those things you have to buy. And he promised to do so.

I have here a statement of what the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west require, which was laid before the Tariff Commission when they were at Winnipeg. Mr. James Fleming was the spokesman of a very large delegation of farmers. The second resolution they submitted to the Finance Minister and the Controller of Customs reads as follows :—

2. That agricultural implements, farm machinery and all tools used on the farm, binder twine, fence wire, lumber, nails, and building material, coal oil and fruit be free, and that the duty on salt, cotton and woollen clothing be materially reduced.

I showed before dinner that there is 35 per cent duty on much of what the farmer uses. I showed there is no change whatever in the duty on implements. I pointed out that there was only 1 cent taken off coal oil. When I mentioned salt, the hon. member for one of the Hurons said—and he must have known that I was speaking of dutiable salt—that I was wrong in saying that the bulk of dutiable salt came from the United States. I have looked at the report of the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the report of the Controller of Customs, and I find I was quite right. The great bulk of dutiable salt comes from the United States. The third resolution was as follows :—

3. That the high protective tariff has very materially restricted commerce with Great Britain, which is the country we look to above all others for our markets, and has greatly retarded the settlements of this province.

Mr. Fleming referred to a number of duties that inflicted great injustice on the people of Manitoba, and then he spoke of the coal oil duty, and said :

Mr. Fleming then went on to speak of the duty on agricultural implements, believing the time had come when implements should be placed on the free list. He very strongly urged a reduction of the coal oil duties. If it was necessary to tax people's light, they should begin with electric light, which was a luxury, while coal oil was a necessity.

The hon. Postmaster General, when he sat on this side of the House, was in the habit of speaking of coal oil as one of the necessaries of life; but he is silent about it now. His mind that formerly was agitated in regard to the interests of the farmer and the poor man is as calm as a looking-glass. We have some phenomena of that kind in other respects, if I may say so in passing. The hon. member for Simcoe—this has nothing to do with coal oil, but with light of another kind—had an annual motion on the Order paper when our friends were on the Government side of the House. He then took the North-west under his wing, and he had a Bill that was considered of a very disturbing character; but I neither see him in his seat nor the Bill. Mr. Fleming, continuing, said:

Mr. Laurier, discussing coal oil duties, had said that, in adjusting the tariff, he proposed to keep his eye on grand old England. "I hope," said Mr. Fleming, "when the matter comes up in the House, he will still keep his eye on grand old England, and not on grand old Petrolia."

What is the fact? The matter has come up in the House, but there is only a squint at "grand old England," while the other eye is full-orbed and very perspicuous on "grand old Petrolia." Further, Mr. Fleming said:

For seventeen years in this country, Mr. Fleming said, he had fought in the Liberal ranks because he had believed the Liberal leaders were sincere in their protestations of abolishing the unjust protective duties. Now when they had won the battle and relief seemed to be at hand, he was disappointed and disgusted to hear Liberal Cabinet Ministers assuring "protected" eastern manufacturers they would not be disturbed. He was disappointed to hear Hon. Messrs. Laurier and Mowat now saying the tariff changes must be made slowly and gradually. Hon. Mr. Laurier, before election, had declared the high protective tariff was legalized robbery, and now did he propose to continue for any length of time the legalized robbery?

That is what I would like to know, and the North-west wants to know, why he is going to continue this legalized robbery?

Messrs. Laurier and Mowat reminded him of two new and nervous surgeons about to amputate a man's injured limb. They knew the limb must come off, but as the man was hollering a good deal and declaring he would die under the operation, they decided to take it off gradually, first by cutting off a toe. The fear was, he said, they would not cut off more than the toes before next general election.

Who can doubt after the speeches we have heard here, but that his fear is well-grounded. Mr. Fleming who is a clear Grit, I expect, a true, sound Liberal to the core, continues:

I would rather have the Liberal party fail in trying to do right than succeed in doing wrong.

That is a sentiment that may be very vigorous in his breast, but I am inclined to think that there is not a bosom of any Cabinet Minister here that shares any such sentiment as that. I rather think they would prefer to keep their seats by doing wrong, than to fall by doing right. They have turned their back on every principle they held, and there they sit and not a blush on a brazen cheek nor a tear in an iron eye. When one asks oneself, how respectable men can so act, the only thing that one can think of, apart of course from the honours, is the moral of an Irish story. During the penal laws in Ireland a gentleman had turned to be a Protestant, and he was asked how such a good Catholic as he could have changed. Well, he said, seven thousand acres of the best land in Munster make seven thousand good reasons. I suppose there are seven thousand dollars yearly that will account for hon. gentlemen opposite pocketing their principles. Not only that, but the air is alive at the present time with honours; this is Jubilee year, and I read in the papers a long list of the honours that are to be conferred.

This is what Mr. Elder said, speaking to the memorial:

The farmers have returned the present Government on the policy of free trade, and a free trade policy they desire carried out.

I have shown what the farmers expected. Let me show that the leaders of the Liberal party when in Opposition responded to those expectations. The Prime Minister, then leader of the Opposition, spoke in the Windsor Hotel, Montreal, on 22nd January, 1895, and here are the mottoes that were hung around the room:

"Protection breeds corruption." "Remove the brakes from trade." "Lessen the cost of living." "A tariff for the requirements of the public service." "Down with the monopolies, trusts and combines." "And a large placard indicated the evil results of the National Policy."

But there they are to-day clinging to the National Policy. When the Prime Minister spoke at that meeting he quoted from their abandoned charter, that is now quoted by his friends with undying effrontery in this House and elsewhere; this charter of the free trade policy that has not been carried out. He said:

The Conservative party believe in protection; all their hope is in protection. The Liberal party believe in free trade on broad lines, such as exists in Great Britain, and their immediate object is a revenue tariff.

And yet they now uphold the strongest protectionist doctrines and principles

that have ever been in any tariff. As I have shown by quoting a list of things at 35 per cent, they have made no effort whatever to arrange a lower tariff on the articles that the poor man buys. The Prime Minister further said :

Our programme is for a customs tariff upon the basis of revenue, and nothing else.

But that is not all ; when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) went to Prescott he was accompanied by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), who was the spokesman for the Liberal party on fiscal questions, and at Prescott the Minister of Trade and Commerce was eloquent over broken promises, and the present Prime Minister was eloquent about the same thing. Well, Sir, they say that hell is paved with good intentions ; the sunny ways of the present Prime Minister are strewn with the barren brambles of worthless promises. This is what the Minister of Trade and Commerce said :

He objected to the establishment in this country of a privileged class to tax the people for their own benefit and to give no return to the people for it. Were the people put in possession of the knowledge, through the Public Accounts, of the taxation that they were compelled to pay for the benefit of the sugar-refiners and cotton manufacturers——

And now we have the duty raised on cotton manufactures, especially that class which the poor man wears.

—and the iron smelters——

And we have a bonus for the iron smelter——

—and for favoured individuals, they would sweep the whole system away to-morrow.

I hope that the people will take the hon. gentleman at his word, and march on Ottawa, and sweep away as well those who are continuing it. The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Laurier) then said :

The farmers had evidence that the promises made in 1878 had not been fulfilled, and that the whole system of protection had failed. At the evening meeting, Mr. Graham presented a brief but effective argument in support of the policy of a revenue tariff.

And then we had the member for Leeds and Grenville :

Mr. Frank T. Frost, of Smith's Falls, arraigned the National Policy, and pronounced it a flat failure.

Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Frost) was fighting on velvet. He had assurances that he would not be hurt, and that he would be placed by the Liberal tariff in a better position than he was by the Conservative tariff. Under the present tariff not only has he the same protection on his manufactured goods as he had before, but he has his raw material on more advantageous terms.

The present Prime Minister declared in 1887 against retaliation. He said on that occasion :

The ministerial press, the salaried press, and consequently the press which represents the ideas of the Ministers, declared that the people of Canada did not want any trade with the United States, if the latter feel that way. But retaliation is not free trade. The policy of the Conservative party is one of retaliation, but the policy of the Liberal party should be one of friendship and good-will towards the United States.

And yet, Sir, what have we to-day from these gentlemen, but a policy of retaliation ? Then the present Prime Minister, when in Opposition, and asking the people to place him where he is at the present time, in 1882, moved a resolution against the coal duties, and spoke as follows :—

Well, then, if the hon. Minister assents to this position, and his followers also assent to it, why do they legislate against nature? They will tell me that the Americans also legislate against nature.

What speech did we have this afternoon from the Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson) ? He pointed to the Dingley Bill, which is, according to the Prime Minister, legislation against nature. And what did we have from the Finance Minister ? He said things had changed—the United States were not in the same mood as he alleged they were in 1893. They were legislating against nature, and we must do the same. But the Prime Minister, when on this side of the House, said :

Can this reason ever be given in a civilized country, that because one nation legislates against nature, we should also legislate against nature? The hon. gentleman reminded me of what is said of the Chinese mode of duelling. In Paris, where duels are frequent, a man who is offended calls his adversary out, and they settle the matter between themselves ; but in China, if a man is offended, he commences by opening his bowels, and when this is done, the bloody sword is sent to his adversary, who also opens his bowels, so that, instead of one man going to the grave against the laws of nature, two men do so. On this continent, instead of having one nation legislating against the laws of nature, you have two pursuing that course.

So that because the Americans are disembowelling themselves, our hon. friends on the Government side disembowel themselves too, and contrary to the promises they made. I have further statements made by the present Finance Minister, the present Minister of Trade and Commerce, and the present Prime Minister, when they were looking for votes, when they were holding themselves out as the proper persons to administer the affairs of the country, and were therefore making promises and pledges to the people. Here is what the Finance Minister said in 1894 :

Referring to the coal trade, he said the Liberal party would not preach one doctrine in Cape Breton and another in the rest of the Dominion. If the coal business could not be carried on without protection, then it is better not to carry it on at all. Protection was not a necessity for its welfare; the coal business is not a pauper business.

But what does he do here to-day? He puts 60 cents a ton on coal. The present Minister of Trade and Commerce also said:

Now, if there be a principle of political economy clearer than another, it is the principle that the worst tax which could be imposed is a tax on a necessity of life like coal. Moreover, it is a tax exceedingly partial and unjust in its operation. It will fall on the poorest classes of the community in the depths of the Canadian winter. It is absolutely sectional, pressing heavily on the people of Ontario, and not at all on the great mass of the people through the other provinces. It will form a standing grievance. It is a most doubtful benefit to Nova Scotia.

It is not merely Ontario that the tax on coal affects; it affects Manitoba and the North-west as well. It affects the price of coal along the whole line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. In the section of country to which I belong many of the farmers burn coal, and the price of coal from the Lethbridge mines and from the anthracite mines is regulated strictly by the price of coal that comes from below the line. The Prime Minister, speaking in Montreal before the election, said:

They have a tax on iron, which is a raw material of every industry. The tax on coal, which is also a raw material of every industry, is 60 cents a ton. Although I have not the latest quotations of coal, I am sure that this tax is equivalent to 40 per cent. Now, I am asked, What are you going to do? I have just told you what we are going to do. We are going to have a tariff for revenue, and we are going to abolish completely the duties on raw material.

Here is the positive language of the Prime Minister. Then, speaking at Sohmer Park in the same city a few days later, he remarked:

I say that if we were to have a revenue tariff, raw materials would be free. Raw materials are not free to-day under the protective system. There are certain raw materials which are free. Wool is free; thank heaven, they have not thought of taxing it. Cotton is free also. But is iron free? Cotton is a raw material, and wool is a raw material for certain manufactures. But there are two articles which are raw material of every manufacture, and these articles are coal and iron, and are they free? If you have a revenue tariff, the object would be to develop the country, and all raw materials should be free under such a tariff.

The Winnipeg "Tribune," whose editor and proprietor is a member of this House, began to suspect in December last that the Liberal Government, of which he is a supporter, was not going to carry out its promises, and this is what that paper said:

It was with considerable pain that the "Tribune" observed the remarks of members of the Dominion Government who have recently passed through the city, with reference to the tariff. Both Mr. Davies and Mr. Blair observed that they had not heard the tariff mentioned while in the west. If they are disposed to interpret silence on this great—nay, paramount question—to mean that the people of the west are not desperately in earnest in their desire to secure a revolution of the tariff, then we must tell them plainly that they entirely misapprehend the spirit and sentiment of the people. We would like to inquire how it could be possible that they should hear anything about the tariff while passing hurriedly over our plains in private cars, without a stop of more than an hour or two here and there, on their way east? Citizens of the west are noted for their innate courtesy and kindness to visitors and visiting Ministers, more especially if they are here for the first time.

And having spoken pretty strongly, it says:

This may be deemed very plain talk. It is intended to be plain. Like Mr. Greenway, the "Tribune" is a thorough believer having the same policy in power which it advocates when in opposition.

How will the hon. gentleman act now? Is he going to support these men who turned their backs on their promises, who have done the very thing he feared? It will be very curious to see what he will do. I do not know whether there is a shred of a promise or a profession made by the hon. Prime Minister that he intends to keep. Why, when he was at Renfrew he as good as made a promise that he would not do what it seems is now going to be done. The Rev. Mr. Huxtable, a gentleman representing the prohibition movement, said to him:

A majority of some 80,000 of the voters in Ontario have decided in favour of the prohibition of the liquor traffic. We understand that Sir Wilfrid Laurier——

But, Sir, the moment these words fell on the sensitive ear of the hon. gentleman, he stopped and said: "I must tell my friend that I am not Sir Wilfrid Laurier, but only plain Mr. Laurier. I am a Democrat to the hilt." And yet, Mr. Speaker, if all accounts are true, this quasi promise will not be kept and the hon. gentleman will have a title which will sit very gracefully on him. It looks as if we were going to have men made knights, who have so completely belied their promises; we shall have stars glittering on truthless bosoms and honours showered on dishonoured heads. However, I hope for the sake of consistency, that that little shred of a promise will remain unbroken, and that the hon. gentleman will come back from the Jubilee, the same plain Mr. Laurier. I express that wish, though I am really afraid that when he gets to the other side and finds himself in an aristocratic atmosphere, his virtue will ooze out from his finger tips, and he will come back decorated with a title. Instead of being the grand Mr. Laurier, he will have a title, and there will at the same time be such a batch of titles,

that I would suggest to the Finance Minister, when dealing with the future deficit which is bound to be large, the advisability of putting a duty on titles, and thus limiting the number or adding greatly to the revenue of the country.

At an earlier period, I was referring to the fact that while on those things which the farmer buys he has to pay 35 per cent, yet, under the preferential tariff, the silks of fine ladies will come in on very advantageous terms. Here are the particulars. Of silks and manufactures of, we imported dutiable :

In—	
1896	$2,564,491
1895	2,331,443
1894	2,489,930
1893	2,776,053

In no year did we import more from the United States than $122,000 worth, which is, of course, a mere trifle. The duty paid in 1896 was $773,950. Now, one-eighth of that will be $96,743 ; and without any one wanting it and despite the demand of the Patrons of Industry to have luxuries taxed, that $96,000 is this year taken off and thrown into the sea, and next year $192,000. If you say that it will apply only to England, that will not help you because the great bulk of these things comes from England. Take wool and the manufactures of wool, $6,970,000 out of $8,723,000 came from England. Nearly all these are fine goods. The amount was $9,413,731 in 1892, and $10,306,786 in 1896 paid a duty of $2,759,183.

How much are you going to put into the pockets of the well-to-do, into the pockets of those gentlemen whom my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce used to say the tariff was made for ? The first year, under your preferential arrangement, $344,900, and in the second year $689,800, or in the two years, without any one asking you for it, you are going to put into the pockets of those people about a million dollars. And this applies to only one staple. On the whole, you will remit to the prosperous, to the fine lady and fine gentleman over $3,000,000. From what source are you going to make that up ? You will have to go to the farmers for the greater part of it. They will have to pay the greater part of that million dollars, and that is not in accordance with the principles enunciated by the Reform party. It is not in accord with the principles of the Patrons, whom the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce took to his heart and called friends and brothers, nor is it in accord with any sound view of what is in the interests of Canada.

I want to say one word as to the course taken with regard to our wheat. Two and a half cents a bushel has been taken off. I am afraid the result will be that we shall not be in the good position we enjoyed in the North-west Territories and Manitoba last year and the year before. In 1895—and that was not nearly as good a year for us as last year, the prices of wheat at Duluth, and Winnipeg, and at Fort William, were as follows :—

1895.	Fort William.	Duluth.	Difference.
May 4	80	67	11½
do 7	79	65⅛	12⅞
do 9	79	66¼	11¼
do 10	79½	65	13
do 16	85	70¾	12¾
do 23	1.00	80½	18
June 3	1.00	78½	20
July 22	81	69	9½
Sept. 14	58	54½	2
do 19	59	56	1½
do 23	59	54¾	3¾
do 26	60	55½	3
Oct. 4	60½	57⅜	1⅝
do 11	60	56½	2
do 14	59¾	56¾	1½
do 16	59¾	56¼	1¼
do 22	59	56¾	¾
do 24	59	57¼	¼
do 30	59	57¾	¼
Nov. 7	58	56	½
do 12	55	54¾	1¼
do 19	55	54½	1
do 21	55	54¾	¼
do 26	61	54½	5
do 30	59	54	3½
Dec. 2	60	54½	4
do 6	55	54½	1
do 21	54½	51¼	1¾
do 23	55	51⅝	1⅞
do 24	55	51	2½
do 28	55¾	52¾	1½

The prices at Fort William are values at which No. 1 Hard was sold on the respective dates. The Duluth quotations do not allow for 1 floating, which is ½ cent, and being on a basis of No. 1 Northern. Therefore, I allow 1½ cents for difference in prices obtained at those points, as the cost of taking wheat to eastern points, and Europe is the same. This is a fair comparison. These columns show the prices obtained at Fort William, which allows the 1½ cents difference for floating, and shows largely in favour of Canadian wheat. This was due to the tariff preventing American wheat coming in competition with our wheat.

An hon. MEMBER. Carried.

Mr. DAVIN. I have no doubt it is carried. No doubt conviction is carried to the mind of the people that the change was a bad one for the North-west, and it is perfectly gratuitous, for nobody was asking for it, so far as I know, and it can do no good whatever. But on the same plane with it is the removal of the duty on corn, which my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) knows some of the people in his own province object to. I have the " Commercial " here, in which there are articles pointing out that in 1896 the price of wheat in Manitoba was very much

better than at points below the line. As you know very well, Mr. Speaker, the prices were so good that in some cases men made money, notwithstanding the duty, by bringing over wheat from below the line. And the general opinion of men who know much more of this subject than I do is that the prospect of touching it already greatly influenced for the worse the price of wheat in Manitoba and the North-west Territories even this year.

I wish to refer for a moment to the speech of the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding). I am sorry he is not present. I stated in an earlier part of my remarks that that speech was full of inconsistencies, and inconsistencies that are very suggestive in the light of what I have been reading. In the course of that speech he said :

It was not, indeed, until 1876, or about that time, that the question of a high tariff gravely occupied the attention of this House.

He goes on to say :

Now, I believe that Sir John Macdonald was as good a free trader as Mr. Mackenzie.

Well, Sir, I had the honour of intimacy with Sir John Macdonald and knew his opinion on every political question ; and I can say that the statement that Sir John Macdonald was a free trader and not a protectionist, which has been made by the Liberal press and by certain Liberals, for an object, I suppose, is without foundation. He was an enlightened protectionist and thoroughly honest in his conviction. No man, as those about me know, could make a sounder, more conclusive or more convincing protection speech than my late illustrious leader. The hon. the Finance Minister denounced the infant industries and said that "if the nursing-bottle be taken away from them they will immediately perish from the face of the earth." And he indicated that he would take it away. But he has not attempted to take it away, and it is there yet. Then, he denounced bonuses. He gave us a fancy description, a fine picture, of the old-fashioned workman who never dreamt of asking a bonus. But in the tariff which he was about to propose there was a bonus to the iron manufacturers. He says further :

I hesitate not to say that, if we should to-day, by some rash step, do that which some hon. gentlemen say we are bound to do, but which intelligent men know we are not bound to do, and would not do, we would not only break down the manufacturing interests of the country, but we would deal a blow at other interests of a wider and more serious character.

He shows that they would be perfectly within their rights if they were to treat the manufacturing industries—and I say they would—as having no vested rights whatever. Then, having given a bit of free trade clap-trap, he comes to action. The words are the words of a free trader, but the action is the action of a protectionist. He says, in effect : Some may suppose that we are going to keep our promises, but intelligent men know us by this time, and do not expect us to keep our promises. There is another piece of inconsistency in this speech. The hon. Minister says :

I believe that there is nothing inconsistent with sound free trade principles in a government dealing with a neighbour, to hold in its hands whatever levers it may possess in the negotiations;—

And yet in this tariff he gives up the duty on corn, which would have been a powerful lever in dealing with these same neighbours, and gives up three cents on wheat, which also would have been a lever. And this is how he finishes this part of his speech :

—and I say so to-day, not in the spirit of retaliation, because I say, Sir, that we ought not to retaliate upon the United States in the way some people advocate.

Yet he retaliates upon them. While he says we ought not to retaliate he has in his hands a retaliatory tariff.

I have heard it argued that what we should do is to let our tariff stand as it is to-day. I cannot subscribe to that doctrine. The Liberal party has pledged itself to give tariff reform, and the country expects the Liberal party to fulfil their pledge.

And then they do not give the reform they promise. In connection with that, I have already read what the Prime Minister said about retaliation. We are told that this tariff especially belongs to him and that he is to be honoured in England because he is the author of it. And yet, he says he does not believe in retaliation.

I think that the country feels very much as certain carpenters felt when they marched through London on a celebrated occasion, when what was a sham reform was before Parliament, and they had a banner on which was inscribed : "Deal with us on the square ; we have been chiselled too long." Consider the promises of the hon. Prime Minister, of the hon. Finance Minister and the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce. I do not mention the smaller fry in that brilliant Ministry. But take the great men among them, take the leaders. When we take their promises and their performances, we feel like the carpenter, and the country must feel in the same way, that they have not dealt with us on the square, that we have been chiselled, and we want to know exactly where we are. I say there is in the character of the leaders, or of a few of the leaders, a sort of innate subterfuge by reason of which they cannot possibly make their conduct square with their professions. I have an article here in the "Reveil," written by an admirer of the Prime Minister, and it is a very extraordinary article. It goes over the history of the Prime Minister, and says that he was a disciple of Papineau. It gives you the policy of Papineau and the policy of 1854, and says of that policy :

It was logical and admitted, with all its consequences, the necessity of crushing the clergy in order to make its programme victorious.

Then it goes on to say that in 1877 Mr. Laurier came to the front, and the old chiefs disappeared. Some died, and others were shelved like the Dorions. It goes on to say:

Laurier embodied the new policy. We will not do him the wrong of supposing that he has denied a single one of his Liberal convictions, but he took a new line, which he follows still, and the progress that he has made is none the less real. From his first speech in 1877 he freed himself of embarrassing questions, and no longer pretended to speak of the old programme; but, thank God, in the words of Gambetta, he thought about it all the time.

So he threw over the programme because it was troublesome and not easily managed, but all the time he was thinking of it and aiming at it. This is the character given the present Prime Minister by this brilliant French writer. He goes on to say:

We ask but one thing of Mr. Laurier. Let him speak openly and act above-board. What he does suits us, what he says does not suit us. We want not only acts, but we want words. Is that asking too much?

Now, Sir, in the light of the promises of the Prime Minister that I have read, has not this brilliant writer given us a few X rays by which we may comprehend an interesting, a fascinating, an inscrutable, but still a very undesirable character? If this analysis should be correct, it would make out the Prime Minister to be somewhat like those cynical abbés of the 18th century, who preached Christianity and believed in Voltaire. However, there is the description. Here we have all these promises—promises in regard to coal, promises in regard to iron, promises in regard to implements, promises in regard to articles which the farmer contends are his raw materials. We have all these promises from the Prime Minister as long as he is leading the Opposition, but when he gets into power he turns his back on them all. I reverse the language of this brilliant writer. He says that the acts of the hon. gentleman suit him, but not his words: the farmers say the words of the hon. gentleman suit us, but not his acts. He says, We do not want merely his acts, but we want his words also. Well, the farmers will dispense with his words, if he will only give them acts. He need never again throw one ray of his sunny manner over North-west matters, provided he gives us solid acts. As Alexander Pope says, we prefer solid pudding to empty talk. We prefer the solid legislation that would give us free implements, free coal oil, free iron, free coal, free lumber, a low duty on a number of things that farmers use. We prefer that, a good deal, to any brilliancy of rhetoric, or any charm of manner. Sir, I am really sorry in a way, I can safely say without affectation that I am very sorry for the failure of character on that bench in ten months. In Opposition they were virtuous; their elevation to the bench has been disastrous to them, morally. They have in ten short months sacrificed all claim to the confidence of the people of Canada. A distinguished colleague of the hon. Premier referred the other night to William Shakspere, and to some things that he said. The hon. Premier is himself a student of Shakspere, one can see that in his style; as he is a student of much else that conduces to purity of utterance. Let us look at the way free trade has been treated here by its friends, betrayed from that very side by the Finance Minister, one of the loudest self-styled free traders in Canada, or on the continent, or, for that matter, in the Empire. He is in charge of this policy, and he goes and slavers free trade all over with praise, and then betrays it at the close of his speech. Sitting behind him was the Minister of Trade and Commerce. He looked grim, I do not say he looked ghastly, he rather looked the reverse of ghastly, he looked rubicund; but he looked grim and angry, and even contemptuous. I could not help thinking that he felt that some of his heavy armour had been put on a much slighter man. But, Sir, I was glad, I may say to the Prime Minister, that the Finance Minister was a much slighter man, and I will tell him why. He has a distinguished follower behind him who owns a paper in Winnipeg; and when the Minister of Finance was up in Winnipeg, this follower of my hon. friend had an article in which he said that we had now found a leader. He quite filled me with alarm, he indicated, as I thought, a rival; and now I am only doing for that side of the House what an hon. gentleman opposite did for us yesterday when he warned the leader of the Opposition of a coming rival. I am not warning, but consoling, the Prime Minister that he need not fear a rival. I was alarmed, because I thought that when the Finance Minister broke out, we should have something very colossal indeed, and very overpowering. But I may say this, that after the experience of the last four or five days, I do not think that my hon. friend the Prime Minister need fear the rival that the editor of the "Tribune" would have given him. But, Mr. Speaker, there cannot be the least doubt about this, that the promises made by these gentlemen made a deep impression on the country, and the denial of these promises, the failure to keep the pledges made, the failure, above all, to keep the pledges made to the North-west Territories and to Manitoba, have made an impression on the country that I do not think will rapidly pass away. I was referring a moment ago to the turn for quotation that is possessed

by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and especially his fondness for quoting Shakspere. The Prime Minister himself is a student of Shakspere; and he is probably a student of Dante also. Anybody who reads Richard III. will see that the great man who wrote that play must have been a student of the King of Italian song, because the dream of Clarence is palpably an inspiration from the Inferno. It will be remembered that Clarence dreams that he is gone beyond this life, that he has passed the melancholy flood, and the first person that salutes him is the renowned Warwick, who asks:

> What scourge for perjury
> Can this dark monarchy afford false Clarence?

And so he vanishes. And then there comes the victim of Clarence's great crime, who appears to him and cries out:

> Clarence is come,—false, fleeting, perjured Clarence.

Sir, if there be a Hades where the kings of free trade are, as a great poet and prophet once fancied, and the time comes—which heaven forfend should be near—when the hon. gentleman should go there, why Bright and Cobden will rise up and say:

> What scourge for perjury
> Can this dark monarchy afford false Clarence?

Free trade itself will appear and cry out, pointing to his betrayer:

> Clarence is come,—false, fleeting, perjured Clarence.

I say this with great regret, because it is a pity from every point of view, but above all, a pity from the point of view of the good of the country. With respect to the constitutional question that is involved in this matter. We had a speech yesterday from the Minister of Trade and Commerce in which he talked constitutional law or international law, and I saw that one of the newspapers to-day said he evinced his usual precision of language. I am a great admirer of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), but really I do not think precision of language is his great gift—I think recklessness of language is his gift. He said that this was a mixed question of law and fact. There could not be a more fallacious description. It is at the present moment purely a question of law. There is no question of fact; nor has England ever acknowledged the American view on this subject; nor does the case cited by the Minister furnish an anology.

I say here that although the Prime Minister said it was not intended that the present tariff should apply either to Germany or Belgium, the Minister of Trade and Commerce as good as admitted that the contention made on this side of the House is correct, namely, that if this preferential column is to apply to England, it will have to apply as well to those countries that have the most-favoured-nation clause. I do not think it is necessary, after the speech delivered by the leader of the Opposition, that I should quote the clause of the treaty with Belgium or the treaty with the German Zollverein. It is enough to say here that as a man who has given some attention to the subject, I have no hesitation in saying that the preferential column must apply to some twenty-two other countries besides England. I say moreover, that England's name is not mentioned there, and that the pretense put forward that there is a clause preferential to England, is erroneously described as picturesque; it would be more correct to describe it as fraudulent; there is no foundation for it, it is essentially deceptive. Let me point out to the House that if these resolutions pass, the Controller of Customs by and by may give whatever advantages he desires to the United States without receiving any authority from this House or Parliament having had anything to say in respect to the matter. If hon. gentlemen will look at the resolution they will see that it gives extraordinary power to the Controller of Customs, and the result would be that the Government would have it in its power to make any arrangement it pleased with the United States. What did the Minister of Trade and Commerce say? That perhaps this was the best way to get reciprocity, and there was running through the speeches of other hon. members something of the same sentiment. Sir, the striking change that has taken place in the sentiments of hon. gentlemen opposite is suspicious. I hold in my hand a report of the speech that has often been referred to, an authoritative speech delivered only six years ago, and I may add that it is a very admirable and able speech. It was delivered in 1891 by the present Prime Minister. As we are pointing out the beautiful consistency of hon. gentlemen opposite we may as well make the case complete. In that speech at Boston the hon. gentleman said:

> Our object is, when there is a Liberal Administration at Ottawa, to offer to the United States the free entrance of our territory to all American products, whether natural or manufactured, provided the United States extend the same privilege to the products of Canada.
>
> This involves that we would offer to the American nation advantages denied to the rest of the world. So it does, and it is a cause of bitter reproach against us by the Conservative party, who charge us with disloyalty to England. This is not the place to discuss the grounds of difference that separate us from our opponents. This much only will I say: In the very nature of things, from the sole fact that Canada is growing, developing and progressing, the interest of Canada and the interest of England are on the other side; the only consideration for me is, what is best for Canada, leaving to the people of England to consider, and do what is best for England. This is not

a question of sentiment, and, for my part, I am firmly convinced that the economic interests of Canada lie with this continent, and it is on the broad basis of continental freedom of trade that I place the question.

Sir, has geography changed since that speech was made? Have the great features of this Dominion changed since then? And yet we have utterances now, as though such sentiments had never been entertained by either the Prime Minister or his party. And again:

Sir, without entering into controversies which, for obvious reasons ought to be avoided at this board, I may be allowed to observe that men there are in my own country who seem always to forget that Canada is in America. I do not question their motives—I doubt their discretion. They look to a political federation of the whole British Empire, an idea, it must be admitted, not without grandeur, but which would remove the colonies from the position of security which they now occupy, and would embroil them in all the wars which Great Britain, in her present stage of advancement, might have to wage in all parts of the world.

And now, Sir, when the conversion from such views as these has been so recent and so marked, and the utterances that we now hear, of devotion to preferential trade and devotion to the union of the Empire so strong, we should look carefully at any clause to see what power is given to the Government under it. I, for one, look with great jealousy on giving the Government power to do, what only Parliament in a constitutional country should do. I entirely object to the Government doing what should be done by an impartial tribunal. I would like to have an arrangement made whereby combines should be at once hit, as they should be hit the moment they appear, but, Sir, the tribunal under that 16th clause will not be impartial. I take great objection to the present vague clause about which we can get no information, and I want an explanation of what the words "on the whole" mean. Does it mean an average? If it does, in the German Zollverein there might be an average on goods which the business men of Canada would not be interested in and yet under that average these goods would be able to come in.

I say we ought to have explanations on these matters, that we should look with suspicion on a tariff which erects a 35 per cent wall against the poor man and the farmer. The poor men and the farmers of this country had a right to hope for better than to have been abandoned by the men who professed to be their friends.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, this is an important question and one which has been freely discussed throughout the country for a number of years. It is a question which affects every part of Canada, and I for one cannot allow it to be voted on, nor can I vote upon it myself, without saying a word in justification of the vote which I give. I shall speak especially as to how the tariff is regarded in the western part of the Territories. I wish to say, that there are features in the tariff as it stands, which are disappointing to the people when considered in relation to the promises which have been made, and the ideas that have been gathered in the past from the party at present in power. There are, as I say, certain features of the present tariff which, as I understand it, are disappointing to these people, and it is on account of that that I wish to speak to-night. While there are features that are disappointing, there are also features most encouraging, and we are bound to consider not only the features that are disappointing, but also the features that are satisfactory. If we remember that on the whole, the tariff as proposed to us is more satisfactory than anything that was offered to us otherwise, we are bound to accept it as a whole, even though we do not approve of all it contains. The dissatisfaction has reference to the duties on articles which the farmer uses, and chiefly the duties on agricultural machinery and coal oil.

Now, we in the west are not unreasonable. We understand the difficulty of the task that this new Government had to face in remodelling the tariff. We do not ask for impossibilities, and we are willing in this matter to accept a policy of conciliaton, as we were in the matter of the settlement of the school question. We do not wish to see any longer, the different industries in this country held up to antagonism with each other. We do not want hostility to be perpetuated between the agricultural and the manufacturing classes, if a compromise can be effected whereby justice will be done to all classes. At the same time it must be understood, that there is a strong demand for reductions in the tariff in these particular articles which I have named, and the reason is, as read by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin), that the fall in the price of agricultural products in the last few years, has been greater than the fall in the prices of the articles that the farmer had to buy. The farmer has been face to face with dire necessity, and it is because of his dire necessity that he asks for relief. It is for this reason also that he is less willing to freely accept the compromise that is now offered than he would be if his circumstances were better. I say, that the western farmers have been face to face in the past few years with unfortunate and unexpected conditions, and they now demand relief, as far as relief is possible, from these conditions.

The point now is: From what source is that relief to come, and toward whom are they to look? In this House, and on this occasion, if the present Opposition had any measure of relief to offer the farmers, now

and here was the time to offer it. We have listened to what has been said by the leaders of the Opposition and by their followers who have spoken, and so far as I am able to see, wherever we may look for relief we cannot look to them. Whatever measure of relief we have received we have received from the present Liberal Government; and whatever measure of relief we hope to receive we must look to the present Government for, because we have the definite announcement of the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster): that as it was the policy of that party when in power to place the interests of the manufacturers first, so it is the policy of that party in Opposition, and will continue to be their policy.

Now, we have nothing against the manufacturers. We wish the manufacturers of this country to prosper; but we wish to have some share of prosperity ourselves. We wish to have the tariff adjusted so that the industries and interests of the farmers will be considered just as well as the industries and interests of the manufacturers. This is what was not done under the late Government, and so far as we can see now, there is no prospect of its being done should the present Opposition obtain office with their present principles. Under the circumstances, although the new tariff is not, in all its particulars, satisfactory to the members from the west, I for one feel bound to support the resolution on this occasion, as being the best offer made through this House to the people of the western country.

I think the importance of the customs tariff to the people of the country has been exaggerated in the arguments that have been brought forward in regard to it. In the western part of this Dominion, I can assure this House, we do not look upon the customs tariff as the most important issue. I do not wish to minimize its importance at all. We look for a square deal under that tariff, as under every other part of the legislation of the Government. But let it be understood that there are other questions which affect the interests of the people there, and which will affect them in the future, more than the customs tariff, whether it is high or low, a revenue tariff or a protective tariff. The tariff on what we have to buy is not our principal burden. The great burden is the tariff on what we have to sell. It is not the customs tariff—it is the railway tariff which is the great burden on the western country. That is the great question in that country. I think it only fair to put this matter squarely before the House on this occasion, when we talk about what the tariff or the changes in the tariff will do or will not do. It is well to understand that they are not and cannot be expected to do everything for us, and that the part they play in the western country is small compared with the part played by the question of transportation.

With reference to the duty on coal oil, which was six cents a gallon, and is now five cents a gallon, it is an open question whether that change of a cent in the duty will make a difference of a cent in the price. Admitting that it will, when we pay fifty cents a gallon for coal oil in the North-west, it can easily be understood that the reduction of a cent a gallon does not cut much of a figure in that part of the country. If you were to take off the whole duty, it would not make much difference in the price, as long as the freight rate of nearly twenty cents a gallon remains. I mention this to show the difference in the effect on the price as between the customs tariff of five cents a gallon and the railway tariff of say twenty cents a gallon. But we can pay twenty cents or thirty cents freight, and the duty on coal oil, provided we can sell the products we raise at a fair market price. It is the high cost of delivering the produce of the North-west in the markets of the world which is the great drawback in the North-west. For instance, a farmer buys a self-binder, and pays $20 duty on it; but that self-binder he uses, we will say, for five years in cutting one hundred acres of wheat. That is five hundred acres, yielding, say twenty bushels to the acre, making in all ten thousand bushels of wheat. The duty on the self-binder with which he cuts that wheat was $20, whereas a difference of one cent a bushel on the freight charges on that wheat would amount to $100, or, in other words, would pay the duty five times over in the five years, or once each year. That is an illustration of the difference between the effect of the duty upon imports, and the freight rates. No matter whether the duty on the machinery is high or low, it is a small matter compared with the freight charges on the farmer's product.

Now, whatever the Government has done or may do in the matter of the customs tariff, I say that they have done well so far as they have gone, in giving us free binder twine and free fence wire, and in reducing the duties on the smaller articles required by the agriculturists and also on larger machinery. In all these things they have done well; but if this tariff is framed for the purpose of developing the North-west, it will need to be followed up by something much more radical in order to secure that development. I have heard several times in this debate, the question of the development of the west alluded to. It appears that it is considered an important question. As one of the representatives of the west, I say—and I think every one of the others will back me up—that the question of the rates of transportation is the great question in the west, and the one which we wish this House to consider when it considers the question of the development of that country. There is no part of the country that can stand a high customs tariff better than the western

part of the country, provided that we get a low tariff of freight rates.

There is another form of taxation besides customs taxation, which has to be borne in the west as well as the east, that is, local and municipal taxation for school and municipal purposes. I had the honour to place on the Order paper of this House last session certain notices regarding the taxation of lands in the Territories, and I am going to take this opportunity of pointing out to this House that owing to a certain condition of affairs in regard to the land of that country, the settlers have to pay a very much higher tax for their school purposes in the parts of the country affected than they should pay, if the understanding entered into by this Parliament with regard to the railroad companies of that country were carried out.

Certain railroad companies, which are entitled to the odd sections, or alternate sections in certain tracts of land, are relieved—I do not know by what arrangement or lack of arrangement—from their proper share of the burden of taxation in that country. They should not be so relieved, because a greater burden is thereby thrown on the settlers of that country. There is the unjust burden, in so far as it is unjust now, of the tariff, of railway rates and of local taxation. I again say to the House that the measure of relief given from the one injustice does not give relief from the other two, and the injustice we are relieved from is not as great as either of the other two. If it is desired to develop the North-west, while the intended lowering of the Customs tariff will, I believe, tend in that direction, it is necessary that this House should follow up its action with regard to the tariff by acting on the other lines and seeing that the settlers are not made to pay more than their fair share of local taxation and not more than is necessary for the transport of their produce. I am not speaking on behalf of the farmers in the eastern country because they have plenty of representatives to speak for them, but I have every assurance that the question of transportation is just as important here as it is in the west. I heard the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) say the other night that the farmers of Ontario were paying more to have their produce hauled 100 miles to Toronto than their competitors in the United States paid for haulage from Chicago to Toronto. If that be the case in Ontario, certainly the farmers here have a grievance similar to ours in the West, which calls for active intervention of the Government in this matter of railway rates.

Mr. CRAIG. I had not intended to speak to-night, but as I have only very few remarks to offer on this question, I might perhaps as well take this opportunity as any other. I am sure that we all must agree that no subject could occupy our attention which is more important than the one now before us. Not only is the attention of this House directed to the subject of the tariff but also the attention of the country, and I propose, in the few remarks I have to make, to consider this subject as free from party bias as possible. I find that in discussing a great many subjects in this House, it seems impossible that we should not look at them through party glasses. Now, I feel satisfied that almost every hon. gentleman opposite who speaks on this question will say that the tariff is what it ought to be. I was pleased to hear the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Oliver) and who represents the Great North-west, express himself as seemingly perfectly satisfied with the tariff. Although he admits that one cent on coal oil makes no difference, still he is satisfied with it, taking it all round. I might be expected to say that I am dissatisfied with it all round, but I will not say that I am. In some respects, I am pleased with this tariff. I am very glad indeed that although the members of the Cabinet and their supporters are placed in a very strange position before the country,—in the position of breaking all the pledges they made—they have done good service to the country by retaining in a great measure the tariff of their predecessors. But as I look at this tariff, I am struck with one very peculiar feature of it, and that is that it faces both ways. It is intended to catch protectionists and free traders as well. I must confess that while I would not be prepared to say that the members of the present Government have more real ability than their predecessors, yet on a good many questions they show more dexterity and more agility. To use a word which is not quite parliamentary, but which aptly expresses the idea, they have the ability and capacity to humbug the people better than the members on this side. Barnum said that people liked to be humbugged, and it really looks like it.

As I look at this tariff I find it faces both ways. We have, first of all, the general tariff. I noticed that the hon. the Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson) while reading over the items, said, in a great many cases, for the sake of uniformity we have taken this article which is at 20 per cent, and this other one which is at 30 per cent, and we call them both 30 per cent. Then when this was greeted with a laugh on this side, he would say: This is the general tariff, but wait until we come to the reciprocal tariff. He was evidently then talking to his own side and the Liberals all over the country. We are levelling up, he said, in a good many places, but that is the general and not the reciprocal tariff, but wait until you hear the reciprocal tariff. It is a very ingenious arrangement indeed. They go to the protectionists and manufacturers and they say to them: Here

is the general tariff, have a look at it, we have not reduced the duties, but have left them in a great measure as they were before. Keep your eye on that tariff and we expect you to support us. Then they turn to their friends who are in favour of a revenue tariff, and to them they say: Do not look at that general tariff, but at this reciprocal tariff. Keep your eye fixed on that all the time, and you will be satisfied. That may seem a little exaggerated, but when I went home, a few days ago, I heard of a case exactly in point. A gentleman who is an ardent supporter of the Liberal party, who has grown gray in supporting them, who would not listen to any arguments at all to show that there was anything good at all in the Conservative party, went to a friend of mine who was a Conservative as soon as he got the general tariff, and he was thunderstruck. He said: I am so disappointed, I never thought our party would do anything like this, and he went away disgusted. But after a while he came back. Oh, he said, it is all right, here is this reciprocal tariff—and he went away perfectly happy. He saw a way of getting out of it. That is a very ingenious arrangement to suit all parties, and I congratulate the First Minister and those who devised the scheme on their success, if only they can keep it up. It is all right so long as you can keep each man's attention confined to the one tariff that suits him, but if one man looks at both tariffs and compares them, he will wonder where he is at and what the thing really means. To show that what I say is not at all exaggerated, let me read a small selection from a newspaper which, while it calls itself independent, is a supporter of the party opposite—the Montreal "Witness." I once took occasion, in my early political career, to say that the "Witness" was a Liberal organ, and it repudiated the soft impeachment entirely and said it was independent. Perhaps it is independent, but it leans very strongly in the direction of hon. gentlemen opposite. I notice that in this article in the Montreal "Witness" that came out the day after the tariff came down, the 23rd April, it said that the tariff was better than they had feared, that the most important part of the tariff was the reciprocal part, and that in reading it, as a whole, and in reading every clause of it we must remember this reciprocal feature. They wrote that way because they were writing for members of the Liberal party who expected a greater reduction than they got. They go on to say:

> In order to appreciate it as a free trade measure, the tariff reformer must grasp the fact that its vital clause, that containing the principle of preferential trade, lowers the tariff immediately 12½ per cent, and at the end of a year from next July an additional 12½ per cent all round, so far as the British Empire is concerned, as well as those countries having a treaty with Great Britain, treaties containing the most-favoured-nation clause, of which the principal are Germany and Belgium.

This is for the free trader. Now, a little further on in the same article, I find the following:—

> The form of the tariff is made somewhat more free-trade fashion by the substitution of ad valorem duties for specific duties, but in its multiplicity of classification it remains, as before, protectionist in form.

That is a very good article; it is both a free trade and a protectionist tariff. That is what I say is the great characteristic of this tariff—it faces both ways. Now, they must have some reason to give their supporters for making or keeping this tariff a protectionist tariff. What reason is given? It is that the United States is making a high protective tariff. Now, what does the Montreal "Witness" say in the same paper?

> It will show the British people that the story of British disloyalty in Canada was untrue. It also strikes a blow at the United States, and, as they have struck a blow at us, most people will like it for that reason. Mr. Fielding was ready to deal with the United States, but until the negotiations take place, he keeps most of the duties on goods from the United States as they were.

So that is the great argument—that the United States are making a protective tariff and that, therefore, we are justified in making a protective tariff. I have here a selection from the "Globe," but, as hon. gentlemen on the other side all read the "Globe" for themselves, I shall not trouble the House by reading that extract to them. But I may say that it is a very strong argument in favour of protection against the United States. It is a very satisfactory and very conclusive argument, to my mind. It shows that we especially need a high tariff against the United States because their manufactures are so large they have their specialists in the various lines, and it says that if we had no taxes on American goods, the manufacturer of New York State could control our markets as easily as he controls that of his own state, and if we had not a protective tariff our young men would be sent in ever-increasing droves to the United States. That is a good argument to me, a protectionist; but I am very much surprised at the "Globe" addressing arguments like that to a party who denounced protection consistently year after year as long as they were in Opposition. But I suppose we need not expect consistency from hon. gentlemen opposite. The Liberal party, in taking the stand that the Dingley Bill is an excuse for a protective tariff, here forget that during part of the time the Conservative party were in power the McKinley Bill was in operation. They forget that the McKinley Bill made as high a tariff as the Dingley Bill will be after it passes through the Senate of the United States, perhaps higher.

But that, they said, was no excuse—if the United States were fools enough to have a high protective tariff that was no reason why we should be fools also. A while ago they maintained that high protection in United States was no excuse for high protection here, but now that they are in power they make high protection in the States the excuse for higher protection here. Moreover, they argued that the consumer pays the duty. That was a part of the creed of the Liberal party, I believe. If that is true, what nonsense it is for them to talk about having a high protective tariff against the United States. But I venture to say that they know that in a great many cases the consumer does not pay the duty. Perhaps they did not know it before; I hope they are learning; I suppose they are, since they got into power. I believe that in a great many cases the consumer does not pay the duty, and that when we levy a protective tariff against the United States, it does not follow that we pay higher prices; it does follow that articles from the United States are kept out, or if they come in, must come in at a lower price than we should give for them if we had no protection. I will not go on to repeat what was said about protection being a curse to the country. These are matters we all understand. I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite hardly meant all they said. I am sure they do not mean it to-day. They say to the manufacturers: Here we have given you a protective tariff. But what do they say to the free traders? They say: Look at the reciprocal tariff and see what a reduction we are making to you; we are in favour of free trade; we are going in the direction of free trade, and this reciprocal tariff is in that direction. They say more. They say that this reciprocal tariff is a preference given to Great Britain, and they take great credit for that. I do not want to deprive them of any credit they may be entitled to. But how do they give this preference to Great Britain? They say: We offer the same to every nation of the world. When we tell them that, under the treaties, they cannot give a preference to Great Britain, they say: We are not giving a preference to Great Britain. And yet, in the same breath, they say they are giving a preference to the mother country and they take great credit to themselves for that. This article that I have read from the "Witness" says that this tariff hits the United States, and for that reason people will be pleased with it. How does this tariff hit the United States? This Government says: We want to hit the United States; how shall we do it? They decide to take the duty off corn. That is a strange way to hit the United States, but they do it. But they are not satisfied to hit the United States once, they must do it again and so they take the duty off binder-twine. But to hit the United States twice is not enough, they must get another blow. And so they take the duty off barb wire. To hit the United States once again takes some consideration. But, after considering every opportunity, they decide to take some of the duty off coal oil. Of course, that does not hit the United States very hard. So they reduce the duty on wheat. As the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) said, that is something nobody asked for. But they wanted to hit the United States, and so they reduce the duty on wheat 3 cents a bushel, they reduce the duty on flour 15 cents per barrel, they reduce the duty on iron, and in doing all those things, they are hitting the United States. Well, now, I do not think that the United States objects to be hit in that way. I think if the Government keeps on hitting them that way, they will be quite satisfied. Yet hon. gentlemen say that in this tariff they are retaliating against the United States. But they are not satisfied with that. One would think they might be satisfied when they hit the United States so often, but they are not satisfied, they are going to hit the United States again under certain conditions. And what do you think they are going to do? The Finance Minister threatens to put a duty on anthracite coal. Now we have no anthracite coal in this country, and if we put a duty on anthracite coal, we will raise the price of coal to the consumers all over the country. The people all over this country will have to pay more for hard coal. If this 50 cents a ton duty is put on it, it will raise the price, perhaps, that much, and perhaps not quite as much, but it will raise the price. And so they are going to hit the United States. If they put up the duty to 75 cents on coal they are going to hit them by making the people of this country pay more for coal. Now, I think this is a strange way of hitting the United States, this is a strange way of retaliating; but the Government say they are going to do all this. Now I hope they will not put a duty on anthracite coal. I know the idea is spread over the country that the United States is making a high tariff and we want to retaliate, we want to show them that we are independent, that we can do without them. But after all I think it would be rather foolish to put a duty on anthracite coal. It is not as if we had anthracite coal in our own country, we must get coal from them. Therefore, I would advise the Government to be satisfied with the way they have hit the United States, and not put this duty on anthracite coal, no matter what the United States may do. Now, I intend to consider for a few minutes this resolution about preferential trade. I consider this a dangerous resolution for the reason that it places too much power in the hands of any Government. I do not care what Government it is. If a Conservative Government were in power, I would say that this is a dangerous resolution. Although a supporter of the Conservative party, I would not want to have such

a power placed in the hands of a Conservative Government. I consider it dangerous, because the decision as to what countries come under this clause, is left to the Controller of Customs, subject to the authority of the Governor in Council. Now, I think that is a great mistake. Not only that, but if there was a tariff specifying what any country must come to in order to come into this arrangement, that would be all right, but no tariff is specified. There has been a good deal of dispute about those words in this resolution "a tariff which, on the whole, is favourable." Now, it is a great point to find out what that means. Suppose, for instance, the United States said: We will admit your lumber free, but we want you to admit us to come in under this favoured clause. Now would this Government say: You can come in under this favoured clause if you allow one or two articles to go in free, which are exported by us. Would the Government be justified in saying that? Sir, it is a very serious question, and I hold it is a dangerous thing to intrust any Government with such a great power. For that reason, if for no other, I should be compelled to oppose this resolution. It might be worthy of consideration if, as I said, some duties were specified as the limit to which the Government could go under this clause; but when nothing is specified, when it is left so indefinite, when the whole matter is left to the decision of the Controller of Customs, subject to the Governor in Council, I think it is a most dangerous thing to intrust the Government with such power. Now, what is the result of that? The result is that the whole tariff, and all the manufacturers of this country, are placed entirely at the mercy of the Government. I want to say further, that this scheme is not a preferential scheme to Great Britain, but it looks to me like the thin edge of the wedge to destroy protection altogether. The Liberal party have promised to destroy protection, and while they have not done it yet, and while they do not pretend that they are going to do it, yet I believe that some day they will carry out their pledges if they can. Sir, it is impossible to hold that any body of men can have made such pledges, can have made such solemn declarations on the floor of this House, can have made such declarations all over this country to their supporters, and can have been elected on those pledges, and now turn their back on them. So it seems to me that this scheme of preferential trade, as it is called, is just a scheme to enter the thin edge of the wedge and take protection out of the tariff altogether. We find that all nations are invited to enter into this arrangement. I was reading an article in the Montreal "Witness" which said that it may turn out that Germany, and Belgium, and these other nations have a right to come in under this clause. Well, if they have, says the "Witness," the consumers will get the benefit. Then the "Witness" goes on to say: We would not be satisfied long to allow a highly protected country like Germany to have these benefits, and to refuse those benefits to our kinsmen of the same language to the south of us. While the Montreal "Witness" may not be in the secrets of the Government, still no doubt its editors have a pretty good idea of its policy. The danger is this, that in a short time almost every nation will enjoy the benefits of this preferential clause in the treaty, because the Government are to be the judges as to what nation shall come in and what shall stay out; and while to-day we find them talking about this Government being against the United States, and while I have shown that they are hitting the United States very hard in certain ways, yet I know what their feelings are towards that country. I remember how they have talked about the United States, how they have ridiculed the idea of going to Australia to build up trade and neglecting the republic to the south of us, and I well know how their thoughts turn in that direction. The "Witness" echoes their opinions no doubt when it hopes that before long the United States will come into this arrangement.

I am in favour of a true preferential trade arrangement with Great Britain, a truly reciprocal arrangement. This is called a reciprocal tariff. I repeat that I am in favour of true reciprocity with England, but I object to this pretended preference, because it is nothing but a pretended preference. I venture to predict that before long we will find other nations are included, and that Germany, Belgium, and twenty-two other countries, and no doubt the United States, will come under and reap the advantages of this arrangement. So this is not in any sense of the word a preferential arrangement with Great Britain. I have no doubt that a great many people will like the idea of entering into a preferential arrangement with Great Britain; it gives vent to their loyalty, they feel we are part of the Empire, and think that it will bind the Empire closer together. If that arrangement were confined to Great Britain, no doubt such would be the case, but if it is extended to almost all the nations of the earth, I do not see how it can have the result of binding the colonies to the mother country and assisting in the consolidation of the Empire. So I object to this pretended preference. It may be said that it is very strange that hon. members on this side of the House, who have talked so long about loyalty should rise and object to this scheme: that while we have always been saying we are loyal, when this great advantage to the mother country is proposed, we turn around and raise objections. But we object because we say this is only a pretended preference, not a real preference to Great Britain. Speak-

ing for myself, I think I may claim that I am as loyal as any hon. gentleman opposite. I do not think a man is better for constantly talking about his loyalty, but I believe I am expressing my honest sentiments when I declare that true loyalty to the Empire is loyalty to Canada, or that true loyalty to Canada is real loyalty to the Empire, and that the true way to build up the Empire is to build up Canada. The strength of the Empire to-day lies in her colonies, and if we devote our energies to building up Canada, to filling up and settling the prairies in the great west and having this country prosperous, I hold we are doing for the Empire in that way real service. We are making Canada great, and we can best serve the Empire by serving Canada. I am not sent to this House to represent workingmen in England, but I am sent here to represent workingmen in Canada. I am not sent here to legislate for the Empire, but I am sent here to help to legislate for Canada, and I maintain that if I do my duty by Canada, if I seek to promote the best interests of this country, if I support legislation which will produce work for the workingmen of this country, if I support legislation which will give proper protection for the farmers, which will help the people of Manitoba and the North-west, then even although I may not talk about loyalty to the Empire or go around singing about it, I am more loyal in doing what I can to build up Canada than those who are neglecting Canada and prating about their loyalty to the Empire. I hold that a true preferential arrangement would help to build up Canada. What would a true preferential arrangement do? It would give the products of Canada preference in the British markets. It is said: It is no use talking about securing that advantage, because Great Britain will not do it. I might reply in the words of the hon. Finance Minister the other evening who, when an objection was made, said, "the world moves"; and I do not think it would be a very reckless prediction to say that the time will come when we will secure a preferential arrangement within the Empire, under which the products of the colonies will receive a preference in Great Britain, and in this way tend to bind together different portions of the Empire. Suppose we received manufactured products from Great Britain under a preferential arrangement, and our products received admission to the British market under a similar arrangement. I hold that if Great Britain would do that, then the result would be most beneficial to Canada. I believe such an arrangement would attract population to Manitoba and the North-west and that our western country would be filled up: and while it might be said that the reduction of the tariff in favour of British manufacturers, would increase competition with our factories, and would reduce the amount of work furnished to our workingmen, the result would be directly opposite, because while more goods might come in from Great Britain, yet there would be a large population in Manitoba and the North-west and our manufacturers would have the market there, and there would be no conflict with Great Britain, and the interest of the Empire would be advanced in this way.

I am opposed to this resolution—I would be glad if I could support it—because I hold it is a dangerous resolution. It is dangerous to entrust such power in the hands of any Government, I do not care what the Government may be, and I would oppose giving such powers to a Conservative Government as much as I do to a Liberal Government. Under this arrangement the Government will have power to make treaties; they will be able to override Parliament altogether: it will not be necessary for the Government to come before Parliament session after session and ask Parliament to assent to treaties, but the Minister of Customs, when he ascertains that a nation offers Canada certain terms, will be able to accept them or reject them as he pleases, and his decision will at once go into effect. This proposition is a most outrageous one—it is dangerous, at least.

Then I oppose this proposal because it makes concessions for nothing. I may say frankly, whether I am accused of disloyalty or not, that I would object to give this preferential advantage, even to Great Britain, for nothing. I should want a preference in return, because, as I have already intimated, I am sent here, not to represent British workingmen, but to represent Canadian workingmen. And I hold that if the tariff is thus reduced in favour of Great Britain alone, and even if their goods came in and our factories were idle to the injury of the Canadian workingmen, and you were to say to them, you have nothing to do, but you have the consolation of knowing that your fellow-countrymen in England are working and are having the employment which you have lost, our workingmen would not be satisfied. So I would object to this concession being made to Great Britain alone.

But I go further, and I say that much as I would object as I do object to granting this concession to Great Britain, so I would in a greater degree object to Germany, Belgium and other nations being included in this arrangement, if it should be carried out. I hold this is a strong objection, because it gives concessions for nothing, not only to Great Britain, but also to Germany and Belgium and twenty-two other countries. I object to that course being adopted, and when the people of this country understand this proposition they will also object to it. The workingmen will object to it. I do not think they want to see the work they are now doing done in Germany, or even done in England—they are not loyal enough for that. I am loyal enough for most people, but even if I did not object to such an arrangement being made with England without return, I would object to such an ar-

rangement being made with Germany and Belgium and other nations, and in this case we are giving something for nothing, and our people will strongly object to it.

Another objection is that this proposition destroys all chances of ever securing a preferential arrangement with Great Britain. That, in my opinion, is a very serious objection. I know it is said we can never expect to obtain a preferential arrangement. We do not know, however, what may happen. We can try to secure it, at all events: if we fail, we can remain as we are. It is folly for any nation, situated as Canada is, to throw away all chances of ever securing a true preferential arrangement. I do not think that statement is too strong in its terms. If any hon. gentleman questions it, I have an answer which will satisfy him, for the "Globe" will no doubt be accepted by hon. gentlemen opposite. That paper says:

> If, however, there should be other issue, and Great Britain should decide that the Canadian tariff infringes upon the sanctity of Imperial treaties, and should refuse to denounce the treaties with Belgium and Germany, then our measure of tariff reform becomes still wider, and if the manufactures of countries can be sent into Canada even under the special schedule that it was designed should apply only to British goods, we do not know that the masses of the Canadian people need complain. But in this event a fatal blow would be dealt to preferential trading arrangements within the Empire, and the agencies that are making for Imperial union on the basis of inter-Imperial trade, would have received notice to withdraw from the field.

That is conclusive to my mind, and as it is taken from the "Globe," I hope it is conclusive to gentlemen on the other side of the House. While the argument, that this is a dangerous resolution is a good argument, and while the argument, that we are giving valuable concessions for nothing, is a better argument, I believe that this last argument is the strongest of all. It is: That in introducing this resolution and entering on this system, we are throwing away all chance of what we have talked about and dreamed about for years, and which would be a great benefit to this country. Sir, I hope that the Government will reconsider this. I suppose they are not pledged to it so that they cannot withdraw it, but if they should persist in it, for my part, I hope it will not be found workable, because I think it would be a most unfortunate thing for this country. I do not suppose that any advice of mine will have weight with the Government, but I hope they will reconsider the question and look into it carefully. I believe that it would be the part of wisdom to withdraw a resolution like this which is fraught with such serious consequences.

But if they do not reconsider it, and if it goes through the House, I prophesy—although I am not giving to prophesying—that the general tariff will have disappeared altogether in a short time, and that instead of this general tariff which to-day we are willing to take because we cannot get any better one from the Government, which we are willing to take because a great part of it is practically our own tariff; I prophesy that this general tariff which they are holding up before the manufacturers of this country for them to see, will have vanished from before their eyes, and that all that will be left will be the specific tariff. Then, Sir, our fortunes will be almost decided. I know that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have in times past ridiculed protection, and said it did no good to this country. I am glad, Sir, they have belied their former statements by what they have done in the present tariff. I am glad that they do admit, I am glad that their chief organ the "Globe" admits, that Canada needs protection; and yet I am sorry to see that by this preferential arrangement as they call it, they are still bent on destroying protection, and in destroying protection, destroying the manufacturers of this country.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I cannot pretend that the very little learning I can bring to this all-important question, has been gained in any higher school than the school of experience and observation. Abler men than I will approach this subject from the standpoint of political economy; I will have to try and wrestle with the question without any help from Adam Smith. I was reading the other day that Sir Walter Scott was always telling strange stories about the abstraction and singularity of Adam Smith; how, that a man who could hardly put on his coat or order his dinner at the butchers, was scarcely fit to decide on the proper course of industry or the mercantile dealings of nations.

The point I want to make out of this reference is: that the teachings of political economy are of less value to Canada just now than the teachings of common sense and experience. The proverbial difference between theory and free trade is always wide, and never is it wider than the awful gulf fixed between the theory of free trade and the practice of free trade. The question how a country can best develop her own industries and raise a revenue, is a question that every country must decide according to the circumstances of her own position and the interests of her own Government.

Free trade might be very good for England and very bad for Canada. Probably no man on earth would be more disappointed if he could come to earth to-day than the late Mr. Richard Cobden; for did he not, in 1844, say:

> You have no more right to doubt that the sun will rise in the heavens to-morrow morning, than you have to doubt that in less than ten years from this time, when England inaugurates the glorious era of commercial freedom, every civilized community will be free traders to the backbone.

I think Mr. Cobden would be disappointed if to-day he came to this country looking for free traders to the backbone. Free traders of that description are very scarce, and I am glad for the sake of the country it is so. Free trade like universal peace is a very beautiful and grand and glorious ideal when it works, but the nation that throws away its tariffs before the dawn of universal free trade is about as foolish as the nation that would throw away its guns and ammunition before daybreak on the millenium morning. I am not a free trader; I never was a free trader, and I never will be a free trader. I controlled the first newspaper that advocated protection and the National Policy in Toronto, and I used all my influence in favour of the National Policy, and I am not ashamed to stand on this floor to-night, in this House of Commons, and proclaim my allegiance to the National Policy, and my cheerful acceptance of the leadership of the hon. the leader of the Opposition—on this question.

I entered this Parliament a pledged supporter of the Conservative trade policy, and in view of the character of the trade proposals of the Government, I am not in doubt where to look for opponents of the Conservative trade policy. The leader of the Opposition has been robbed of his clothes by the Government but he still retains the principles of protection, and it is my duty to follow these principles, clothes or no clothes. The Liberal party is half converted to the principles of protection. For the country's sake I rejoice that the Government is half-seas over on the voyage to protection, but the Opposition is sound in the faith, and my place is with those who stand fast by protection for the country's sake. The Opposition is the mother of protection and loves the policy for its own sake; the Government is a sort of wet nurse that takes protection and suckles it in order to earn a living for its party.

Believers in the National Policy must rejoice, they ought rejoice, to see that the system to which they have pinned their faith is so strong and so interwoven with the highest and best interests of Canada, that it defies immediate attack. I admit that some precious features of the National Policy have been spared; but at the same time I confess to an uneasy feeling that there is too much free trade and too little protection in this tariff. I believe that the Government's gradual attack on the National Policy is the only style of attack that is dangerous to the protective principle. Supposing that a Liberal Government really wanted to destroy protection, have they not taken the best and the surest road to the end? It would have been folly for them to begin the work of establishing a revenue tariff by a revolution. They are smart enough not to want to dally with a catastrophe. A policy of sweeping change would have brought about a panic, and this panic would have discredited the Government. Thus public feeling would have been aroused, and a discredited Government would have perished in the ruins of its tariff policy, and all hope of a revenue tariff would have been destroyed. As it is, the Government lulls public sentiment with a fair show of protective items in this tariff, and sooner or later the country may be awakened by changes which will bring us very near to the basis of a revenue tariff. That prospect may not be terrifying to a free-trader. But I am not a free-trader. Neither am I a revenue tariff man. I am a sincere and convinced protectionist, and I recognize in the Government an enemy to my principles, an enemy all the more dangerous because in this instance it is long-headed and far seeing in its methods. Protection had nothing whatever to fear from any party that would attack it after the manner of a bull in a china shop. It is a much harder fight when the friends of protection have to meet an enemy that lays siege to the citadel which it could not take by assault. The citadel of protection was abandoned to its enemies by the folly of its friends and the party that climbed in over the ruins of the last Government expected to destroy the fortress which its orators had been cursing for eighteen long years. Well, the fortress is not destroyed, but the enemies of protection are inside the breast-works. Some of our friends complain that the Liberal party took a contract to pull down protection, and are merely scribbling free trade maxims on the walls of the citadel which it gained by false pretenses. The Government has marred the perfect beauty of the National Policy; but we are told that a high tariff still shelters some of our industries, and that the Government has placed itself in a position to profit by those national impulses created by the impending tariff of the United States. If this new tariff were all that the protective principle had to fear from the Liberal party, I could sympathise with my hon. friends on this side of the House on the loss of their clothes—I would be keenly sensitive to the loss of those clothes. It is chilly over here; I am beginning to feel cold myself. If this question were merely whether the country should permit the Opposition to be robbed of its clothes, I would be willing that the Government should borrow our garments. All I would ask is that the Government should wear those principles as a livery in the service of the country, and not as a disguise at a sort of political masquerade. Surely it is better that the Government should borrow our garments rather than altogether destroy the industries which feed and clothe so many of our countrymen.

Mr. McMULLEN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 28th April, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 64) to incorporate the British Yukon Chartered Company.—(Mr. Fraser.)

Bill (No. 65) respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Landerkin.)

Bill (No. 66) relating to the Canadian Power Company.—(Mr. Gibson.)

Bill (No. 67) to incorporate the pilots doing duty between Quebec and Montreal.—(Mr. Guay.)

Bill (No. 68) respecting the American Bank Note Company.—(Mr. Frost.)

Bill (No. 69) respecting the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway Company.—(Mr. Langelier.)

Bill (No. 70) respecting the Great Northwest Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Richardson.)

Bill (No. 71) respecting the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—(Mr. Mills.)

Bill (No. 72) respecting the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company.—(Mr. Richardson.)

Bill (No. 73) to incorporate the Kaslo and Lardo-Duncan Railway Company.—(Mr. Bostock.)

Bill (No. 74) to incorporate the National Life Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Lount.)

Bill (No. 75) respecting the attachment of the salaries of Dominion employees.—(Mr. Richardson.)

SEIZURE OF ILLICIT STILLS.

Mr. DUGAS asked:

1. Is it true that one F. A. Jobin, of Pont Rouge, in the county of Portneuf, was convicted of having had unlawfully in his possession a still, or of some other infraction of the law respecting the inland revenue.
2. If so, was the said F. A. Jobin condemned to prison?
3. Did he undergo the penalty imposed?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). The initials of Jobin are not correctly given, nevertheless, I will answer the question. One J. Jobin, of Pont Rouge was convicted and was condemned to prison. He underwent the penalty imposed.

Mr. DAVIN asked:

1. Is it true that one George Vézina, of Quebec, was convicted of having had unlawful possession of a still, or of having committed some other infringement of the Inland Revenue Act?
2. If so, was the said George Vézina sentenced to a fine and imprisonment?
3. What was the sentence given against the said George Vézina?
4. Did he pay the fine and undergo the term of imprisonment?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). The following are the answers to the gentleman's questions:—1. Yes; on the 17th of March, 1896. 2. Yes; on the 17th of March, 1896. 3. Fine of $100 and one month's imprisonment, and a further fine of $500 and one month. 4. He paid the fine of $100 on the 13th April, 1896, and did not undergo imprisonment.

CLAIM OF THOMAS W. ASPDIN.

Mr. DAVIN asked:

1. Whether the papers respecting the claim of Thomas W. Aspdin for scrip or a land warrant, for services rendered during the rebellion at Fort Macleod, have been brought before the Acting Minister of Militia?
2. When will these claims be settled?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). That matter is under consideration. It is not possible to say when the claim will be settled, or how.

TERRITORIAL EXHIBITION ACCOUNTS.

Mr. DAVIN asked:

Whether it is the intention of the Government to place a sum in the Estimates to pay outstanding indebtedness of the Territorial Exhibition?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The Government is at present investigating the accounts.

THE FAST LINE—WINTER TERMINUS.

Mr. ELLIS asked:

Is the Government aware that the Finance Minister in 1894 stated to the House that Halifax or St. John, or both, were in the provisional agreement for the Canadian winter terminus of the fast line? What is the present arrangement or understanding with regard to said terminus?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The Government is aware of the statement which is referred to in the question. The whole matter is at present undergoing careful consideration by the Government, and as soon as arrangements are completed they

will be brought down. My hon. friend (Mr. Ellis), I am sure, will admit that it is not possible to give any details so long as the matter is open.

MR. W. C. CHISHOLM.

Mr. GILLIES asked:

When and why was Mr. W. C. Chisholm removed from the office of Indian agent at Heatherton, Nova Scotia? Who was appointed to succeed him, and by whom was his successor recommended?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I have not under my hand the precise answer which I would like to give my hon. friend; I shall be obliged to give it from memory. Mr. W. C. Chisholm was removed in November last, or thereabouts. One Macdonald was appointed in his place.

PACIFIC-YUKON ROUTE.

Mr. PRIOR asked:

Is it the intention of the Government to prosecute surveys this year for the purpose of finding out the best route from the Pacific Ocean into the Yukon country, so that Canadian merchants may be able to obtain the trade of that country?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). It is the intention of the Government to prosecute surveys for the purpose stated in the question.

SMUGGLING IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. PRIOR asked:

Are the Government aware that large quantities of goods are at present being smuggled into the Yukon country on which duty might be collected if customs officers were appointed at certain points?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The Government is aware that goods are smuggled into the Yukon country, but the Government is not yet aware what will be the best method of stopping the evil. That question is undergoing investigation.

Mr. PRIOR asked:

Is it the intention of the Government to at once place a fast steamer in British Columbian waters to put a stop to the smuggling now carried on from the American side, and also to stop the poaching by American vessels in our deep sea fisheries?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The question of my hon. friend infringes rather flagrantly upon the rules which prohibit statements of fact from being made in questions. I do not admit the truth of the alleged facts that the hon. gentleman has imported into his question. I may say to the hon. gentleman that last autumn the steamer "Quadra" was detailed to go into the Hecate Straits, with instructions to ascertain whether smuggling or poaching was being carried on there; and the official report the department received from the commander of the ship, does not justify me in believing that the rumours to that effect were true. But I may say to my hon. friend that the Government has appointed a special agent from the Marine Department and the Customs Department jointly, as an officer who will be carried by the "Quadra" to those northern coasts, and whose instructions will be to make a special investigation into this alleged smuggling and poaching.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must beg hon. members to observe the rule which prohibits them from making statements of fact in questions, or statements that may be open to dispute. I hope hon. members will avoid that in future.

MARINE LIGHTS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. PRIOR asked:

Is it the intention of the Government to place lights on Fiddle Reef and Brochie's Ledge this year?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). It is the intention to place a light on Brochie's Ledge this year, and I think on Fiddle Reef. I am not sure at the moment whether I correctly remember the name of that reef, but it is the intention to place a light on Brochie's Ledge.

WRECK OF THE "SAN PEDRO."

Mr. PRIOR asked:

Is it the intention of the Government to cause the wreck of the "San Pedro" to be removed at once? What is the cause of the delay in removing the vessel?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). It is the intention of the Government to cause the wreck of the "San Pedro" to be removed. It may be necessary to pass a small Act through Parliament, and one was prepared by my predecessor in office, to justify the Government in removing that wreck.

Mr. PRIOR. What is the cause of the delay.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not know what the hon. gentleman means by delay in the matter. The department have given instructions to notify the owners of the vessel of their intention to remove it at once, and I assume it will be done as soon as possible.

USE OF FISH TRAPS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. PRIOR asked:

Is it the intention of the Government to allow British Columbia fishermen to use fish traps in Canadian waters where American fishermen are using traps in waters contiguous thereto?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). It is the intention of the Government to allow British Columbia fishermen to fish with traps in the same manner in Canadian waters as they were used last year. As there has been a good deal of controversy on this matter, I may say to my hon. friend that I declined to allow additional fish traps to be used in Boundary Bay, for this reason, that when I had the honour of visiting British Columbia last year I promised the fishermen and the packers that I would make no material alteration in the fishing regulations of that great province until Commissioner Prince had visited it and had reported to me upon the fishery conditions, and whether I would be justified in allowing further traps. I may say that Commissioner Prince has instructions to proceed at an early day to British Columbia, and to spend a long time there, and thoroughly to master the fishery conditions.

POSTMASTER, NORTHFIELD, B.C.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I want to call the attention of the Postmaster General to an answer that he gave me yesterday, and that I may put myself in order I will conclude with a motion. I will read the record from the "Hansard":

Mr. DAVIN asked:

"Why was Mrs. Isabella R. McManus deprived of her position as postmistress of Northfield, B.C.?"

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The postmaster in question was dismissed because of the overbearing conduct of the postmaster and her husband towards many persons who were obliged to visit the post office.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my hon. friend's (Mr. Mulock's) attention to the question, which is:

"Why was Mrs. Isabella R. McManus deprived of her position as postmistress of Northfield, B.C.?"

Her husband is not now living. I would ask an answer to the question.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have given the answer.

Mr. DAVIN. Has her husband been overbearing since he died?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The term "postmaster" is applied to the occupant of the office, whether male or female. In this case the postmaster was Mrs. McManus. Her husband is living. The report of the inspector was to the effect that they had both been overbearing in their demeanour to many persons who had occasion to visit the office.

Well, Sir, I think it would be a matter of great gratification to Mrs. McManus to be assured, on the high authority of my hon. friend, that her husband is living. He died in February last, he was buried three days afterwards, and I have not heard of any resurrection miracle having been performed. I have a letter here from that poor widow that I will read to the House:

Northfield, B.C., 11th March, 1897.

Dear Mr. Davin,—I don't like to trouble you with my misfortunes, but, under the circumstances, I think it right to ask your influence on my behalf. I have been for nearly three years postmistress here, and I believe I have carried out my duties to the entire satisfaction of the department. I was appointed on the recommendation of Mr. Haslam, the then member for Nanaimo. I had a great deal of trouble with the unruly element here, and had to prosecute one man for assaulting me in my office, and had him convicted and fined, and the expense of this was borne by me. On the 19th of November my husband, whom you knew at Qu'Appelle, and who was my mail carrier, met with an accident while carrying the mails, from the effects of which he died on the 12th of last month.

That is the 12th of February. She goes on to say:

I do think it is hard for a poor widow who has lost her husband, for the postal service to supersede her in this manner. It reflects little credit on a Liberal or any other government. I have petitioned the Postmaster General for compensation for the loss of my husband.

The petition did not evidently make much impression on my hon. friend, because, up to yesterday, he was under the impression, and made the confident statement, that the man was alive.

You are well aware of the services that my husband rendered in the North-west Territories—

That is, during the rebellion of 1885:

—for which services he received no reward. I need hardly tell you that my husband's long illness and death has left me in very straitened circumstances, and that I feel keenly the way that I have been treated by the Government.

Now, Sir, I knew Mr. McManus when he kept an hotel at Qu'Appelle station. He was a man who had served Her Majesty, who had seen service, who had fought for the Empire; and I will say of him that a more gallant man and a more obliging man did not walk the earth than that same McManus. In 1885 when the flag of rebellion was lifted up in the North-west Territories, he rendered signal service. Sir, I think these are things that a Government should remember, especially a Government whose bosom is swelling with great British enthusiasm, whose bosom is almost incapable of holding the new flood of loyalty that has poured into it. I think it is extraordinary of them to do as they have done. Surely the facts that this man has served his country, has worn Her Majesty's uniform, and has served this Government during the rebellion of 1885, are matters to be considered. But there is another thing to be considered, the fact that this man is dead, and that this poor widow is left without her protector and her provider. I think that mere chivalry—I will not speak of his conduct as unchivalrous—but surely the commonest humanity would

have impelled the Minister not to dismiss a poor woman like that who had served the department for three years—not to dismiss her right on the heel of the burial of her husband. Her husband suffered from the accident that he received while doing his duty as an officer of the department, and as a servant of Canada. Here was a servant of Canada, who, after being laid up for months, died, and the duties of this office were performed by his widow, but she was shortly afterwards removed by the Postmaster General, and deprived of the means of living. I say it is a hard case. I know the hon. Postmaster General has some Irish blood in his veins, and if that blood has anything of the kindness, pity and generosity that is supposed to inhere in Irish blood, I hope when he reconsiders what he has done, he will be able to tell the House in a few days that the course he took was inconsiderate, that he was not aware as to what the facts of the case were, and that the bare circumstance that the husband may have been the supporter of Mr. Haslam, and been a good Tory, should not lead him to strike a poor widow. I hope he will be able to assure the House that he will reconsider the matter.

An hon. MEMBER. What was the salary?

Mr. DAVIN. I am afraid it was very small. I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). By accident I happen to have in my bag the papers which I brought to the House yesterday in order to answer the hon. gentleman's question, otherwise I would be at the disadvantage of not being able to make an answer except from memory. The hon. gentleman, in his chivalry, omitted to extend the ordinary courtesy of giving a Minister of the Crown notice that he would bring up this matter. I have no knowledge whatever of the circumstances of this case except what appear in the files of the department. I am not aware of the politics either of the lady or her deceased husband. The matter, so far as this department is concerned, is in no respect tainted with politics one way or the other.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am stating what is true. There was a complaint made in November last by a large number of citizens against the administration of this post office, and this complaint was referred in the ordinary course as a matter of departmental routine, to Inspector Fletcher, who lives in Victoria.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. A Conservative.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know his politics. He made a report in November; the answer I gave the hon. gentleman yesterday was a quotation from his report. Whether the husband has since died, I do not know. The report is dated 25th November, 1896. After referring to the conduct of Mrs. McManus as postmaster, and setting forth that the evidence on that ground was not considered sufficient for her removal, the report says:

> That there has been considerable ill-feeling between those of the petitioners who gave evidence and the postmaster, is, on the other hand, quite apparent, and I would state that from inquiries made among the people of the place generally, there is a feeling that the postmaster and her assistant, Mr. McManus, her husband, are somewhat overbearing in their conduct towards many people visiting the office; and several instances were brought to my notice, trivial in themselves, where a more judicious treatment might have avoided more or less unpleasantness. This has given rise to the feeling amongst many of the residents of Northfield that a change is desirable. In deference to public opinion, a change was made.

Mr. DAVIN. Before you put the motion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I was rather surprised when the Postmaster General rose to reply to the few remarks I made with reference to the letter of this afflicted woman, fell into what it is not too strong description to say, was a piece of brutal flippancy. It is inexcusable in any Minister of the Crown, but above all it is inexcusable in a gentleman supposed to be a gentleman and a scholar, who is connected with a great university and has the advantages, if he had availed himself of them, of the humanizing influences of education in that university. Can it be doubted for one moment, after hearing the report which the hon. gentleman read, that there was no ground whatever for dismissing this woman. The hon. gentleman's own inspector said that the charges made against her were trivial in themselves, and I expect if we inquired into the matter further, we would find this to be the case, that there was a politician who desired to get rid of this postmaster, and the politician desired to appoint a supporter of the Liberal party; and I will venture to say, and the Postmaster General will not dare to deny it, that a politician in British Columbia recommended the dismissal of this woman and recommended the appointment of D. S. Macdonald. The course taken by hon. gentlemen opposite in carrying out the spoils system is bad enough. There has been cruel and tyrannical conduct all over the country, but it caps the climax that a poor widow with her husband's grave still fresh, should be dismissed from her position, and when I bring up the case in this House we should have from a man in the position of the Postmaster General a piece of brutal flippancy.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the Postmaster General will lay on the Table of the House the report from which he has quoted.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is no objection.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot help saying that I think the language used by my hon. friend, although strong, is not one whit too strong. I have heard certain statements made across the floor of the House which were said in a moment of anger or during keen debate that had better not have been said, and for which allowance could be made, but when a Minister in cold blood commences an answer with an insinuation of that kind, if that is a sample of what this side of the House is to be subjected to by Ministers, I think it is well that the House should take notice of it. Now, that report, so far as it was read by my hon. friend, was not a grave report against the postmaster.

Mr. LISTER. What is the insinuation ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. What does my hon. friend (Mr. Lister) say ?

Mr LISTER. I say you said there was an insinuation and I ask you what is it ?

Mr. FOSTER. Is my hon. friend (Mr. Lister) the keeper of the Postmaster General ?

Mr. LISTER. You are talking to the House.

Mr. FOSTER. With his great love for the Postmaster General, he comes to his rescue.

Mr. LISTER. What is the insinuation ?

Mr. FOSTER. The insinuation is well known. The insinuation was intended and every man in the House knows it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot allow the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) to impute motives to me. I neither intended nor made any insinuation, and I will not allow the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) to say so.

Mr. FOSTER. All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) was very unfortunate in the choice of his language.

Mr. LISTER. You are misinterpreting him, like you always do.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, while I have the floor I would like to have a little fair-play from that side of the House, if you can bring them to that pass.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Why do you not tell what the insinuation is ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot continue to address the House, Mr. Speaker, unless you keep order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope hon. gentlemen will be good enough not to interrupt an hon. member who has the floor unless by asking him a question which he is willing to answer.

Mr. LISTER. He has not answered the question.

Mr. SPEAKER. It must be distinctly understood that any hon. gentleman who has the floor has the right to refuse to answer any interruption whatever. He has the right to refuse to answer, or to give an answer, just as he chooses. It is a mere matter of courtesy, and if the hon. gentleman addressing the House does not wish to answer he should not be further interrupted.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I presume we have a right to listen or not as we please.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope, Mr. Speaker, to get an opportunity of continuing my remarks. I would not mind if I were not so unused to public speaking in the House, but these interruptions disconcert me. Leaving this incident, which I think I have sufficiently and fairly characterized, I want to ask the attention of the House to what I think is an injustice involved in the dismissal upon the report as it is given even by the official of the department. It appears that in this case, before the woman's husband was dead, there was certain dissatisfaction in the vicinity where this post office is, and that it reached the ears of the Government. As is proper and right, the Government asked for a report from their inspector. The inspector, Mr. Fletcher, visited the locality and made a report. Between that time and this, a great change took place with reference to the condition of the postmistress. At that time her husband was living, but between that and the middle of February her husband died. Now, the post office inspector stated in the report as follows :—

All those who signed the petition were requested to appear and to give evidence under oath. A fair proportion of the witnesses attended, and of these, the evidence of Thos. Webly and Mrs. Margaret Patterson was taken, and is inclosed herewith.

For the postmaster, the evidence of Mr. L. F. Martin and Rev. S. Asquith was taken, and is inclosed herewith. The evidence of the postmaster, Mrs. Isabella Rose McManus, is also inclosed herewith.

The evidence of Mr. Badcock, called by Mr. Cane, was taken. He is not, however, one of the signers of the petition.

Mr. G. F. Cane, barrister, appeared on behalf of the petitioners, Mr. E. M. Yarwood, barrister, on behalf of the postmaster, Mrs. Isabella R. McManus, and Capt. Dillon on behalf of Mr. Robert McManus, the assistant postmaster.

The evidence of Thos. Webly shows some disagreement between the postmaster and Mrs. Webly, as to the origin of certain correspondence addressed to the latter, concerning which the postmaster refused to give any information.

The evidence of Mr. Badcock concerns chiefly his failure to receive certain letter addressed to

him at Northfield, which had been reforwarded to East Wellington, where Mr. Badcock resides, although carrying on business at the former place.

That is a matter which might easily take place in the best regulated post offices. Here is a man who resides in the vicinity of this post office and does business in another place, and his letters during his absence were forwarded to him to the place he was carrying on his business.

The evidence of Mrs. Margaret Patterson deals chiefly with an instance of the delivery to her daughter Lizzie of a letter concerning which the postmaster had some doubt as to whether it was intended for the addressee or not, and to the delivery in March last of a letter to John Patterson intended for her husband, John T. Patterson, as well as to the disposal of certain newspapers delivered to her in error.

Mrs. Isabella Rose McManus, postmaster at Northfield, testified, in connection with the statement of Thos. Webly, that an insufficiently prepaid newspaper, addressed to him, was tendered to Mrs. Webly, with a request for the deficient postage, which she refused to pay.

With regard to Mr. Badcock's evidence, the postmaster states she knew him to be engaged in business at Northfield, although residing in East Wellington, and that, in re-directing his letters to the latter place, she claims to have acted strictly within the meaning of the regulations, and that, as regards Badcock's supposition that she must have opened the East Wellington mail-bag in which to inclose his letters, the postmaster states that a separate bag is made up at Northfield for East Wellington, in which these letters were inclosed ; and this is really the case, but the postmaster at East Wellington should have been present to corroborate this.

She explains also—and in my opinion satisfactorily—the circumstances of the delivery of the letter to Lizzie Patterson, and also of the letter for John T. Patterson delivered in mistake to John Patterson.

The " paper with the rules of the post office," referred to by Mrs. Patterson, is a statement that this letter was intended for John T. Patterson, and is signed by him as an acknowledgment of its receipt, and the same is inclosed herewih.

The misdelivery of the paper for Mr. Morgan to Mrs. Patterson is explained from the fact that it was inclosed with hers in the same package, which was not opened by the postmaster, as it should have been, in the first place and the contents distributed, as the postmaster was not aware that the outside wrapper should have been removed.

That is a mistake which might occur in the best regulated post office. The report continues :

There hardly seems to be sufficient ground in the evidence of the petitioners to support the charges of " mismanagement of the office."

And this report is underlined by some person with a pencil, to show that it must have been brought to the attention of the Postmaster General.

That there has been considerable ill-feeling.

Do you see, Mr. Speaker, all that is in one paragraph, and the Postmaster General, in replying to my hon. friend (Mr. Davin), left out the first sentence of the paragraph. The whole paragraph reads as follows :—

There hardly seems to be sufficient grounds in the evidence of the petitioners to support the charges of mismanagement of the office. That there has been considerable ill-feeling between those of the petitioners who gave evidence and the postmaster is, on the other hand, quite apparent, and I would state that from inquiries I have made among the people of the place generally, there is a feeling that the postmaster and her assistant, Mr. McManus, her husband, are somewhat overbearing in their conduct towards many visiting the office, and several instances were brought to my notice, trivial in themselves, where a more judicious treatment might have avoided more or less unpleasantness.

That same remark applies to my hon. friend the Postmaster General. Sometimes he is inclined to be a little overbearing, but we would not dispossess him of his office and his salary just because two or three instances of that kind were cited.

Mr. LISTER. Oh yes, you would.

Mr. FOSTER. Where would all of us be, if that were done ? Where would my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce be sometimes if we dispossessed him of all his emoluments because he was a little overbearing at times ? Most high-mettled people are inclined sometimes to lose their basis of self-control, and to be perhaps a little overbearing. The report continues :

This gave rise to a feeling amongst many of the residents of Northfield that a change is desirable. On the other hand, the duties of the office are satisfactorily carried out, and more attention is given to detail than is generaliy found in a country office. I beg, therefore, to submit the result of my investigation for your consideration.

That report of the Postmaster General's inspector is in favour of the postmaster rather than against her, and under that report I think the most that ought to have been done would have been to have cautioned the postmaster as to this fault of character in being overbearing, and to have given this woman the chance to retain the office, more especially under the circumstances. Her husband lost his life in the service, from injuries actually received in the service. That is a mitigating circumstance ; but, more than that, the fact that this man took his life in his hands and fought for the flag of his country against rebellion makes at least a prima facie case for some sort of consideration for his widow who is left to earn her own living, partly by carrying on a post office which the inspector says has been satisfactorily carried on, and in which more attention is given to detail than is generally found in a country office. Now, having animadverted, a little harshly perhaps, but still I think justly, upon my hon. friend's conduct, may I now appeal to his good nature, and ask him to reconsider, in the light of this report of his inspector,

whether or not under all the circumstances this poor woman might not be given back the office the duties of which she has attended to so well.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I did not intend to take any part in this discussion; but I happen to be acquainted with some of the facts in reference to this lady for whom the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) expresses so much sympathy. It appears that about ten years ago, at the time that hon. gentleman belonged to a temperance lodge out there, the lady in question kept a temperance hotel. My hon. friend was in the habit of going there at times. I myself, I think, have seen him there. Now, the hon. gentleman has said a great deal about the loyalty of Mr. McManus and about what he had done for the flag of his country. I happened to be there at the time, and I know all the circumstances of the case, and what this gentleman did for his country was to sell illicit whiskey.

Mr. BENNETT. Were you a customer?

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I do not know whether my hon. friend from Western Assiniboia got any of it or not. When I first knew this lady, she kept at Qu'Appelle station what they call in the west a dance-house, and not a respectable dance-house at that. I was surprised to hear that any person of that character was keeping a post office in British Columbia or anywhere else.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, this is one of those cases which attract attention, not so much from the action of the Government, if based upon a reasonable report against the party implicated, as from the fact that the dismissal has been made avowedly not on the report of the officer sent to investigate the case, but on ex-parte statements like those of the member who has just spoken. It is quite probable that Mrs. McManus was not dismissed on the report of the inspector; but on the complaints of other people, like the charge of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, that at one time she kept a dance-house—a charge which is not substantiated, and in which I am informed by the hon. member for Assiniboia there is not a word of truth. As I say, it is a case which attracts attention not so much on account of the importance of the position, but as throwing a light on the action of the Government in a great many cases of a similar character. Why is it that the Ministers refuse continually in this House to give any information to us as to the reasons why men are dismissed from employment? Why is it that they have dismissed this woman if there are no grounds or complaints apart from the report of the inspector? Why do they commit such an act of injustice as is shown by this report, and then shield themselves behind the report, saying that there is no politics in the matter, although the remarks made by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down clearly prove that this is not a question of misconduct at all, but wholly one of politics. Where is there an office in this country as to which statements of the same kind as those made in regard to this office cannot be made? Where is there a district in which there are not to be found Grits and Conservatives? And if the votes of the Grits are taken against a Conservative officer, it can easily be said there are many in the district who would like to see the officer dismissed. That is all that this report says. How easy would it be to find people in any district who would like to see a Conservative officer dismissed, whether in a post office, a custom-house or an inland revenue office? How easy would it be, if there were Liberal officers in any of these positions, to get Conservatives in the district who would like to see them dismissed. And this is the ground put forward by the Government for dismissing this poor woman. Now, having, as the hon. member for Western Assiniboia says, some of that Irish blood in my veins which revolts against such an action as this, I deem it my duty to raise my voice in support of those who have spoken in favour of this poor woman, and to ask the Government to reconsider the action that has been taken. I draw the attention particularly to this case of the hon. Solicitor General, who, if he occupies any position in the Government, is there as the representative of the Irish Catholic people of this country. I ask him to take in consideration the case of this poor woman, and to see that justice is done her. He is there as acting Minister of Justice in this House. Let him not occupy the position of acting Minister of injustice. Let him consider this case in a spirit of justice, and I feel sure that the result will be that the Government will reinstate her in the office from which she has been dismissed.

Mr. McINNES. I was not in the House when this question came up, and I do not know exactly how it has come to be discussed. But as the party who has been dismissed was an officer in my district, I think I may make a remark or two on the question. An investigation was asked for into the management of the Northfield Post Office. So far from politics having had anything to do with the matter, as the last speaker has suggested, let me inform him that the parties who made the charges against Mrs. McManus were Conservatives who were among the strongest opponents I had in that district in the last election. An investigation was held and a report made. I have never seen that report. The ex-Minister of Finance seems to be more familiar with it than I am. He has, however, read statements from that report which I think would amply justify the Postmaster Gen-

eral, or any one else in his position, in dismissing the person against whom these charges were made. But whether the report justified the dismissal or not, I know as a matter of fact, and every person within a reasonable distance of that post office knows, that that dismissal was wholly justifiable.

Mr. QUINN. That is the trouble: the members were made the judges.

Mr. McINNES. That is a fact which is incontrovertible. The overbearing character of that late postmistress and her husband caused a condition of unrest among the people with whom they had to deal that was very far from satisfactory. Let me give you an illustration. It may seem almost incredible to hon. gentlemen, but I know it is an absolute fact. People have gone to the office to complain against the conduct of the postmistress in not handing out the mail to them which was in their boxes. Instead of giving them their mail or giving any satisfactory explanations why it was not delivered, she has actually walked up and down behind her wicket with a six-shooter in her fist. Hon. gentlemen may laugh, but I am not overstating the facts. They have laid stress on the fact that Mr. McManus lost his life while in the service of his country. I know as a fact that he was not engaged in carrying the mail when he met the accident which brought about his death. On the contrary, he was in a condition which coincides very much with the reputation the hon. gentleman behind me (Mr. Davis) gave of him when he was out in the Territories. If he had not been in that condition, that unfortunate man would probably to-day be in the land of the living. As to the dismissal of Mrs. McManus, it took place before the death of her husband. I have got a certain amount of sympathy in my disposition, and if that poor man had died and no dismissal had taken place, I would have strained a point to retain to the postmistress this partial means of livelihood. But the dismissal took place weeks before her husband died, and when, as a matter of fact, he was on a fair way to recovery. Under these circumstances, knowing as I do, the uneasiness and unrest which existed, and, in some cases, the acts of violence which took place in and about that post office, I think the hon. Postmaster General was absolutely justified in making this dismissal, and if the dismissal had not been made, there would have been ample occasion for alarm at his retaining such an official in a Government office.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What seems to strike me as an important feature in this case is that charges having been made and an investigation ordered, the charges were practically dismissed. We have had statements made here in support of the action of the department which indicate the very unfair treatment of which the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) very properly complained, because these are statements of a nature which have never been made, much less on oath, in the presence of the late postmistress. The conduct of the Postmaster General must strike every lover of fair-play as very extraordinary indeed. He would not even read the report of the commissioner on the charges, no doubt because he felt it could not justify his action, but he simply gave in his defence some observations made by the commissioner, which are wholly unsupported by the evidence taken. The commissioner does not pretend that he went into any inquiry as to whether this woman was unpopular or overbearing. The charges were serious enough, if proved, but they were wholly disproved, and under the circumstances it seems to me that a very strong case has been made out for reconsideration by the Postmaster General. It is to be hoped that the case of this woman will in no way be prejudiced by the ex parte statements which have been made in this debate. If the hon. gentleman wishes to establish a new rule, that postmasters or postmistresses must not, unless at the peril of their lives, be overbearing—whatever the inspector meant by that particular term—let that be understood and that charge be investigated. Let the inspector take fresh evidence and make a fresh report before condemnation is passed. Moderate men on both sides will agree with me that the Postmaster General, having undertaken to make a thorough inquiry into the matter, should follow that fairly out and not act without evidence. Certainly, so far as the documents go, there is not a tittle of evidence to support the impression which, no doubt, the inspector gathered in that district. We do not know whom he consulted in order to find out whether this woman was overbearing or otherwise, and the hon. Postmaster General ought to be in possession of that information before finally dismissing this postmistress.

Mr. OSLER. I know nothing about this case at all except what I have heard in the House about it. I should feel humiliated, as a member of this House and a citizen of Canada, to think that our politics have come to this condition that a dismissal should take place on the evidence which has been read to us. I will undertake to procure stronger evidence against any postmaster or postmistress in the county of North York than has been presented in this case. I live in the summer time in the county of York, and I know that in every little town there are jealousies and bickerings; and if these are taken notice of and if on evidence as slight as that given in this case, a dismissal is to take place, I say that our civil service is in a condition worse

than that of the United States in the worst stage of the American republic. I feel humiliated that any member of the civil service should be dismissed on the evidence presented to us in this case.

Mr. PRIOR. As I have known for a number of years the parties interested in this case, I think I may be allowed to say a word. I may say, in the first place, that it seems to me we have at last found a case of offensive partisanship—not by the poor woman who held the position of postmistress at Wellington but by some parties through whose influence she lost her means of livelihood. I think I can speak in quite an unbiassed manner, because Mr. McManus, the husband of this woman, took a lively interest in myself at all elections by assisting the Opposition members to do their best to keep me out of my seat in the House. But for all that, I know that he was a man among men. He was a fine specimen of manhood. He belonged to the Imperial army for many years and afterwards to the Canadian militia, he had fought and bled for his country, and although he had his faults, that is no more than the majority of us have. But whatever might be the faults of the husband, that had nothing to do with the wife. The husband is dead, let him rest. But judging by the report which the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) read to the House, we must all be convinced that it is certainly from no shortcoming of this poor woman that she had lost her situation. I quite agree with the speakers who have said that all public servants may, at one time or another, appear to be a little overbearing, but surely that is not sufficient to deprive a poor woman of her livelihood, and especially the wife of an old soldier. The hon. member for Vancouver certainly surprised me in unfolding to us the picture of one lone woman holding up a mining camp with a six-shooter. I have lived a number of years in British Columbia, in the vicinity where this post office is situated, and I know pretty well all those miners who live there, and I cannot for a moment believe that there should be a feeling of unrest amongst those stalwart sons of toil because one woman happens to brandish a six-shooter. Surely, Sir, they have not come down to the condition of hon. gentlemen who live in the effete east. We thought they were manly men; but it is evident that one woman has frightened not only the hon. member but all his constituents. But, joking apart, I do sincerely trust that justice will be done in this case. Mr. McManus was no friend of mine, still I am always ready to raise my voice for the assistance of anybody in distress, whether friend or foe, and I am sure that if the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) thinks the matter over, he will let politics go altogether and will see that it is his duty, and I am sure it will be his pleasure to reinstate this poor woman in her situation.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Whatever may have been the motives which induced my hon. friend to dismiss the postmaster, it is quite evident from the discussion that has taken place that politics had nothing to do with it. The speech just delivered by my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Prior) makes this still more apparent. We have the fact that the complaints made against the postmaster were not made by the political friends of the present Government, but by the political opponents of the hon. member who represents the riding in this House. This fact is established in the speech of my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. McInnes). Now, we have the further statement of my hon. friend from Victoria that the husband of the postmaster was not a Conservative but a Liberal.

Mr. PRIOR. He was a Conservative, but was paid by the Liberal press.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman himself has just said that the dead should be respected. And now he says that this man was paid. That is the way he respects the dead. That is quite in keeping with what we have heard from the other side of the House.

Mr. PRIOR. I say he was paid for letters written——

The PRIME MINISTER. But he was paid—the hon. gentleman says he was paid, and that is the way he respects this man's grave. I will leave that with himself and with the House. I am not going into the inquiry whether he was paid or was not paid. But from all that has taken place up to the present time, what inducements could my hon. friend the Postmaster General have had to bring politics into this matter? The hon. gentleman from Victoria says that this man's character was so low that he accepted money for political purposes.

Mr. PRIOR. No, I did not say so.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend from Vancouver says that this complaint was made, not by Liberals, but by Conservatives. What were the complaints? One was that the postmaster was overbearing in her office. There were some charges besides that, but they were not proven. But what was proven by the report of the inspector, was that the postmaster was overbearing in her dealings with her customers. I do not know whether she used a six-shooter in her dealings with them or not, but the evidence is sufficient without that. We know a little of what takes place in country villages. Whatever may have been the cause, it is evident that the postmaster had made herself objectionable and obnoxious to the people. The office is a trivial one. I have not gone into the case; this is the first intimation I have had of it, and I do not know the particulars. It may be that my hon. friend's (Mr. Mulock's) judgment in the case

may have been hasty. I do not say it was. But what I want to call attention to is that whether his judgment was right or wrong, there was nothing to show that he had been influenced by political considerations in this matter.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I wish to say, on the line of my leader, that if cases of this kind where the facts have been clearly proven, are to be brought up in this House on the allegation that political considerations have influenced the action of the Minister, it will be impossible to go on with the public business. Is no attention to be paid to complaints, which, in this case, were made by opponents of the Government, without charges been made against friends of the Government of partisanship in trying to secure dismissals. I do not believe there is a person in this House listening to this discussion but must have honestly come to the conclusion that the people who asked for the change in this post office were Conservatives, and Conservatives of the clearest stripe. These people were dissatisfied with the management of this post office and asked to have a change made. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) says that this man was a very active opponent of his, an active Liberal who not only talked against the late Government, but being a man who could wield his pen and wrote able articles in condemnation of that Government. It must appear strange to any honest man that charges of political influence in the action of the department should be based upon such a case. I think that when the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Osler) looks at these facts his indignation will seem somewhat amusing to himself. If complaints such as were made in this case, when taken notice of by the department, were always to give rise to charges of political partisanship in the administration, the work of the department could not be carried on at all. I think it is to the injury of all the departments of the civil service that the time of the House should be taken up by such trivial and ridiculous nonsense as we have heard in regard to this case. Who are most to be considered in cases of this kind? Surely the people Does my hon. friend who brought up this matter say that the friends of his party living in that district are not respectable people, or that when they sent this petition to the Postmaster General they did not wish that petition to be granted? The small revenue derived from this office could not make it an object to any person to receive the appointment. It is perfectly clear that this change was made out of regard to the petition of respectable citizens living in that district, and for no other reason; and I am surprised to hear the hon. member for Toronto, after hearing the discussion here to-day, making the statement he did with regard to the action of the Administration. Every fair-minded man on this side of the House, and Liberals not holding seats in the House, have been anxious that men holding positions in the service should not be interfered with without cause.

Mr. McCLEARY. Beamsville post office.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I say that, and I say it without fear of contradiction. I say further, that we have reason to complain, from a party standpoint, of the administration of this Government, so anxious have they been to deal in the most liberal manner with the office holders of this country. But it is ridiculous to say that, when a charge of misconduct is brought against an official, the department is to take no notice of it under penalty of being misrepresented by statements such as that of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) that insinuations were made that were never made or intended to be made. I think that fair-minded men on the other side of the House must say that the Postmaster General did perfectly right in listening to the petition of the people who asked them for a change in this post office.

Mr. McCLEARY. While the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sutherland) who has just taken his seat may charge that this matter which has been brought before the House is of no consequence, and to him it is of no consequence, but it is of consequence to the widow who has been deprived of that office. The hon. gentleman contends that no question should be raised in the House as to the action of the Postmaster General in dismissing this lady from office because charges had been submitted against her. But he failed to tell us that, though these charges were submitted, none of them were proven. Will he, as a fair-minded man, as a man who has a reputation in his own province for frankness, say that it is fair, honourable or decent for the Postmaster General to dismiss this lady from her position without charges made against her having been proven? But while we are on this question, before the resolution now before the House is voted upon, I have a matter in which the Postmaster General is interested, that I would like to bring before his notice and before the attention of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. It will be necessary for all hon. gentlemen taking part in this debate to confine themselves to the question which is raised by the hon. member who moved the adjournment, that is to say, the dismissal of the postmaster at Northfield. It is impossible to go into a general discussion of dismissals.

Mr. McCLEARY. I was just going to give an illustration of the way the Postmaster General administers his department. I presumed, being a new member of the House, that I was within my right.

Mr. SPEAKER. The illustration should be very brief, indeed.

Mr. McCLEARY. I am not so sure about the brevity. But if I cannot go on and discuss the question as pertaining to the administration of the Postmaster General's Department, I will sit down and bring it up at another time.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman stated that he proposed to go into some specific case under the administration of the department, other than this one. I do not think that would be in order. The hon. gentleman can bring it up at the proper time.

Mr. DAVIN. Would the hon. gentleman lay the evidence of this case before the House?

Mr. LOUNT. I desire to draw attention for a moment to some facts that appear in the report of the investigation, and to show that they do not warrant many of the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite. I apprehend that it is the duty of the Postmaster General to see that every office of this kind is properly conducted, that those who discharge the functions of public offices should do so in a courteous and obliging manner, that their manner should be of such a character that the people who have to resort to their places should be satisfied with the conduct of the civil servants who have to discharge those duties. When charges come before the Postmaster General, or any other member of the Government, in relation to the duties appertaining to their departments and to officials under their charge and when, upon investigation by such member of the Government, by the Postmaster General in this particular case, it is found that the person discharging the duties of the office in question has not been discharging them satisfactorily, or to the benefit of the community, to the satisfaction of the community, then I apprehend it is the duty of the Postmaster General to see that a change is made in that office. Now, hon. gentlemen on the other side have condemned the Postmaster General, and especially is this the case with the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) who always, I won't say improperly, but who always flaunts his loyalty, flaunts his great admiration for British institutions, and who on this occasion took opportunity to state to the House that Mr. McManus was dead at the time of the dismissal, and therefore he accused the Postmaster General of acting unfairly towards his widow in discharging her, in view of the fact that her husband had been in the service of the country, and has discharged his duty in that service in an honourable and in a proper manner. Now, according to this report, there was no evidence before the Postmaster General at the time this report came to him—and I suppose that he acted upon the report, and upon nothing else—there was no evidence before him whatever that Mr. McManus was deceased. The evidence before him was to the contrary, the evidence was that Mr. McManus was in the living flesh, that he was represented at the investigation by counsel, and that therefore Mrs. McManus was not then a widow. Now, to sustain what I am saying, and to show that there was great reason for the inquiry, that there was great reason for the action of the Postmaster General, and that the public in that locality were not satisfied, I will read to the House a few extracts from that report which I think will convince the House and will convince the country that the Postmaster General has done his duty, and that all the charges from the other side of the House to the effect that the conduct of the Postmaster General was merciless, was unkind or severe, are without foundation. Let me draw attention to some statements in the report of the investigation:

> Mr. G. F. Cane, barrister, appeared on behalf of the petitioners, Mr. E. M. Yarwood, barrister, on behalf of the postmaster, Mrs. Isabella R. McManus, and Capt. Dillon on behalf of Mr. Robert McManus, the assistant postmaster.

There is the evidence of this report that Mr. McManus was in the flesh at the time of the investigation, and therefore Mrs. McManus was not a widow, as the member for West Assiniboia has told the House, and therefore she was not a person for whom sympathy could be claimed on that ground.

Mr. DAVIN. I am sure that my hon. friend does not wish to misrepresent me. I did not say that at the time the report was made, or the investigation was held, Mr. McManus was dead; I said that he died on the 12th of February, and that so late as the 11th of March, Mrs. McManus was still occupying the office, although she had been notified that she would be dismissed.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. She was dismissed in January.

Mr. LOUNT. The dismissal took place in January. I understand the hon. member for West Assiniboia to say that the dismissal took place before the death of the man. But the facts are plain before the House that the dismissal was not made upon any ground that would give the hon. gentleman reason for saying that the conduct of the Postmaster General was merciless in any respect. I submit that the evidence shows the contrary. I observe that upon occasions like this every opportunity is seized upon by hon. gentlemen opposite to make capital against the Government, and to make it appear to the press and to the country that this Government are acting in a merciless manner, especially in regard to dismissals; therefore, I take this opportunity of saying that so far as my observation has gone, and I have endeavoured to observe the conduct of the Government in this respect, their conduct has been, on all occasions, prudent, wise and courteous, and the charges to the contrary which have been so furiously hurled against the Government, are without foundation. Now, I have drawn

attention to the fact that Mr. McManus was living at the time of the investigation and that he was represented by counsel. Let me for a moment—for I do not wish to occupy the time of the House at any length on a matter so insignificant, nor would I have spoken at all except for the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite are endeavouring to make political capital out of something that does not exist—let me draw the attention of the House to these charges and to the finding: and if they do not warrant the dismissal, then I am unable to form a proper judgment. Some of the charges were these:

The evidence of Thomas Webley shows some disagreement between the postmaster and Mrs. Webley as to the origin of certain correspondence addressed to the latter, concerning which the postmaster refused to give any information.

There was one charge.

The evidence of Mr. Badcock concerns chiefly his failure to receive certain letters addressed to him at Northfield, which had been reforwarded to East Wellington, where Mr. Badcock resides, although carrying on business at the former place.

There was another specific charge.

The evidence of Mrs. Margaret Patterson deals chiefly with an instance of the delivery to her daughter Lizzie of a letter concerning which the postmaster had some doubt as to whether it was intended for the addressee or not, and to the delivery in March last of a letter to a John Patterson intended for her husband, John T. Patterson, as well as to the disposal of certain newspapers delivered to her in error.

Now, these were some of the charges, and what is the finding?

There hardly seems to be sufficient grounds in the evidence of the petitioners to support the charges of mismanagement of the office.

Mr. DAVIN. Hear, hear.

Mr. LOUNT. Quite true, but there may be reasons why the postmaster should be discharged, apart from the question of mismanagement, if her conduct is, as it is shown to be, overbearing or tyrannical. That would justify the dismissal of a postmaster. Now, let us read further:

That there is considerable ill-feeling between those of the petitioners who gave evidence and the postmaster is, on the other hand, quite apparent.

Showing that the people in that locality who were making the charges and who were to be served, had considerable ill-feeling produced in their breasts by the conduct of the postmistress. Then, again, the report states:

I would state that from inquiries made among the people of the place generally, there is a feeling that the postmaster and her assistant, Mr. McManus, her husband, are somewhat overbearing in their conduct to many people visiting the office, and several instances were brought to my notice, trivial in themselves, where more judicious treatment might have avoided more or less unpleasantness.

The gist of this, and the ground of the dismissal, and the ground on which it is warranted—and I venture to say every fair-minded member in this House and every fair-minded man in the country will approve it—is that the conduct of both the husband and wife was overbearing towards many visiting the office. I would ask if, in a public office, whether a post office or any other office where civil servants are employed, their conduct is to be allowed to be overbearing? Is such overbearing conduct to be permitted to continue? I will not say that walking around with a weapon behind the post office partition would be a cause for dismissal in the opinion of the hon. member for Assiniboia, whose courage has been shown on all occasions both in the House and out of it, but if the conduct of the postmaster and her assistant was such as to be overbearing, then I venture to say it is a cause for dismissal; and so far as my investigation of the case goes, I thoroughly and cordially support the conduct of the Postmaster General in taking action under such circumstances.

Motion to adjourn, negatived.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, before taking into consideration the new tariff that has been submitted by the Government for the approval of this House, I will endeavour to pay my addresses shortly to hon. gentlemen opposite who have criticised the tariff, some of whom have shown that they quite misunderstand the intention of the Government, and have expressed doubt as to the result of the application of that clause which provides for closer trade relations with the mother country. My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) and other hon. members stated that they could not understand how that clause could be applied under present conditions in so far as Great Britain is related to other nations. Permit me to say that it is quite evident that if hon. gentlemen opposite do not understand the new tariff and the application of the preferential clause to our trade with Great Britain, some of the constituencies that have been recently appealed to have clearly indicated that they understand it. Winnipeg clearly understands the new tariff. Yesterday it returned a supporter of the Government by over 1,100 majority. Then there was Macdonald. That constituency was represented by a Conservative and supporter of the late Government, and the voters there clearly understand the tariff, for they de-

cided to support the Government by electing the Government candidate by six or seven hundred majority. Then there was Prince County, Prince Edward Island. The people of that county understand fully the application of the tariff to their own condition and to our relations with Great Britain, for they have returned our old friend, Mr. Perry, by a respectable majority.

An hon. MEMBER. With three polls to hear from.

Mr. McMULLEN. These recent elections clearly prove that while hon. gentlemen opposite may not understand the tariff, at least the people in the constituencies understand it, and have expressed their confidence in the Government and in the tariff revision. I also find that a large portion of the press understand it. The "Flag," published in Ottawa, a paper which is somewhat independent, publishes the following in its editorial columns this morning :

Leaving Conservatism alone, leaving Liberalism alone, leaving all questions of party politics alone and looking at it strictly from the national, from the Imperial, from the British-Canadian standpoint, we have nothing but satisfaction to record with the tariff speech of Hon. Mr. Fielding, Minister of Finance, Thursday night, so far as it dealt with British-Canadian interests. It was a great night for Canada, a great night for Great Britain, a great night for Britishers all over the world.

It was the keynote to the first step to an impending rapprochement between all the nations that fly the British flag and honour the Queen as Her Britannic Majesty's subjects. A special, a reduced tariff for Great Britain, and for all countries that meet us in the same way ; and a general tariff on present lines, a general tariff to confront all the rest of the world that keep up the bars against us. That is an intelligible, sensible and strong policy that every man who is British Canadian first and foremost, and partisan afterwards, will hail with sober approval. We do not expect all Conservative readers to take this view. It is not the view of party, it is the view of a patriotism, lifted above party, that is purely national.

That is the utterance of an independent newspaper with rather Conservative leanings, I presume, with regard to that provision of the tariff. And then we have again the following in this morning's "Citizen" :

In the House of Commons to-day, Sir Charles E. H. Vincent, Conservative and Fair Trader, member for the central division of Sheffield, announced he would move the following resolution a month hence :

"The House expresses grateful and fraternal recognition to the Government and people of the Dominion of Canada of the generous fiscal changes in favour of British trade and labour, announced on Thursday by the Parliament of Ottawa, and already in force, and hopes this first step towards a commercial federation of the Empire will be followed by Australasia, South Africa and the other colonies."

The Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, replying, said : The Government cordially appreciated the friendly spirit shown by the tariff action of Canada. "But," he added, "I understand the proposals do not depend upon any alteration of the system of free trade established in the United Kingdom." That is the utterance of a very distinguished Imperial statesman whose name is well known in this House. The Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain declares that he highly appreciates the action of this Government in offering better terms to England. The hon. gentleman from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) told us that we adopted the policy of the Conservative party. I earnestly hope, Sir, that in the interests of this country, and for the credit of the party which I support, that whatever vestige of Conservative policy there may in the meantime permit to remain in the tariff, we will at least not adopt the tactics which hon. gentlemen opposite have adopted during their career. We recognize that the moment has come when the affairs of this country should be administered in an honest and patriotic manner, and we trust that those lamentable circumstances which all true Canadians were sorry to hear of, will not be associated with names of members of the Liberal Cabinet as they have been associated with the names of members of the late Conservative Cabinet. It is a singular thing that hon. gentlemen opposite will persist in the statement that these tariff resolutions offer no special privileges to Great Britain, in the face of the utterances to the contrary of British statesmen. We know, Sir, that there were read on the floor of this House quotations from the "Times" and from leading English journals, accepting in a spirit of gratitude and recognizing in a spirit of mutual friendliness, the action of Canada with regard to the preferential clause in the tariff.

It is said that this clause is going to give privileges to other countries as well as to England, and the hon. member (Mr. Davin) stated that some twenty-two countries including the colonies, would be enabled to claim the same privileges as England was likely to become heir to. Sir, if there are other countries prepared to give to Canada the same advantages which she enjoys in the markets of Great Britain, we will have no objection whatever to admit their goods on favourable terms. If there is anything that Canada requires more than another, it is an extended market for her products. We know that owing to the unfortunate action of the United States—unfortunate in their own interests as well as in ours—we have been practically shut out of that market. England has of necessity become the great market for the surplus products of Canada, and I do hope that the loyal action of Canada may be the means of giving us preference in that market that we have not enjoyed before. If, before the embargo was placed on our cattle in England, hon. gentlemen opposite had announced a policy showing their desire to give Great Britain an advantage in our market, I have not the slightest doubt that we would be

enjoying to-day the privilege of free entry of our cattle into England.

My hon. friend (Mr. Davin) stated that Mr. Laurier had promised free trade as it is in England. Well, Rome was not built in a day, and at the first session of a Parliament it is an utter impossibility for any political party to carry out all the pledges they made with regard to reform. We have an enormous national debt, and of necessity we will have to raise a large revenue each year. For many years Canada will have to levy considerable amount of taxation in order to provide for the demands on the Dominion treasury. The present is the only course we can adopt now, but I do hope that from year to year the debt of the country, and the annual expenditure will be kept from increasing at least, so that the gross amount of taxation on the people will be considerably less than at present. Thus, the way will be open for further tariff reform. I believe that the present Government have made an honest effort to cut down expenditure. I believe that the Postmaster General, who has been subjected to unfair criticism with regard to his course, has made an honest effort to curb the growing expenditure in his department, and I believe he will persist in that direction. The hon. member (Mr. Davin) also told us that this new tariff had more marked evidences of protection than had the old tariff. Sir, it is rather amusing to notice that since the announcement of the tariff, we have any number of deputations waiting on the Government, and the corridors of the House are filled with men urging that if the tariff goes into force in its present shape it will be a serious thing for their institutions. That to me is a positive evidence that there is a reduction in taxation, and that the tariff is not protective as it has been in the past.

It is quite evident that the Government are travelling in the right direction; it is quite evident that some of those institutions have been struck. If they were not, they would not be here appealing to the Finance Minister for some concessions, and the fact that they are here urging the Government to grant them relief, is positive evidence that the changes in the tariff are in the direction of giving to the people of this country the commodities they use at considerably lower prices.

Mr. DAVIN. Did not similar deputations come to Mr. Foster?

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes, similar deputations did come to Mr. Foster; but the difference is that those that waited on Mr. Foster, as a rule, got everything they wanted, and were protected up to the hilt, while those that have waited on Mr. Fielding and presented arguments in that direction, have not, I am inclined to think, gone away as well satisfied as they were before. When hon. gentlemen opposite conducted a protective tariff, we know that they opened their ears to the manufacturers, and were willing to carry out their suggestions. We on this side of the House have no ill-feeling towards, and no disposition to interfere seriously with, any manufacturing institution that can hope to live. We want them to live; but the unfortunate fact is that in the past they have not only lived, but have heaped up enormous fortunes under the advantages which were given to them by the previous Government.

The hon. member for Western Assiniboia said that when a government came into power they should carry out the promises they made in Opposition; that after appealing to the people, they should carry out the promises they made to them. Well, an honest effort is being made by the Government to do that. But a man who supported the late Government, as the hon. member for Western Assiniboia did, can hardly claim that they made an honest attempt to carry out their promises. We know that in 1891 they went to the country promising to seek for reciprocity with the United States; that was their cry; and after the election was over, they sent a sham deputation to Washington; but we know that they made no honest effort to carry out that pledge. We know that the people were virtually humbugged. Therefore, such an insinuation comes with very bad grace from any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House.

The ex-Minister of Finance stated that this tariff was exactly the tariff of the past—that there was no difference. Well, when we come to look over the different changes, we find that there is a very considerable difference. The farmers are to have free corn for feeding purposes; after a year they are to have free binder twine; after a year they are to have free barbed-wire fencing; they have certain reduction in coal oil and improved facilities for handling that commodity. All these show that there are considerable reductions in the tariff.

The hon. member for Western Assiniboia eulogizes the bounty system. So far as I am concerned, I have expressed the opinion in this House on previous occasions that if there is any industry in this country which it is thought desirable, from a Dominion standpoint, to encourage, it should be done by the bounty system. In that way you make all the inhabitants of the Dominion pay their proportionate share towards the development of the industry. Thus, the hon. member for Assiniboia, if he wears a silk hat and pays a duty upon it, will contribute a part of that duty towards helping to develop iron. But where you impose a tax on the users of iron, in order to shut out competition, and to develop the industry in that way, it is the users of iron alone who pay for the development, and those who do not use iron do not pay anything. I agree with the hon. gentleman that the bounty system is the proper system if we are going to contribute towards the development of any industry.

Then the hon. gentleman talked about a customs star-chamber. I was surprised to hear his remarks on that point. We had a customs star-chamber in this country for years. We know that by the regulations of the Customs Department in past years the Minister of Customs reserved the right to go back and examine the importations of any importer for months—to go over his books and impose an additional duty if he thought fit. Even when the goods had been sold and used, and there was no possibility of the importer reaching the parties to whom he had sold them, the Minister of Customs claimed the right to make a thorough and exhaustive investigation into the affairs of the wholesale man for months and years back. I would like to know what my hon. friend would call that. Would he not call that a star-chamber? But I am glad to know that the present tariff makes an improvement in that respect. Years ago we offered hon. gentlemen opposite the opportunity to establish the same system. We know that the hon. gentleman who now occupies the Speaker's chair proposed that power should be given to the Government to take off the duty from any article that was the subject of combination, in order to prevent combinations being formed in restraint of trade, and people being imposed upon and charged high prices for goods.

The hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig) said that this tariff was a policy that faced both ways. Well, that may be true; in a sense it does. It faces, first to the general interests of the people of Canada, and, in the next place, it faces towards closer and better trade relations with the motherland. We quite admit that it faces two ways, in the interests of the mother country as well as in the interest of our own country.

Now, I want to make a comparison between this tariff and the tariff that was in existence in the time of Mr. Mackenzie. At the time hon. gentlemen opposite came into power they declared that in the tariff of Mr. Mackenzie there was no protection, that the industries of this country were languishing, that we required a tariff that would protect those industries and make them prosperous. They declare that this tariff is full of protection clauses—that it is protective from top to bottom. Here is a comparison, as to the rates of duty on a number of articles, between the Mackenzie tariff and the Fielding tariff:

Articles.	Mackenzie Tariff.	Fielding Tariff.
Ale, beer and porter, per gall	18 cents	16 cents.
do in bottles, per gall	20 do	24 do
Butter, per lb	4 do	4 do
Cheese, the product of British North America	Free.	
do from other countries, per lb	3 cents.	3 do
Coffee, ground or roasted, per lb	3 do	2 do
Fish, salted or smoked, per lb	1 do	1 do
Fruits, preserved in spirits, per gall	$1.80	$2.
Lard and tallow, per lb	1 cent.	2 cents.
Meats, fresh, salted or smoked	1 cent	2 do
Malt	2 cents per lb	15c. per bush. or about 1c. per lb.
Oils, coal, &c., per wine gall	6 cents.	5 cents.
Rice, per lb	1 do	1¼ cents.
Soap, per lb	1 do	1 do
Starch, per lb	2 do	1½ do
Spirits, Imperial gall	$1.20	$2.40.
All other spirits	$1.80	$2.40 per gall. and 30 p. c.
Teas, green and Japan, per lb	6 cents.	10 per cent.
Tea, black	5 do	10 do
Vinegar, per gall	12 do	15 do
Wines, containing 20 p. c. or less alcohol, per gall	36 do	25 do
All other except sparkling wines, per gall	72 do	30 do
Sparkling wines, per doz	$3	$3.30
Cotton, manufactures of	17½ per cent.	25 p. c. and 35 p. c., but there is ¼ off under the preferential clause with England, which, at the end of the year, will reduce the duty to 19 p. c. and 26 p. c.
Woollens	17½ do	35 p. c., but under the preferential clause with Britain, 26 p. c.
Clothing made by hand or sewing machines	17½ do	35 p. c., with ¼ off in favour of England, 26 p. c.
Boots and shoes	17½ do	25 per cent.
Glass and glassware	17½ do	20 p. c. common, and ornamental 30 p. c.
Harness and saddlery	17½ do	25 p. c.
Patent medicines	25 do	35 do

When you look over the list of articles I have read and compared the tariff collected during Mr. Mackenzie's regime with the tariff now imposed, and take into consideration the fact that the expenditure of the country is about one-third more, I think that the tariff of the present Finance Minister bears a very close resemblance to that which was in existence when Mr. Mackenzie was in office. So that when hon. gentlemen opposite say that it is protection from top to botton, I consider this a very strong answer to that charge.

It is said that the Reform party promised that its policy would be death to protection. Well, Mr. Speaker, we intend to carry out that policy so far as the monopolies of this country are concerned. Monopolies will be absolutely forbidden to exist under the regime of the present Government. We do not want, by the simple passage of a law, to permit a certain number of favoured individuals to draw heavily on the resources of the people and put money into their own pockets. We are willing that any home industry should have what advantages a revenue tariff will afford it, but those specific duties, levied for the purpose of enabling favoured individuals to manufacture their commodities and draw from the people excessive taxes, are repealed, and such advantages are being rapidly brought to a close. It was not desirable, in the interests of the people, that such a condition of things should continue. A revenue tariff is the only sound tariff. When we had a protective tariff, our Finance Minister was entirely at the mercy of those who were ready with arguments in the interests of the different institutions they represented. I should like to know in what position the ex-Finnace Minister found himself when parties came to him to urge increased taxation. I should like to know how possibly the ex-Finance Minister, when parties came to him asking for increased taxation, could judge whether what they were asking was reasonable or excessive. He could not possibly know anything about it. It would require an expert in the business of every party seeking protection to decide whether the increased protection sought for was too large or the reverse. And if the Finance Minister was not an expert, he could not possibly be in a position to decide that important point himself. Therefore I contend that a revenue tariff is the only safe, sound and honest means of levying a customs tax in any country. The moment you depart from that, the moment you open your ear to the remonstrances and persistent demands and importunities of the men who advocate increased taxation in their own interests, that moment you run the serious risk of imposing an enormously increased taxation on the people, not for the people's good, but for the benefit of those who are interested in securing an advance in the tariff. A revenue tariff is the only safe, prudent and honest system. Levying taxes in Her Majesty's name and not for Her Majesty's purposes is a dishonest method of taxation, to which the people should not be asked to submit. The difference between the tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite and the tariff we have now in force is simply this. They made protection the leading feature of their policy. To protect every institution was their first object, and the question whether the tax imposed was sufficient to meet the demands on the Dominion treasury or not was only a secondary consideration. We have reversed that order. The tariff now levied is levied from the standpoint of honestly collecting the sum necessary to meet the demands on the Dominion treasury, and any institution that can get any little incidental advantage out of a tariff of that kind is quite welcome to it. But we deny that it is proper to tax the people because some institutions want to benefit thereby.

The hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) last night gave us a little exhibition in the style of Mark Twain. The hon. gentleman seems to occupy a somewhat similar position in this House to that filled by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). The latter hon. gentleman occasionally affords us considerable amusement, but I must say that the returning officer who gave that one casting vote which put the hon. gentleman in his seat, who has wasted so much of our time, has a great deal to answer for. The hon. member for Toronto is evidently training to take the place of the hon. member for Assiniboia and he gave us some little amusement last night. He said that we had stolen the clothes of the Conservative party. I deny that, Mr. Speaker. We never at any time wanted to clothe ourselves in the filthy rags of protection. We have always opposed the system, and we intend to oppose it, on principle, to the end.

Now, the hon. ex-Finance Minister said that the Slogan cry was "Death to Protection." If he will just alter that to "Death to monopoly," we will admit the truth of the statement. We intend to do away with monopolies; and hon. gentlemen opposite cannot but admit that monopolies do exist in this country. I believe that the Reform party will carry out every pledge they have made. But it is impossible to do all in one session of Parliament. I think the step they have already taken in the direction of relieving the people of excessive taxation and of reforming the tariff is a guarantee that from time to time, as necessity arises, further steps will be taken and the tariff so revised as to reduce the prices of commodities which the people require. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite declare themselves apprehensive of the effect of the new tariff upon the country, and claim that it was a mistake on the part of the people to change from the policy which has been in existence for the last eighteen years. When we

look at the record, what do we find the National Policy to have done? It was to have brought in population. Has it done so? We deny that it has fulfilled that promise, but claim that it has been the means, to some extent, of driving out population. The National Policy was to have brought back our people from the United States. If you take up the speeches that were delivered in 1877, before hon. gentlemen opposite appealed to the country to support their protective policy, you will find that they indulged in glowing promises as to the results of the National Policy, and one of these results was to have been the bringing back of our people from the United States. But we find from the record that more people went to the United States from 1878 down to the present time than ever before. The National Policy was to populate our North-west. Has it done that? Every man admits, as a matter of great regret, that we have not been able to send more people into the North-west than we have done. It was to develop our mineral resources. I am glad to see the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) in his place. We can well remember when he introduced his iron duties in this House. He told us in glowing terms what would be the result of vitalizing the great iron industry in Canada. He declared that our iron resources were equal to those of any other part of the world. I believe they are. He declared that as a result of the increase of the duty on iron our great iron deposits would be developed, that our population would be increased by 200,000 and that we would have blast furnaces all along our frontier. We were to have them at Kingston, Weller's Bay, Cobourg, Toronto, and several other places from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The people bore the tax imposed by the increase of the duty on iron, and it was a tax that bore very heavily upon the farmers. But did the country realize the advantages promised? No; the duties utterly failed to develop the iron industry. Where are the blast furnaces promised? One has been erected at Hamilton, but that is the only one brought into existence by the duties, I believe, in the whole Dominion. The National Policy was to have given us a home market. The people of this country have sent out more products per head, year by year, since the adoption of the National Policy than before. The National Policy was to have secured reciprocity. That was the great thing that we were to have as the result of this protective system. But, after eighteen years, we find we are further off—no, we are not, but we were, before the 23rd of June last, further off—from reciprocity than ever before. I hope that we may, under the management of the present Government secure a reciprocity treaty with the United States. This every one will admit will be a great advantage to us.

The ex-Finance Minister, in his first budget speech in 1889, intimated to the House, after reviewing the expenditure that Canada had made in national improvements and public works, that he thought our debt had reached its highest point, and that from that time it would begin to diminish and the annual expenditure to go down. But we find that instead of this prediction being carried out, our debt has increased every year, as the figures will show:

Year.	Increase of Debt.
1890	$ 3,170
1891	275,000
1892	3,322,403
1893	549,605
1894	4,501,989
1895	6,891,897
1896	5,422,505
	$20,967,391

This is the increase that has taken place in the face of the prediction of the ex-Finance Minister. It represents an average annual increase of $2,995,000, or, in round numbers, $3,000,000 a year.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) made some remarks with regard to the Bill abolishing superannuations, and said that it did not abolish superannuations. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman—he says he is willing to support the Bill—if he is ready to bring in a Bill that would go any further than the Bill that has just been introduced? It would be a violation of justice to those who are now on the superannuation list to deprive them of the annuities they are to receive as long as they live. If such an act were perpetrated, I think the people affected would have a plea with which they could go before the Exchequer Court and demand, and no doubt, receive redress. In the same way it would be unjust to deprive those of superannuation who had served ten years. But the Bill is made to apply as far as it can apply. The intention is that superannuations should be abolished as far as it is possible to abolish them. I wish to draw the attention of the House to the action of the Conservative press with regard to the course of the Government in superannuating the few that have been put on the list since the Liberal party came into power. These newspapers say that the Act has been abused. The Act has not been abused, but has been administered in every instance honestly. Not a single man has been placed on the list who was given more than he was entitled to. Not a year was added to the term of service of any man put upon the superannuation list.

I desire to draw the attention of the House to some of the things which, in my humble opinion, are of advantage under the present tariff. In the first place, specific duties are largely abandoned. There is no kind of duty that is so objectionable as a specific duty. Undoubtedly, under their operation, the people cannot realize the enormous du-

ties they pay. I am glad that the thin edge of the wedge has been introduced, absolutely abolishing specific duties, and I hope that the Government will keep on on that line until every item and vestige of specific duties is eventually wiped out. The free list has been increased by adding corn and binding twine, which is also a step in the right direction. The restrictions surrounding the sale of coal oil are also going to be removed, and facilities are to be offered for the purpose of distributing it without surrounding it with those restrictions to which it has heretofore been subjected. Then fence wire will also be in the free list, and this, no doubt, will be of great advantage to our farmers in the North-west, and to our farmers in other parts of the Dominion. It will undoubtedly be a decided advantage. Then, again, we are enjoying a very large and desirable development in our mineral wealth, and mining machinery to be used for that purpose, is to be admitted in order to facilitate the development of our mineral resources. Then we are to have cheaper iron. I am sure there is not a user of iron in Canada, including all our farmers, but will appreciate the reduction that has been made on iron. That is a desirable move, and I hope the Government will move still further in the same direction. The question of the bounty on iron I shall not refer to, as I have already sufficiently done so. Then, again, the taxation is increased on tobacco, spirits and cigarettes. I do not think there is an individual in this country, unless those who are personally interested in these articles, who will challenge the prudence of the Government in having added to the taxation under these heads, thus bringing a large amount into the Dominion treasury from the increased taxation on these items. Now, Sir, in my humble opinion, the important feature in connection with this whole tariff is the offer, and the inducement, and the advantage, held out to the mother country in the direction of receiving her goods at a lower rate than we will receive the goods of other nations. I think that move will bring in a new era. I believe, Sir, that from the present time the future of Canada is assured. I believe that on the morning of the 24th of June a new condition of things dawned upon this Dominion. The sun rose that day on a condition of things that I believe will eventually secure that measure of prosperity that is so necessary to the future development of this country. I believe that wealth and population will increase, I believe that our farmers will take courage and be in better heart; I believe that our North-west will fill up rapidly with a thriving, active and industrious population. I believe that our mining interests will develop rapidly; I believe that an impetus will be given to a great many industries throughout our Dominion: I believe that under the management, the prudent management, the careful management, the statesmanlike management of the hon. gentlemen who now occupy the Treasury benches, a brighter era has opened for Canada. I believe that the people in Canada are realizing that they are beginning to cultivate confidence, they are beginning to act more hopefully. They believe that upright men now occupy the Treasury benches of this Dominion, who are endeavouring to conduct its affairs honestly. I am not for a moment intimating that Conservatives as a whole are dishonest; I am glad to say that there are honourable, upright and patriotic men, no doubt, in the Conservative ranks, just as there are in ours. But I must say this, that if they had rid their skirts of men who were dishonest, of men who showed a disposition to do what was wrong; if they had purged themselves of those men who were willing to live by dishonesty, and those men that lent their countenance to dishonesty and winked at such transactions as the Curran Bridge, the Tay Canal, the Langevin Block, the graving dock scandal—if they had done that their chances with the people of this country on the 23rd of June last, would have been much better than they were. Now, the hon. ex-Finance Minister has evidently sat in his seat with a great deal of uneasiness since this House met. He feels, no doubt along with others, that he is in the cold shades of Opposition. Well, hon. gentlemen on that side of the House had better make up their minds that the country is going to ask them to stay where they are for a considerable time. I think the evidence afforded by several constituencies recently clearly show that the country is going to give a fair and impartial trial to the present Government, it is going to give them a fair opportunity of handling the affairs of this country. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that so far as I am personally concerned, I shall support this Government just as long as they do what is right; but I will say this to them, that if they allow themselves to be dragged into the mire of disgrace by Curran Bridges, by Tay Canals, by Langevin Blocks, and such things, I shall claim the right to separate from this Government, or from any other Government that is found guilty of those things. If hon. gentlemen opposite had taken that course, their prospects before the people of this country would have been much better on the 23rd of June last than they were in fact. I said the ex-Finance Minister did not appear to be comfortable in his seat. Well, I earnestly hope that he will peaceably and submissively accept the decision of the people of this Dominion, and I hope that he will endeavour prudently and properly to discharge his duty as one of the prominent leaders of the Opposition for a number of years to come—I do not know how long. But let me say this, I believe that if the Hon. Wilfred Laurier continues to conduct the affairs of

this country in the manner he has done from the moment he was sworn into office until the present time, if he continues to gain upon the confidence and good-will of the people of this Dominion in the same way in which he has from the 23rd of June up to the present time, the prospects of hon. gentlemen opposite coming back to power are very slim indeed. I hope that he will do that. I hope that the people of Canada will appreciate the honest efforts he is making in their behalf; and that not only the people of Canada, but the people throughout the British Empire, will recognize in him a statesman, a noble man, a man who is determined to serve this country to the best of his power, and the interests of the people who have placed him in the distinguished position he occupies. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have made these remarks, feeling it my duty, as a humble representative of a rural constituency, to express my appreciation of the honest efforts the Government have made in constructing this tariff. I am sure that among the people of the Dominion generally the policy of the Government will meet with the same approval that was given it in several constituencies yesterday. Let me say also that should my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), in the course of events, be asked to appear again before the electors of that constituency, unless he makes up his mind to declare himself an out-and-out supporter of the Hon. Wilfrid Laurier, I have no doubt that we shall lose his musical voice in this Chamber. Sir, I do not for a moment fancy that he will do that, and it is very doubtful if he comes back again. He has furnished a good deal of amusement to the House, in times past, and if we have to bid him adieu, we can do so with a kind regard for the manner in which he has endeavoured to discharge his duties, and with a hope that whatever sphere of life he may be called upon to fill, he may prove successful.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 58) respecting the Temiscouata Railway Company.—(Mr. Domville.)

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, in continuing the debate on this question which has engaged our attention for the last few days, I desire to do so very briefly, and to point out a few facts in connection with it that I think should receive our attention. But before going into the subject proper, I wish to say, in replying to some of the observations made by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), whom I regret is not in his place, that if he had been thoughtful or considered for a moment what he was saying, he would scarcely have used the language which he did. He said: It is quite clear that the elections of Winnipeg, of Macdonald and of Prince County, Prince Edward Island, understand it—speaking of the tariff—because they have returned members to support this Government. I take the members for Winnipeg and Macdonald. Hon. gentlemen who were in the House for some years past must remember the petitions that came here from time to time on behalf of the people of that distant country. What were their requests made from the Government, and how far have those requests been granted? For if they have not been granted, it would scarcely justify a verdict in favour of the plea that the Government carried the elections on the basis of the tariff. I jotted down on the spur of the moment a few of the demands they made, and which from time to time they have urged to be granted. They demanded better freight rates. Has the Government given better freight rates by the tariff? It does not touch the question at all; it is not natural that it should do so, and the Government has in no way dealt with the question since they came into power, and therefore freight rates remain the same. They demanded the removal of duties on agricultural implements, as being one of the necessaries of life in that agricultural country. But the tariff does not reduce the duty; it allows them to remain as under the old tariff, and therefore there is no concession in the interest of Manitoba and the North-west in that direction. It is true that the hon. member for North Wellington, speaking of the general tariff, pointed out that reductions would be made under the favoured-nation clause, that the duties on English goods would have an advantage of one-eighth the first year and another eighth the second year, or altogether one-fourth. But how will this benefit the North-west? They do not bring in agricultural implements from England, which is the only country that will benefit under the favoured-nation clause. Then they demanded the duty on barbed wire to be taken off. They have received a slight advantage in that direction and abolition of the balance of the duty on the 1st of January, 1898. They also demanded the removal of the duty on binding twine. There is a reduction for the present year and there will be a greater reduction next year. They demanded the removal of the duty on coal oil. The duty has been reduced one cent per gallon. On these three lines the Government have partially met the request of the people of the North-west, but only on these lines, and they must be considered as of minor importance compared with the balance of the tariff. The people of the North-west also wanted cheaper

cotton. But the duties on those articles have been raised. It is true we may get cheaper cottons from England by and by, but at the present time the duties must be considered as having been increased. Further, they wanted the duties removed from dressed and undressed lumber. No change has been made under the tariff, as under the favoured-nation clause England will be unable to take advantage in this respect. Considering these facts, it is unreasonable to say that the people of Manitoba and the North-west are satisfied with the tariff ? It cannot be so, and we must look for another reason why candidates have been elected to support the present Government. I consider the decision of the electors was largely given on account of the settlement of the school question, because the people of that country were very greatly interested in that question and are not entirely dissatisfied, although they complain, of the settlement effected. The hon. gentleman should go over the subject again, and reconsider the reasons he has put forward.

The hon. gentleman said that industries of the country had been struck by the tariff. No doubt such is the case, or there would not be deputations here asking for items to be reconsidered. The tariff has injured several interests so as to compel manufacturers to close their doors. I have here a Montreal paper which mentions several establishments that have been closed. Here is a sample :

> But if the cotton men look with uncertainty to the future, it is still worse with the wire industry. The Dominion Wire Company, whose works are at Lachine, closed down the barb-wire department on Saturday afternoon, and the key will be turned in the other branches of business as soon as the company have worked off what raw material they had in hand. In fact, the darkest view of the case was taken in the office of the company on Saturday afternoon. They state that at their Lachine works 250 hands will be thrown out of employment, and a great many of these men have been with the company since they started operations. It will be most gratifying to the tariff reformers, that not only will the twelve barb-wire factories be closed down, but that even as early as Saturday a representative of the Consolidated Steel Company, of Pittsburg, was in Montreal, prepared to gobble up the trade that Hon. Mr. Fielding had so proudly placed within their grasp.

There is no wonder that manufacturing industries were struck by the tariff. They were, however, struck in the wrong way, in such a manner as to take employment from our people and from our wage-earners, to whom it should be the duty of the Government to give all employment possible.

The hon. member for North Wellington said the bounty system is the proper system to compensate iron manufacturers. Only a year or two ago that hon. gentleman strongly condemned the bounty system when the late Government introduced provisions for the granting of bounties in connection with the manufacture of iron, but now he declares that this is the proper system. What was wrong two years ago cannot be right to-day. The hon. gentleman must either have a bad memory, or he must be very inconsistent. If it was an evil then, I am sure it is an evil at the present time.

The hon. gentleman went on to say that the proper way to collect duties is by a revenue tariff. The claim is made that this is a revenue tariff, and that the distinction between this tariff and the old tariff is that the protectionist feature has been abolished. I take issue with my hon. friend on those grounds. I hold that the proper principle on which to frame a tariff is not on the revenue principle. Why do I say so ? Because it means that when a revenue tariff is established taxes must be placed on necessaries of life that come in from other countries and which cannot be raised or manufactured here. Why ; because, if they cannot be made or raised, and are consumed and imported, there is a duty paid on them, and that duty means revenue. Sir, that will result in what the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) did when he was in power in 1874, namely, the placing of a duty on tea, on coffee, on rice, and upon these lines that cannot be made or raised in Canada. That is a revenue tariff, but it is not raising a revenue tariff to put a duty upon goods that can be produced in Canada. Such a duty is put on for protective purposes so as to shut out foreigners and to give Canadian manufacturers and Canadian labourers employment at home. Therefore, the tariff now proposed cannot fairly be claimed to be a revenue tariff. So far as the first features of it are concerned, it is as protective as was the late tariff, and when hon. gentlemen opposite say that their new tariff is the proper system upon which to raise a revenue, they either do not understand the principle of a revenue tariff, or else they do not understand the principle of protection.

I hold that the proper principle upon which to raise our revenue is to raise it upon the lines of goods that can be made and produced in Canada, for if we make these goods and raise these goods, then we do not require to bring them from abroad. But, sometimes outsiders will send their goods in here when they find it a better market than the market at home, and so they are obliged to pay duty on them, and that duty makes up our revenue. That is the difference between a revenue and a protective tariff. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) said, that every particle of protection was taken out of the tariff, but he ought to know that protection is not removed by any means through lowering the duty 1 or 2 per cent. Protection applies, rather to the class of goods a duty is levied on than to the rate of duty charged in the tariff.

I shall now, Mr. Speaker, deal with the financial statement for a minute both as

regards the future and as regards the past. The Finance Minister told us, that in the year 1895-96 we raised, in round numbers, $36,618,000 from our tariff and other sources of revenue, and that we spent $36,949,000; that in 1896-97 we raised,—or will when the year has closed—we will raise, according to his calculation, $37,300,000, and we will spend $37,850,000. Therefore, for the first year these hon. gentlemen are in power, they have increased the expenditure, and for the second year of their regime they propose to raise $37,500,000 and to spend $38,250,000. Let me direct the attention of the House to this condition of things. Before these hon. gentlemen obtained power, they told the people that they were too heavily taxed, that our public expenditure was too heavy, and that if they were given the task of governing the country they would reduce, through economy, the expenditure by at least three or four million dollars. Such statements were made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen). Now, Sir, did the people of the country believe these statements? If they believed them and returned the Reform party to power to make retrenchments, then the people were sadly deceived because the Liberals have not reduced the expenditure, and they do not propose to reduce it. The hon. Minister (Sir Richard Cartwright) told us a few nights ago, that in the very nature of things it could not be expected that the expenditure would be very much reduced, and that for some years it would be in the neighbourhood of from $38,000,000 to $40,000,000 a year. Sir, the people have been promised economy by this Government, and they must be disappointed now when they find that there is to be no decrease in the taxation.

On the other hand, the Liberals before they attained power, claimed that we were raising more money from the people than we should raise to carry on the affairs of the country. Well, Sir, these hon. gentlemen have had an opportunity of showing their hand, and instead of decreasing the amount raised from the people, they propose to increase it, and to spend as much as their predecessors in office did, or in fact a little more. There are two things in connection with this which attracts our attention. First, these hon. gentlemen when in Opposition, either believed that they were right or they believed that they were wrong. If they were as intelligent as men who aspire to govern a country ought to be, they should know what the necessities of the country were, and if they believed that this economy could be made and they have not made it, then they misled the people for they have not carried out their pledges, and they are unworthy of public confidence. Will they state now, that they did know it but tried to deceive the people; or will they say, that they had not intelligence enough to know it, and they find now they were mistaken. In either case they merit the loss of the confidence of the people. Another point in connection with this matter is: The Government came to power pledged to economy, but they have not exercised that economy, or else their judgment was bad; because the expenditure under their rule is as large or larger, than it was under Conservative rule. They came to power declaring, that they would reduce taxation; but as I have shown, they propose to raise as much as their predecessors did, and consequently they cannot reduce the taxes of the people. They told us, that tariff reform was to bring about reduced taxation and destroy the protective principle. Now, the tariff reform which they have made has not destroyed the protective principle, because practically the protective principle is in the new general tariff which we must have in operation for some time. They came to power declaring that they would relieve the farmer of the onerous duties he was obliged to pay on the commodities he uses, but they have not reduced the duties on farm implements, and therefore the farmers of Canada must lose confidence in their pledges. They told us, that they were to relieve the manufacturer by giving him his raw material free, such as coal and iron. Well, the duty on coal is the same as it was before, and although they have partly reduced the duty on iron, it is not free iron by any means. Therefore, these gentlemen opposite have not kept their word in that respect. It is true they have done something for the miners of the country, and for that I commend them. They allow miners to bring in their machinery free, but in proportion as that machinery is brought in free, they strike the Canadian manufacturers; and I think the home manufacturers should have some consideration.

I come now to an analysis of the tariff that is presented to us. We have practically two tariffs in the Budget; the first which comes under schedule "A" and the second which comes under schedule "D." The first is the general tariff, and I shall refer presently to what the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) said that tariff is to be. Last night the Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson) read the declaration of the principles of the Liberal party when they would come into power, and I shall beg leave to refer to it briefly. Here is what they said they would do:

> We, the Liberal party in Canada in convention assembled, declare that the customs tariff of the Dominion should be based, not as it is now upon protective principles, but upon the requirements of the country.

They say in their platform, that it should not be based upon protective principles, but the Finance Minister told us that the new

tariff is largely on the principle of the old tariff, and therefore it cannot be other than protective in its principles. They told us :

That the existing tariff is, founded upon an unsound principle——

The unsound principle in the old tariff was protection, and yet the Finance Minister tells us that the old tariff is largely the one which this Government has adopted. It was on an unsound principle before, but they have not changed that principle ; therefore, they have not kept faith with the country. Then, it says, that this tariff, based on this unsound principle, has produced these evils :

It has developed monopolies, trusts and combinations ;
It has decreased the value of farm and other landed property ;
It has oppressed the masses to the enrichment of a few ;
It has checked immigration ;
It has caused great loss of population ;
It has impeded commerce ;
It has discriminated against Great Britain ;
All of which evils must continue to grow in intensity as long as the present tariff system remains in force.

And yet, notwithstanding all these evils here enumerated, the Minister declares that the tariff is very much as it was before in the first schedule, which is the principal one and the one under which we will operate for some time to come.

That the highest interests of Canada demand a removal of this obstacle to our country's progress.
That it should be so adjusted as to make free, or bear as lightly as possible upon, the necessaries of life, and should be so arranged as to promote free trade with the whole world, more particularly with Great Britain and the United States.
We denounce the principle of protection as radically unsound, and unjust to the masses of the people, and we declare our conviction that any tariff changes based on that principle must fail to afford any substantial relief from the burdens under which the country labours.

If they have based their new tariff, and according to the hon. Minister's declaration they have, upon exactly the same principle, then it must fail to bring relief to the people of Canada, according to his argument.

Now, I have a word to say on what the hon. Minister is pleased to call the general tariff, because we have practically two tariffs. In my judgment it deviates very slightly from the old protective tariff, and so far as it keeps close to that line, I confess I admire it, and have not much complaint to make with it. The changes they have made are in my opinion in the wrong direction, though they will not much disturb the business of the country. But in all the glamour with which this general tariff has gone out to the world, many people have lost sight of the other part, which gives special privileges to other countries. I candidly believe that as time advances, and the operation of that tariff becomes better known, you will hear a very widespread complaint against it. Now, we have the tariff of to-day, which is a protective tariff. The hon. gentlemen were to do away with protection. The hon. Finance Minister admits that himself. He says in his own speech :

But with the exception of these articles to which I shall refer as I proceed, I have to tell the House that it is not the intention of the Government—speaking of the question generally, and not with reference to any particular article—to propose any great reduction in the tariff as applied to those countries which are not disposed to trade with us. We propose, therefore, to have a general tariff, and that general tariff will be, to a large extent, the tariff of to-day.

Then, I say, it is a protective tariff, and to that extent I admire it and have very little complaint to make of it. But the hon. gentleman says they are fulfilling their pledges. Is that a fact ? What did the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) say in my constituency in 1896. He said :

I stand by the declaration I have made, that protection is nothing more nor less than deliberate, legalized and organized robbery, and, more than that, if you do not stamp it out, it is the very high road to political slavery first, and industrial slavery afterward.

What did he say at Chatham ? He said :

That is very largely due to a most vicious system of legislation, under which the whole fiscal system of Canada has become an instrument of legalized robbery on a scale and to an extent absolutely unprecedented in the history of any other country so young as our own.

He said further :

Our policy is death to protection and war to the knife to corruption. Sir, we strike, and we will strike, for liberty and freedom from this system of protective taxation ; and I tell the hon. gentleman that we will not rest until the slavery that they have imposed upon us has become a thing of the past, and until Canadians are as free as Canadians ought to be free to make the most they can of the opportunities God has given them.

Yet the hon. Minister of Finance tells us it is the same tariff, with the exception of a few changes to do away with some of its enormities. Then the hon. member for South Oxford, speaking of the taxation of the people, said :

We pay 31 or 32 million dollars of taxes every year into the Treasury, and we are really taxed to the tune of 50 or 60 millions a year, counting what we pay to the legalized robbers, whose hands are never out of our pockets at your down-sitting or your up-rising, whether you eat, or drink, or work, or play, or sleep, or fall sick even.

He says, put us into power and we will change it all ; and yet the Finance Minister says that the tariff under which we are

going to operate is largely the tariff of to-day. What will the country say about the hon. member for South Oxford? They will say that he was either wrong then or is wrong now, that he was dishonest either then or now, that he either misled the people or was misled himself, and did not know what the necessities of the country were; because now that he is charged with responsibilities of Government, he finds that he cannot carry out his promises. If that tariff was taking $60,000,000 out of the people before, it will do it again. I say that so far as the general tariff is concerned, the people of the country were misled, and they have a right to call the hon. gentleman to account for it.

The hon. member for North Wellington said this afternoon that the system by which the duties are levied is wrong: it should be the ad valorem system instead of the specific. I confess that my examination of this subject leads me to the conclusion that there are strong arguments in favour of the ad valorem system, and perhaps equally strong arguments in favour of the specific system. It is much easier and occasions less difficulty to the importer to collect the duties on the specific principle than on the ad valorem system, because everybody knows exactly what the amount of the duty is, and it is not necessary to keep an army of men to ascertain the values of the goods where made. But the hon. member for North Wellington advocates the ad-valorem principle because he says it takes less money from the people. As an illustration of the working of the ad valorem principle, I find that a student of a medical college in Montreal the other day sent abroad for a book that he wanted. What is the taxation on that book on the ad valorem principle? $1.30. What was it on the old principle? Thirty-six cents. How has the ad valorem principle improved that man's finances or taken less money out of his pocket? If that was the purpose of the ad valorem principle, it has proved a failure in this instance. This is an illustration of what the ad valorem principle may do when improperly applied, and what the specific principle may do when properly applied. Now, the hon. Finance Minister said, and the statement was repeated by his friends, that our classification of goods was wrong and that in the new tariff there was an improvement in that respect. Well, the classification in this tariff is not materially different from that of the late tariff. If the late tariff classification was wrong, why did not hon. gentlemen opposite change it, and in not changing it they fail to come up to the expectations of their supporters.

There is another feature of this tariff to which I shall for a moment call attention. There are one or two articles which hon. gentlemen opposite have not touched and which, judging by the explanations they have made, I fear they will not be inclined to touch this session. There is the export duty on logs. I live in a part of the country which feels this evil very much—that is the right to send our logs out of Canada to the United States without any export duty being charged, and the right to send pulp wood out of this country free of duty. We have only a limited timber area to-day, especially of white pine. That wood is becoming more and more valuable every year. The people to the south of us are anxiously looking to us for that lumber, and they will be obliged to come here for it at no matter what price. Years ago I urged that an export duty should be put on logs. I have always blamed our friends because they did not do so, and I was in hopes that the new men would profit by the experience of the past and move in this direction. But they tell us they are not prepared to put an export duty on logs or pulp wood, although, if they did, they would be the means of bringing hundreds of thousands of dollars of capital from the other side to be invested in the sawing of lumber on this side, and this would give employment to our own people. I trust, therefore, that these hon. gentlemen will reconsider that point and decide to put an export duty on logs.

Let me now proceed to an analysis of the tariff. The hon. Finance Minister has told us that they have a general and a special tariff, and that the Liberal party are pledged to tariff reform. But when we examine this general tariff, we find that in it there is no such thing as tariff reform. A few items are changed from specific to ad valorem duties and a few lines are increased and some others lowered. I remember the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) spending an hour, during the session before last, in attempting to prove that the people of this country were imposed upon by the very high duties on cotton, and he did this, although he is said to be one of the men who inspired this tariff. But, Mr. Speaker, the duties on cotton are higher in the general tariff of this Government than they were before, and higher on the same line of cottons on which the hon. gentleman declared the duties were too high. We have also heard the hon. gentleman who now fills the Chair of Speaker (Mr. Edgar) prove conclusively to his own mind that the cotton manufacturers of this country were impoverishing the people and enriching themselves by means of the too high duties imposed. And yet, these duties have been raised still higher.

I come now to the subject of the reciprocal tariff. The first question I ask is, have we the constitutional right to make such a tariff? I endeavoured to elicit that information from the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) the other night, but I regret to say that the very dignified and courteous reply I got, was: Oh, we were not born yesterday. That

is a self-evident fact, and therefore did not require any information from the hon. gentleman to make us aware of it. But the other is not a self-evident fact, and to my mind it was a very pertinent question on which the House should be informed. If these hon. gentlemen have consulted British authorities and obtained a reply, the House ought to know it. That would not be giving away state secrets which must be kept sacred until the negotiations are completed, because there are no negotiations going on between this country and Great Britain with regard to this question. Any information which they may have obtained from the authorities in Great Britain as to their right to make this special tariff should have been given to this House. It is the right of Parliament to expect it and the duty of Parliament to demand it, and these hon. gentlemen are doing less than their duty when they refuse to give it. I do not think it adds to the dignity of a Minister of the Crown to reply in the peevish fashion he did to a pertinent question of this kind, and I do not think that it adds to his credit in the country. If we believed what we have heard lately, we must conclude that we have not the right to make that tariff. While I do not intend to say very much on this question, I cannot refrain from reading clause 15 of the Belgian treaty which is the one that applies to this matter in the case of the most-favoured-nations :

Article XV. The produce or manufacture of Belgium, shall not be subject in the British colonies to higher duties than those imposed on goods of British origin.

Now, British and Belgian goods come in to-day at the same duties. Will the Belgian goods be subject to higher duties or not ? The hon. Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson) said undoubtedly they will. Then, I say, that will be a deliberate violation of that article of the treaty, so far as I can understand it. Lord Ripon said, in answer to the report made by Lord Jersey regarding the Colonial Conference, which was held in this city in 1894 :

Clause 15 in the Belgian, and clause 17 in the German, treaty do not prevent differential treatment by the United Kingdom in favour of the British colonies, they do not prevent differential treatment by the British colonies in favour of each other, but they do prevent differential treatment by the British colonies in favour of the United Kingdom.

Will the hon. gentleman answer that by saying that this is not a differential tariff ? That may be the case in the sense that it make the same offer to Belgium as to England and every other country, but what is the spirit of the Belgian treaty ? Belgium says : We entered into that treaty long ago, in the year 1862, and under it we were to have the right to put our goods into any British colony at the same rates of duty as English goods. Have we that right under this tariff ? The reply is, of course, certainly not. But hon. gentlemen opposite say : We have made them an offer contingent on their doing something. What is that something ? It is that they reduce their tariff to us. But, Mr. Speaker, there is no contingency in this Belgian treaty. That treaty secures to Belgium absolutely the right to enter her goods into British colonies at the same rate of duties as English goods, and they can safely say to us : We are not called upon to regard any contingency. We demand the advantages we secured under that tariff in 1862, and we have a right to demand them. And what is the result ? The Belgian consul in Montreal says: We expect your customs collector to understand it, and not to charge higher duties on Belgian goods than are charged on those of England. If he does not understand it, we can only apply to our home government, give them the information and let them do as they like. I think this is a deliberate violation of that clause of the Belgian treaty ; and, if so, it is a violation of article 7 of the German treaty, because it is practically the same. What does that mean ? Either the goods from other countries, come under the lower tariff or they do not. If they do not, then we violate one of the treaty obligations of England ; and it is said and very properly said, in effect, that as soon as a nation disregards its own treaties it practically declares war against the nation aggrieved. If a nation does not respect its own treaties, its national word is worth nothing, and this must lead to trouble. If the goods of these countries do come in at a reduction under the new tariff as we believe they have a right to come in, what does that mean ? It means that we are going to receive at the lower rates the goods from the Argentine Confederation, Austria, Hungary, Belgium, Bolivia, Chili, Colombia, Corea, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, German Zollverein, Liberia, Madagascar, Morocco, Muscat, Persia, Portugal, Russia, Sandwich Islands, Siam, South African Republic, Spain, Sweden and Norway, Swiss Confederation, Tunis, Uruguay, and Venezuela. It means that the goods from those countries must come in under the lower tariff if we are to observe the favoured-nation clause, and I do not see how we are to get round it. It seems that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce is not very strong in his conviction, that we have the right, because, in speaking of that he says "that it will be found that the passage of the tariff we have at one and the same time rung the death-knell of protection." We have done that, but we have done more than that. He said that the ex-Finance Minister asked for a precedent but that it was utterly unprecedented.

I believe the world will agree with him in that. But it would be better if there was a precedent. He says further :

As to England, I submit that the case is very different. Our Government intend to bring the

matter of our relation with Great Britain to a head,——

He is not satisfied.

--and if the Opposition in this House possess real courage and patriotism, they will accept the advice tendered to them by the London "Times." I say, Sir, that, instead of carping at the proposal, they should be glad to help it forward. Sir, in time past these hon. gentlemen have made every hustings ring, have made the floors of Parliament ring, with their professions of loyalty and devotion to the old flag. They have a chance to prove their loyalty now. They have repeatedly declared their desire to show independence of the United States. They have declared, some of them, that they wished Canada would assert herself. Canada is asserting herself now. Let them stand by us, shoulder to shoulder, and help us to assert ourselves in the eyes of the world.

It seems he is not certain whether we can do so or not, but he has taken the ground that we should take action first, and find out afterwards whether we can carry it out. He has taken a leap in the dark, and does not know what the consequences of that leap may be. There is one feature of this matter that attracted my attention. They have amongst them Sir Oliver Mowat as Minister of Justice. He is regarded as a high legal authority. When he was Premier of Ontario he had a great deal to do with some questions concerning which absolute knowledge was not in his possession. Take, for instance, the temperance question. Did he first pass a prohibition law and say: We will see whether we have the right to pass it or not. No. He said: We do not know whether we have the right to enact a prohibitory law or not. We do not want to throw the country into confusion, and so we will submit the question to the highest authority, and if they decide that we have the power to act, we will act. But this is a comparatively small matter beside the one that is now before us. This may mean a disturbance of international trade and of the relations between England and her colonies, and between England and other countries. It means a great disturbace of trade with our own country. But, still, hon. gentlemen opposite, think it is not worth while to ascertain whether they have a right to adopt any such legislation as this or not. They proceed to act first, and the country may take the consequences.

We have heard a great deal of what the British papers have said in eulogy of what the Canadian Government has done. I do not wonder at it. We have given them concessions in our market for which they give us nothing in return. Would not any nation eulogize a people that would do that for them? In the generosity of their heart the British people are aiming at free trade the world over. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) says that this tariff is a step in the direction of free trade. Its effect is to give the British producer a larger market. That being so, why should they not be pleased? Standing here I put myself in a position second to none in my loyalty to the mother country. But my loyalty does not lead me to give away the rights of the people I represent unless I get something in return. I want the mother country to give me something in return for what I give her. We are charged here with a certain duty. What is it? To look after the interests of the people of Canada. The Scripture says: "He that provideth not for his own is worse than an infidel who denies the faith." We are told that England is pleased with this concession. Why should she not be pleased? She gets from us a concession she never got before. She is reaching after the ideal of the Cobden Club. Few countries have done for her what we have done; I do not wonder that she is pleased. But we have no right to give away Canada's estates and rights, which are valuable to her, without getting something in return. We as Canadians are willing to do our duty, but we should not be called upon to do more than our duty. Now, assuming that we have the right to make this tariff, I come to the second phase of it. What does it mean? It means that within a year from 30th of next June, at latest, a tariff change will commence that will reduce our revenue by $3,782,000 a year, according to our importations of the last year or two. Now, that has got to be made up in some way. It can only be made up, as my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has said, by increased importations in these lines or a higher duty on some other lines of goods. Assume that there are to be increased importations? What does that mean to the manufacturers of Canada? It means the killing off of some of their industries. It means an increase in the importation of cotton, which will strike at the cotton man. It means an increase in the importations of woollens, which will strike at the woollen men. Representatives of lines say that they cannot stand it if the tariff is reduced. Now, we take the first year. A reduction of one-eighth in the tariff, according to the importations of the present year, would mean a falling off of $1,891,000 of revenue. Then it is a serious drawback to the raising of a revenue in that respect; but on the other hand, if it brings in goods enough to make it up, then it is a very serious thing for the manufacturers of the country. Now, what does it mean to the manufacturers of the country? They think they are barely able now to live under the tariff that has been in force, which is a protective tariff. Well, it means that the tariff will be lowered to three-fourths of what it is to-day, or one-fourth inside of two years. What does it mean to the farmers of the country? Let me show the change that it will make in some of the principal articles of produce:

	Old Tariff.	New Tariff.
Apples	40c. per brl.	30c. per brl.
Beans	15c. per bush.	11½c. per bush.
Buckwheat	10c. do	7½c. do
Pease	10c. do	7½c do
Potatoes	15c. do	11½c. do
Rye	10c. do	7½c. do
Rye flour	50c. per brl.	37½c. per brl.
Hay	$2.00 per ton.	$1.50 per ton.
Barley	30c. per bush.	22½c. per bush.
Meats	2c. per lb.	1½c. per lb.
Corn meal	40c.	18½c.
Oats	10c. per bush.	7½c. per bush.
Oatmeal	20 p. c.	15 p. c.
Wheat	15	8

Now, I would like to ask the Canadian farmer what it means to him. In 1879 we put a duty of about one and a half cents a pound on meats, but we found that the lowering in values on the other side was so great that the Americans commenced to send their meat into Canada in increasing quantities, until in 1890, they sent in thirty-three million pounds of meat to feed Canadians. We asked the Government to increase the duty, we asked it for two or three years, and they finally put it up about ½ a cent a pound, in round figures, and what was the result? Inside of one year it shut out fourteen million pounds of meat. But if the Government reduce it half a cent a pound to-day, as they do under that new schedule, provided the Americans do, then it must come in again. I would like the farmers to understand this, because it will mean a very serious thing to them when this new schedule gets to work. Then take corn. Corn is free to-day, but there was a duty put on corn in 1878 because it was coming in in large quantities, it was lowering the price of the Canadian farmers' coarse grains, of the Canadian farmers' oats, barley and pease. These are the coarse grains raised, at least, in my part of the country. Where the farmers turn their attention to feed solely, they want cheap feed; but the most of them have not reached that stage yet, like my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. McMillan). They have not yet become feeders of cattle solely, they are farmers in the agricultural sense of the word, and they are making their money largely out of coarse grains. Now, I say that free corn to-day must seriously reduce the value of their grains. What will be the effect in the western counties of Ontario, in Essex, and Kent and Middlesex and Brant? What will be the effect where they raise so much corn? I see the hon. member (Mr. Campbell) who lives at West Toronto Junction, dissents. Does he think that it will be all right? I think he has severed his connection with that part of the country, but if he is not interested in free corn, I would like to ask his farmer friends if they like it. When they only sold their corn for 19 and 20 cents this year, do they want to have free corn coming in from the other side?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Corn is two or three cents higher now.

Mr. SPROULE. It may be at the present time, but what has been the ruling price for the year? The farmers around Owen Sound know that at certain seasons of the year, during navigation Americans can bring in corn from Chicago for one or one and a half cents per bushel, at low freight rates. And when you can bring it in for a cent a bushel, it comes directly into competition with the peas of the farmers of Canada. There is no doubt of it. Peas are worth 40 cents per bushel there to-day, corn is worth 24 to 26 cents in Chicago, and can be laid down at 25¼ cents in Owen Sound during the season of navigation, if the freightage happen to be the same this year as in past years. If you can buy fifty-six pounds of corn for 25 cents, will you be likely to pay 40 cents for sixty pounds of peas? No, Sir; the hon. member for Huron would not do that, because he is feeding for the money he can get out of it; therefore, he is going to buy corn from the western United States farmers. That is going to take the place of the peas and the oats, and the barley, of the Canadian farmer. There is no doubt about it. I saw it done years ago in my own village, and it will be done again. There is no doubt that when the farmers come to see the operation of this tariff, and to feel its effects, they will not agree with the hon. gentlemen that it is to their advantage that they should have free corn. Then we are told that it is not going to be made free when used by distillers. Now, if they keep the duty on corn to the distillers, what will happen. The seedsmen in our country import corn and sell it to the farmers, and when they have a lot of it on hand, they will turn around and sell it to the distillers. What is to hinder them selling it to the distillers? Under the old system which allowed corn to be brought in free for seed, a declaration is made by the seedsmen in Toronto that the corn is to be used as seed, and the retail seedsmen sells them for that purpose, but when they have any left over it is sold for feed. And if it can be sold to the farmers for feed, what is to prevent them selling it to distillers? I have seen it brought in and come into competition with our own grain as food for the stock of the country, because the seedsmen brought it in and sold it for seed, and the farmers then turned round and used it for food. Now, what is to hinder the distillers getting their corn free in the same way? The farmers will have corn free, and the distillers as well. That corn-growing country in the west, where so many farmers live, will they be pleased? I do not think they will. I am quite sure they will not be pleased, therefore I say that does not satisfy our requirements. But this tariff will have serious effects in other ways. There was a barb wire factory shut down; there was a woollen factory in Perth closed down a few days ago, and another closed up in Peterboro,

I am told, by the change that was made in the tariff. When the manufacturers know the great change that is made and what it will mean to them, they will not be pleased. It will mean throwing out of employment hundreds of Canadian labourers, and sending our money to feed labourers in England and Germany, and other countries who are manufacturing goods for us. We as Canadians do not want that to be done. We want to give employment to labour at home, we want the labourers of our country to live and to keep their families alive in comfort. We want to give them fair wages, we want their wages to be spent in this country; therefore I say that if goods come in under that new schedule it is going to affect injuriously the manufacturers of this country. But we were told by the Finance Minister the other night that they have no right to expect very much from him, because he said that they got the benefits of the tariff while it was in force. He thinks these people have no right to look unpleasant, but that they must bear the consequences. Well, that is not a very agreeable thing to tell a man when he is losing his means of living, when he is losing the money that he has invested in manufactures. Therefore, I do not think that he will be very liable to praise the Government for the new tariff that they have given. I stand squarely upon the question of protection, as I have always stood. I believe it is the policy for Canada; I believe that the interests of Canada demand it as much to-day as it ever did, and I believe we will require it in the future. I am to-day unalterably on that platform, and I will remain there. So far as this tariff makes no changes in the old tariff I have little complaint to make, but in regard to the favoured-nation clause I take strong exception to it.

Finally, I will deal with two questions involved in these resolutions. There are two vicious and unsound principles in these tariff resolutions. The first is the granting of power to the Controller of Customs, subject to the Governor in Council, to say what countries shall have the advantage of the favoured-nation schedule. What does that mean? It means placing vast powers in the hands of the Controller of Customs. To my mind, it practically places in the hands of the Controller, subject to the Governor in Council, the right to make treaties. We do not, in this tariff, specify that if a certain duty is imposed on certain specified articles, and the country from which they come take off or reduce the duty on similar articles of ours going to their country, then we will make concessions to them as was the case with our offer of 1879 to the United States. We then provided that when the United States gave us the freedom of their market for certain articles, then we would give reciprocity in the articles affected. That was definite and specific, but this is neither definite nor specific. The British Parliament has never placed this power in the hands of the Governor in Council there. England has never given us the power to make treaties, which have to be made through England; but this Government is giving the Controller of Customs, governed by the action of the Governor in Council, the right to make treaties. He will consider whether Germany should come under the favoured-nation clause. He will say to that country: if you lower your duty to a certain extent, we will let you come in under the new tariff; if not, we will refuse you the benefit of the preferential clause. This action is not subject to the review of Parliament, but the Controller of Customs will have the power to take action, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council; in other words, the Governor in Council will have the right to make treaties with other countries, if my interpretation be correct. I hold it is correct. This I contend is a vicious and unsound principle; there is precedent for it; it is another leap in the dark, and it is a proposition which should not be allowed to pass this House.

The other vicious principle is that involved in the power given to the Governor in Council to say what articles are under combines, and what reductions should be made in the duty on the same class of articles coming from abroad, or whether the duties should be taken off absolutely. What does this involve? It says to every manufacturer that if you make any arrangement to raise the price, the Government can call you to account; they can bring you before them, and if on examination it is found that you have arranged your business or output with others in the same line so that the price is increased an Order in Council can be passed lowering the duty or placing said articles on the free list. That is taken from an American Act, which I remember reading a few years ago, but it involves a principle which has never been acknowledged here. It places in the power of the Governor in Council control over the manufacturers of the country, a power which might be used in the spirit of blackmail. They might bring manufacturers here and inform them that they had their line of business under review, and if they did not support the party pretty well, they would change the duty, but if they made peace with the Government, it would be all right. Parliament should not place in the hands of the Governor General in Council that power, for it would lead to evil most assuredly. Admitting that hon. gentlemen opposite might exercise this power properly, honourably and honestly, all governments might not so act, and perhaps the Government of the party with which I am connected might not act properly, and therefore I hold this power should not be conferred on any Administration. In that respect the tariff resolutions are entirely wrong, and this principle should

be changed. We should not place in the hands of the Controller of Customs, subject to the Governor in Council, the right to say what nation should come under the favoured-nation clause. Further, we should not give power to the Governor in Council to reduce or remove entirely duties on any articles as that body might see fit. As regards the tariff, in some respects I am satisfied with it. If the general tariff were allowed to remain, I should not have much complaint to make; but in regard to other features I am very much opposed to them on the grounds that they are not in the interest of Canada, that they are radically wrong and unsound in principle and that they are not what Canada requires. We require a protective tariff to-day as much as it ever was required in the history of the country, and in my opinion we should stand by such a tariff.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to discuss at any great length the merits of the tariff, and I shall devote my efforts largely to a discussion of a few features of it as those features affect Manitoba and the North-west Territories. Before, however, I enter upon a discussion of these points I wish to make one remark with respect to a statement made by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). The hon. gentleman spoke of his loyalty and with a great flourish he announced that he would take back water to no man in the Empire as regards his loyalty to the British Crown, and then he went on to say with respect to the tariff that his idea of loyalty was that he would give nothing unless he obtained something in return. It occurred to me that that was putting the question of loyalty on a dollar and cent basis, and I do not think it reflected very much credit on the sentiments expressed by the hon. gentleman. He seemed greatly disturbed because of the article which the London "Times" has published applauding Canada for its tariff, and he also sought to make some explanations with respect to the same. I will read, with the permission of the House, a despatch which appears in the "Globe" of to-day with respect to a motion of which notice has been given in the Imperial House by Sir Charles E. H. Vincent, and I call attention to the fact that that gentleman is a Conservative and a free trader. The motion reads as follows:—

The House expresses grateful and fraternal recognition to the Government and people of the Dominion of Canada of the generous fiscal changes in favour of British trade and labour, announced on Friday by the Parliament of Ottawa and already in force, and hopes this first step towards a commercial federation of the Empire will be followed by Australasia, South Africa and the other colonies.

The Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. J. O. Chamberlain, replying, said the Government cordially appreciated the friendly spirit shown by the tariff action of Canada.

I call particular attention to these remarks as coming from one of the foremost British statesmen in the British Empire.

But, he added, I understand the proposals do not depend upon any alteration of the system of free trade established in the United Kingdom.

Now, Sir, if you will permit me, I should like to supplement this motion with a poem which appears in the London "Times" from the pen of Rudyard Kipling, probably the future poet laureate of the British Empire:

A nation spoke to a nation,
A queen sent word to a throne:
Daughter am I in my mother's house,
But mistress in my own.
The gates are mine to open
As the gates are mine to close,
And I set my house in order,
Said the Lady of the Snows.

Neither with laughter nor weeping,
Fear or the child's amaze,
Soberly under the white man's law
My white men go their ways.
Not for the gentile's clamour,
Insult or threat of blows,
Bow we the knee to Baal,
Said our Lady of the Snows.

My speech is clean and single,
I talk of common things,
Words of the wharf and market-place
And the ware the merchant brings.
Favour to those I favour,
But a stumbling-block for my foes,
Many there be that hate us,
Said our Lady of the Snows.

I called my chiefs to council,
In the din of a troubled year,
For the sake of a sign ye could not see,
And a word ye would not hear.
This is our message and answer,
This is the path we chose,
For we be also a people,
Said our Lady of the Snows.

Carry the word to my sisters,
To the Queens of the East and South.
I have proved faith in the heritage
By more than the word of mouth.
They that are wise may follow,
Ere the world's war trumpet blows,
But I, I am the first in the battle,
Said our Lady of the Snows.

A nation spoke to a nation,
A queen sent word to a throne:
Daughter am I in my mother's house,
But mistress in my own.
The gates are mine to open
As the gates are mine to close,
And I abide by my mother's house,
Said our Lady of the Snows.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I shall discuss the tariff especially from the point of view of Manitoba and the North-west Territories. I may say at the outset that when I decided to enter parliamentary life, and when I went into the constituency of Lisgar, I told the farmers of that county on every platform: Gentleman, it makes no difference to you whether the Government in power at Ot-

tawa is labelled Grit or Tory; but it does make a great difference to you whether that Government shall do right or do wrong by you. I said to them: Gentlemen, you have been persistently misrepresented at Ottawa for the last fifteen years; the men whom you sent as your delegates always failed to tell the House of Commons and to tell the people of the country what the disabilities were under which you laboured. I said, further: Gentleman, if you send me to Ottawa, whether it be a Conservative Government or a Liberal Government that is in power, I shall stand up and tell them what I think your wants are. It is because of that pledge that I address this House to-night.

An hon. MEMBER. What about Bob Watson?

Mr. RICHARDSON. A worthy member calls my attention to the fact that there was an exception to the Manitoba representation in the case of the Hon. Robert Watson. I am pleased to stand corrected, because all will bear witness that Mr. Watson was a faithful representative of Manitoba in this Parliament

I am here, in some respects, in a different position from many other members. I had a Patron opposed to me until a short time before the election. He, however, was a Conservative Patron, and when it was pointed out to him that if he remained in the field he would jeopardise the chances of the Conservative candidate—my opponent, he goodnaturedly decided to retire from the contest, and leave a straight fight between the president of the Conservative Association of Manitoba and myself. I said to the Patrons, and I said to the Liberals, and to all who attended my meetings: Gentlemen, I am not obliged to make any professions with regard to Patronism, but I pledge you my word that if you elect me to the House of Commons I, at least, will be as good a Patron as will be sent to the House from any part of Canada; and I hope, before I have concluded, Mr. Speaker, that you and the House will agree with me that I have redeemed my pledge in that regard.

I want to say a word with regard to the west. It has been the custom for many years to regard the people of the west as chronic kickers, and daily I hear the epithet used. It has been the custom to consider that we in the west are always desiring more than the people of the east consider to be our share. Well, Sir, the people of the west have laboured under great disabilities, and to these I wish to address myself briefly. I consider it to be my duty to speak of these things, because we in the west who have been pioneers, we in the west who have borne the burden and heat of the day, are but trustees for eastern Canada for the care and development of that country. We have not had that development in the west which we should have had. I was pained indeed to hear the Hon. Mr. Sifton, now Minister of the Interior, at a banquet tendered him in the city of Winnipeg, declare that during the last ten years as many people had left the province of Manitoba as had come into it. That is a deplorable condition of affairs, and it behooves the members of this Parliament to turn their attention to it, and to find out what the reasons for it are. When we think of the glowing pictures that were drawn in regard to the progress of that country some twelve or fifteen years ago, we must all agree that its condition to-day is a great disappointment to our people. The people of that country endure many hardships. They have no coal worth speaking of, and wood is scarce. In the severe cold of the winter many a farmer is obliged to drive twenty or twenty-five miles for a load of wood. It is all very well to talk about the people of the west being constantly complaining, but I am sure the House will agree with me that they have many reasons to complain, and if they had not, Manitoba would now be one of the most thickly populated provinces of the Dominion, for it certainly has rare natural advantages, and a soil than which there is none more fertile on the face of the earth. Notwithstanding that, it must be confessed with humiliation that our province has not made the progress we expected. The country is inland, far removed from eastern Canada, and is therefore entitled to special consideration. It has suffered very severely from heavy railway freights, and unfortunately there seems to be little prospect of obtaining relief in that respect. Many of us have come to think that Manitoba and the west should receive special treatment, and that it might be the part of wisdom for this Government to deal in a particular manner with the province of Manitoba, even if we were to go the length of giving it a special tariff.

My own view with regard to the settlement of that country is that the best immigration policy is to make the settlers happy and contented. My deep and abiding conviction is that 5,000 happy, contented and prosperous settlers in that province are worth more than the expenditure of $1,000,000 a year to bring immigrants from foreign countries. If you do not make the people who live there happy and contented, they will leave the country, and they will write to their friends warning them against going there. I repeat, Sir, that the true immigration policy is to make the settlers of the west contented and happy. It is not our country, Mr. Speaker; it is your country: it belongs to the Dominion of Canada at large. The Dominion of Canada has a very great stake in that country; and in considering this question, I think all true statesmen and friends of Canada will be disposed to meet together and devise means for the development and up-building of that

country, and rendering its people contented and happy.

At the last general election the people of that country looked forward to a possible change in their political representatives, and it was with considerable regret when the polls closed on the 23rd of June, that we in the west had to recognize the fact that we had not sent a solid delegation against the late Government which had so mismanaged affairs in Manitoba and the North-west. But, Sir, this House and the country are well aware why we were not able to send that solid delegation. We were practically taken by the throat and throttled, the ballot-boxes were stuffed, and a special effort was made to send members to this House who would vote for the coercion of the province of Manitoba. But I ask you and the House to look at the result of the polling in Manitoba yesterday, when nearly 1,200 majority was given in the city of Winnipeg in favour of the Liberal candidate and this Government, and between 300 and 400 majority was given in the constituency of Macdonald for the Liberal candidate there. I think that is the best vindication that the province of Manitoba requires.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I promised to refer to a few of the disabilities under which that province laboured, and I will do so. Let me briefly call the attention of the House to the tariff as it existed, and as I regret to say it still exists, on fruits. The amount of duty paid on fruits at Winnipeg last year was $58,000. Peaches to the value of $6,063 paid a duty of $2,223; plums to the value of $6,727 paid a duty of $1,681; pears to the value of $4,134 paid a duty of $827; strawberries to the value of $2,299 paid a duty of $502; cherries to the value of $768 paid a duty of $138; grapes to the value of $3,086 paid a duty of $1,333; lemons to the value of $31,000 paid a duty of $3,423. It will surprise the House to know that the people of that country pay as much as five cents for a single peach and from five to seven cents for a single pear; and the folly of protection on these articles will be illustrated when I point out that the duty affords very little protection to Ontario fruit, because the fruit imported from the United States is usually imported at a period when the Ontario fruit is not available, and in many cases the Ontario fruit would not stand the long railway or lake passage to that country. The duty on peaches is nineteen cents a box, and five cents on the box, which is no good. The duty on strawberries is two cents a pound, or six cents a box. There are children in Manitoba and the North-west who rarely, if ever, taste fruit at all. In country places it is rare to find any fruit ever brought into the home of the settler. On apples, the duty is forty cents a barrel, and that duty practically amounted to the value of a barrel of apples in Ontario last season. Apples are about the only fruit within the range of the farmers of Manitoba. To illustrate how we suffer in regard to fruit, I may say that one of my colleagues, I think the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis), made the statement to-day that a car-load of apples delivered in Prince Albert cost some $600 and of that entire amount the cost of the apples was but $136, the duty and freight amounting to nearly $500 on the car-load. Bananas are thirty-five cents a pound in the country. It takes about a bushel of wheat to purchase a pound of bananas.

I will invite your attention briefly to the duty on lumber. The high price of lumber practically compels farmers to live in that rigorous climate in poor houses, and without shelter for their stock. It is almost impossible for them to engage in mixed farming with lumber at the present price, because they cannot afford to buy lumber to construct byres for their cattle and other buildings necessary. Along the line of the Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway, rough lumber is from $3 to $7 per thousand cheaper than it is along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, owing to competition on these grades. The Premier of Manitoba, the Hon. Mr. Greenway, informed me the other day that he was able to bring in lumber from the United States and take it on the Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway to a point called Mariopolis, some twenty miles from his home, and then cart it that distance, and yet save $200 on the lumber required for his barn, as compared with the cost of Canadian lumber. Mr. Kenneth McKenzie, one of the pioneer settlers of Manitoba, the gentleman who was defeated by Dr. Rutherford in Macdonald yesterday, made the remarkable statement in Winnipeg to the tariff commissioners, the Minister of Finance and the Controller of Customs, that he had put up buildings twenty-four years ago with lumber which had to be floated down the Red River and that he had got it just as cheap as it was at present, with all the railway facilities that exist. I am sure you will agree with me that that is a remarkable state of affairs, and I would urge on the Government the desirability of revising its tariff with regard to lumber, and if possible reducing the duty and relieving the people of Manitoba and the North-west. Let me read in this connection a letter which I received two or three days ago from a constituent of mine:

Pilot Mound, April 14th, 1897.

R. L. Richardson, Esq., M.P.,
House of Commons, Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—Owing to so many manufacturers' deputations having met the Tariff Commissioners since Messrs. Fielding and Paterson met the western people, at Winnipeg, it has been deemed advisable that each delegate write to the M.P. for the constituency in which he resides, to press the claims of the farmers' delegation on the Government and the House at the revision of the tariff. It will not be necessary to go over the

whole ground again, and, to be short, I shall only emphasize one item. I will touch on lumber.

The early settlers obtained from the woods logs of sufficient size to construct houses for themselves and stables for their stock. This source of supply being limited, has been exhausted years ago. The farmer to-day has to use lumber, but, owing to a combine, prices are forced up, and farmers whose market towns are along the C.P.R. lines, cannot buy lumber at the same rates as those along the N.P.R. This fact was prominently brought out at the last session of the local House. The facts, so far as lumber is concerned, are as follows :—

The great majority of farmers are in need of lumber for stables, granaries and dwellings. New settlers on vacant, or partly improved, land, are in the same position. They have to use lumber or sods.

Twenty thousand farmers could expend $1,000 each in lumber, amounting in the aggregate to $20,000,000, and then not be half through building. This does not include what the new settlers that we expect, will require, neither does it include what would be used in building in cities and towns. Dairying and stock-farming are a necessity for profitable returns to the farmer. He requires buildings for live stock and buildings for his feed. Were the hon. commissioners to visit the farmers in Manitoba in February and March last, they would require no argument that this is a vital necessity.

At Swan Lake, on the N.P.R., the prices of lumber are as follows. These rates are lower than on the C.P.R. :—

	Price. Per M.	Duty. Per M.
Inch siding, No. 2.....	$21.00	$2.75
do do 1.....	26.00	4.00
Flooring, No. 2.....	21.00	2.75
do do 1.....	26.00	4.00
Dimension lumber.....	16.50	Free.
Shingles	2.50	Free.

I have also a copy of a letter which of itself clearly establishes a combine in lumber, besides what was proven before the commissioners in Winnipeg :

"Vancouver, B.C., March 15th, 1897.

"Messrs.....,

"....., Man.

"Gentlemen,—We shall be glad to quote for shingles, in reply to yours of the 9th inst. But must first ask if you are an active member of the Western Retail Lumberman's Association, of which we are honorary members.

"Yours truly,

"(Signed) E. H. HEAP & Co."

Here will be a chance to operate that provision with regard to crushing out combines. When the commissioners were in Manitoba, it was clearly proven that a combine existed in lumber in that country, and I hope that should evidence be furnished later on to prove that that combine still exists, the Government will take the matter into its serious consideration and crush out that combine by removing the duty on lumber. The writer continues :

The parties I got the letter from do not wish me to use their name. Like all business letters in up-to-date offices, it is type-written. I trust, and confidently expect, that the western members and the Government will do what is in the interest of the west, and that, as the Hon. Mr. Fielding remarked when closing the session at Winnipeg, that the revision of the tariff will be in the right direction.

The American lumberman obtains his logs practically from the same forests, whether those forests be in the Lake of the Woods country or B.C., one north, the other south of the boundary line. Why cannot the Canadian lumberman put lumber on the market at as low a rate as the American?

In the battle for a decent tariff, the west is watching you. I have no doubt but that the member for Lisgar will do his duty.

Yours truly,

D. A. STEWART.

Delegate for the Constituency of Mountain.

And now, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the point made about getting lumber from the province of British Columbia, I may reply that that seems almost hopeless in view of the high rates of freight which exists. I was informed by a gentleman who purchased the lumber that on one car which cost him $114, the freight alone was $147 or considerably more that the price of the lumber itself. The statement was freely made that lumber sells on an average $3 to $5 per thousand cheaper in Dakota and Minnesota than in Manitoba, and yet this lumber comes pretty much from the same source. I heard a very prominent farmer, named Ben Swanson of Manitou, make the statement before the tariff commission in Winnipeg that the cost of lumber used in a barn for which a neighbour had secured an estimate was for Canadian lumber $1,200, while he was able to procure the same lumber from the States for $800.

Now, I propose to refer very briefly to the question of coal oil. That, if you will allow me to make a pun, was a burning issue during the recent elections in Manitoba. The farmers who appeared at our meetings asserted with gravity and sincerity—and I have no reason whatever to doubt their statements—that coal oil can be bought in Pembina, a very short distance south of the international boundary line, for from 10 to 12½ cents per gallon, and it is retailed at Emerson, just a few hundred yards north of the international boundary line, on the Canadian side, at 35 cents. The average price throughout Manitoba and the Northwest is from 40 to 50 cents per gallon. It is only fair to say in this connection that six gallons of American oil are only equal to five gallons of Canadian oil, for the Canadian measure is Imperial and the other is wine measurement. To illustrate still more strongly how deeply that country suffers from the exorbitant price we pay for coal oil, I need only mention that it takes one bushel of wheat to buy one gallon of coal oil.

Mr. DUGAS. It will take two bushels under this last tariff.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Wheat is going up and coal oil is going down.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The price of wheat this last season was something over 60 cents, so that a bushel of wheat would purchase

more than a gallon of coal oil this season. As a matter of fact, farmer after farmer rose in our meetings throughout the province of Manitoba and declared that they were only able to secure one gallon of coal oil for one bushel of wheat. Owing to many considerations the price of wheat has been much higher this last season than it has been on an average for many years past. Of course the higher price of coal oil is not wholly due to the duty. We suffer especially in the matter of coal oil from the high freights. It is also fair to state that the retailer charges a very high profit on coal oil. We also suffer from the restriction in connection with the bringing in of coal oil in tank cars and also from the duty on barrels.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the difficulty about tank cars ?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I understood that there were certain restrictions in this respect, that we were not allowed to distribute the coal oil in the North-west in these tank cars—that we could not send a tank car, for instance, to Regina or Prince Albert. I believe American oil is barrelled before it comes in the country, and I think I am correct in saying that at least most of the Canadian coal oil is put in barrels in eastern Canada. I believe that, under the law and regulations, we are unable to distribute the imported product in tank cars throughout the country.

Mr. FRASER (East Lambton). If the hon. gentleman will permit me, I would state for the information of himself and other hon. members that the barrelling of coal oil for the North-west is done in Winnipeg. I would also like to say a word as to the price at Pembina, which, I think, he stated at 12½ cents, while the price a short distance away on the Canadian side is 35 cents. It is quite manifest that the price a short distance from the border on the Canadian side should be the price on the American side plus the duty. Now, 12½ cents plus 6 cents duty would be 18 cents if the gallons were the same.

Mr. WALLACE. It would be 5 cents duty, allowing for the wine gallon.

Mr. FRASER (Lambton). Yes, the imperial gallon is one-fifth larger than the wine gallon.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Continuing my remarks I may say that I was disappointed that the Government announced a reduction of only 1 cent per gallon on the duty on coal oil. We in the west had advocated free coal oil. I may say that I scarcely expected that we might be able to get it free, but we fondly hoped, at least, to have the duty cut in two. However, something has been promised us in regard to the removal of these restrictions ; and gentlemen connected with the coal oil trade inform me that the removal of these restrictions will represent a further reduction of 1½ cents or 1¾ cents per gallon. Assuming this to be correct the change amounts almost to cutting the duty in two. I sincerely hope it will be so. I have just one brief observation with regard to the coal oil industry itself. The petroleum produced from the Canadian oil fields, as it comes from the earth is inferior to the American article. I am informed that it is supercharged with sulphur, the extraction of which is a very costly process to which the American crude oil has not to be subjected.

I come now to deal with the question of agricultural implements. The figures I will quote were given before the Tariff Commission when it sat in Winnipeg, and I have no reason to believe that they are not accurate ; for, according to my recollection, and I attended all the sessions of the commission there, I heard none of these figures contradicted. Now, a binder which would sell for $100 in Ontario costs the settlers of our province $145. The McCormack or American binder sells retail for $119 south of the line, in Manitoba for $155. To demonstrate the enormous profit on binders you will allow me to cite one circumstance. Some years ago an accident happened to a train load of McCormack binders in the United States, and according to the court record, I understand, the claim which the manufacturers put in for these binders was only $36 a piece. A seeder made in Brantford for $17 sells in Winnipeg for $70. The duty on a binder is $20, and on a mower $8. If you estimate the duty on a farmer's entire outfit, I am told on good authority, that it will be found to be about $500. I am sure the House will agree with me that that is an enormous tax for the settlers in the North-west to pay. Then there is the question of arbitrary valuation at the international boundary. The binder which is most popular in Manitoba and the North-west is the McCormack, the American binder. This is said by the settlers to be, far and away, the best binder that has ever been produced on this continent. But, when they are imported into our province under the regulations of the late Government which, I understand, are being carried out now, instead of these binders being admitted at $80, the price at which they are invoiced to the dealer in the United States, they are entered at $100. Thus the settler in Manitoba is obliged to pay 20 per cent, not on the price of the implement, but on the arbitrary valuation of $100.

Mr. WALLACE. I understand the hon. gentleman to say that $80 is the price to the dealer. Has he any evidence of that ?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have no evidence.

Mr. WALLACE. I deny the statement, and I can prove the contrary.

Mr. RICHARDSON. As I informed the House these figures were given before the Tariff Commission in Winnipeg and I never heard them disputed. If I did not believe them to be strictly accurate I would not repeat them in this House.

Mr. WALLACE. Did the McCormacks give these figures ?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not know anything of what the McCormacks gave. My belief is, from corroborative statements given to me, that these figures are strictly accurate. I was going on to say that the figures show that instead of paying 20 per cent, the settlers are paying at least 25 per cent for these implements. I would urge upon the Government, inasmuch as they have not seen fit to reduce the duty on binders, the desirability of having the restriction of this arbitrary valuation removed, and so enable the settlers in the country to secure their implements at the valuation which, I believe, is placed upon the implements in the United States. There is another important point to be considered in this connection. American machinery is universally acknowledged by the settlers throughout Manitoba and the North-west to be much superior to the Canadian-made article. In order to satisfy myself upon that point, I made careful inquiries from a considerable number of settlers ; and when I was out visiting my old homestead about 50 miles from here, a couple of weeks ago, I questioned my brother and a number of his fellow farmers on that point, and they all assured me that the American implement was a much better one than those manufactured in Canada. Now, if that is so, you will recognize the importance of having these restrictions removed in order that the settlers may have the best implements at the lowest price. I am told that the life of an American implement is much longer than that of a Canadian implement. It is only fair for me to say, however, in that connection, that I discussed that point in Ottawa a few days ago with the general manager of the Massey-Harris Company and he asserted positively that the Canadian implement was equal in every respect to the American implement, that the steel was as good, that the iron was as good, and that in fact everything that enters into the manufacture of that implement, was equally as good as that used in the United States. In order to be perfectly fair, I present these two statements, the one from men who have no interest in saying that the Canadian implement is inferior, the other from a gentleman who is interested in saying that it is not ; and I will leave the House to judge which evidence they wish to accept. Now, let us take ploughs. The Canadian article, according to such evidence as I have been able to procure in the North-west, never would suit the farmers. Of 80 gang-ploughs sold in Portage la Prairie last season, 72 were of American make. I am sure the House will be astonished at that fact. It must be remembered that our exports must pay for our imports, and pay the interest on the national debt and on foreign loans. The agricultural exports for 1896 amounted to $48,531,000, while the manufacturers' exports amounted to the paltry sum of $2,249,000. It is true that in the rough the manufactured articles exported were put down at 25 million dollars, but this improperly includes 17 million dollars for lumber, the most important article of export next to agricultural products. It will therefore be seen that the exports of farm products paid for the imports. In view of these figures, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that instead of going any distance to assist manufacturers, this House should with one voice be in favour of assisting the agriculturists of Canada. It is said that the manufacturers have some 370 million dollars invested in Canada, and these figures are always used for the purpose of influencing Parliament to protect those industries. But I would make a plea for the farmers of Canada, who have not only 370 million dollars invested, but who have, I think, according to a moderate estimate, about 3 billion dollars invested in this country. They are the class, Mr. Speaker, who should receive the first consideration. Let me read to you a telegram which I received an hour or two ago. An announcement was sent up to the west this afternoon saying that the members from the West would raise their voices on this question ; and I received this dispatch :

R. L. Richardson, M.P.,
House of Commons, Ottawa.

Although products of the mines are insignificant in value, compared with the wheat yield of Manitoba, the Government makes mining machinery free, and leaves the duty on agricultural implements. Tell the House that the greatest mine in the country is the golden fields of Manitoba grain. The inference is obvious.

I am sure that those who have visited the province of Manitoba during harvest time, and all who have studied the figures of the agricultural exports, particularly the wheat exports of Manitoba, will agree with me in saying that Manitoba is indeed a gold mine, and that the farmers of that province should be considered infinitely before the mines of British Columbia.

Now, in connection with the duty on agricultural implements I wish to refer to another industry, and to give you a few facts with reference to the iron industry of Canada. I do so more especially as it has a very important bearing on the duty on agricultural implements. The Canadian duty is $4 per ton (short), or $4.48 the long ton of 2,240 pounds. If the Nova Scotia product were given to the manufacturer free of cost and delivered free of cost, he could not use it, because it is too hard ; it lacks flexibility. In order to make a good mar-

ketable iron to be used in the manufacture of implements or in general industries, our manufacturers of iron have to import about 40 per cent of their ore; the New Glasgow furnace brings it from Newfoundland, and the Hamilton furnace brings theirs from the United States. This is necessary to obtain a proper blend.

In trying to protect that industry we are protecting an industry, a considerable portion of which is located in the United States. The returns in connection with this iron industry show that this terrifically costly experiment which has been going on since 1887 has not produced any result commensurate with the direct and indirect outlay in bounties paid out of the Treasury and in duties taken out of the pockets of the people. In this age, which is essentially an iron and steel age, there is no industry skilled or unskilled that does not rest primarily on these two fundamental articles. From them are made the machinery in the factories and even the tools employed by the workmen therein. From them are manufactured the vehicles for carrying the product to the market and the vehicles for bringing in the raw material and sending out the finished produce. Take the farmer and consider the amount of steel and iron in various forms which he uses, and there are no two products in his whole economy that occupies so large a space in it. Consider that his stoves, his kitchen hardware, his implements, his fences, his nails, his saddlery, his wagons, and even the shirts on his back which is manufactured in the factory, are all affected in order to keep this industry going.

Let us look and see how this industry prejudicially affects the agricultural implement industry. The contract price per ton of implement iron in Chicago or Pittsburg is $11. The duty is $4.48 per ton, or 44 per cent. The duty is about 40 per cent on steel. The duty on coal and fuel that these manufacturers have to use is 60 cents a ton or 60 per cent ad valorem, reckoning the mine price in the United States. To get that pig-iron from Chicago or Pittsburg to Ontario costs $2 per ton for transportation. Leaving out the bounties, therefore, the Canadian smelter has a natural protection of nearly 20 per cent and an artificial protection of 40 per cent. To import iron from the States costs $17.48 per ton. The American manufacturer of implements and other products in which iron is employed obtains his iron for $11. To get a ton of iron from New Glasgow costs a great deal more than $11; it costs in the neighbourhood of $12. The American people enjoy no bounty, while our people have a bounty of $2.24 a ton. The transportation charge from Nova Scotia to Ontario is $4.75 per ton by rail or water. The only reason why it is so high is that if it were brought by water, they would be unable to take it the entire way; bulk would have to be broken, and this accounts for the high rate.

There is really no essential difference between buying the stuff at the frontier and paying the duty, and bringing it from Nova Scotia. We pay in transportation 45 per cent of the actual cost of the ton in Chicago. All the other articles that enter into the construction of implements, share in the tax imposed through these iron duties. They might be enumerated as malleable iron castings, nuts, bolts, screws, wire nails, and even the cotton duck that is used for binder aprons is taxed. Then the enormous cost of iron, steel and other machines comprising the plants in all factories must be taken into consideration also, workman's tools, steam hammers and a thousand and one machines used in connection with the manufacture of implements. It is safe to say that it is cheaper by 50 per cent to start an agricultural implement factory in the United States than it is in Canada. The implement manufacturers has to add the extra cost of his plant to the price of his machine.

It ought to be pointed out here that this agricultural implement industry was created and fostered when raw material was absolutely free. The industry took root during the American war when there were no duties on either iron or steel, which were then imported from Great Britain. We secured our iron and steel then on an average of $10 a ton cheaper than the Americans at that time produced theirs. That $10 a ton was tantamount to a bounty to that amount to the Canadian manufacturer. These conditions in Canada which existed in 1876 and later have been reversed, that is to say the Americans have got the cheap material and Canada the dear. Nature, it has been demonstrated, has been kinder to the people of the United States. Providence and not protection did it. We do not want to do any injury to any legitimate industry, but it must be pointed out that the way to modify the high duties on agricultural implements and hundreds of others, is to wipe out this illegitimate industry. It is responsible for very much of the trouble. In the interest of the farmers and of the west generally, the Government has not gone far enough in the reduction of these iron duties. It may be quite true that many millions of dollars have been invested in the iron industry in Nova Scotia, but the question is whether we should go on compelling the taxpayers to support an industry of that kind that will continue to be a deformed infant no matter how long we nurse it, even if we continue to hold the bottle to its mouth till the crack of doom. The true way to cheapen agricultural implements is to sweep the iron duties away altogether even if in doing it the Government had to commit the crime of infanticide. In view of the deformity of the child the country would prove the crime. It is quite evident in view of the facts I have submitted that the agricultural industry would not be fairly treated if the duty were entirely taken off the finished article, thus leaving it exposed to high duties

on the raw material, which be it repeated is tantamount to a bounty to the foreign implement maker who gets his raw material at first cost.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want, unnecessarily, to interfere with the hon. gentleman's speech, but I call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that he is reading it.

Mr. SPEAKER. Probably the hon. gentleman is referring to his notes.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Owing to the large number of figures employed in discussing this question and a desire to be strictly accurate, I feel obliged to make copious notes. Another way to cheapen implements and every thing else and to put money directly into the farmer's pocket, is for the Government to see if something cannot be done to secure lower freight rates.

Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson, president of the Grand Trunk, recently announced that the company paid last year $375,000 for duty on coal. That amount capitalized is about three times the amount of aid, which according to report is to be given by the Government to construct the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. Now, it is quite clear that it is not the Grand Trunk but the settler of Canada that pays this $375,000. If the duty were taken off coal the settlers would save that vast amount.

The dilemma in which the Government found itself was whether they should kill these deformed infants outright or wean them gradually. They have decided upon the latter alternative. As a North-west member, representing a purely agricultural constituency, I cannot refrain from expressing my great regret and disappointment that such articles as agricultural implements, coal oil, lumber, and other necessaries have not either been placed upon the free list or very greatly reduced. I know that my constituents, and the settlers generally of the province of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, will share in the regret and disappointment to which I have given expression, as they have been fondly hoping for years that the principal commodities and necessaries of the farmer would be either placed upon the free list or reduced to a minimum. While in justice to myself and my constituents, who trusted me to accurately and honestly represent them, I have felt bound to present the views I have offered, I would not like to set myself up against the united wisdom of the entire Cabinet, for no one recognizes more thoroughly than I do the magnitude of the task they have had to face; the heroic style in which they have grappled with it, and the pretty thorough manner in which the pruning knife has been applied. However, as a representative of a purely agricultural constituency and in view of the pledges I gave and of the confidence which I flatter myself my constituents repose in my integrity, I am bound to say that if it were not for the very general sweeping reductions that have been made if it were not that I see in the changes a strong trend towards ultimate free trade; if it were not that I regard the changes as an instalment only; if it were not that I recognize the tremendous difficulties that beset the path of the Government in rescuing the country at one stroke from the effects of a long in-grained policy of protection, and placing it on a free trade basis; I am bound to say, however, regretfully that I would be forced to oppose the Government if I took cognizance only of the failure to gratify western expectations and demands upon two or three important articles. When, however, I find hon. gentlemen opposite proclaiming that the new tariff is a death blow levelled at protection, and that this that and the other industry is killed, I am greatly encouraged in my purpose to support the Government, for according to my way of thinking, and I doubt not that the west will agree with me, the sooner that many of these so-called industries which cannot exist without the nursing bottle, are slaughtered the better for the country. I don't want any better material with which to campaign in the west than the fact that dozens of these little misshapen, atrophied, pap-fed industrial monstrosities have been sent to the land of Kingdom Come by the operation of the new tariff. If I wanted to buttress myself with an additional reason for supporting the Government I might add that it would be furnished in the prospect of a return to power of the high priests of protection sitting opposite, and I could not justify a vote which might tend to bring about a consummation so devoutly to be deplored. If hostile critics of the Liberal Government were to say that so far as the west is concerned it is chastising us with whips, it would certainly not be stretching the metaphor too far to say that if the Conservatives were returned to power, they would promptly resume the grim occupation of chastising us with scorpions.

Mr. KLOEPFER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words in reference to the trade policy of the present Government, and at the outset I shall say, that there never has been a time in the history of Canada when our fiscal policy required greater attention than at the present time, and greater caution before interfering with existing conditions. During the last campaign the exponents of the Liberal policy made many promises to the people, and indeed I may say that they made very different promises. One time they pledged themselves to "free trade as it is in England"; another time "tariff for revenue only"; another time "tariff reform" and then they went on to explain, that the farmers were robbed and that the manufacturers were spoon-fed long enough. In the light of all this, it is strange that the Liberal Government should have

brought down to this House a tariff practically the same as it existed under the Conservative Government. They have taken the National Policy to their side, and have only put the same hat on another man. Nine-tenths of the tariff they left the same as it was in the National Policy, and one-half which they changed they lowered, and the other half they raised. I contend, Sir, that the tariffs which they lowered have ruined some of the manufacturers, and as the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) pointed out there are any number of manufacturers in this city to-day dissatisfied and disappointed. It is also true, that the industries which the tariff affected are the chief industries of this Dominion, and are the life of Canada, such as carriage hardware, carriage manufactures and I might also add, that this tariff has injured the farmers of the country as well. Let us see some of the industries which have been ruined by this new tariff. Take the bolt manufacturers. In the small sizes of bolts which cost 32·49 cents a hundred, weighing four pounds, the old duty was 1 cent a pound and 25 per cent, which amounted to 12·12 cents per 100, while the new duty is 35 per cent, amounting to 11·37 cents, which makes a difference of 6 per cent lower under the new tariff. On two by quarter inch bolts, which cost 35·08 cents a hundred, weighing four and a half pounds, the old duty was 1 cent a pound and 25 per cent, making 13·27 cents a hundred, and new duty amounts to 12·28 cents, or a reduction to the extent of 7 per cent. In the larger bolts, two and a half inches by three-eighths, the duty has been reduced by 20 per cent. The old duty was 22·65 cents, and the new duty 18·65 cents. On the larger sizes the new duty is 25 per cent lower. In the case of coach screws which cost $2.52 for 74 pounds, the old duty was 1 cent per pound and 20 per cent, making $1.24, and under the new duty of 35 per cent it is 88 cents, which makes the new duty 30 per cent lower than the old. Washers are lowered from 15 to 25 per cent according to the size. On buggy springs, inch and a quarter, which cost $2.09 per pair, weighing 33 pounds, the old duty was 1 cent a pound and 20 per cent, making 74 cents, and the new duty is 30 per cent amounting to 63 cents, which is 15 per cent lower. On carriage springs the old duty was 1 cent a pound and 20 per cent, amounting to $1.05, and the new duty amounts to 84 cents, which is 20 per cent less. In axles for buggies, inch, which cost $1.82, weighing 42 pounds, the old duty was 1 cent a pound and 20 per cent, making 78 cents, and the new duty is 30 per cent amounting to 54 cents, which leaves a difference of 35 per cent between the new duty and the old. The new duty on rivets is from 25 to 33 per cent lower than the old duty. Wood screws, which used to cost on the American side 17·95 cents per gross, with a discount of 90, 10 and 5, and 3 off for cash, cost laid down in Canada 28·45 cents per gross under the old duty of 3 cents per pound, while under the new duty of 35 per cent they will cost 24·23 cents.

The following table will show the new duty and the old duty on the articles mentioned as well as the decrease of duty on those articles. I hold that the Canadian manufacturers cannot stand this reduction.

CARRIAGE BOLTS.	Old Duty. (1c. p. lb. & 25 p.c.)	New Duty. (35 p.c.)	Decrease.
	cts.	cts.	p. c.
1½ x ¼, cost 32·49c., weigh 4 lbs....	12·12	11·37	6
2 x ¼, do 35·08c., do 4½ do ...	13·27	12·28	7
2½ x ¼, do 37·69c., do 5 do ...	14·92	13·19	12
2 x 5/16, do 42·23c., do 7¼ do ...	17·80	14·78	17
3 x 5/16, do 48·75c., do 9½ do ...	21·69	17·06	20
2½ x ⅜, do 53·28c., do 12 do ...	22·65	18·65	17
4½ x ⅜, do 71·48c., do 19¼ do ..	33·55	25·02	25
5½ x ½, do $1·30, do 38 do ...	64	45·50	25
TIRE BOLTS.			
1¾ x 3/16, cost 16·67c., weigh 1¾ lbs..	5·92	5·83	15
2 x ¼, do 23·08c., do 2⅛ do ..	8·65	8·08	7
FULL SQUARE CARRIAGE BOLTS.			
2 x ¼, cost 54·82c., weigh 4⅞ lbs....	18·57	19·18	
2½ x ¼, do 57·01c., do 5⅛ do	19·38	19·95	
SQUARE NUTS.			
¼-in. nuts, Canadian, cost 6·25....	2·56	2·19	15
5/16 do do 5·75....	2·44	2·01	17½
3/8 do do 5·25....	2·31	1·84	20
7/16 do do 4·25....	2·06	1·49	28
½ do do 4·25....	2·06	1·49	28
9/16 do do 3·95....	1·99	1·38	30
5/8 do do 3·75....	1·94	1·31	32
11/16 do do 3·75....	1·94	1·31	32
¾ do do 4·05....	2·01	1·42	28
⅞ do do 3·55....	1·89	1·24	35
RIVETS.			
3/16-in., cost 4·66	2·17	1·63	25
¼ do 4·32	2·08	1·51	27
5/16 do 4·15	2·04	1·45	33
do 3·99	1·99	1·40	30
COACH SCREWS.			
⅝ x 8-in., cost $2.52, weighs 74 lbs	1·24	0·88	30

WASHERS.	Old Duty. (1c. p. lb. & 25 p.c.)	New Duty. (35 p.c.)	Decrease under New Duty.
	cts.	cts.	p.c.
⅛-in., cost 8c. per lb.	·03	2·80	6
¼ do 7·20 do	2·80	2·52	10
⅜ do 6 do	2·50	2·10	15
½ do 5·20 do	2·04	1·82	10
⅝ do 4 do	1·80*	1·40	15
¾ do 4 do	1·80*	1·40	15
⅞ do 3·60 do	1·73*	1·26	25
1 do 3·60 do	1·73*	1·26	25

* Old duty. (1c. per lb. and 20 p.c.)

The price charged by Canadian screw makers was 29·76 cents per gross. So the prices were pretty close. On the smaller sizes of screws the price per gross was proportionately less, so that the specific duty amounted to a higher rate; that is where the advantage of a specific duty comes in. The following table shows the cost of American screws under the old specific rates of duty, and under the present ad valorem rate of 35 per cent, respectively, and the prices of the same sizes of Canadian-made screws:

Size.	Cost of American Screws.		Present cost of Canadian Screws
	Und'r Old Duty.	Und'r New Duty.	
	cts.	cts.	cts.
2¼ in. × 14 gauge, per gross	28·45	24·23	29·76
2 in. × 14 do	26·10	23·08	28·35
1¾ in. × 12 do	25·89	16·73	20·56
1½ in. × 12 do	23·12	15·00	18·42
1¼ in. × 10 do	16·80	11·54	14·18
1 in. × 11 do	16·05	11·54	14·18
⅞ in. × 9 do	12·84	9·23	11·34
¾ in. × 11 do	14·52	10·15	12·47
⅝ in. × 9 do	11·38	7·26	9·92

That shows that it will be impossible for Canadian screws under the new tariff to compete against the imported article.

On drop forgings the duty under the old tariff was 32½ per cent, which was too low. With that rate about one-third of the drop-forgings used in Canada were brought in from the United States. Now, the Government have reduced that duty to 30 per cent, which will make matters still worse.

The duty on bar iron has been reduced from $10 a ton to $7 a ton to make the raw material cheaper; but the raw material will not be cheaper, and I will show you why. Some years ago there was only one rolling mill in Canada; that was in Hamilton. Afterwards four more started in Montreal, and one in Guelph, and two rolling mills in Toronto. The competition between these mills has brought down the price of bar iron to $26 a ton, or from $1.30 to $1.35 per hundred. The price of American bar iron at the present time is from 95 cents to $1 per hundred. The new duty of $7 a ton is equivalent to 35 cents per hundred, which would bring the cost of American iron to $1.30 per hundred. Although our iron manufacturers have sold their iron at from $1.30 to $1.35 per hundred, this was less than it actually cost them to make, because they cannot make it for less than from $1.45 to $1.50, and it is only because times are so hard in the United States that American iron can be got at the present low price. When times improve in the United States, the price there will be raised to at least $1.20, which at the new rate of duty would bring the price up to about $1.55 in Canada. Therefore, I say that this reduction in the duty will not enable manufacturers to get their raw material any cheaper than they could get it under the old rate of duty.

The duty on steel billets has been reduced from $5 to $4 a ton. The result will be that the Montreal, Guelph and Hamilton mills will not be able to compete with the American producers. But while the reduction on billets is 5 cents a hundred, the reduction on steel bars is 15 cents a hundred, so that Canadian mills will not be able to make any steel bars at all. The pig iron smelting works are in a different position, because hon. gentlemen opposite, although claiming that they are not protectionists, increase to the smelting works the bounty on pig iron, while the rolling mills men do not get any bounty. The latter make their iron from scrap, and although the duty on scrap iron is reduced from $4 to $1.50 per ton, they will not get it much cheaper than they do at the present time, because it would not pay men to collect scrap iron at any lower price than they are now paid.

Now, what has the new tariff done for the farmer? Hon. gentlemen opposite have always told the farmer that he was robbed by the manufacturer, while not as well protected. But what have they done with the farmer's protection? They have taken off 3 cents a bushel from wheat, reducing the duty from 15 cents to 12 cents a bushel, they let in corn free, and they take 15 cents off flour. Free corn might do very well for large farmers who raise a high grade of cattle, and who of course want cheap feed. But eighteen out of every twenty farmers cannot afford to keep these high-grade cattle. They raise peas and oats for the market, and now that corn comes in free, they will get even less for their peas and oats than they did before. Their heads are cut off, as well as those of the manufacturers.

They cannot manufacture these goods in competition with the Americans. When you take off from 15 to 20 per cent, and then take off another one-eighth from the foreign goods, where will our manufacturers be? They will not be able to resist because they have no protection on their raw material. They cannot buy their raw material any cheaper now than they did before, as iron cannot be manufactured any cheaper than it is at present. Now, we want to protect these manufacturers. If we do not, if we are not loyal to them, this country cannot propser. And the farmer is just as much a manufacturer as are the others. He ploughs up the soil in order to manufacture wheat just as the baker manufactures bread out of the flour. Let me say further that I am a Canadian, that I am out for Canada first before any other country, and that I am next a British subject; but I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I am here to protect our country strongly, so that our farmers and mechanics may be able to earn a living. If we do not protect the manufacturers, if their establishments are not kept in the country our young men will have to go where manufacturing industries do flourish. The hon. gentleman who spoke last (Mr. Richardson) wants everything admitted free into the North-west, and does not want to give any concessions to the manufacturers here who employ so many hands. The hon. gentleman wants to feed these hands; but if he does not protect the manufacturers, all these hands will have to go to the other side of the line. If these goods are not manufactured in Canada, they will be manufactured in the United States, and our people will emigrate to the United States to seek employment in these factories. It will then be the American farmers who will feed them, and our North-west friends will not have any people here to feed.

Our hon. friends opposite were continually urging that the United States were friendly to them and hostile to the Conservative party, and that if we would only return them to power they would secure better trade relations with the United States than possibly could the late Government. But what have we found since they came into office? Two Ministers went over to Washington to talk trade relations, and they came back and told us that they had favourable reports. But hardly were their backs turned when the Dingley Bill came down and the American tariff went up higher. I do not believe in running after people. That exhibits weakness, and you can never make a success by conduct of that description. Let a business man run after a thing too much and coax too much, and he will never succeed. One requires to be more independent, and by dint of being independent he will get more than he could otherwise.

In my opinion, it would have been much better if the present Government, instead of travelling through the country hearing what the people had to say, had stayed at home and written to the manufacturers and got their views. If they had done that, we would have a much better tariff than we have to-day, and you would not see so many deputations running to Ottawa as we now see. I am sure that none of these factories can stand if the duties are not changed. The least little change in a tariff will help goods in from other countries. I believe that the old tariff was all right, except that it was rather too low, and instead of reducing it where the duty was 32½ per cent, we should have made it 35, and where it was 35 per cent we should have made it 40 per cent, and kept the home market for our own farmers. If we cannot keep our people here, our farmers will not have a home market. There is no use expecting that we can ship any manufactured goods to the other side because if any did enter England, the English merchants would soon drive them out. The United States are protectionists from the infant in the cradle to the great-grandfather, while in our case our duties are actually too low and the consumers do not benefit. In the time of Mr. Mackenzie, when the duty was 17½ per cent, goods sold for twice the price in Canada that they do now. Therefore, 35 per cent duty is not too much on all goods, and it will be found that fifteen or twenty years ago the prices were much higher. I have known goods which sold at $4.50 in Mr. Mackenzie's time sell at $1.85 to $1.90 now. Why should a country like this have a tariff only averaging 30 per cent when our neighbours have a tariff of 40 per cent, which tariff they are about to run up to 50 per cent. That is a policy which is suicidal on our part. Instead of reducing the tariff, we ought to raise it. Hon. gentlemen opposite have only reduced the tariff here and there, but where they did reduce it, they hit the best industries we have in Canada. Now, I shall go on to sewing machines.

Mr. GIBSON. Your own factory?

Mr. KLOEPFER. Well, I have an interest in it, and I have not had it very long either. Before 1894 sewing machines were charged $3 specific duty and 20 per cent, but in 1894 the late Government made a mistake by reducing that tariff down to 30 per cent. What happened? From 1894 out, American machines came in, and the poor manufacturer in Guelph struggled along as best he could until at last his business went down and he stopped.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). He was dead long before that.

Mr. KLOEPFER. You do not know anything about it. That man made money before. He had a plant there which must have cost him $350,000, and which, after

his business went down, would not fetch $50,000, and the hon. gentleman would be the last man to buy it. He would not have courage enough.

The man in Guelph made money, as everybody knows. In 1894 the duty was reduced. The result was that the importation of sewing machines increased from $80,000 to $113,000, crippling his industry. The citizens of Guelph did not wish to see the industry go away, and some citizens put up money and kept the thing there. We do not know whether we are going to make any money or not under the 30 per cent tariff. A specific duty ought to have been put on, or the ad valorem duty greatly increased. If we had the market, and were called upon to supply all the machines used in Canada, instead of having a portion of it come in from the United States, we could run that shop full time. At present the workmen are only getting four and a half days a week. We could then pay the mechanics for six days a week, and, running the factory full, we could make the machines cheaper. It is well know that, at certain seasons when times are hard in the United States, the American manufacturers send over goods and slaughter our markets, thus crippling our manufactures. My hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Wood) knows that.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I know all about it.

Mr. KLOEPFER. I always find that a wholesale man does not want to see high protection. He likes to get his goods as cheaply as possible, because then he can sell to the local dealers. When he has large capital he can import largely and thus make a profit even if he has to sell at low prices. But when the goods are manufactured in Canada, the goods come more direct, and these wholesale men are cut off. That was the result in the case of Mr. Crathern in Montreal. He made a fortune on bar iron. He would get large quantities in, and when it reached Montreal would distribute it to buyers throughout the country. Then, when navigation closed, he could make an extra price. When the iron mills started in Canada the goods went more direct and he lost his trade—and he is kicking about it. When a mechanic gets full time he need not be so very careful of his expenditure, and the additional money put in circulation is a benefit to all. It is a hard thing for a man to be given only four and a half days in a week. When he has the money to spend he will spend it, and it is better for everybody. In the same way, when the price of wheat goes up to $1.50 per bushel, even in towns they are tickled over it, for there is more money in circulation, and it is a benefit all around. I do not believe in too cheap goods; they are the ruination of any country. In this tariff Nova Scotia gets the best of it. They have the duty on iron and also the bounty on both the pig and the billets. Then they get flour reduced and free corn. I suppose that while the election was on it was found desirable, from the Government standpoint, to give them some concessions. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the House for your patient hearing.

Mr. DOUGLAS moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 29th April, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DISMISSAL OF MR. P. J. WILLIAMS.

Mr. DAVIN asked:

1. Is the statement made in the Winnipeg "Tribune" of April 17, that P. J. Williams, Indian agent at Battleford, has been dismissed, correct?
2. If so, why?
3. Is it true that C. M. Daunais succeeds him?
4. Is this the same Daunais who was instructor on Red Pheasant's Reserve, Battleford, in 1885-86?
5. Why did Daunais leave the service of the Indian Department?
6. Was he not dismissed for immorality?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The statement that Mr. P. J. Williams has been dismissed is correct. He was dismissed on account of his incapacity and gross neglect. The cattle of the agency were allowed to get into a most wretched condition and about 150 head of them were lost. Mr. Charles M. Daunais succeeds Mr. Williams. The department does not know whether he is the same Daunais who was instructor on Red Pheasant's reserve, Battleford, in 1885. The Daunais who was employed as instructor on Red Pheasant's reserve was dismissed by the then Indian Commissioner, Hon. Edgar Dewdney. Information reached the department that he was accused of immorality, and the then Indian Commissioner ordered an inquiry on the 25th February, 1886. But on the following day, the 26th February, 1886, the then Indian Commissioner dismissed the said Daunais without inquiry.

CIVIL SERVICE—COUNTY OF GASPE.

Mr. CASGRAIN (for Mr. Chauvin) asked :

1. Who was appointed, by the present Government, to hold inquiries in relation to the civil service in the county of Gaspé? ;
2. The number of such inquiries?
3. Salary and expenses of commissioner?
4. Duration of his mission ; its object and nature?
5. At whose request, and on whose recommendation was the said commissioner appointed?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). 1. Charles A. Lebel. 2. Three inquiries held in Gaspé for Marine and Fisheries. 3. Salary allowed by Order in Council : $4 per diem and living and travelling expenses ; $200 paid on account of salary and expenses. 4. Employed thirty-six days in investigation. The object and nature was to investigate charges against Government officials of political partisanship on the occasion of the last Dominion election, or of inefficiency in the dicharge of their duties. 5. Mr. Lemieux, M.P.

MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked :

By whom was the settlement of the school question signed, after the same was agreed upon by both the Federal and provincial governments, and why are not the names given in the copy brought down?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I have already stated to the hon. gentleman that the negotiations which took place between the Canadian Government and the Manitoba Government were confidential. When they were concluded, the terms of the agreement were communicated to the press and taken back to Manitoba by the commissioners of the Manitoba Government, and afterwards embodied in the Act of that legislature.

FISHERY GUARDIANS, NORTH VICTORIA.

Mr. HUGHES asked :

1. Who were fishery " guardians " in the waters of North Victoria, including Sturgeon, Cameron, Balsam, Mud Turtles, Moore's, Gull, Kushog, and other North Victoria lakes, and Fenelon Falls and Gull River, last year, under direction of Fishery Overseer Fitzgerald?
2. Are these guardians yet in the service of the Government?
3. Have others, or any, been appointed since July, 1896?
4. If so, what is the name of each?
5. Why were the former officers, guardians, or any of them, removed?
6. When were they retired?
7. By whom were the new men appointed?
8. What is the date of the authority or appointment of the new guardians by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries?
9. Had the department, at Ottawa, anything to do with the retirement of the former guardians or with the appointment of the new ones?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). 1. J. W. O'Brien, Sturgeon Lake and Goose Lake ; Thomas Johnston, Cameron Lake ; Wm. Wellwood and Dougald Sinclair, Balsam Lake ; Wm. Batty, Mud Turtle Lake ; Thomas Leary, Moore and Gull Lake ; John Mortimer, Bohs and Deer Lake ; George Hewitt, Gull River; A. Martin, Burnt River. 2. No. 3. The parties mentioned in answer to No. 1 were employed since July, 1896. 4. Answered by No. 1. 5. The time of their engagement having expired, they are no longer in the employ of the department. 6. The time of their engagement expired on the 15th April inst. 7. No guardians in this riding have yet been engaged, but they will be appointed at once. 8. Answered by No. 7. 9. Their time of engagement had expired and new guardians will be named to the fishery officer by the department.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS. N.W.T.

Mr. DAVIS asked :

Are the collectors of customs at the ports of York Factory, Moose Factory and Churchill officials of the Hudson's Bay Company? When were they appointed, and do they receive any salary? If so, at what rate are they paid?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The Department of Customs understands that the customs officers at York Factory and Moose Factory are also officers of the Hudson Bay Company. There is no customs officer at Churchill. The present officer at York Factory was appointed on the 1st of July, 1893, and his salary is $200 per year. The present officer at Moose Factory was appointed on the 1st September, 1892, and his salary is $200 per year.

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would like to mention to the hon. members that I have directed a little change or addition to be made to the Votes and Proceedings which are laid on the tables of hon. members every day, by adding to them a statement of the meetings of the committees of the House, which I think will be kept up as completely as possible by the clerk of committees. Unless they are very suddenly called by a notice from the chairman, the places and times of meetings will be placed in the Votes and Proceedings.

RAILWAY EXPENDITURES.

Mr. MARTIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish again to call the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) to an order that was agreed to last session calling for a statement of the expenditures on railways in the different provinces. It is very necessary to have this statement laid before the House at an early day. I have a notice of motion

on the Order paper in regard to the building of branch railways in Prince Edward Island, and it is very necessary that this statement should be brought down before that notice of motion is reached. I want to bring before the notice of the House, and for the guidance of the Minister of Railways in preparing this statement an error that I think occurs in the report of his department.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid the hon. gentleman cannot go into a discussion of a subject like that at this stage of the proceedings.

Mr. MARTIN. I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. If there is a notice of motion by the hon. gentleman on the paper covering this subject, it is not possible to anticipate the discussion with a motion to adjourn the House. The hon. gentleman has risen to ask for information about returns which have been ordered, and I do not think that he can go beyond that.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman says he wishes to call the attention of the Government to an error in the report.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understood him to say that he wished to discuss matters in the report of the Minister of Railways, in connection with a return to be brought down. I do not possibly see how we can allow that. I wish to give every latitude that the rules of the House will allow, but I do not think we can permit that.

Mr. MARTIN. I say I think it would help the Minister of Railways in preparing the return to be brought down. I find a statement here——

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I cannot see how the hon. gentleman is in order. He cannot refer to a motion which is on the Order paper.

Mr. MARTIN. I wish to call attention to a statement which is on page 12.

The PRIME MINISTER. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have decided that the hon gentleman is out of order.

POSTMASTER AT BEAMSVILLE.

Mr. McCLEARY. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to draw the attention of the House to what must be considered by all fair-minded and unprejudiced men an outrage in every respect against a free-born Canadian citizen, an outrage not committed by any power of Government unfriendly to Canada and Canadian institutions.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). If my hon. friend intends to conclude with a motion, he will be in order, but not otherwise.

Mr. McCLEARY. I propose to conclude my remarks by a motion to adjourn. I was going on to say that this outrage had been perpetrated by a Canadian Government, upon a Canadian citizen, debarring him from his civil rights, and his privileges as a British subject.

The Sultan of Turkey has for the past months perpetrated most atrocious outrages on the Christian Armenians. Cold-blooded and heart-rending have been those nefarious outrages that have been perpetrated. There is, however, excuse to be made for the Sultan of Turkey; there may be something said in palliation of those terrible offences and awful crimes that have been carried out in his domains. But the Sultan of Turkey is a Turk—he is without the pale of ordinary civilization. Therefore there can hardly be a comparison instituted between the conduct of a Government such as Canada possesses, which enjoys the light of civilization, with the conduct of a despot who does not enjoy the enlightened environments of the Canadian people, a despot who knows nothing whatever of the great principle laid down by that greatest of teachers who ever trod the sands of time,—"Whatsoever you would that man should do unto you, do ye even so unto them." While we characterize such acts as most abominable by the Turks, what shall we say of this Government which stoops not only to take away the means of livelihood of a Canadian citizen, but also to destroy his ability to make a livelihood in the future, even to take from him what is dearer to him than any position he occupies, namely, his character and his honour. It is because I consider this a most important matter, affecting primarily the individual to whom I have referred, but which if carried out to the extent that hon. gentlemen who sit behind the Government wish to carry it out, will affect a very large proportion of the citizens of this country, I beg leave to call the attention of the House to it.

In the early part of this session I placed on the Order paper of this House certain questions relative to the dismissal of W. D. Fairbrother, postmaster at Beamsville. The Minister of the Interior, acting for the Postmaster General, whom I regret is not in his place, answered the question. The inquiry I made was as follows:—

1. When was W. D. Fairbrother appointed postmaster at Beamsville?
2. Was he appointed by Order in Council?
3. Has the said W. D. Fairbrother been dismissed from said position?
4. If dismissed, what was the cause, and were any charges made against him?
5. If charges were made against him, was an investigation of the truth of such charges made?

6. Has a successor been appointed to Mr. Fairbrother? If so, who is he, and what is his age?

The Minister of the Interior, for the Postmaster General, replied as follows :—

W. D. Fairbrother was appointed postmaster of Beamsville on the 11th of April, 1895. No Order in Council was passed appointing him. The following charges were made against him :—That, from the time he took possession of his office until the 23rd of June last, every possible means was taken to sell and give away Conservative literature through the office, and that he held back literature that was in the interests of the Liberal party ; that, during the last campaign, he repeatedly absented himself from the office in order to attend political caucuses in the interests of the Conservative party ; that he endeavoured to utilize the office rather for profit to himself than for the public convenience ; that he would keep a lobby full of people waiting for their mails whilst he parleyed over the sale of papers through the wicket ; that he changed the general delivery from a convenient arrangement of fifty boxes to that of twenty-one, which made the office so crowded as to occasion nearly double the necessary time for the distribution of papers, circulars, &c., the public being thus kept waiting ; that this change in the system of delivery was such as to greatly delay the delivery, involving a handling of from twenty to fifty pieces of mail matter for almost every person calling for mail ; that when asked by the assistant why he so inconvenienced himself and the public in keeping them waiting so long, he replied : "I do not care how long they have to wait ; let them purchase boxes. If you make it more convenient for them than they have it, they would never rent a box." That the postmaster would stand by the half hour reading the contents of ingoing and outgoing postcards passing through the office ; that the assistant cautioned him against this practice without avail ; that he took an active political part in the last general election, that, during the whole of the election day, he acted as outside scrutineer and took an active part in bringing voters to the polls, instead of attending to the duties of his office ; that satisfactory evidence was furnished as to the postmaster having taken such political part, which rendered any further investigation unnecessary, and he was accordingly removed from the position and Alex. Allan appointed in his stead.

Any single one of those charges that were stated by the Minister would, I presume, be considered sufficient by the members of the Government to dismiss Mr. Fairbrother from his position. The only ground of complaint I have is, that Mr. Fairbrother was not given an opportunity of meeting those charges, notwithstanding the fact that the Prime Minister from his place in this House, at the first session of this Parliament, declared that no officer or civil servant would be dismissed without an inquiry being instituted. There is not one single point of proof adduced.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I rise to a point of order. I thought the hon. gentleman was merely calling the attention of the Postmaster General to some one fact. I see, however, that the hon. gentleman is opening up a very wide discussion on a motion on the Order paper connected with this very dismissal, and I submit that the discussion cannot be anticipated.

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the hon. gentleman point out the motion.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The motion stands in the name of Mr. McCleary, and is for copies of letters and correspondence referring to the dismissal of W. D. Fairbrother, as postmaster at Beamsville, with a copy of the charges, and by whom such were made.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. member has not the right to anticipate a notice standing on the Order paper in regard to this very matter.

Mr. McCLEARY. I have no intention of bringing on a general discussion. I am now referring to the answer given to me on behalf of the Postmaster General.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it would be perfectly in order, if the notice of motion were not on the paper in the name of the hon. gentleman, to refer to a past answer given ; but as the hon. gentleman has chosen to place the motion on the Order paper, it is impossible for him to anticipate it, because it would be inconvenient and contrary to the rules and practice of the House.

Mr. McCLEARY. I will have to bow to your decision, Mr. Speaker, but I certainly think it is a strange procedure, that I have not the right to reply to an answer given to a question by the Postmaster General.

THE RECIPROCAL TARIFF.

Mr. McNEILL. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to ask my hon. friend the Controller of Customs, if he has yet determined whether the tariff of Belgium is "on the whole" as favourable to Canada as our schedule "D" is to Belgium ?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). I have not so determined.

Mr. McNEILL. Might I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson), if he has determined yet whether the tariff of Germany is "on the whole" as favourable to Canada as the offer made in schedule "D" of our tariff is to Germany ?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I have not so determined.

Mr. McNEILL. Then we must understand, that the Government have placed this resolution upon the paper, in blank ignorance as to whether——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. McNEILL. Surely, Mr. Speaker, I am in order——

Mr. SPEAKER. By the practice of the House, the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) is allowed, at this stage, to ask questions relating to important matters of public business, and I apprehend that the questions which the hon. member (Mr. McNeill) asks are of that nature. However, the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) should not now indulge in comment upon the answers given.

Mr. McNEILL. I, of course, abide by your decision, Mr. Speaker, but——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) has the right to ask questions on important business. Whether the Government are ready to answer them or not is their affair, but comments on that are out of order.

Mr. McNEILL. I know, Mr. Speaker, that you will allow me to make an observation. You know that I would not for a moment desire to say anything disrespectful to the Chair. But, I must ask you, Sir, to consider whether you are not pressing that rule a little hardly upon me now.

Mr. SPEAKER. The greatest respect an hon. member can show to the decision of the Chair, is to abide by it.

Mr. McNEILL. Under the circumstances——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman may have some important matter to mention which is not out of order. I will be glad to hear it if he has, and I am sure he will not again be out of order.

Mr. McNEILL. When I was interrupted by that somewhat unseemly noise from the other side of the House, I was about to say, that as this is a matter of the very greatest moment to the country, I think it right to conclude with a motion. If it is necessary I shall do that, but you know, Mr. Speaker, that I have hardly ever done it before. It was only one sentence I wished to utter, and that was——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; sit down.

Mr. McNEILL. I am going to move——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) is entirely in order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) has said that he will conclude with a motion, which, of course, will be a motion to adjourn the House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That has been moved already.

Mr. SPEAKER. It was not put to the House. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) does that, and confines his remarks to the point he has raised, he will be in order.

Mr. McNEILL. I do not intend to pursue the matter any further, or to take up the time of the House intentionally; but the one remark I was about to make is: that if it has not yet been determined; if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) has not yet made up his mind, and the Government have not yet made up their minds, whether or not the tariff of Belgium is as favourable to us as schedule "D" is "on the whole" to Belgium——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is now discussing the tariff.

Mr. McNEILL. I must protest, Mr. Speaker. I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Davies) to be bound by the decision of the Chair.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I will take a point of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; sit down.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) cannot anticipate a discussion on a question relating to the tariff which is now before the House. He is plainly and palpably anticipating that discussion by expressing an opinion as to the action of the Government in respect to these resolutions. That is my point of order.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) has asked for information, and he has the right to that.

Mr. McNEILL. It was well understood, Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER. I may be wrong, but I understand that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) is not discussing the resolutions, but as to whether the Government has taken action upon these resolutions or not. I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) should go into a discussion of these tariff resolutions which are the next order upon the paper.

Mr. McNEILL. What I propose to do is, to make a remark as to the conduct of the Government, and that, I gather from your ruling, Sir, to be quite in order.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I submit, that if my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) is ready to state to the House, that the subject is not connected with the matter now before the House and not connected with the tariff resolutions, of course he would be in order. I am sure, however, that my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) would not be able to

state upon his honour to the House, that the comments he is about to make are outside of the tariff resolutions. His remarks clearly have reference to the resolutions.

Mr. McNEILL. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) wishes to imply by the word "outside," that my remarks have no relation to the resolutions, of course I cannot say so. It is in reference to the resolutions that I am about to make the remark, and it is in reference to the conduct of the Government in relation thereto, which I understand you have ruled I have a right to refer to, that I wish to make the remark. Now, I say, that if the Government have not—as the hon. the Controller of Customs has told us they have not—if the Government have not yet decided whether the tariff of Belgium is as favourable to Canada "on the whole" as schedule "D" of our tariff is to Belgium; and if they have not decided yet whether the tariff of Germany is as favourable "on the whole" to Canada as the offer contained in schedule "D" is to Germany, then, I say, their conduct in placing this resolution upon the paper——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Order.

Mr. McNEILL. I am speaking of the conduct of the Government, and the hon. Minister (Mr. Davies) should be controlled by the ruling of the Chair. The Chair has ruled, that I have the right to refer to the conduct of the Government, and it is most unfair of my hon. friend (Mr. Davies)—and I am very sorry to have to say that to him—it is most unfair that he should continually interrupt me in this way. He desires to intervene between the observation I am about to make, and the country, and he is afraid of the observation.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Speaker, I accept your ruling if you have so ruled. If the hon. gentleman is allowed to make a speech now instead of when the tariff debate is resumed, I accept that ruling. The hon. gentleman has no more right in the House than anybody else——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; Chair.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Surely I have the right to say this—and if he is allowed to discuss the tariff resolutions now, other hon. gentlemen can do so.

Mr. FOSTER. As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, you have made your ruling, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will have to obey.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; sit down.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER. Neither the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) nor the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) seem to quite apprehend my ruling, and, therefore, I shall be glad to state it again. If the hon. member (Mr. McNeill) is discussing a subject which arises from these resolutions and relates to these resolutions, he would not be in order to do so, now, on a motion to adjourn. If the hon. gentleman confines himself to a subject which has arisen since these resolutions were placed on the Table of this House, and which can be discussed apart from these resolutions, I do not see how I can prevent him doing it.

Mr. McNEILL. Mr. Speaker, I am about to call attention to what I believe is the improper conduct of the Government. It has reference to these resolutions, but it arises from a question which has been answered in this House since the resolutions were placed on the paper. I wish to say again—and I hope I shall be allowed to finish one sentence, just one, without interruption—that the conduct of the Government has been culpable, and very culpable, in so far that they have made a proposal which may have the result of bringing in here, in competition with the products of Canadian industries, the goods of those great productive countries, Belgium and Germany, and that they made that proposal by the admission of the Controller of Customs in crass ignorance.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member refers, I am afraid, to the tariff proposals.

Mr. McNEILL. Certainly, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. That puts the hon. gentleman out of order.

Mr. McNEILL. I have finished, Mr. Speaker.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman has not concluded with a motion.

Mr. FOSTER. The motion to adjourn is to come.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Then he has spoken under false pretenses.

Mr. FOSTER. Not under false pretenses, because the hon. gentleman said that he would conclude with a motion, but he was called to order before he could do so.

Mr. McNEILL. I was prepared to move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) has the floor.

THE BELGIAN CONSULATE, MONTREAL.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I beg to call the attention of the Government to the following advertisement in the Montreal "Gazette" of yesterday:

The Belgian Consulate in Montreal gives notice to importers of Belgian goods that a protest has been entered to the Imperial Government, in London, against the non-application by the Government of the Dominion of Canada of the Anglo-Belgian Treaty of 1862, which guarantees, without any restriction, the most-favoured clause to Belgium in all the British colonies.

In consequence, importers of Belgium goods will be instructed to pass their customs entries under protest, and to forward a copy of the same to the Belgian General Consulate in Ottawa.

Montreal, April 27, 1897.

I would ask the Government what is their intention in regard to this announcement.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The answer of the Government is what has already been stated, that the Government do not admit that the German and Belgian treaties apply to the resolutions now before the House.

BRITISH GOODS AND CUSTOMS TARIFF.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I want to ask the Controller of Customs or the Finance Minister whether or not it was to be understood that, when an order was given to the customs officials to allow British goods in at one-eighth reduction, that included or excluded the British colonies ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The decision of the Controller of Customs is that the only country at present entitled to the privilege of the reciprocal tariff is the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. There may be other countries which may become entitled to those privileges upon representations, but the decision of the Customs Department is to apply that tariff at present to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and to no other countries.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, I have another question to ask, if my hon. friend will allow me, and that is, whether, up to the present time, any report has been made by the Controller of Customs, in accordance with that clause, to the Governor General in Council, and whether they have acted formally upon that report ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The judgment of the Government is that the Controller of Customs has ample authority, under the terms of the resolution, to act for himself, subject to any later action which the Governor in Council may be pleased to take, and therefore no report from the Controller of Customs was necessary to immediate action, and I think I am correct in stating that, while the Controller of Customs has discussed the subject, no formal order has been passed up to this moment on the subject.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, I want to ask the Minister of Finance if he has yet brought down those bank note contracts, which he promised so long ago : he has not been half as prompt to fulfil that promise as he was to fulfil the promise he made to the coal men in Montreal.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Perhaps I found the coal men more reasonable. I had an opportunity to run through the papers for the first time to-day, and I think they will be completed and possibly laid on the Table to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. I also want to ask for the returns I moved for very early in the session as to the commissions and the commissioners appointed in reference to partisan offences. We want them very particularly.

Mr. IVES. Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I want to ask one question supplementary to those which my hon. friend has asked. I want to ask if British goods are now being admitted at the different customs ports at one-eighth off the ordinary tariff ; if so, what proof of British origin is required by collectors ; and whether the Controller of Customs or the Minister of Finance will lay on the Table at a very early moment the regulations which have been made for the proof of British origin of the goods admitted under the preferential arrangement ?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). I presume that the hon. gentleman would like me to lay on the Table the instructions sent to the different customs officials on that point ?

Mr. IVES. Yes.

Mr. McNEILL. I would like to ask my hon. friend the Controller of Customs, in view of the fact that it is not yet determined whether Belgium and Germany have the right, irrespective of any treaty, to send their goods into our market on the strength of this resolution on equal terms with England, where the preference to England comes in.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. May I be permitted to answer ? The preference to England operates in this way, that to-day British goods are being admitted at the preferential rates, and the goods of the other countries are not.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McNEILL. Will my hon. friend say that if it is shown that under the clause Belgium and Germany have a right to come in, he will endeavour to prevent their coming in, or that he can prevent their coming in ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend may safely assume that whatever we decide is right shall be done.

Mr. McNEILL. I did not at all refer——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. McNEILL. My hon. friend will, I am sure, allow me to say that I did not at all refer to what my hon. friend might think

was right. I wish to ask him whether he thinks he would have any power at all under this resolution to exclude the goods of those countries.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think that any question, even if proper notice has been given on the paper, would be in order which calls for an expression of opinion. The hon. gentleman's question would not at any time be in order.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As a representative from one of the agricultural districts of the great North-west, I desire to address the House on the tariff in its relation to the farming interests of that country. My position perhaps is a little peculiar. In the west, the people were accustomed to call me a Patron Grit; and by and by, when we found that our presentation of policy secured a large support from the Liberal-Conservatives, I was wont to claim the title of Liberal-Conservative and Independent Patron Grit. I thus speak, as you see, for a mixed multitude in the far west, and I wish to draw your attention to the condition of the people there under the old tariff and their prospects under the new. Our people in the North-west have but little sympathy for the principle of protection. We have come by experience to learn this fact, that whatever protection may have done for the cities of the east, it has done very little for the wide prairies of the west, and is not of a nature to be of any benefit to our settlers out there in their particular calling. In making this statement, I am convinced that I have the support of a large number of Liberal-Conservatives in the country. Have we not had ample proof of this statement? The empty pockets of our people, their want of credit, the fact that they are handicapped by monopolies of various kinds—all these things have led them to change their faith and to look for help in some other direction. Under the old system, it was supposed that there should be a home market for the products of the people, but we have found by experience that the home market is a fallacy and a delusion, and to-day we find ourselves out in the wide world competing in a free trade market, so that the duty upon wheat and flour is no protection to the farmer whose market is not at home, but in free trade England. We have then to put to ourselves the question, who are our opponents in this free trade market? In the production of grain and beef and dairy products, who are those with whom we have to compete in this great market? They are the producers of Europe and of Asia and the Argentine Republic and the United States. Under these circumstances, the western farmer is submitted to special difficulties. He has to stand shoulder to shoulder with the cheap labour of the world. I have some knowledge of the production of wheat in the far east, and I know that men can be employed there for sixpence a day, and such is the nature of the climate that they scarcely need a house to sleep in or clothing to protect them. In fact, six yards of cloth at 10 cents a yard would clothe half a dozen of them. In these countries, therefore, the farmer, who is producing grain for the British market, has a decided advantage over the western producer, living as we do in such a climate as we have in the North-west. I could easily show that at the prices in the North-west for clothing, it requires at the very least 120 bushels at 50 cents a bushel to clothe one of our farmers respectably. So that the eastern labourer has an advantage in the matter of clothing as well as in the expense of living. Clothing is more expensive in the North-west than it is even in Ontario, and the people of the east are better clothed than our people in the west.

Again, the odds are against the farmer in the west because of his great distance from the seaboard, which is a difficulty that cannot very well be overcome. The average haul for grain in the Argentine republic, now a strong competitor in the production of wheat, is only 50 miles, while we have a long and expensive haul, so that it really takes one bushel to pay for another in putting it on the market. It is a common thing for the farmers to say, when asked what a certain one is doing—Oh, he is farming on shares with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Massey-Harris Company. And this is a difficulty that cannot easily be overcome.

Then, if you look at the cost of freight from Asia. Last October wheat was being brought from Bombay and from Guzzerat, according to the Bombay "Gazette," at 60 cents per ton, so that it is impossible, under these circumstances, for us to compete with people who enjoy such advantages in a great open free trade market. After the freight is paid and all the charges, the balance is exceedingly small which is left to the producer in the North-west.

I also wish to say a little about the disadvantages under which we labour in the grain trade. The fact is that the producer in the North-west to-day is very much in the position of a dumb beast of burden. He produces his grain, and he takes it to the market. He knows very well that he must be exceedingly civil and take precisely what is offered him or he may fare worse in consequence. We have combines in the buying, and we have also the mixing of grain, which

is a grievous wrong inflicted upon the trade. Buyers generally buy on a lower grade, and if the farmer produces a superior article, say sixty-four or sixty-five pounds to the bushel, he does not receive the commercial value of his superior article; but the buyer finds that after he has given the farmer the highest price, it may be, for No. 1 hard, he has an article that he can manipulate. He can mix inferior grades with this superior article, and if the mixture comes up to the Government standard he has made money by the mixing of the grain, and often it occurs that the grain is bought upon the one grade and sold upon another. This is a source of great anxiety to the farmer of the west. The wheat goes into the elevator at Port Arthur on one grade and it is shipped to Europe on another grade, and we have good reason to believe that England knows very little of No. 1 hard as it is produced by the farmer of the west. This works decidedly to his disadvantage; it destroys the reputation of the grain in the British market, hence reduces the price, and the loss comes back upon the producer. We hold that there is great room for investigation into this whole business, that the farmer may have the just reward of his labour, and the fair advantage of his superior grain. Now, there is another difficulty under which the farmer labours—I refer to the freight rates, which are bushel for bushel—it requires one bushel to place another upon the market. We hope that in due time, with our deep waterways improved, freight rates may be reduced.

Then, again, perhaps the chief difficulty that we have to contend with is the difficulty and expense of getting the machinery that it is necessary to employ. Considering the position, the North-west farmer occupies in relation to his competitors in the British market, we have reason to fear that the high prices of former days have gone by, and that we cannot hope to receive the prices we realized five or six years ago.

What, then, is to be done to relieve the people under these circumstances? The people have met together and discussed the question themselves with empty pockets and no credit, and with difficulties staring them in the face, they have asked what is wrong. Many of them do not understand the situation, but they have asked what is wrong, and have studied the question carefully; and have arrived at the conclusion, which they expressed on the 23rd of June last, that there was need for a change in the whole fiscal policy of the Government. I think, Sir, we are exceeding happy in appearing as the representatives of the people under a new Government whose fiscal policy is largely in accord with the principles that we have been wont to support. What we chiefly want is tariff reform, but not tariff reform on the principles upon which it has sometimes been asked. We are not here to clamour for everything that the farmer needs in the production of his grain to be put upon the free list. No, Sir. We want to say to the Government and to this House that we are willing to bear our share of the public expenses; but we wish simply to see to it that every man shall do the same thing. We believe, then, in tariff reform upon the principle of equity and justice; we have no sympathy with class legislation; we believe in the great principle that it should be the object of a Government to secure the greatest good to the greatest number. This being the case, then, we want to say that the idea of protecting certain industries in the country to the extent to which they have been protected in the past was a wrong inflicted upon the agricultural classes of Canada generally, and upon those of the North-west in particular. Let us, then, come to the point that is specially interesting to the North-west farmer. In the new tariff there are many things to encourage him. We have got rid of the forty and fifty and sixty and eighty per cent duties in the new tariff. This must be a relief to the agricultural classes generally. However, as representing the people and the opinions of the people in the west, we are bound to say that we would have been glad if the Government had been able just to do a little more along the same line. We know very well that it is difficult for any Government to make such a revolution on the fiscal policy as to strike out altogether the protective principle, that this would cause serious injury to many who are engaged in manufacturing interests, and that it might produce panic in many quarters. We are glad, however, that such changes have been made, and we believe that the Government have gone as far as they possibly could go, in view of the general interests of the Dominion. But we hope that they had given the manufacturers such a hint as to show them that they have only a taste of that which is to come in future years. They have, in my opinion at least, only administered a homeopathic dose to the manufacturers of the country. We hope it will stimulate their growth and that the infant industries will advance as soon as possible, so to take care of themselves. I know that some hon. members have said that it is not a wise thing to keep the manufacturers or the business interests of the country in any uncertainty, that the mere fact that uncertainty exists will do an injury to all trade. I do not think, looking at the new tariff, that the Government is likely to keep manufacturers in any uncertainty, or the business of the country in any uncertainty. They have declared that they believe it is not to be a perfect tariff, not to be an ideal tariff, but it is all that they can do under the circumstances in which they find themselves placed to-day; and we hope that by and by they will be able to carry out their pledges and their promises to the people and travel still further in the same line. So we regard the new tariff as a very gentle hint to the manufacturers of the country that the time must

come that they will be required to do without the support they have enjoyed for so many years past. Why should such a state of things be perpetuated? Looking at the matter from a western standpoint, we regard the manufacturing interests, especially those of machinery in this light: If our manufacturers cannot, to-day, after eighteen years of special advantage, give us as good and as cheap an article as we can get elsewhere, we feel that we are not justly dealt with when we are called upon to support them any longer.

Now, there are many things in the tariff Bill which we would be disposed to accept as a fair instalment of what the Government is likely to do, and we shall be able to return to our people, I hope, with a good deal of encouragement arising out of what has been done in their favour. Yet there are a few things which we must bring under the notice of the Government, and we are not, I am sorry to say, in a position to adopt without dissent all that has been done. One point to which we take exception is the duty on agricultural implements. If we hold, as we do, that the protection principle has not done the west any great service, then we regret that the new Government, in the new tariff, should do more for the manufacturer than the old Government did, because the duty remains the same as under the old Government on agricultural implements, but they have increased the privileges of the manufacturers. I understand why it is that they have conceded to the wishes of the manufacturers. To-day they find themselves not able to compete with the Americans in the production of machinery of the best grades. They needed some reduction on steel and iron to put them on an equal footing with their American competitors. Now, we would like to go back to our people and be able to say that under the new tariff the oppressor has not been strengthened, that his privileges are not greater than they were formerly, I would be better pleased to be able to say that the duty remains unchanged. But we shall be obliged to state that the manufacturer of agricultural implements has greater privileges under the new tariff than he had under the old, without any consideration being given to the consumer. Well, there is a way out of this difficulty. We have been reminded by the members of the Government that this is not an ideal tariff. If it can be shown that an injustice has been done, they will be ready and willing to repair it; if a change is necessary, they will take it into their serious consideration. We would like to get out of the difficulty in this way. A large business in machinery is being done by the United States in the west, and when the duty is imposed upon the machine, it is not the duty upon the invoice price, or the commercial price of the American machine, but is is a duty imposed by the customs-house officer according to his judgment in the case. A machine that can be bought in the United States for $65 or $80 is valued at $100, and the people of the west have to pay a duty on $100 instead of a duty on $65 or $80. Now, I would like to throw out a hint this afternoon, that if the Government will see fit to alter their law in reference to the valuation of those articles, and allow them to come in, not at a reduced price, but upon the price at which they are sold to people in the United States, it would very largely assist the farmers of the North-west in procuring the machinery which they specially desire. I want also to say here that the preference is largely in favour of American machinery. That may have arisen out of the way in which the manufacturers have dealt with the people during the past years, and I mention here especially the Massey-Harris Company. No better campaign literature could be used in the North-west Territories than the will of the late Mr. Massey. It opened the eyes of the people: they felt that while they were struggling with difficulties, paying to that company, in many instances, not only 12 per cent, but sometimes 24 per cent, that while they had been subject to great hardships, and hundreds of our settlers had been turned out of home, many being obliged to leave and go elsewhere, this company had made the money, and oppressed the settlers of the West. This question of machinery, therefore, has caused considerable dissatisfaction; the duty upon smaller implements has been reduced, but this is of more importance perhaps to the farmers of Ontario and of Quebec than it is to us. Scythes, hay knives and such articles are not very largely used. It is true the duty has been thrown off various smaller implements that are a necessity, and hence a ground of encouragement. There is, however, another question that we wish to bring under the attention of the Government in the hope that they may yet, remedy the matter, that is the question of coal oil. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not in the position of one who has a by-election hanging over him, and I am not in the position of one who has clamoured for coal oil to be put on the free list, when speaking to the people. But I feel that something ought to be done in this matter to relieve the people of the North-west generally. This is a question of rates rather than of duty, the duty is a small matter, but the rates upon coal oil are a very serious matter. Now, I will read in your hearing the rates as given by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the figures that are here given can be fully substantiated. Freight rates per gallon from Petrolea, Ontario, to the following places in the North-west: To Winnipeg, 7·24 cents; to Portage la Prairie, 8·23 cents; Brandon, 8·88; Moosomin, 9·43; Broadview, 10·25; Regina, 10·99; Moose Jaw, 11·28; as near as we can make it; these are the figures of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Medicine Hat, 13·03 ; Calgary, 13·86 ; Revelstoke, 16·54 ; Lethbridge, 15·39 ; Manitou, 8·51 ; Killarney, 9·06 ; Deloraine, 9·43 ; Carnduff, 9·51 ; Prince Albert, 14·13 ; Edmonton, 16·64 ; Rapid City, 9·06 ; and so on. I need not occupy the time of the House by reading further, but you will see this is a very serious matter. At present, coal oil may be sent in tanks by rail to Winnipeg ; there it is put in barrels and distributed over the west. This also adds to the expense of coal oil in that country. The cost of barrelling the oil, warehousing and re-shipment will be about 5½ cents. Now, I wish to elaborate this a little further and show what the result is when looked at in another light. The rate on coal oil from Petrolea to Lethbridge, for example, per hundred pounds is $1.66½ ; according to their own rates it is 15·39 cents per gallon, making the freight rate per ton $33.30. At this rate the freight per carload of twenty tons would be $666. The distance from Petrolea to Winnipeg is about 1,500 miles, and from Winnipeg to Lethbridge 777 miles. Now, it is generally acknowledged by railway companies the world over that half a cent per ton per mile is good pay. Proceeding upon this principle, half a cent per ton per mile for 2,277 miles would be $11.38, or per car of twenty tons, $227.60. The rate charged, you observe, is $666 instead of $227.60, or $438.40 in excess of the generally admitted paying rate. The railroad rate of 15·39 cents per gallon is three times what it should be, three times a paying rate, and should not be more than 5⅓ cents per gallon on the cargo.

Here, then, you see the freight rate is a very great difficulty. This is not a matter perhaps that the Government can rectify, but they can allow the coal oil transported by railway companies to be examined and permitted to pass on to points in the west, where it can be handled and distributed, thus saving the expense of barrelling the oil which will be 5 cents more, and in this way the difficulty could be to some considerable extent overcome. My contention was when I came to this House this session that we should have at least a 3 cent cut on coal oil. We were met here with this difficulty, that this would seriously affect the business in western Ontario. Well, Sir, I am not so selfish, and I hope the people of the west are not so selfish that they would desire to injuriously affect parties interested in this business. But here is a way out of the difficulty, one which would relieve our people and promote the interests of gentlemen engaged in the business in western Canada, and I hope it will receive the careful consideration of the Government before the House closes, inasmuch as a 5 cent per gallon advantage might be realized by the people.

We would like to see some change made in the new tariff—(1) in regard to agricultural implements, (2) in regard to coal oil, (3) in regard to fruit.

It is well known that the North-west is not a fruit-growing country. The Territories can produce the best of wheat and of beef, and the people are prepared to purchase their fruit. But a serious difficulty is met with in the new tariff, especially as regards grapes and strawberries. There is a duty of 2 cents per pound upon both these articles, which simply means 200 per cent. In California grapes can be bought for $20 per ton. The duty on those grapes is $40 per ton, the duty on packages being extra. Last year it was possible to buy Concord grapes in Michigan at $7.50 per ton, with the same duty of $40 per ton, or nearly 500 per cent. We see no reason why the people in the west should be debarred by the tariff from purchasing fruit, and it is desired that lower rates should be granted than those in the new tariff. We are simply throwing out hints and stating reasons why in the interest of the people of the North-west changes should be made, and I hope the hints thrown out will be taken into serious consideration by the Government and that they will give us some relief along those lines.

I believe this Government has at heart the well-being of the agricultural classes. They have given evidence of this in regard to the dairying question and cold storage, and those interests will be largely strengthened by the attention already given them, and our people, having in view what has been done already along those lines, are taking new heart. I am glad also to observe from letters I have received from the North-west that the new tariff is already taking pretty well there. I have pointed out these difficulties, which I personally feel, and I consider it is incumbent on me to speak of them in the interests of the western country. So we accept this tariff as an instalment of what the Government will do. I know it is impossible to remove this principle of protection which is obnoxious to the people of the west—it cannot be done in a year or two. You cannot take the smell out of a fish barrel by one scouring, it needs to be repeated, and so I hope that as regards the tariff, after it has passed under the revision of the Government, the people of the west will find they have supported a Government that is looking forward to the adoption of free trade principles.

I desire to say a word about our relationship to the motherland. As farmers we send many of our surplus products to the mother country, and she receives them gladly ; at the same time we are pleased to have access to her markets, and we feel it a hardship that we cannot be allowed to purchase in an unrestricted market. If she takes our surplus products, it is only just and fair that we should take her manufactured goods, if they are better and cheaper

than we can produce at home. I rejoice in the step taken towards lowering the duties between Canada and the mother country, and I rejoice at the adroitness with which the present Government have tackled that question in view of all the difficulties that surround it. I think we may hope for great things that shall result to the country's good. I can fully understand why hon. gentlemen opposite have a great deal to say on this question, because virtually this was a tid-bit with them in former years, and the Government of the day has literally scooped the whole thing out and left them nothing to talk about along that line. We desire, then, to leave these matters with the Government and hope that the measures which have been taken will do much to strengthen the hands of the producers in the North-west and to give us new encouragement and new strength to cope with difficulties of climate and general living.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the House has listened with much interest to the hon. gentlemen who have spoken as representing the Manitoba, North-west Territories and British Columbia. I think it must strike every one as strange that those gentlemen's campaign speeches should have consisted largely of a general cry that the people of the North-west were being ground down by an exorbitant tariff which was unbearable. But the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has told the House that members of the Opposition must feel pretty uncomfortable because they have been scooped out and nothing has been left them on that line. If we have been scooped out, it must be because the tariff, according to that hon. gentleman, is substantially the same protectionist tariff which was in force under the Conservative Government. While I do not agree with the hon. gentleman in that regard, I think the general proposition and statement made here that nine-tenths of the tariff is the old tariff is true, and it indicates that hon. gentlemen opposite have been afraid to adopt that policy which, when in Opposition, they declared they would adopt. They do recognize one fact, that it was not the policy of the Liberals when in Opposition that returned them to power, but that it was the mistakes of the Government of that day, who adopted a policy in respect to separate schools in Manitoba which did not meet with the approval of the Conservative party, nor of the people of Canada. I must say in addition—and I do not wish to say it in any hurtful sense—that the late Prime Minister had surrounded himself by Ministers, some of whom did not receive the full confidence and support of the Conservative party. For these reasons, and not because the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite commended itself to the country, the Conservative party went into Opposition and the Liberal party were placed in power.

Mr. DOUGLAS.

Now, the first thing that has struck me in connection with this tariff proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite, is its omissions. They have told us nothing about their policy on the export duty on logs and pulp wood, a question that is agitating the people of the province of Ontario and the province of Quebec, and a question upon which the future prosperity of a large portion of these provinces depend. For my part, I have no hesitation in saying, that in face of the conditions at present existing, the true policy for this Government to adopt is to impose an export duty upon saw logs and upon pulp wood. I believe that such a policy would restore a large measure of prosperity to portions of Canada that are not prosperous to-day; portions of Canada that have been deprived of the wealth nature has given them. I believe that the Government would be consulting the best interests of the entire Dominion by adopting such a policy. Then, Sir, we were told that the Government might have another policy, some time in the future, about coal; and they foreshadowed that they are going to put a duty upon anthracite coal, an article from which the late Government removed the duty. Sir, this Government have not been able to give us any evidence that would justify the re-imposition of that duty upon anthracite coal.

We heard a great deal on the stump from hon. gentlemen opposite, and we heard a great deal from the Prime Minister, as to what the Liberals were going to do when they got into power. The Prime Minister told the people: We will enlarge the free list and give the manufacturers free raw material. Sir, have they done so? Can they point to a single instance in which they have given free material to the manufacturer, to enable him to produce more cheaply? No, Sir, they cannot. They have discovered since they came into power that the Conservative Government had already done that for the manufacturers of Canada. A protective policy looks after two important features, first, to make the raw materials of the manufacturers free of duty where these raw materials are not manufactured in this country, and second, that the necessaries of life for the people should also be free of duty, when these necessaries are not produced within the Dominion. The late Government adhered to these two ideas closely, as a necessary portion of their policy of protection; and, Sir, the new Government, in spite of all their pledges about raw material have commenced their career by putting a duty of 92½ per cent upon uncleaned rice, which is the raw material of the rice manufacturers of Canada. That, this Government has done without any justification whatever. I find that there were over 13,000,000 pounds of uncleaned rice imported last year at a cost of $108,000, or 81 cents per hundred pounds, and this Government in their wisdom have put

a duty of 75 cents per hundred pounds on an article that cost 81 cents per hundred pounds.

I would like to hear the Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson) or the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) justify such an extraordinary imposition of duty upon an article which is the food of the people. The result of it will be without doubt, that not only will the rice not be cheaper, but that it will be dearer, because under this tariff it cannot be cleaned in this country and will have to be imported. Most of the rice importations consumed in British Columbia comes direct from China, but for the greater portion of the eastern provinces the rice is cleaned or manufactured in Canada, and they sell it cheaper than it can be imported, or else they would not be able to sell it at all. Henceforth the rice will have to be imported, and the result is, that the people will not have that superior article which is produced in our Canadian factories to-day. We never had a satisfactory article of rice produced in this country until we adopted the plan of cleaning the rice ourselves. Another disadvantage of this increased tariff on the raw material of rice, is, that British ships will not in the future be employed in carrying the uncleaned rice to Canada.

Now, Sir, this Government have adopted a policy of giving free corn in this country. In my opinion that is a disastrous move. In 1878 when corn was free of duty, there were about 7,300,000 bushels imported from the United States; while last year, there were only 2,750,000 bushels imported, and I am told that most of that corn was either used by the distillers or by the starch and glucose factories, and that while a little was imported for human food, a very small quantity was imported for cattle feeding. What will be the result under this new tariff? The result will be, that instead of having 7,300,000 bushels imported as we had in 1878, the importations will very largely exceed that amount, and will correspondingly displace the production of coarse grains by the Canadian farmers. To-day we are exporting large quantities of these coarse grains. Last year we exported nearly a million bushels of barley, nearly a million bushels of oats, and the product of another million bushels of oats in the shape of oatmeal. We also exported 1,500,000 bushels of pease, 139,000 cwt. of bran, 400,000 bushels of buckwheat, and 214,600 tons of hay. The prices of all these products will be lowered to the Canadian farmer by the free importation of Indian corn. The total value of these articles of which we produced a surplus for export was over $4,500,000. Yet I venture to say that next year the Canadian market for these products will be lost to the Canadian farmer, and will be supplied by the American farmer in the shape of free corn. So that I do not apprehend anything but loss to the Canadian farmer from the free admission of corn. The proposition made by the late Government was, I think, the fairest one this country could adopt; that was, that we would permit the free importation of corn into Canada if in return the Americans would give us the free importation of barley into their country. But the Government of the United States declined that proposition, and to-day we find the Government of Canada giving them this advantage without obtaining any reciprocal advantage in return.

Now, Sir, we have heard a good deal in the last two days about preferential trade with Great Britain. For myself, I may say that I would be most strongly in favour of any proposal of that nature that would be satisfactory to both countries. But as the discussion proceeds, and as questions are asked across the floor of the House, the question becomes still more confused, and the course the Government has taken becomes more unsatisfactory. I was much pleased myself to hear a general proposal to give preferential treatment to Great Britain; but that proposal should have been carefully considered, and should have been one that could have been strongly justified, and one that would not leave the business with loose ends, as the proposal of the Government undoubtedly does. If, in giving preferential trade to Great Britain we are also giving preferential trade to Belgium and Germany, as appears somewhat probable, we Canadians will be committing a very great mistake in giving trade advantages to both Belgium and Germany without getting any corresponding advantages from them in return. And, from what we heard from the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), we have some reason to believe that such a proposal would delight him and delight the members of the Government; and if that preferential trade could be extended to the United States as well, that would please them still more. While I would give preferential trade to Great Britain, I would not give it to any other country unless we got substantial and equivalent advantages in return. We have been told that the Government are not very certain what the outcome may be. I think they should have ascertained exactly the position in which this preferential arrangement with Great Britain would place Canada. We heard an hon. member to-day read an advertisement which has been inserted in the press by the Consul General of Belgium to Canada, in which he announces that he is going to enter a protest at once, and demand from the British Government that the same advantages be given to Belgian goods coming into Canada as are given to British goods. So that we shall be at once confronted with that question; and if it is decided that Belgium is to receive the same privilege as Great Britain, it follows, I am told, that Germany will get it as well; and then the people of this country will find that

by the legislation now before us we are giving preferential trade to Belgium and Germany without receiving any corresponding advantage whatever in return.

But, Sir, when you examine more closely what these proposed preferential arrangements with Great Britain are, I think you will find that they are not so great as has been supposed. I imagine that the British Government and the British people are being imposed upon these few days, because, while they have been told that we are going to decrease the duty on British goods one-eighth this year and another eighth next year, they have not been told that before we reduce those duties, we did what they say is done in those "fake" stores. These stores, in advertising bargains, first raise the price, say from 16 cents to 25 cents, and then advertise them as bargains at 20 cents. That is pretty much what this Government has done? In the case of linen goods, what have they done? On the greater portion of the linen imports they have put on an additional duty of 25 per cent, and they then announce that they are going to reduce the duties on these goods from Great Britain 12½ per cent. Last year, of linens, brown or bleached, we imported $71,000 worth; of linen duck, canvas, huckaback or other manufactures of flax, $492,000 worth; of linen thread, $119,000 worth; and of other manufactures of flax, hemp or jute, or these combined, $180,000 worth; making a total importation of these goods of $863,000 worth. But on all these goods the Government, before decreasing the duty 12½ per cent to Great Britain, added 25 per cent to the old duty. Of another large class of linen goods, damask of linen, including napkins, tray cloths, stair linen and diaper, we imported $270,000 worth; of linen handkerchiefs, $110,000 worth; and of towels, $122,000 worth; making a total importation of these articles of $1,366,000 worth. On all these goods the Government have increased the duty from 16⅔ to 25 per cent, mostly 25, before reducing it 12½ per cent to Great Britain. They may say: If we have increased the duty on these articles, why do you protectionists complain? I complain because of all these goods there is not a dollar's worth made in Canada to-day, and there will not be for the next seven years. Great Britain has the complete control of that trade, so far as Canada is concerned. The duty on these goods was placed at 20 per cent by the late Government, because, as they are not made in Canada, the duty affords no protection to Canadian manufacturers, and therefore the articles should be brought in at the lowest possible rate.

They talk about giving this preference to Great Britain. Why, Great Britain has the preference in these articles to-day. Our importations of linen goods amount to about $1,366,000. How much do you think of these goods come from Great Britain? $1,292,000, or a little over 95 per cent, showing that the preferential trade given to Great Britain can not help her at all, since she has the whole trade practically to-day. Now, with reference to cottons, the same remark applies. Of cottons, printed, divers colours, we imported last year to the extent of about $2,560,000. Of this amount we imported, in round numbers, to the extent of two million dollars from Great Britain, so that all other countries supply less than 20 per cent of our importations of these goods. We cannot therefore expect, by giving preferential trade to Great Britain, to increase her trade in that commodity, because there will be always special lines of which the American manufacturers and others have the control and which we will continue to import from them. What more has been done in this matter of preferential trade? Before these hon. gentlemen took off the 12½ per cent, they took the precaution to add 16⅔ per cent to the duty on these articles. I venture to say that had they said to Great Britain: We have given you a preference over all other countries, but before we took off the 12½ per cent we added 17, the case would have presented a different aspect. With regard to other cotton goods, we imported $4,230,000. Of this, $3,130,000 worth came from Great Britain, or more than 75 per cent, and, as I have said, there will be special lines in the manufacture of which some countries are sure to excel and of which Great Britain, even with preferential trade cannot expect to send us a larger proportion in the future than she has done in the past. Then we come to the question of woollen goods, on which these hon. gentlemen have changed the duties from specific to ad valorem. And, Mr. Speaker, one after another, these gentlemen on the other side who got up to sing the praises of the new tariff made it one of their strongest points that they had abolished these specific duties very largely, and, as the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) said yesterday, they will not rest until the last vestige of these specific duties is abolished. You would think that specific duties were something indefensible, something very improper, and yet I may say that in every case where they abolished it, these hon. gentlemen have destroyed a Canadian industry. Such, no doubt, was their object in abolishing specific duties. But to-day, what have they on their tariff? Why, the most of the duties they collect in Canada to-day, under their new tariff, are specific duties. I have here a long list of the articles on which specific duties are charged. Most of the products of the Canadian farmer are protected by a specific duty. If these duties were wrong, why did not hon. gentlemen opposite change them? They dared not do it. I have a list of five articles on which were paid $11,750,000 duty, and the duties on which in every case are specific or specific and ad valorem combined. We get from

the customs on spirits and wines $2,140,000 specific duties, or, what the hon. gentlemen opposite say is worse still, specific and ad valorem combined. On tobacco imported we collected $267,000; on sugar, $1,250,000, all specific duties or specific and ad valorem combined. From excise I think we get $7,950,000, making on these five items $11,630,000 collected of these objectionable duties of which hon. gentlemen opposite complain. Not only that, but I have a long list here, which I shall not trouble the House with reading, of goods that are to-day, under the new tariff, subject to specific duties only or specific and ad valorem combined.

The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce a few days ago, in speaking of specific duties, said that under them the people could not tell what they were paying. Why, the only way in which you can tell what you pay is by charging specific duties. You charge 35 per cent on British goods, do you know the cost of these goods in England? Not at all, you have no means of knowing it. The only way, therefore, in which you can tell exactly what you are paying is by paying specific duties. If you abolish specific duties, then you will not know what you are paying. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce again said:

> Let me say, speaking from experience, that it is a far harder thing to inflict a heavy protectionist tariff under ad valorem than under specific duties, and therefore it is a matter of some practical importance that we have succeeded in purging the present tariff to a large extent from specific duties, which had the pernicious effect to which I have alluded.

Nothing of the kind. In every case in which specific duties were abolished, as in the case of these woollen goods, they will have the effect of destroying a Canadian industry. What are the facts with reference to woollen goods? We imported last year $2,674,000 worth of woollen goods under the old tariff which imposed a specific duty of 5 cents a pound and an ad valorem duty of 25 per cent, and the duty collected amounted to $873,000. Hon. gentlemen opposite said that was too high a duty. It means 50, or 60 or 70 per cent on the goods. But what does it mean? It means exactly 32½ per cent, and the duty these hon. gentlemen have put on is 35 per cent. Then they say to us: Well, if we have increased the duty, why do you protectionists complain? I shall tell you why. Because all these goods worth over 60 cents a yard will pay an increased duty. On these, under the old tariff, the duty was 18 1-8, and under the new tariff it will be 21. That is, you are giving more protection to the finer classes of goods. To the coat of the rich man, you are giving nearly 3 per cent more protection than you did before.

Then you are giving protection to the finer class of goods, to the goods of the rich man nearly 3 cents more than was given before. On goods at 50 cents a yard, there will be 15½ cents protection, or nearly 2 cents more than under the old tariff, which gave a protection of 18 5-8 cents. But what about the class of goods bought by the poorer man, goods that are produced from Canadian wools? The result of this tariff is that our goods that are sold under 40 cents a yard, and weigh twelve ounces to the yard, the protection is less than before. On goods at 40 cents a yard the protection is about the same. Goods at 20 cents are given 25 per cent less protection than before. And what is the result? The result is that the manufacturer who imports all his raw material, the fine cape wools and merino wools, has a larger protection than before, while the manufacturer who uses wools produced by the Canadian farmers has a lower protection than before, and, as a result, we are told, will be wiped out of existence. We had already reduced the duty to such a point that we had gone a little too far, in my opinion, as regards these lower classes of Canadian cloths, tweeds, blankets and flannels. We touched the lowest point to which reduction could go, without wiping out the manufacturers. This reduction means the death of this industry. But hon. gentlemen opposite tell us: We will give the poor man cheaper goods. Not a bit of it. You may give him lower-priced shoddy goods from England in place of our own goods made from the pure Canadian wool. To prove what I say, I have a telegram here which says:

> Cobourg woollen mills shut down early in the year and offered for sale yesterday.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. They failed under the old tariff.

Mr. WALLACE. I said that we had got the duty down to the lowest point at which the manufacturer could live. This proves that we did cut the duty down to such a point that it could not be further reduced without injury. The Government make a further reduction on these goods, and the results is that these mills were offered for sale yesterday and no bidders.

Now, with reference to the trade with Great Britain. I said that last year we imported of these woollen goods, $2,674,000 worth, the duty upon which was $873,000, or an average of 32 per cent. It is now made 35 per cent. But what I wish particularly to call the attention of the House to is, that of this $2,674,000 worth imported, $2,583,000 worth were imported from Great Britain—that is to say, 96 per cent of those woollens imported are produced in Britain. How much more can you expect to import from Great Britain under any preferential tariff? She may send in a larger proportion of our imports, but I do not believe she will. The effect of that tariff combined with the preferential arrangement will be to import a much larger proportion of our whole consumption. And what does that mean? It means that for every hundred

men employed in England to make these goods, a hundred Canadians will be walking the streets without employment. That will be the effect in my opinion, of the change from a combined specific and ad valorem duty to an ad valorem duty with a reduction of 12½ per cent on that class of goods. The manufacturer of the finer class of goods who imports the raw materials, will be benefited by this tariff, but the manufacturer of the Canadian wools or Canadian shoddy, if you like, will be wiped out of existence and the Canadian farmer and the Canadian artisan will both be injured. I think it just to call the attention of the House to another error, as I think it, made by the Government with respect to the duty on cheap yarns. They have reduced the duty to 15 per cent, while the manufacturer who uses this raw material is given 35 per cent. Now, there is a great fallacy in this regard. It is said: Here is a manufacturer who pays 20 per cent on his raw material, while there is a duty of 20 per cent on his manufactured article, and so he has no protection. But that does not follow; he may get a very substantial protection, because the material upon which he pays the duty may be only one-quarter of the value of his finished product. If his raw material costs $100, and he pays a duty of 20 per cent, the amount he is charged for duty is $20; but if he sells the manufactured product for $400 and has a protection of 20 per cent, he has a gross protection of $80, or a net protection of $60, after paying the duty on his raw material. The carpet manufacturers of this country, as I am informed—in fact, I know—do not make the yarn themselves, but buy it from men whose only business it is to make it. We have a large number of yarn manufacturers in this country who supply not only the carpet manufacturers but the woollen manufacturers and the manufacturers of other products, who all now get protection to the amount of 35 per cent. With a reduction of duty on these yarns to 15 per cent these yarn manufacturers will be wiped out of existence. I do not see any reason why yarns of this cheap quality should not get as much protection—and we gave, and I think properly, a little more—as is given to the manufacturers of the finer yarns. If it is said that the finer yarns require more labour, I answer that the price is higher in proportion, and to be consistent you will have to give at least as large a percentage of protection on the low-priced goods as on the high-priced.

Now, there are other things, the duties upon which have been raised. For instance, the Government has increased duty on linen goods 25 per cent. Linen goods are not made in this country to the amount of a single dollar. The duty on guns, muskets, rifles, pistols, revolvers and firearms in general are increased 50 per cent—from 20 per cent to 30 per cent. I think I am right in saying—I speak subject to correction—that there is not a single factory of these articles in this country. What is the reason for this increase of duty? None that I know of. I would like the Ministers to state why they have increased the articles 50 per cent, when none are made in Canada, and probably will not be made in Canada. Then there are musical instruments not elsewhere specified which are imported to the amount of nearly $100,000. The duty has been increased 20 per cent. I do not know why. We had a little higher duty on those instruments that were produced in this country, on organs and pianos, and by that means we had built up an enormous industry and gave employment to hundreds, yes, to thousands of skilled artisans; but we kept those instruments that were not made in this country, down to the lower rate of duty, 25 per cent. Now, without reason, not for the purpose of promoting any industry, the rate has been raised to 30 per cent. I do not believe that it will be for the benefit of the people of Canada, nor a benefit to Great Britain, because of the $96,000 worth imported, less than $5,000 are imported from Great Britain, $34,000 from the United States, and $50,000 from Germany. I believe Germany will have the advantage of this manufacture, because they have devoted themselves more to that kind of industry than they have done in Great Britain. So I say that the Government has made a mistake with reference to those articles. I am reminded at this moment, Mr. Speaker, of the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), how he raised his voice last year, and every year in fact, about the diamond duty. Why, he said, the unset diamonds of the rich man are brought in free of duty, while the necessaries of the poor man are taxed from 25 to 35 per cent. Now, he says he approves cordially of the present tariff, but diamonds are free just as they were before, and I suppose that the hon. member for North Wellington is quite satisfied, because he is going to invest in diamonds.

Mr. MILLS. Is there any duty on ice?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Put some on your head.

Mr. WALLACE. Now, Sir, the Government have thought fit to increase the duties upon liquors and cigars, and they say, perhaps many people say, that these are proper articles upon which to raise a revenue; there is not much sympathy for the consumers of these articles. A portion of the people, at any rate, are very glad to impose a tariff upon these articles. Well, Sir, while these gentlemen were revising the tariff, I think I could have pointed out a way in which they would have very much improved their finances. It may be said, and can be said, that when I was upon the other side of the House I did not advocate this; but even so, a general revision is taking place now, and those gen-

tlemen are reforming everything. Now, Sir, they might have gone in the direction I will point out. The customs duty, according to the new tariff, is $2.40 per gallon on proof whisky; the excise duty is $1.90 per proof gallon, leaving a difference between the customs and excise duties, of 50 cents per gallon. Now, what is the cost price of this article? I do not know whether the hon. gentlemen have looked into the matter, but the cost is not excessively large. A bushel of corn will make a fraction over three gallons of proof whisky—that is the estimate of the Department of Inland Revenue. The bushel of corn costs in Toronto now about 25½ cents, the duty additional is 7½ cents. But it was contended by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), and I think very properly, that the Government will not be able to collect that duty from the distiller. Suppose the distillers undertook to buy Canadian corn, which they can do to-day, and no duty can be imposed upon it; would the distillers have to pay duty then? I would ask the Controller of Customs if they would have to pay duty. I am sure they would not. Then they can buy Canadian corn, or they can buy American corn either, and what is to prevent the farmer from buying a carload of corn, and teaming it in on his wagon, and bringing it to Gooderham & Worts's distillery, or Seagram's distillery, or any other distillery in Canada—what is to prevent them from doing that and selling his American corn there, without paying duty, and nobody paying duty? Can the inspector tell Canadian corn grown on one side the St. Clair River, from American corn grown on the other side? They cannot do it. Therefore, I say that the proposed imposition of 7½ cents per bushel on the Canadian distiller will be ineffective, you will not be able to collect it. Now, even if you add the 7½ cents to the 25½ cents, the cost of the corn, and you have 33 cents for a bushel of corn that makes three gallons of whisky, that is, at the rate of 11 cents per gallon of proof whisky that has to be kept several years. There is the cost of manufacture, which I think the value of the offal will about meet: but at any rate, allowing a liberal margin for the cost of manufacture, keeping it two years, interest and insurance—the whole put together would not bring this whisky up to a cost price of 15 cents a gallon. Then you are going to have the protection. A protection is the difference between the excise and the customs, which is 50 cents a gallon to-day, and you are giving on an article that cost 15 cents, a protection over the importer of 50 cents a gallon, or 333 per cent.

Mr. McMULLEN. You gave them 55 cents.

Mr. WALLACE. I said that. I said of course we might be open to that imputation. The hon. gentleman is not stating anything new.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is new. You want the House to think it is higher now than it was before.

Mr. WALLACE. I did not say anything of the kind. I said that the charge might be made that when I was on that side of the House, I did not call attention to this fact. I am calling attention to it now, at any rate, I am putting it on record; and the only question is, not whether I have been derelict in my duty, but whether the Government, when the facts are brought to their attention, are going to adopt any measure in order to raise more revenue. I think in that way they could have protected the revenue better, because, in my opinion, they have exceeded the limit of making the duty on whisky, revenue producing. The excise duty in the United States is $1.10 per wine gallon, which makes the duty $1.32 per Imperial gallon. Now, if they pay excise duty in the United States, they still have $1.08 protection on every gallon as an inducement to smuggle it into Canada. If they bring in a 40 gallon barrel, they will have $40 clear after paying a cost of 8 cents a gallon to bring it in under ground. So I say I think the Government have gone beyond the limit; we had reached the limit ourselves in making the duty $2.25, and the Government have gone beyond the limit of the revenue producing powers of this customs duty. Now, with reference to tobacco. The excise duty was 25 cents a pound, they have added 14 cents per pound, making it 39 cents per pound. Without doubt they have made a great mistake. Why, Sir, what is the history? If they look back at the returns of 1884, they will find that when the duty on tobacco was 12 cents a pound, there were eleven millions pounds of tobacco imported for manufacture here. In 1886, the Government in the meantime having increased the duty to 20 cents per pound, the quantity fell to 8,500,000 pounds, or 2,500,000 pounds less were imported. Do hon. gentlemen opposite mean to say there were 2,500,000 pounds less consumed? Not at all. The increased duty could not make very much difference, a difference perhaps to the extent of half a million pounds; so 2,000,000 pounds are to be accounted for, and the only way to account for them is by stating that they were smuggled into this country.

I desire to say a few words with respect to the present duty. The excise duty, as the Finance Minister explained, is 39 cents per pound. The Americans pay an excise duty of 6 cents per pound, and accordingly on tobacco smuggled across to Canada the smuggler makes the difference between these two amounts, or a profit of 33 cents per pound. On a 20 pound caddy he accordingly makes a profit of $6.60. The Government here made a great mistake in increasing the duty, and at the end of the year they will not show that more revenue has been collected, but

the results will exhibit even a falling off of revenue. The Controller of Customs knows very well the difficulties that occur in preventing smuggling along the frontier; but when there is a temptation to the extent of $6.60 for every caddy of tobacco brought in under the arm, smuggling operations will not be confined to the frontier, but will be scattered all over the country, and the revenue instead of being increased will be largely decreased by the imposition of this increased duty. That is the opinion I have formed on this subject.

Another objection I submit in regard to the duty is this. In 1876 eight and a half million pounds of tobacco were imported into Canada, most of the product being manufactured here; and in 1896, twenty years afterwards, with a large increase of population and enhanced consumption, the quantity was only 10,000,000 pounds. This shows conclusively that the duty of 25 cents we imposed curtailed the production of the manufacturers. When we add 56 per cent, as hon. gentlemen opposite have done, there must be only one result, that tobacco will be smuggled into the country, and the Minister of Inland Revenue, instead of having, as the Finance Minister stated, $1,000,000 more revenue from that source, will find the revenue very largely decreased.

The effect of the increased duty on cigars will be that all 5 cent cigars will be made in Quebec by cheaper labour. The 5 cent cheap cigar, the one which is ordinarily consumed, must be made by cheaper labour than that employed to-day. The vendors will have to make their profits and the cigar makers must turn them out so as to be able to sell them at 5 cents each at retail. As cheaper labour will be required, this will involve the transference of the manufacture of 5 cent cigars to the province of Quebec, where labour is cheaper than in the province of Ontario and in the western portions of the Dominion. I am quite satisfied that the effect will be, first, the transference of the manufacture of this class of goods from the other provinces to Quebec; and second, the employment of cheaper labour than the manufacturers employ to-day.

Some hon. members, and especially an hon. gentleman who addressed the House last night, have expressed gratification because the Government inserted a "combines" clause in the tariff. I think the country will be very grateful to the Government if they will strike it out, for it will be found to work injuriously. I should like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite, how they are going to put that clause into operation. I was chairman of a committee that investigated the subject of combines in trade, in 1888. That committee made a report to this House. The committee was composed of members of both sides of the House, of members many of whom were engaged in trade, and some of whom were in favour of such combinations to a moderate extent. The report of the committee was unanimously adopted, when it had been prepared after long investigation. One of the clauses of that report show that "the Canadian Iron Founders' Association now numbers eighteen firms; outside of the association, however, there are about forty manufacturers of the same goods, some of whom are large manufacturers but the majority are small firms." The proposal submitted by the Finance Minister gives arbitrary power to the Government, without collecting evidence, to say "whenever it shall appear to the satisfaction of the Governor General in Council" certain action shall be taken in regard to the firms forming a combine. In the case now under consideration those manufacturers number eighteen. But what about the forty manufacturers who were not in the combine? A gross injustice and wrong would be done by the Government if it were to say that they would wipe out those forty Canadian firms who had nothing whatever to do with the combine. The Government may conclude that those special manufacturers in the combination have acted wrongly, or they wish to bring pressure to bear on them, especially at by-elections or general elections. The Government is given that extraordinary power, which no other body but Parliament should possess. It is an outrage not only upon the manufacturers, but upon the whole Dominion.

An important fact ascertained by the committee to which I have referred, and on which the hon. member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain) and the hon. member for West Northumberland (Mr. Guillet) were active members, was that the most objectionable combines in this country, those which did most injury, were not combines of manufacturers at all. There was the Wholesale Grocers' Guild. We examined and investigated their proceedings, and we found that to be a most objectionable combine. In their case, what could the Government do? They might say they would take off the duties. The duties off—what? The Wholesale Grocers' Guild would, no doubt, be delighted to have the duties removed on certain articles; but those who have built up special industries would not be as well pleased. The committee showed that there was a combination among fire insurance companies. How can we apply this clause to them? It cannot be applied any more to them than to the Wholesale Grocers' Guild. Then we made a most exhaustive examination of other industries, and we found that the dealers in coal had a combine. But there is no duty on anthracite coal, which was the principal article in question. The only action the Government could do would be to impose a duty on coal; but they could not do so without the assent of Parliament. Then the committee found that dealers in eggs had a combine. Of course they were not the manufacturers, but the dealers. Then the undertakers had a combine. They did

not manufacture the coffins, but they bought them from the dealers, and there was a combine to prevent manufacturers selling them to other people. How is the Government going to deal with such cases? This clause of the tariff will be inoperative, and it cannot be applied to any of these combines. You cannot punish them by this Act; but the Government would be able to put screws on the manufacturers at a critical period. They could threaten them; they could say: We have heard, and there is no investigation, and no evidence taken. Can these hon. gentlemen opposite give any reason why the illegal acts of combines should not be taken before the courts? If the law to-day is not strong enough and long enough to reach them, then make the law strong enough and leave it for the courts of the land to decide. That is the only proper course to adopt in regard to that matter. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Government should reconsider this clause referring to combines, and that they should withdraw it, because they cannot point to one good result that will come from it.

I wish now to refer to another matter in connection with preferential trade. According to the resolution introduced, the countries that are to have preferential trade with Canada are to be selected by the Controller of Customs, subject to the authority of the Governor in Council; and we were told this afternoon, that the Controller of Customs has full power to do all this himself. Sir, I do not think such power should be placed in the hands of any man. The power of making treaties, which is not so great a power as you propose to confer upon the Controller of Customs, has been most jealously guarded by all parliaments, and here in Canada the Government is not given power to make a treaty. It must come to this House, and be discussed, and be ratified, before it becomes the law of the land. Then, why does this Government seek for this great power to be conferred upon one member of the Government. I am free to admit, that if it is to be conferred upon any one member, the Controller of Customs is the proper officer on whom to confer it; but I hold that it is a great mistake to confer that power upon a single member of the Government, or even to confer it upon the whole Government. We in Canada want to decide that question upon the floor of Parliament, and we as representatives of the people have a right to be heard upon that matter. On every question that comes up with reference to preferential trade, the people's representatives on the floor of Parliament have an indefeasible right to be heard. Therefore, I say, that the proposal is entirely wrong in principle and should not be adopted by this House. Mr. Speaker, there are some other matters that I might refer to, but it is just about 6 o'clock, and I thank the House for having listened to me so patiently.

In conclusion I wish to say, that taking the tariff as a whole, I believe it to be injurious to the people of Canada. I refer to those items in which the Government have made changes. Where they have left the tariff as it was, of course we on this side of the House, as well as gentlemen on the other side, must admit that it is pretty good. I contend that in every single instance where changes have been made these changes are indefensible, and that they will wipe out the industries of this country which are affected by them, and which industries have been built up under the tariff of the Conservative Government. We can recognize in the construction of the tariff, that there was an attempt made to please everybody, but the consequence is they have pleased nobody. The hon. the Premier can say to the free traders behind him: You say we have not a free trade tariff, but did you listen to our speeches on the floor of the House; did you hear the Finance Minister; did you hear the Minister of Trade and Commerce; would you desire to have better free trade speeches than they made? And then, he can say to his protectionist friends behind him: You object to our free trade programmes, but look at the facts, why nine-tenths of the articles are left where the protectionists left them. He will please one party by quoting the speeches, and he will please the other party by referring to the large number of articles that have been left at the same tariff as the Conservative Government left them.

The PRIME MINISTER. Then it is pleasing everybody?

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is what he is mad about.

Mr. WALLACE. Sir, I am delighted to know that to such an extent have this Government recognized the fact, that protection is the policy for this country, that they have left 90 per cent of the articles at the same rate of duty as under the old tariff. I have too much consideration for the welfare of the people of this country to be displeased with such action as that. I believe that the prosperity of Canada is bound up in a protective policy, and I say that in every case that the present Government has departed from that policy, they have made a very serious mistake.

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

[illegible]

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few observations on the questions which have been discussed before this House for the last few days, I wish at the outset to offer my congratulations to the

Government on the tariff they have brought down. It is not possible for everybody to be satisfied with all the items of the tariff. Very many of us view the tariff from our own particular environment; but the Government must take a higher position and judge what is best for the whole country, for they do not govern for a locality, but for the whole country from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Therefore they must take a wide, broad and liberal view of all the industries with which they have to deal. Although I cannot agree with all the items in the tariff, I congratulate the Government upon accomplishing with such success the difficult task they had before them. They have presented to this country a tariff which I believe will be generally accepted by all the industries of this country, and by people outside of the industries, with a degree of favour which has not been accorded to any other tariff since confederation.

Hon. gentlemen of the Opposition at times try to make out that the Liberal party have stolen their clothes. It brings a smile across the face of everybody who knows the history of the two parties to suppose for one moment that the clothes of the Liberal-Conservative party are large enough for the Liberal party of this country, and more particularly so, when they have worn those clothes for the last eighteen years, and now we find them out at the elbows, out at the knees, and out at every other place where you would expect to find them out if you understood the anatomy of the human frame. In fact, the clothes of the Conservative party are made up of shreds and patches; patch after patch has been put on them for eighteen years, until they are speckled and spotted like the animals that Jacob agreed to take from Laban as his share of the herd. And it is absurd to suppose for one moment that we are going to accept garments of such a character, garments across which the electorate of this country wrote on the 23rd of June last, "Mene, mene, tekel upharsin." No, Mr. Speaker, we have garments of our own; they are up-to-date, made after the latest fashion, and they are of the colours, red, white and blue. Upon these garments are buttons which are stamped alternately, the beaver and the maple leaf on one, and the lion and the unicorn on another, and underneath the whole is written "Dieu et mon droit"—my God and my country. Now, that means a great deal. When we say "My God," it means purity with the Liberal party: and when we say "my country," it means patriotism to Canada, for which the Liberal party has long been noted.

Sometimes hon. gentlemen opposite will say we are drifting towards free trade. That was just the way England obtained free trade as she has it to-day. She did not take one big, bold step towards free trade. Free trade went on developing from the year 1842, when the duties on some articles were reduced, until 1885, when she removed the last vestige of the duty on sugar; and if the Liberal party are retained in power, as I hope they will be, for the next forty years, and if I am living at that time, I may be in a position to tell hon. gentlemen opposite that we have free trade as it is in England.

Then, again, we are told that we are going to destroy the industries of this country. Now, Mr. Speaker, do you suppose for one moment that the Liberal party of this country have any desire to destroy the industries of their own friends? A majority of the manufacturing industries of this country are conducted by supporters of the Liberal party, and a majority of the workmen engaged in those industries to-day are Liberals. Therefore, while we require a revenue tariff so high as we do, it will give an incidental protection which, in my opinion, will sustain and support any industry that is adapted to this country. The hon. gentleman who preceded me (Mr. Wallace) said that the Government made a great blunder in increasing the duty on rice, claiming that that was detrimental to the rice users of this country. But, Sir, the plainest calculation, if he had made it, would show that the Government realize about $59,000 a year for the exchequer by that simple change, without charging the people of this country one solitary cent in addition, but taking this contribution out of the large profits of the manufacturers or cleaners of rice. Let me give you a simple illustration which proves this to a demonstration. Last year we imported into this country 7,249,000 pounds of cleaned rice, invoiced at $122,000, on which a duty of $89,614 was paid, making a total cost of $211,806, which was equal to $2.92 per hundred pounds. Of uncleaned rice we imported 13,311,000 pounds. Allowing a loss of 20 per cent for cleaning, which is a very large reduction, this represented 10,648,872 pounds of cleaned rice. Now, how much did that rice cost the importers? The invoice price of it was $108,477, and the duty paid was $40,538, or a total cost of $149,015. This made the cost to the cleaners of rice $1.39 per hundred pounds. Now, the difference between $1.39 and $2.92 per hundred is $1.53 per hundred, which went to the cleaners of rice. Now, if you multiply the 10,648,872 pounds by $1.53, it will give you $162,987 which the cleaners of rice in Canada made out of the transaction. Now, there are only two rice mills in this country, one in British Columbia and one in the city of Montreal; and, according to the statements made by the late Finance Minister, they employ seventy-five hands, though others say not forty. But taking the higher figure, if we paid $1,000 to every man employed in the mills, it would leave $87,987 of clear profit to an establishment which only employs seventy-five men. We contended in the past, and we contend now, that these profits were far too large, and that there should be a reduction of them, either in the form of decreased prices of

rice, or of an increase in the duty which would go into the exchequer of Canada. Now, we shall have a new order of things under our new policy, and that policy I shall christen the Liberal National Policy. By it the Government has taken out of the hands of the manufacturers $59,000 of their profits, by increasing the duty on uncleaned rice from three-tenths of a cent to three-quarters of a cent, and have placed that sum of $59,000 into the exchequer of this country to be used to meet the general expenses of administration. Yet that is the very thing for doing which the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) tried to condemn the Government. If by that change, we do not reduce the price of rice, we at least obtain $59,000 additional for our exchequer, and to that extent will require less revenue than we did in previous years, and thus lighten the burdens of the people.

Now, we are charged with not having fulfilled our promises. I remember that when I sat on the other side of the House, we made many promises to the electorate which we said we would carry out if returned to power, and I think I can prove to you before I sit down that we have done so to a very great extent, and that where we have not carried out our promises, we are going to do so just as soon as the proper time arrives, and is at our disposal. Now, what did we promise? Every hon. gentleman opposite remembers that we promised to settle the school question. Every one remembers how, day and night, we fought the late Government on that question. Every one remembers that when the late Government was determined to coerce Manitoba by forcing upon that province a school system against which the people of that province rebelled, and sought to thrust upon them a Dominion education law, we, as the Liberal party, while not denying to the Catholics what they were entitled to receive, maintained that any legislation to relieve them from the grievances which they claimed the Manitoba Act of 1890 had imposed upon them, should come from the Manitoba legislature. And we promised that if we came into power, instead of settling that question by coercive means, we would settle it by conciliation. Did we not accomplish our object? To-day that question is settled, and settled amicably and satisfactorily, and you will never hear more of it inside this chamber. For this the Liberal party deserve the gratitude and commendation, not only of the Liberals of this country, but of every free man, let his politics be what they may.

We made another promise and we made it frequently. We made it by resolution, by voice and by vote. We declared in this chamber repeatedly, year in and year out, that if the Liberal party came into power, the extravagance then prevailing in the management of the Government departments would cease. We promised to reduce the expenditure as rapidly as we possibly could. Many of us said we could reduce it by two millions, other more sanguine said we could save an expenditure of three millions a year, and others still more sanguine, said: Give us time, and in a few years we will cut down the expenditure of this country, without affecting the efficiency of any department, to the extent of $4,000,000. What have we done in the space of one short year? Let me tell you. We have saved on the following items the following amounts:—

Charges on management of Public Debt, nearly	$ 15,000
On Civil Government	36,000
On Penitentiaries	67,000
On Legislation	83,000
On Quarantines	16,000
On Militia	330,000
On Railways and Canals, chargeable to income	140,000
On Public Works, chargeable to income.	176,000
On Ocean and River Service	48,000
On Lighthouse and Coast Service	40,900
On Fisheries	74,000
On Indians	46,477
On North-west Mounted Police	145,000
On Post Office	150,875

We owe a debt of gratitude to the hon. Postmaster General for the efficient and able manner in which he has administered that department during the past year. By withdrawing contracts which had been given extravagantly by the late Government to friends of their own and re-letting them, he saved $70,000 to the country.

Mr. CLANCY. Is the hon. gentleman referring to the estimates or to what has been passed?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). My hon. friend will know that this is a cut on last year's estimates. The hon. gentleman may laugh, but men sometimes laugh who cannot argue, and I think that is the position in which my hon. friend is. He must know that we are only in office about a year. When we came in there were large engagements entered into by the late Government which had to be carried out in good faith by the present Government, and when an hon. gentleman—an intelligent gentleman also—pretends that we could cut down in the first year of our office as much as we could in the second, he is begging the question entirely. I might mention some other items, but shall confine myself to saying that, on the whole, we have saved $1,722,642 or in the neighbourhood of two million dollars, and by the time we reach the end of this Parliament, I am sure that the most sanguine expectations will be nearly realized through the economy prevailing in the various departments of the Government under the present Liberal Administration. It is evident therefore that the promised reductions have largely been made, and that we are not open to the charge of having stolen at least that part of the Liberal-Conservative programme.

But there was another promise we made. We promised our farmers free binder twine, and I remember well, in days gone by, how the charge was thrust in our faces that we were not sincere, that we were simply moving resolutions and making speeches in order to compromise the position of the Government on the trade question, and that if we came into power we would never crystallize these promises into law. Well, fortunately, we came into office. Fortunately for the country we are here, and fortunately for the farmers we carried out the promises which we then gave, and have placed binder twine on the free list. How much did the farmers realize from that? It is estimated that the farmers of Ontario used, in the last harvest, 6,000,000 pounds of binder twine, and by taking off the duty, you will find that we have effected a saving of nearly $40,000 to the farmers of Ontario alone. And in the North-west Territories there is a large quantity used, though I have not the means of ascertaining what the number of pounds is. But, undoubtedly, very large sums of money will be saved to the farmers of the North-west and Manitoba as well as other parts of the country through this policy. But this did not end the promises of the Liberal party. The Liberal party promised to place corn on the free list. This afternoon an hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) took fifteen minuts to prove that we are all wrong upon the corn question. True, there are differences of opinion upon it even among farmers themselves in different localities as to the wisdom of placing corn upon the free list. But you will understand that when the Government is called upon to frame a policy, they do not frame a policy for one section of the country, but they form a policy which they believe is, on the whole, in the interests of the whole Dominion. I claim that free corn is in the interests of the whole Dominion. Why is free corn advantageous to the farmer? Because the farmers of Ontario particularly, and of other parts of the country also, go largely into the raising of cattle and into dairying, and, in order that they may feed their cattle and fit them for the foreign market in which they have to compete with corn-fed cattle, it is admitted by the best authorities in this country that corn is an absolute necessity. It is asserted that free corn will reduce the price of the coarse grain produced on the farm. It cannot do so because the prices are fixed upon the export prices of these articles. We send a large quantity of pease to the old country and the price in the English market regulates the price here. We sell a great quantity of oats in Great Britain, and it is the price obtained there that rules the market in Canada. Therefore, if the farmers find it more profitable to use corn for the feeding of their animals they will sell their pease and oats and their other coarse grains and buy corn. The advantage is very easily proven. I was told to-day that corn could be purchased in Windsor at 18 cents, and oats at from 16 cents to 18 cents per bushel. Supposing a farmer in the neighbourhood of Windsor wished to feed his cattle, would it not pay him to sell 34 pounds of oats from 16 to 18 cents and buy 56 pounds of corn at 18 cents? Will not 56 pounds of corn go further to sustain and fatten an animal than 34 pounds of oats? It is thus plain that it is of advantage to the farmers of the country to have the food which is their raw material as cheap as possible, so that they may make their finished articles as low as possible, and thus realize the highest profit in the British market.

But the Liberal party made other promises. We promised that we would remove specific duties, and we have largely succeeded in doing so. I am sorry that they were not all removed, but, no doubt, that would be difficult to do. We have always contended that the specific duties bore heavier upon the cheaper goods purchased by the poorer classes of people than upon the goods used by the rich. Let me give you an example: Take the case of a shoddy blanket. The old duty was 20 per cent and 10 cents per pound. The blanket I refer to would weigh about 8 pounds and would cost at the factory about $1. The specific duty at 10 cents per pound on 8 pounds would amount to 80 cents and the ad valorem duty of 20 per cent would amount to 20 cents, or a total of $1. That is 100 per cent on that blanket. Now take a fine French blanket that weighs 5 pounds and which you buy for $5. The specific duty amounts to 50 cents and the ad valorem, at 20 per cent, amounts to $1, a total of $1.50, or 30 per cent, as compared with 100 per cent on the fisherman's or lumberman's blanket. That is how the principle worked. Take any article on which there is a specific duty, not wines, spirits, beer, and tobacco, with which I have no concern, but take the articles used by the people—and apply this principle and you will find that the specific duties bear very heavily upon the goods used by the poorer class. The Liberals promised to remove this form of duty, and I am glad to say that in the resolutions before us they have been removed to a very large extent, showing that the Liberal party has carried out reasonably well the promises it made, its action thus far being an evidence of what is to be done in the future.

We also promised that luxuries should be taxed higher than they were before. From the public platform we proved to the people that many luxuries were imported into this country which bore a lower duty than many of the necessaries of life, and we contended that taxation should fall more heavily upon those parties who were willing and ready and able to buy the luxuries they wanted. And what has been the result? On silk velvets, and all manufactures of silk, embroidery, laces, jewellery, gold and silver-

plated ware, liquors, tobacco, cigars, cigarettes, &c., &c., the duty has been increased by this new Liberal tariff, thus vindicating the promises made by the Liberals to the people.

We promised, further, when we were in Opposition—and I remember some resolutions we put upon the records of the House on the subject—that barbed-wire should be given to the farmers of this country at a much reduced rate of duty or placed on the free list. The Liberal party has fulfilled that promise by placing barbed-wire on the free list and has given to the farmers of this country some great advantage, and particularly given an advantage to the farmers who went to the west, that greater Canada, to work out their destiny. The Government has come to their assistance in this way, and this change will leave in the pockets of the farmers thousands and tens of thousands of dollars which was formerly paid to the manufacturer.

I wish now to draw a comparison between the duties under the National Policy, so-called, of the Conservative party and the Liberal National Policy, the policy now in vogue and which will continue in vogue, probably, for the next fifty years. I want to show the duties under the old policy compared with those that will be charged under the new policy a year from 1st July next. The present duty will be between the two figures I shall read. In this respect I think a large benefit, a most extraordinary benefit will come to the consumers in this country. Now let me read you a table giving a comparison between the Conservative National Policy and the Liberal National Policy, or reciprocity tariff, in respect to a number of articles :

	Con. N. P.	Lib. N. P.
	P.c.	P.c.
Wire nails, shovels and spades....	35	26¼
Linens, napkins, table cloths, &c..	35	26¼
Cuffs, shirts, knitted goods, &c....	35	26¼
Woollen cloths and clothing.....	35	26¼
Gloves, mitts, suspenders, &c.....	35	26¼
Braces, wall paper, &c.....	35	26¼
Earthen and stone ware.....	30	22½
China and porcelain ware.....	30	22½
Wrought iron nails and spikes....	30	22½
Hats, caps and bonnets.....	30	22½
Iron castings.....	25	18¾
Builders' and other hardware.....	32½	22½
Cutlery	25	22½
Files and rasps.....	35	22½
Axes and scythes.....	35	18¾
Adzes and saws.....	35	22½
Machinery	27½	18¾
Clocks and watches.....	25	18¾
Cotton fabrics (white).....	25	18¾
Cotton fabrics (coloured.....	25	22½
Socks and stockings.....	37	26¼
Window glass, plain.....	20	15
	$ cts.	$ cts.
Pig iron, per ton.....	4 00	1 87½
Iron and steel ingots, per ton.....	5 00	3 00
Bar iron, per ton.....	10 00	5 25
Cast iron pipes.....	10 00	6 00

One-eighth reduction, which goes into effect at once. The duty will be midway between the above rates.

And yet our hon. friends on the other side say that we have stolen their clothes ; and they say that we have made no change in the interests of the consumers of this country. Why you know, Sir, that the large importations which will take place under the new tariff must of necessity come into this country a great deal cheaper than they came in under the old tariff. And who is to receive the benefit of this treatment ? The hundreds, and thousands, and millions of people in this country who are consumers of these articles which are imported from abroad. And yet these gentlemen say that nine-tenths of our policy has been stolen from them. In iron, too, there has been a reduction which is going to be an important benefit to the products of the various factories of this country. The duty on pig iron per ton was $4, and under the new reciprocity tariff it will be $1.87½. Iron and steel ingots per ton, under the old tariff paid $5, under the reciprocity tariff they will come down to $3 per ton. Bar iron per ton under the old tariff was $10, it will come down under the new to $5.25. Cast iron pipes under the old tariff were $10 per ton, under the new reciprocity tariff they will be $6 per ton. One-eighth of the reduction is made now, and the figures which one-eighth will make, stand equi-distant between those ranges of figures, which I have given you above. Now, I ask if they have not carried out the promises that were made, not that we would put iron upon the free list—no such promise was ever made ; and I challenge any hon. gentleman opposite to quote one sentence or one paragraph from any Liberal who was speaking on behalf of the Liberal party, in any section of the country, from Vancouver to Cape Breton, who said that the Liberal party would put iron on the free list. We said we would give the manufacturers freer iron, and so we did. We told the consumers of this country that we would give them freer goods, and so we did. We did not promise them free trade, it was beyond the limits of our power to give them that ; but we gave them all that we believed would be in the interests of these industries, and at the same time enable us to raise sufficient revenue to conduct the affairs of this country. Now, I want to show you how much we have paid for the higher duties on iron for the last five years. We paid no less than $413,858 in bounty for the protection of pig iron from 1891-92 to 1895-96. We paid no less than $993,405 duty on the 248,352 tons imported from foreign countries. Now, Mr. Speaker, you know that when a duty is placed upon any particular article, it gives an opportunity to the manufacturer in this country of the same article to increase the price to the consumer by reason of the duty. I do not suppose that the manufacturer in

this country puts the whole duty on. Therefore, taking $3 instead of $4 as the increased price on the Canadian iron, it amounts to $667,056 which the manufacturers in Canada were able to place upon iron by reason of the $4 charged as duty against imported iron. Then, Mr. Speaker, you know that the duty on iron or any other material becomes a part of the original cost to the importer, and he places the profit, whatever that profit may be, upon the duty as well as upon the original cost of the article. Therefore, the consumer not only pays the duty, but he pays the percentage placed upon that duty by the importer or the dealer, and that has been $248,351 during the last five years. Therefore, we have paid in the form of bounty duty, and increased price by reason of the duty, and the profits on duty by importers, no less than $2,322,676; and that was for the protection of the manufacture of 222,352 tons. The cost to the country was $10.16 for every ton of pig iron manufactured in this country. Now, I ask if that was not an extraordinary duty. I say the Government deserve credit, great credit, right in the very teeth of powerful organizations, for putting iron freer in the hands of the manufacturers and others who use it to so large an extent in many ways and thus benefit the consumers. Now there is another thing that I want to bring before you. What saving do we make on that calculation under the Liberal tariff? Taking the same number of tons as we imported in 1896, and making exactly the same calculation, we find that we have saved to the people of this country no less than $54,000 a year, even paying the increased bounty which the Government has promised to pay. It has been a saving to the country of no less than $54,000 on the basis of that calculation.

The Liberal party promised to reduce the duty on coal oil. It is said that some people ran their campaign on the coal oil can. I never did that, although in this House I took an active part during two sessions in urging on the Government to a reduction of the duty, and I repeatedly told my constituents that it was an imposition to ask them to pay 100 per cent on any products that could be manufactured here at reasonable cost; and I also stated it was a heavy burden, and that we demanded from the Conservative party a reduction of duty, and that if we came into power we would reduce the duty. I never advocated the placing of coal oil on the free list. I was accused the other day of having stated during my speech, I think in 1892, that I advocated free oil. I suppose few hon. members in this House remember the speech, and in order to refresh their memories I will read some quotations. The speech was delivered on 30th May, 1892. I said:

> I am not opposed to the National Policy in respect to coal oil, but I am opposed to the excessive duty of over 100 per cent in favour of the coal-oil interest, because this enables them to control the whole industry of refining oil.

Further on I said:

> Although I am favourable to extending to this industry a reasonable protection, it is wrong, I think, in the interest of the consuming population of this country, to extend to the refiners a protection of 100 or 125 per cent.

This was the case at that time. I further said:

> If the Government should reduce the duty from 7 1-5th cents to, say, 5 cents a gallon, it would relieve the people of at least one-third of the burdens which they are now obliged to bear in this matter. I hope the Government will reconsider this question—not upon the basis of free trade, because I do not contend that coal oil should be put on the free list, for, so long as we have the National Policy in this country, it is only right, and just, and equitable that protection should be given to the oil producers, as well as to every other industry along the line of justice. I trust that the Government will try to see their way clear to reduce the duty upon coal oil to 5 cents a gallon.

I was accused here the other day of having preached free trade as regards that article. The Government and the Liberal party have fulfilled their promises to reduce the duty on coal oil to 5 cents, and I must say that I would not be sorry to see the reduction carried a little lower, and in my opinion it would be better in the interest of the consumer to have greater freedom in regard to the distribution of coal oil in tank cars. Oil in tank cars can only be distributed at 78 points in the Dominion, 39 in Ontario, 13 in Quebec, 10 in New Brunswick, 7 in Nova Scotia, 5 in Manitoba and the North-west Territories and 4 in British Columbia. I think the points at which coal oil should be distributed in tank cars should be increased, so as to give the people an opportuinty to bring the oil in as cheaply as possible and thus save at least one cent per gallon.

The Liberal party also promised to reduce the duty on agricultural implements. Hon. gentlemen opposite say we have not fulfilled that promise. There were a few agricultural implements on which hon. gentlemen opposite made a deep cut in 1894, and it was made for a purpose—either 35 per cent was an extortionate rate, or the rate was reduced to meet the demands of the people on the eve of an election. They made such a deep cut on eight articles that now, under a revenue tariff, we find there is a reasonable duty to produce revenue from that particular source. But we constantly urged the Government at that time to reduce the duties on numerous other raticles used by farmers throughout the country. Let me say that under this new Liberal tariff we have reduced the duties on twenty-four articles largely used by farmers. These articles are as follows: Axes, scythes, reaping hooks, hay or straw

knives, hoes, rakes, pronged forks, snaths, farm or field rollers, post hole diggers, all reduced from 35 to 25 per cent. Barbed wire and binder twine have been placed on the free list. Horse powers, threshers, steam engines, separators, feeder or feed cutter or machines, potato diggers, farm wagons, grain crushers, fanning mills, hay tedders, wind mills, pumps, &c., have been reduced from 30 to 25 per cent. Here are 24 articles which farmers largely use, and on all these important reductions have been made.

Another promise made by the Liberal party has been fulfilled. We promised to do our very best for the people, not only for the farmers, but for the whole people of the Dominion, to secure reduced transportation rates. Although we cannot increase the prices of agricultural products in England by any legislation enacted here, we can adopt measures to enable the farmers to get their products to market as cheaply as possible. The Government have adopted two or three methods by which to accomplish this result. One is to extend the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal. I believe this is a bold stroke of policy and one in the interest of the country, because when this extension is carried out, it will become an active competitor of the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway at the point of reception of products from the great west, and if a combination were entered into between those two great private interests, the Government railway would modify that combination by giving proper rates to people on their products sent from the west to the sea. In that way, the Government has adopted a wise policy in extending the Intercolonial Railway to the city of Montreal, the great centre of the trade of the west.

Sir, we promised to repeal the Franchise Act, one of the greatest iniquities ever placed upon the Statute-book of the country. Nothing so abominable in principle was ever crystallized into the law of this land. It was conceived in iniquity, and begotten in sin, and it was enacted for a political purpose. In 1884, when the Conservative party met in caucus to talk over the effects of their so-called National Policy for four or five years, Sir John Macdonald was at their head. That astute statesman, that man who in my opinion was one of the greatest leaders of men who ever appeared in Canadian politics, that man who could take his Conservative friends by the nose and lead them as easily as you could an animal to the market; he was astute enough to fear the coming elections, and out of his fertile brain he evolved the Franchise Act, hoping that the revising officers of his own pick and choice would so stuff the list as to return to this House a majority pledged to support him. Our friends fought that iniquitous Act for six long weeks in this House, and I am almost sorry they did, for if it had passed into law as introduced, the indignation of the people would have been such that it would have to be repealed within a year. The Liberal party promised as soon as they got into power, that they would repeal that Act which legislated Conservative members into this House, in spite of the votes of the people. Every person who has had his eyes open during the last ten years knows, as well as he knows he has a nose on his face, that it was an Act for the purpose of legislating into the councils of the nation persons whom the electorate refused to send here. We have introduced a Bill to repeal that Act, and by doing so we will reduce the taxation on the people of this country. The Franchise Act cost the treasury of the Dominion $1,250,000, although we had only four revisions. It has cost the people of this country, both parties contributing, at least half a million more for revision, and now this vast expense will be wiped out as we promised it should be, and our franchise will be placed upon a more equitable basis.

The Liberal party promised more than that. We promised preferential trade with Great Britain, and we are now carrying out that promise. The Conservative party are very meek and humble now, because they were obliged to eat humble pie by the electorate, but for years they claimed that they were the loyal party, that they were the men who had associations for the purpose of bringing around preferential trade with Great Britain. What a change has come over the spirit of their dreams. To-day one speaker after another on the Conservative side of the House rises in his place to throw cold water upon this loyal and patriotic National Policy which our Government has proposed. Let me bring this matter in a more tangible form before hon. gentlemen. Let me point out that in 1892, the Liberal party foreshadowed this policy of preferential trade with Great Britain. We offered this policy to the Conservative party by resolution, but the Conservatives would not accept it. Let me show how loyal and how British these men opposite are. Why, the most British and the most loyal man in this House—or at least he supposes he is—was the author of the following resolution. In April, 1892, Mr. McNeill moved:

> That if and when the Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland admit Canadian products to the markets of the United Kingdom upon more favourable terms than is accorded to the products of foreign countries; the Parliament of Canada will be prepared to accord corresponding advantages by a substantial reduction in the duties it imposes upon British manufactured goods.

Notwithstanding the fact that every product of our country is permitted to go into the English market without a single cent of duty being charged, and notwithstanding

the fact that in 1892 England gave preferential treatment to our cattle over that which she accorded to the United States; in the face of all this, the most loyal man in the Conservative party asked for more advantages, before Canada would give anything to the motherland. These are the men who call themselves loyal. In contradistinction to that, we had the Liberal party then showing true loyalty. The present Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) moved this as an amendment to that resolution:

Inasmuch as Great Britain admits the products of Canada into her ports free of duty, this House is of the opinion that the present scale of duties exacted on goods mainly imported from Great Britain should be reduced.

Now, this is not exactly the policy we have foreshadowed in our present resolution, but it is the same principle. We were under deep obligations to Great Britain for allowing our goods in free to her markets, and because of other advantages we have received from her during many years. Notwithstanding that, the resolution of Mr. Davies was voted down by no less than 99 Conservatives who sat in this House, and not a single one of them voted for preferential trade with Great Britain. Yet, they tell us to-day that in bringing in this preferential policy we have borrowed their clothes. It is no such thing. In 1892 the Conservatives wanted England to reduce her duties, or give some preference before they would do anything for her, while at that day we offered her preferential trade. I am proud to see to-day, from the various communications which come from the old land, that both the Conservative and Reform press there are united in lauding the Liberal party of Canada which has taken this beneficent step, not only in the interests of Great Britain, but alike in the interests of Canada and the Empire.

Let me tell the House how this preferential resolution will be advantageous to Canada, and probably I will quote some figures which will astonish hon. gentlemen opposite. I take no stock at all in the argument that this preferential offer to Great Britain is going to involve her in difficulty with Germany and Belgium. The Government after taking the whole matter into consideration, and after consulting probably the very best lawyers in the country, have announced boldly and above-board in this House, that it is not to be extended to Belgium and Germany and that in their opinion the most-favoured-nation clause does not apply in this case. Even if it did, that is a matter which has yet to be decided by the highest court in the land.

Mr. PRIOR. Did the hon. gentleman hear what the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) said in regard to that?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Yes, I did, and I heard what Mr. Laurier said this afternoon, that in the opinion of the Government this privilege was not to extend to Belgium or to Germany. Now, that means just this, that after due consideration that was the conclusion at which the Government arrived; and, therefore, they are of opinion that when this matter is tested before the proper tribunal, it will be found, that this offer, made in the manner in which it is made, does not violate in any way the favoured-nation clause in the treaties of 1862 and 1865. But supposing it did, may not this policy bring about the final settlement of this question more quickly than if we had left it alone altogether? Are we to be hampered in the making of our tariffs by those treaties, when England's opinion is that we should be released from the burden of them, if we are under them, and when the most eminent statesmen of England have said time and again that if we find that these treaties compromise our tariff policy, they will take the first opportunity of denouncing them and letting us free in that respect? And this departure may bring that question to a conclusion faster than that could be done in any other way.

We are told that this arrangement is going to be of no benefit. But those who have paid any attention to our shipping know that a large number of our ships crossing the ocean and carrying our produce come back in ballast. Therefore, if we can increase the trade between this country and the old country, we will give labour and profit to these ships and thus bring about a reduction in the transportation rates across the Atlantic. Because everybody knows that if a ship goes over loaded and comes back in ballast, she must charge higher transportation rates than if she brought back goods. Out of 1,541 vessels which left the ports of Halifax, Montreal and Quebec last year, only six left in ballast; while during the same year there came into those ports 1,414 vessels, out of which 358 came in ballast. Now, if we can increase our trade with the countries across the sea, some of these 358 vessels will come back laden, and will be better able to carry the products of Canada across at lower rates than at present. Therefore, there will be more work for Canadian shippers and lower prices for Canadian consumers. In this way we shall be benefited from both sides.

Now, I have placed before you no less than fifteen promises that we made to the people of this country, and I have proven that in every case these promises have been fairly and reasonably carried out. Although this Government has been only ten months in power, no other Government that ever existed in the country could have done more or done better. Nor has there ever been a Government in this country with a personnel of more honour, more integrity or more economy. They are men whose characters

are above the least suspicion, either in private or public life. And when I say that our noble leader is the best leader the Liberal party ever had, I do not mean to disparage the great leaders we had before. The Hon. George Brown was a great man; the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie was a great man; the Hon. Edward Blake was a great man; yet in my humble judgment we never had in this country a man with broader views, greater statesmanship or a better grasp of the affairs of Canada than the man who now leads the grand and noble Liberal party of Canada; and I believe that when he goes to England in a few weeks to represent this great colony at the coming celebration of the Queen's Jubilee, he will receive a greater ovation than any other man from any foreign country or British colony. As the Koh-i-noor is the brightest diamond, and sparkles more brightly in the crown of the Queen than any other diamond in it, so Canada is the Koh-i-noor of the colonies of Great Britain; and what is more fitting than that we should send the Koh-i-noor of colonial statesmen to represent Canada in the great Jubilee year of the Queen's coronation? Now, Sir, not one word of the praise I have given to the hon. gentleman is flattery; but from what he has accomplished during the last ten months, with the aid of the Liberal party behind him and the wisdom of the men surrounding him in the Government—men of ability, integrity and character—how could you expect from him anything but what is good and great and noble, in the interest of the country of which we are all so proud?

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, if there ever was a financial crisis in the affairs of Canada, I think we may say from a perusal of the daily press that the present is that time. A perusal of the daily papers from one end of the province of Ontario to the other, and also in the province of Quebec, will prove that many factories are being closed in consequence of the changes which the Government of the day have made in the tariff now before the House. Little wonder is it, therefore, that the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat (Mr. Macdonald, Huron), and who has for a long time been a constant advocate of free trade, should have seen fit to avoid the tariff measure which is now before the House and the country. The hon. gentleman has nimbly gone over the wide field of Canadian politics. He has dealt with the Manitoba school question, though what it has to do with the tariff is something I fail to understand. Then, in closing, he has endeavoured to make a comparison on the subject of honesty between the gentlemen who now occupy the Treasury benches and their predecessors. It must be a matter of regret to the hon. gentleman that they are minus one gentleman, and that is their representative in the county of Terrebonne, the famous author of the "business is business" letter. When hon. gentlemen opposite boast that they have all the honesty of this country, I ask them to call to recollection their colleague in Terrebonne and fancy what a pity it would be had he been among those innocent nurslings, for fear he might have polluted some of them. Now, I cannot follow the hurried remarks of the hon. gentleman in reference to all the tariff matters upon which he has touched, but this I have to say, that in the ordinary pursuits of life we are accustomed to judge a man's general reputation by his special and particular acts. And if I can show by the statements of the hon. gentleman that he has been simply a wayfarer by the side of the path of truth, I need only say: By one statement judge of the others. The hon. gentleman said, and he defied contradiction, that the Liberal party had never been pledged to the removal of the duty on iron. I think I caught correctly the words of the hon. gentleman. True, it may be that, in the hon. gentleman's estimation, his declarations must have more weight than even those of the leader of his party; but if he will refer back to the columns of the Montreal "Herald" of the 23rd of June, 1895, he will find that the hon. the First Minister is there reported to have said in a speech delivered in Montreal:—

> There are two articles which are the raw material of every manufacture in this country, and these are coal and iron. Are they free? If you have a revenue tariff, our object will be to develop the country, and under such a tariff all raw materials will be free.

Yet the hon. gentleman has told us that his leader never led the people to believe that the duties would be removed on iron. Coming down to some of the other matters on which the hon. gentleman touched, he endeavoured to show that this tariff was framed almost exclusively in the interests of the poorer people, that it was the case of the masses against the classes, and he illustrated his statement by a reference to the duty on silk. The hon. gentleman should know that there is nothing half so dangerous as a half truth, and while I do not imply any intention on his part, he certainly lapsed into a half truth. He said that the new tariff imposed a higher duty on silks. Well, Mr. Speaker, he is altogether in error. He will find that while in the old tariff there was a duty of 30 per cent upon silks, there is only a duty of 26½ per cent in the new. And so on, if you will compare the record with his utterances you will find that the both are very wide apart.

What is the question to-day before the people in this House, for after all is said and done, this House is in reality the people of Canada. We are here as the representatives of the people of Canada, sent here to obey their behests and do what

they have instructed us to do. And while it is quite true that hon. gentlemen opposite are in possession of the Treasury benches, I allege that they have no warrant from the people to interfere in the fiscal policy which has been in force the last twenty years and has produced a great amount of prosperity and content. What is the National Policy? There was a time in the annals of Canadian politics when lines were fairly and squarely drawn, when either upon the public platform or on the floor of this House or in the public press, each party could be told by its colours—the one unswerving in its devotion to the policy of protection, while the other, while giving unyielding opposition to that tariff—alas, for the frailty of human hopes!—never was able to adhere to any fixed line of principle or policy. There have been since the inception of the National Policy a number of general elections. I ask any hon. gentleman if he can show where the Liberal party in this country has ever, during the past eighteen years, adhered to the one and the same policy. In the last campaign, their appeal was made, not on the platform of the National Policy with a preference for continental trade, but was made on the plea that they were in favour of a tariff for revenue alone. In the preceding elections, their appeal was made on the ground that the interests of Canada were tied up altogether with those of the great republic to the south, and that the only hope for the future prosperity of Canada lay in a treaty of commercial union with the United States. Are they to-day the advocates of commercial union? Not at all, and the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat is forced to admit that they have appropriated to their own use the fiscal policy which has been in force during the past eighteen years, with a few changes and conditions.

But what have these hon. gentlemen attempted to do? The hon. the Finance Minister, the other night, said that his party was at the great disadvantage in being asked to raise a superstructure on a poor foundation. Well, all I can say is this, that hon. gentlemen opposite were certainly at their wits' end when they devoted their attention and energies to framing a protective tariff policy in this country, and the reason was that year in and year out, for the past fifteen years, they have been the advocates of free trade and commercial union and reciprocity with the United States, and therefore is it to be wondered at that the measure they present to-day bears unmistakably marks of botched mechanicism.

What has the National Policy done for this country in the past eighteen years? No better proof could be given of the advantage of this policy than the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite are compelled to accept it almost in its entirety. It has given to the people vast manufacturing interests and given work to Canadian labourers and workingmen, and enabled them to earn higher wages than the same classes are earning in the countries of Europe. What are the wages paid to men in this country as compared with those paid in Europe? The wages paid in Belgium are admitted to be the cheapest. In Germany the wages are about one-half what they are in this country. In England they are five-eighths, and in France the wages are about a medium between those in England and Germany. What this country needs at present is not any tinkering with the tariff, but rest, in order that our people may have restored those energies which have been severely tried in the past five years. But where are the hon. gentlemen to-day? They are, as I have said, admirers of the National Policy—the policy which they have for years denounced in the strongest language possible. They remind one of the lines:

> Vice is a monster of such frightful mien
> That to be hated needs but to be seen.
> But seen too oft, familiar with its face,
> We first endure, then pity, then embrace.

For a number of years these hon. gentlemen endured the National Policy. After that they began to pity it, and to-day, the National Policy, by reason of the firmness of their embrace, stands in a fair way of almost being strangled. And of all those who are embracing it, whether it be the Knight of the Rueful Countenance (Sir Richard Cartwright) down to the last admirer of that policy on that side, each one is vieing with the other to prove to the people that the National Policy as tinkered by them is the tariff policy which should prevail in this country for years to come.

Looking back eighteen years, the question is, not whether the National Policy has come up to our expectations, but whether Canada has been a gainer or a loser by that policy, and whether we would have done better under the policy which hon. gentlemen opposite used to advocate in past years. There will come a time, I suppose, when the history of the Liberal party will be written, and it will be found hard to believe that such a party could have departed as it has done from its principles, and they will be looked upon as nothing but the remnants of a once great political party.

Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald, Huron), who has just resumed his seat dealt with some matters to which I wish more particularly to refer. One was the coal oil industry. If there was one plank in the platform of hon. gentlemen opposite in which they affected to have an especial concern, it was in the tariff relative to coal oil. And yet to-day, after all their professions what changes have been made in the tariff? There has been a paltry reduction

of 1 cent a gallon. It is true that some regulations have been made by which coal oil may be taken in vessel tanks. But this will not give one cent advantage to the people of the North-west. It may give an advantage to the people of the maritime provinces, but the farmer of Ontario and the farmer of the North-west will be forced to pay as high prices as they have paid in the past for coal oil. The hon. gentleman went on to deal with the question of the farmer's interests and he brought up the subject of corn. I am here to say that in my humble opinion it is not in the interest of the Canadian farmer and particularly of the farmer of Ontario to remove the duty on corn coming from the United States. It may be an advantage to the feeders of cattle, but it will not be an advantage to the farmers as a rule, because the farmers are not sellers of beef, but sellers of coarse grains. But the hon. gentleman lightly and airily says: All you have to do is to ship your oats and coarse grains to England and feed your cattle on American corn. The hon. gentleman must know that the greater the quantity of any article forced on the market at any time the greater must be the reduction in price, and the farmer who has coarse grains to sell will, by the competition of American corn—for it can be landed at points in Canada at from 17 cents to 20 cents per bushel during the summer months—be forced to accept a less price for his coarse grains. With the Ontario farmer the problem is not so much in what he has to pay for any article; the problem with him is how he will procure better prices for the articles he has to sell.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald, Huron), dealt at some length with the woollen goods duties. I did not follow him in all respects, but I have to say that the farmers of Ontario and the farmers of other provinces will be vitally interested in the changes made in the duties on woollen goods. The other night when the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) was dealing with the Budget he drew a pleasant pastoral picture of Canada one hundred years ago. He longed for the days of stage-coaches and little mills at the cross-roads. He painted a picture that, to be complete, required only the presence of a highwayman. The hon. gentleman said that the world moves, but he forgot to say that it does not move backwards. If we in Canada are to move with the world we must move forward. I am glad to say that hitherto the movement has not been backward but forward, and under the defensive policy we adopted eighteen years ago, we have had the satisfaction of seeing the mechanic of a few years ago develop into the manufacturer of to-day and the small manufacturer of a few years ago grow until he is in control of immense works. But the hon. gentleman expressed, and I believe he was sincere in it, great regard for the small woollen men. Let me tell him that I have assurances from men in woollen mills that the passage of the policy now before the House will result in the closing up of every small woollen mill such as he pictured the other night. Take, for instance, the matter of coarse tweed manufactured in the mills. In my constituency there are four such mills. I have received from men in the business strong and solemn protests against the change proposed in the tariff in this regard. Take an article that weighs two pounds to the yard. Under the old tariff there was a duty of 5 cents a pound, making a straight duty of 10 cents per yard. The ad valorem duty in addition would be 12½ cents, being 25 per cent on the value which would be 50 cents. This made a protective duty on this article of 22½ cents per yard. Under the tariff now proposed, if it goes into force, instead of a duty of 22½ cents per yard, there will be a duty of only 13⅛ cents per yard. I say that the small woollen mills which are scattered all over the country cannot exist under such a duty and will be under necessity of closing up. Now, let me ask what effect will this have upon the farming community. Hon. gentlemen who are conversant with this business must know that these mills are the best customers the Canadian farmer has for his coarse wool, which is not wanted in England and which cannot be exported to the United States by reason of the hostile tariff of 12 cents a pound. I call the attention of the Finance Minister earnestly to that point and I tell him that by lowering the duty on this line of goods he is imperilling the life of every factory of that nature throughout the country.

The duty on wheat has been reduced as also has the duty on flour. The result must be that we shall have the mortification of seeing introduced into this country year by year large quantities of American flour. This must result to the detriment of the Canadian farmer. But, while these hon. gentlemen have stated that they are giving the farmer fair play all round, they have frequently said that fair-play means to give him advantages in the articles he has to buy. I would ask the hon. Finance Minister: Where is the reduction on agricultural implements? Reapers and binders are the articles which the farmers wish to purchase, and the duty of 20 per cent on these remains. On every hustings in Ontario the farmers were told of the Masseys' and these other large combines having been made wealthy under the fostering influence of the National Policy. Hon. gentlemen opposite assured the farming community that if they came into power they would give the farmers great advantage by removing the duties on iron and coal. The hon. leader of the Government (Mr. Laurier) stated without reservation that the duty on coal would be removed. The duty is not removed, but the duty on iron

has been lessened. And who are to be the beneficiaries of this change? The agricultural implement manufacturers, of whom they have a representative on that side of the House in the hon. member for Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Frost), are to have the advantage of the reduced duty on iron, while, at the same time the duty on agricultural implements is kept up in the interests of the hon. gentleman and of the Messrs. Massey & Co., who are strong admirers of hon. gentlemen opposite. The Government had the opportunity to give to the farmers a real advantage in connection with the reapers and binders, and the petty advantage of 1 cent per gallon on coal oil is nothing compared with the advantage they could have given the farmers on the larger article of agricultural implements. But they say: We have done something as much to the advantage to the farmers by reducing the duty on binder twine. All that I have to say is that the figures prove that for the past two or three years binder twine has been sold as cheap in the province of Ontario as in the United States. If it is such a boon to give the farming interests of this country binder twine without duty, why did they not give that boon this year? If it is such a boon to the farmer, why was it not permitted to go into effect at once? The fact of the matter is that hon. gentlemen have been trying to break their fall, and while they have refused to carry out the pledges that they have made to the farmers, they are endeavouring to break their fall with these paltry and trivial reductions on coal oil, binder twine and barbed wire. Now, there is in my riding an industry of great importance, an industry that has grown under the fostering care of the National Policy. In the town of Orillia, the manufacturing concern of Tudhope Bros. employ 100 men all the year round. They are making there, and have made for the last eight or ten years, carriages which have found a ready market not only in the province of Ontario, but even in the maritime provinces. Yet under the policy of the hon. gentleman, as contained in this tariff, a blow is being struck at the carriage industry of this country, which, in my humble opinion, it cannot possibly survive. There was a specific duty of $5 on each manufactured article valued at $20—and a large number of so-called carts are brought into this country from the United States, paying a duty of $5 specific—so that duty of $10 on each article is under the present tariff reduced to $7, as against $10. And why is this change made? It is not made as being warranted by what hon. gentlemen have done, because to the manufacture of carriages they have given little or no advantage; for while the duty on iron is reduced, the duty on malleables, which is the most expensive part of the carriage apart from the workmanship, has not been reduced one iota.

Mr. BENNETT.

This afternoon the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) asked the Government, or pressed upon the Government, the necessity of placing an export duty upon logs, and in that connection I would ask the indulgence of the House while I address a few remarks to the Finance Minister and to any other members of the Government who may be present relative to that great question. To-day we are haggling in this House about matters, and hon. gentlemen opposite are importuning Cabinet Ministers to preserve and to retain customs duties upon certain articles the manufacture of which employ a few hands, while they are entirely overlooking what is to-day one of the greatest industries, or could be made the greatest industry in the whole province of Ontario, namely, the manufacture of lumber. Sir, fifteen years ago, standing in the Legislative Assembly in Toronto, appeared a large number of American buyers, who openly announced their intention to purchase Canadian limits, and having purchased them, to remove the logs to Michigan, and to use them there in the manufacture of lumber. That was the time and the occasion when the Government of Ontario, with their eyes wide open, should have at once made a restriction on the sale of these limits, so that every foot of pine on those limits should be manufactured in the country. Unfortunately for the good of the province, that was not done, and to the mortification of the people of Georgian Bay, they saw, year after year, vast quantities of saw-logs passing from the Canadian to the American side. In a few years after that, Sir John A. Macdonald, then being Premier, had his attention called to the matter, and by reason of its great importance, the Dominion Government imposed an export duty on logs which almost prevented the trade and shipment of them to the state of Michigan. Unfortunately, at that time a movement was set on foot by certain Canadian lumber manufacturers and by American limit-holders in Canada. The duty at that time was $2 on white pine lumber passing from Canada to the United States, and in consequence of a joint proposal made by the Canadian lumber manufacturers and the American limit-holders in Canada, the authorities at Washington and the Dominion Government entered into an arrangement by which the export duty was removed from logs, and at the same time the duty was reduced on white pine lumber from $2 to $1. Since I have had the honour of a seat in this House, I have at all times and on all occasions pressed upon the Government the necessity of taking action in this matter, and preventing the export of these logs from this country to the United States. When I say that I am within the mark in stating that there has been for the past eight or ten years, year in and year out, exported from the Georgian Bay to Michigan 400 million feet of white pine lumber, hon.

gentlemen may form some estimate of the immensity of that trade. Why, Sir, that means the keeping in steady employment of eighty large mills, each cutting five million feet of lumber in a year; that means the employment each summer of upwards of 3,000 men. I ask the Finance Minister to-night while he is listening to the importunities of his followers, and of business men in this country to retain and preserve duties upon certain lines of goods so that small factories may be enabled to keep in their employment ten or a dozen hands, does he not think it is of greater interest that to the province of Ontario there should be preserved the work of two or three thousand men? Now, what has been the result of this policy? The result has been that along the line of the Georgian Bay mills which were formerly in full operation are to-day closed down; and we have, as I said before, the mortification of seeing large rafts of logs continually passing from Canada to the United States, at our cost and to our bitter experience. More than that, I can tell the Finance Minister to-night that he gives under his tariff an unfair advantage to the American manufacturer, in that upon every foot of lumber that passes from Canada into the United States a duty of $2 a thousand is charged, while on lumber that passes from Michigan right across Lake Huron, because it is easy of access, and is poured into western Ontario—there is not a single dollar of duty charged. Now, let that be understood. If we must have a hostile duty of $2 a thousand levied by the American Government against us, then in the name of all common sense let us have the same tariff against their lumber coming into Ontario. But there is a much better plan ahead of us, a plan that is approved of not only by the inhabitants along the shores of those lakes, but even by the lumbermen themselves. I would refer the Finance Minister to the Toronto "Globe" of 21st April, 1897, when the following resolution was adopted by a representative meeting of some of the largest lumbermen in northern Canada; and when I read the names of some of the gentlemen who were present hon. gentlemen who are conversant with the lumber business will admit the fact that these men are in a position to speak by reason of the fact that they have tens of thousands of dollars invested in the lumber interests. At that meeting there were present: Messrs. H. H. Cook, John Bertram, Robert Thompson, Hamilton; W. Thompson, Longford; J. B. Smith, W. H. Pratt and P. D. Master. The following resolution was unanimously adopted:—

Resolved, (1) That any import duty imposed by the United States on Canadian rough lumber and lumber products should be met by a similar import duty on American lumber and lumber products entering our ports; and, also, in addition, by a corresponding export duty on saw-logs and pulp-wood, in order that the product of our forests cut by Americans shall not have any advantage in the same market over the similar product when cut by Canadians.

Now, I make this appeal to the Finance Minister, considering the hostile tariff that has been framed under the Dingley Bill against the white pine industry of this country, has the time not arrived when we should at least hold up our own hands in self-defence, and endeavour to keep that lumber industry in the country, as it can be kept if it is given that fair meed and share of justice that it should receive at the hands of the Government. We then would have the satisfaction of seeing employment afforded at the highest possible rate of wages to 3,000 men every year, on the north shores of the Georgian Bay.

Now, I wish to ask the indulgence of the House for a few moments while I refer to what is known as the preferential phase of the present tariff. There must be one of two things to this phase of the tariff, it must mean either one thing or the other, either that hon. gentlemen are in earnest that it should go into force, or that they are only playing a part and endeavouring to humbug the public, and to weaken the effect of their abandonment of their former principles. If they are in earnest in their intention to carry out this tariff policy, then hon. gentlemen have done wrong and have acted against the best interests of the country. It must, of necessity, be plain to hon. gentlemen, as parliamentarians of years' standing, that there is no possibility under the decision given in the past for England to accept the preference we have offered under that clause. That goes without saying, in the face of all subsequent correspondence to the Australian conference. When hon. gentlemen made this proposition, they made it with their eyes open as to what may result. If to-day it has been ascertained from the Home Government that they propose to accept this offer, and the proposition is legal, then I believe it is the duty of this Government to inform the House of the fact, and that at once. If they have not that assurance, they have erred, and erred very materially because they have, by their action, manifested hostility to the United States. What was the necessity of throwing a firebrand at the people of that republic until the Government had ascertained whether or not the Act they were attempting to place on the Statute-book could become law. But if hon. gentlemen are in earnest about this, it is a matter fraught with the greatest possible importance, for this reason: That while the hon. Premier has stated that to-day a preference could only be given to Great Britain, it must be patent to every man reading the clause and an interpretation of the treaties, that Belgium, Germany and other continental countries, which were under the favoured-nation clause, must be held to participate in the benefits of a preferential

clause in the tariff. If they are entitled to that preference, this Government should at once let it be known to the public what countries it is proposed to introduce under this arrangement, so that the mechanics and the capitalists may know the worst at the first possible moment. If the artisan of Canada is forced to be brought into competition with the artisan of the old world, in such an unequal contest, the Canadian interests must inevitably go to the wall. If that is the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, and every one could see the other night that the Minister of Trade and Commerce showed almost pleasure at the prospect that the United States would be in a position to avail itself of that clause, the Government owes it as a duty to this House, if there is any arrangement with the Imperial Government, to let it at once be known, and further they should at the earliest possible opportunity place a construction on that clause, so that the people may know what countries come under it.

As to the other resolution in respect to combines, I can only say that no such measure should ever pass in this Parliament or in any other Parliament. The terrors of the Inquisition were nothing compared with this, from a trade standpoint, for when we consider the bitter political fights we have in this country, the Government would be in a position to apply the greatest possible influence to every manufacturer who placed himself in opposition to them.

I do not believe the Government expect the tariff to go into force, and I hope it will not, by reason of the disadvantages that will accrue to Canada, for they will be great indeed if all these countries referred to come under the operation of that clause. I believe there are to-day behind the Liberal ranks men like Senator Cox, who are able to control the free trade element of Canada, and to-day the eyes of the people of the Dominion, whether capitalist or mechanic, are on Senator Cox who is seeking to keep down those who have pronounced free trade tendencies in this country. When the Tariff Bill reaches committee, I trust the Government will, as they have stated they will, be prepared to do, listen to every proposition submitted as to changes in the tariff. It behooves us to act in the interests of the country which are far above the interests of party, and while, from a party standpoint it might be advantageous to allow hon. gentlemen opposite to stumble into the hole, still I believe hon. members on this side of the House, having regard not to party interests but to the higher interests of the country, will extend to the Government their most sincere and hearty support in perfecting a tariff which will be to the advantage and for the benefit of the country as a whole.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I do not intend to occupy much of the time of the House, because the tariff has been fully entered into by my colleagues from the west: still, as representing a western constituency I cannot allow a vote to be taken, if it is proposed to take a vote, without having expressed my views on the question now under discussion.

The people of the west, and I speak for my own constituents more particularly, do not expect that the Government would make the radical changes that many think should have been carried out. We are quite aware that when a country adopts a protective policy, it is not easy to revert to the free-trade system; but we find that the present Government are guiding the ship of state in the right direction, and we are quite content to leave it in their hands, expecting that at the proper time it will get into the proper port. It is not, however, the tariff question that affects the people of the North-west so much as the question of freight rates. We have to give about one-half our produce—I refer more particularly to stock, because I know something about that trade—to take the other half to market. If we stockraisers in the Saskatchewan district sell steers for $30 per head, the jobbers are obliged to pay $32 to get them in the English market, and it is quite obvious that this comes out of the pockets of our farmers. We have also to give 15 per cent of our produce to bring back goods which we must necessarily consume in the country; so there is very little profit to our people. On the branch line running from Regina to Prince Albert, the passenger rate is 5 cents per mile and $1 per one hundred pounds for freight, the distance being 250 miles. It is thus apparent that the road should pay pretty well. I myself paid $518 freight on a car-load of apples from Seaforth, Ont., to the town of Prince Albert. I do not consider that this is at all a reasonable amout to charge, and I believe that if the Canadian Pacific Railway were to adopt a wise policy in this respect, they would lower the rates, and enable the farmers of Ontario to find a market for their fruits and other products in the North-west, while they would also enable the settlers there to get some of these luxuries which are now prohibited them. Suppose, Sir, we compare the value of a Pullman car with the value of a box car, we find that while a box car would probably cost $1,000, a Pullman car would cost $12,000. I do believe it to be a fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway does not run a Pullman car between Toronto and the town in which I live, or we will say Regina, on which they make $518 a trip. And yet they charge me $518 for the use of a box car to carry apples. If the Canadian Pacific Railway adopted a wiser policy and cut their freight rates, they would not have to haul so many empty cars to the west, but these cars would go back laden with the products of the farmers of Ontario for consumption by our people. There has been a great deal said about the duty

on coal oil, and I must confess that coal oil is sold at very high rates to the people in our western country. We have to pay 31½ cents a gallon at wholesale prices, and before I came here, I was under the impression that the coal oil refiners were robbing us. However, since I came to Ottawa I have taken the trouble to go into the matter with certain gentlemen who knew all about the rates and everything connected with coal oil, but who are not interested in it, and I figured the thing out. I have discovered that it costs us 15 cents a gallon to lay coal oil down in Prince Albert from the wells at Petrolia. The oil itself costs about 12½ cents a gallon, and with inspection fees and other charges the cost is brought up to 31½ cents, so that after all I have come to the conclusion that the coal oil men are not so much to blame as are the railroad companies for the high freight rates charged. I hope that the Government will take into consideration the advisability of allowing the oil to be brought to the Territories in tank cars. We want permission to take the oil in tank cars from the wells of Petrolia right to the point of destination. At the present time, the oil is taken in tanks to the city of Winnipeg and it has to be inspected and barrelled there. It is then re-shipped to the town in which I live, or to any other town in the Territories, and we are obliged to pay a local freight rate upon it, which is as high as the rate from Petrolia to Winnipeg, and in some cases a great deal higher. This is unfair to the Territories, and as it is a matter which can be very easily remedied, the remedy should be applied at once. With reference to farm machinery, I know that the manufacturers have a great deal of freight to pay, and I presume that because of that they cannot sell the implements very much cheaper in the Territories than they do at the present time. I believe, however, that a great deal of the opposition to the machine manufacturers, was caused by the action of the firm of Massey-Harris & Company, who do not deal as they should deal with the farmers of the Territories. I heard an hon. gentleman state in this House, that this firm had lost a lot of money in the Territories. Well, if they have, I can say that it is not on account of the manner in which they do their business. They take good care to have the very best security, and they take no business risks whatever. They never let a piece of machinery out of their hands until they have a lien note upon it, which is registered, and very often they are not satisfied with a lien note, but take a chattel mortgage on his live stock as well, so that if the settler does not pay when the note comes due they very often sell the poor man out.

I wish to speak in a straight forward manner in reference to this tariff question, Mr. Speaker, and I must say that I am not satisfied with that part of the tariff which refers to agricultural machinery, because I think that the manufacturers had enough of protection before, and now that the duty on raw material has been cut down, I believe that the duty on the manufactured article should be cut down also. Under the regulations of the late Conservative Government, although the duty was supposed to be only 20 per cent on agricultural implements, yet we found that when machinery was imported the McCormick binder was valued at $100 for duty, while it was invoiced at $80, so that under the regulations of the late Government, although the people were supposed to pay only 20 per cent they were actually obliged to pay 25 per cent. If the present Government makes a fair and square valuation of the implements that are imported, I have not the least doubt that the people of the west will be perfectly satisfied. We are not unreasonable out there, and we do not ask for impossibilities. I am glad, Mr. Speaker, to find that the present Government is not forgetful of the western country. They have put binder twine and barbed-wire on the free list, and these are two articles which are largely used by our farmers. We have a prairie country, and there is a good deal of fencing to be done, and I am sure that the farmers will hail with delight the removal of the duty on barbed wire. The same remarks apply to binder twine. The Government have also lowered the duties on sugar, and many other articles which I could mention, such as nails, &c., which will be of great advantage to the farmer. I am also glad to find that the Government have increased the duties on liquors and tobacco. No right-thinking man would object to that. Both of these articles are luxuries, and are good subjects on which to raise a revenue. I regret that the Government did not put a tax on tea, because it can easily bear a tax and is a good revenue bearer. We produce no tea in this country, so that if a duty were placed on it every pound of tea would furnish a revenue to the treasury, and would enable us to reduce the taxation on other things which the farmer uses in the pursuit of his industry. If the Government put a small duty of 1 or 2 cents a pound on tea, the consumer would not have to pay any more for it, because the average profit on a pound of tea is 12½ cents, and the result would be that the retailer would simply have to reduce his profit. On the other hand, if the Government put a duty of say, ½ cent a pound on sugar, the profit is so very low that the retailer would have to raise the price to the amount of the duty.

As regards the preferential tariff I take the view that it is going to be a great benefit to the people of our western country. If the vessels coming to this country can get more freight from the other side—and I believe this will be the effect of the preferential tariff—they will be able to reduce their freight rates, and the people of the west

will reap the benefit thereof, because high freight rates, is one of the great hardships we labour under. Taking the tariff as a whole, I find that it is very satisfactory, and it has the further consolation for us, that it shows the Government are proceeding in the right direction. We take this new tariff as an instalment of better things to come, and I am satisfied that it is the intention of the Government to go further in the desired direction. When the people of the west read the speeches of the leader of the Opposition, and of his supporters who have addressed the House, they will be satisfied to leave the control of the affairs of Canada in the hands of the present Government. We in the west have practically only eighteen years of existence, and nearly all that time we have been governed by the Conservative party. We have had a trial of their legislation, and we have found to our cost that it was not directed towards enabling our farmers to prosper. It was only a year or two ago, when public opinion got so strong, that they were compelled at last to lop off the mouldering branches of the National Policy.

Before that time we were tied up with specific duties, some of which were very hard to bear. They all seemed to be made in the interest of the rich man, and none in the interest of the poor man.

The present Government have also taken a step in the right direction in the interests of the agriculturists of this country by having a practical farmer as Minister of Agriculture. That gentleman has grappled with the situation successfully, and we in the west have every confidence in him. He has assisted us by establishing creameries, which are a great boon to the people of the west; and if he established more of those creameries, there would be less grumbling on the part of the people there.

We are not unreasonable, but we hope that the Government will see their way in the near future to assist in building the Hudson Bay Railway, to which the people of Manitoba and the North-west look for the salvation of that country. We believe that nature created the great bay as a highway to the markets of the world, as an outlet for the produce of those great and fertile plains, stretching from Winnipeg to the foot of the Rocky Mountains. I have no doubt that the time is not far distant when the prejudice that exists in the east against that great railroad will be at an end, and it will be built. Then we in the North-west shall have our importations brought in at much lower rates than the people of Ontario, and no more will be heard in that country of high freight rates or of the tariff.

Mr. KENDRY. Mr. Speaker, the hon gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Davis, Saskatchewan), like a great many of those who come from the North-west Territories, spoke wholly in the interest of the particular locality from which he comes. In this country, where our interests are so diversified, we should legislate in the best interests of all parts of the country. In reference to the tariff, the industries of this country have been built up since 1878 largely by the National Policy. I defy hon. gentlemen opposite to say that they have not. The best evidence we have of that fact is that the gentlemen now on the Treasury benches have adopted that policy, or at least ninety per cent of it. Now, I propose to-night to speak in regard to the effect of the tariff upon the manufacturing industries of this country. I want to say to hon. gentlemen opposite, especially the Finance Minister, that while ninety per cent of their tariff is that of the National Policy, the remaining 10 per cent will close a large number of the mills and manufacturing establishments of this country. These gentlemen, especially those from the North-west, have been for years going from one end of this country to the other, condemning every part of the National Policy; and yet their policy of to-day is the same or nearly the same; and these gentlemen from the North-west now say that this policy will suit that country. When these gentlemen go back to their constituents again, and tell them that the policy which they used to grumble about now suits the North-west; I am certain that they will not be again returned to this House. Now, I want to deal with some of the figures in the tariff of this Government. They have adopted specific duties in about six-tenths of it, and in the other four-tenths they have taken the specific duties off. I make the assertion that the Government will not collect an honest duty by the ad valorem system. In the United States, under the Cleveland Administration, the tariff was largely ad valorem, and they were unable to collect the duties; and I call the attention of the Finance Minister to-night to the fact that his policy will have the effect of striking at one of the largest industries of this country, in which $15,000,000 is invested and over 15,000 hands are employed. It is claimed that the duties have been lowered on the cheaper kind of goods in the interest of the poor man; but I say that the goods that will largely come to this country under the new tariff will be shoddy goods from England, which we want to keep out. Next year you will find that this country will be flooded with these shoddy goods. What I think the Government should have done would have been to increase the duty on those lines of goods which the rich man wears, so as to tax the rich man as well as the poor man and to give the mills of this country some protection. As a result of lowering the duties on cheaper goods, the wool grown in this country will not be used. I make the assertion that in a few months the wool of this country will be three or four cents a pound lower than it is to-day, and that will

not be in the interest of the farmers. There is no doubt that the Government will find that the specific duty is the proper duty. They have adopted it in some cases, for example on coal and sugar; but why not have a specific duty on everything? I suggest to the Government even now that if they impose only a small specific duty, that would be a check on the ad valorem duty, and they would be able to collect the revenue. Another matter I wish to call attention to is the effect of the tariff on the wage-earner. I wish to say that if our industries are to be continued running, this new tariff will mean, at the start, a reduction in the wages of the employees of from 15 to 20 per cent. You are very well aware that in the last six months, some fifteen or twenty mills have failed, and commerce has been in a bad condition from one end of the country to the other. And now the Government has struck a blow which will have the effect of closing down many industries. The smaller mills in all parts of the country will have to close, and if this preferential clause is carried into effect, it is only a question of a very short time when the large ones will follow suit.

As regards this double barrelled tariff which we never had before, and which is styled the preferential tariff, it will have the effect of closing down a large number of manufacturing industries owing to the competition it will create from England. We have had several speakers on both sides expressing themselves in favour of the preferential clause, but for my part, I say that duties should be collected equally from all goods, no matter from what country they may come, whether England, Belgium or Germany. We are bound to protect the wage-earners of this country but by this clause the Government have inflicted a very cruel blow on them. Take for instance the lock manufactories, which, under the old tariff, were protected by a duty of 32½ per cent, but which duty is now reduced to 30 per cent. It is true that the Government have lowered the duty on raw material, but that is a very small element in the matter, and that industry will have very hard work to exist if it be not wiped out.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Nothing of the kind.

Mr. KENDRY. I may say to the hon. gentleman that he does not know everything. In the town where I live, we have a large lock manufactory, and the gentlemen connected with it know something about their own business, and they will corroborate what I say.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). The lock manufactory in our town is perfectly satisfied with the tariff.

Mr. KENDRY. I think the hon. gentleman would be satisfied with anything so long as it comes from that side of the House.

I now come to the carpet industry which has been encouraged under the National Policy, and which is another one that will be wiped out. The hon. gentleman will find that, from one end of the country to the other, unless the tariff is changed, a great number of these manufactories will be wiped out. Hon. gentlemen opposite are sending their emissaries to all parts of the world to induce immigrants to come to this country at the same time that he proposes allowing thousands of wage earners to come into this country to the United States. I hope that is a policy which will not be adhered to by hon. gentlemen opposite, but that they will become convinced by the deputations that are waiting on them from day to day and by the appeal all over the country that these grievances are very serious.

I wish now to refer, before closing, to a clause in the report of the Controller of Customs, which provides:—

> That any question that may arise as to the countries entitled to the benefits of the Reciprocal Tariff, shall be decided by the Controller of Customs, subject to the authority of the Governor in Council.

If that is going to be carried out, it is certainly something which would not be carried out except by this Parliament. It is something unprecedented to give such a power to the Controller of Customs. I remember some years ago a measure somewhat similar was introduced into the United States House of Representatives and they threw it out. It seems to me that the same course should be followed here. I hope the hon. gentleman will not press that part of the resolution. I do not wish to say anything further on the matter except to express the hope that the Government will take it up and see if it cannot do something to help our manufacturing industries.

Mr. ROCHE. I sympathize with those hon. gentlemen from the North-west in their attempts to blow hot and cold in the same breath. No person is in a better position to know the very profuse promises which were held out to the electorate of that western country and when hon. gentlemen compare these promises with the actual performances it is no wonder that we find little enthusiasm in the addresses delivered by them to this House. A goodly portion of the speeches of the hon. gentlemen consisted of a mildly condemnatory criticism of the tariff, but they are careful not to say too much to injure their party. They all, however, agree in saying that this tariff policy is merely an instalment of what is yet to come. Do these hon. gentlemen desire to make this Government a Government on the instalment plan? One would imagine they did. But, Sir, that is the very thing to which the Government and hon. gentlemen opposite objected in their predecessors. They objected to the repeated tinkering with the old tariff. What

was the excuse given by the Government at the last session for not taking up the policy of tariff reform during last session ? They said that during the recess they proposed collecting information and we did look to them, after all this inquiry, to produce a tariff that would stand for a considerable time to come, and when to-day they tell us that the present tariff is merely an instalment of something else, we can see that that is merely a device to cover their own disappointment. The speech of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) was on the same line, condemning the Government very mildly for not doing justice to the great North-west.

The hon. gentleman gave some information why he spoke in this particular line. He declared that he would desire no better campaign literature to go back to his constituents with than certain remarks he was presenting to this House. This is the whole situation. As the House is aware, a protest has been lodged against the hon. gentleman, which will be brought to trial at the end of the present session, and he wishes to be able to say : See the independent stand I took in the interest of the farmers even against the interests of my own party. But the other portion of his speech was highly eulogistic of the Government. In effect he declared " With all thy faults, I love thee still." and desired the House plainly to understand that he would support the Government's policy at any rate. No person accused the hon. gentleman of desiring to oppose the Government by vote, no matter how much he might seem to do so by voice. The hon. gentleman, in the early part of his speech, read a poem by Rudyard Kipling touching the supposed concessions offered to the motherland. The poem was very fine so far as the sentiment was concerned, but its literary merits do not seem to be so highly regarded by the reviewers. The name will hardly be regarded as eulogistic by many Canadians, who are not enamoured of the name " Our Lady of the Snows " as applied to our country. It has rather a chilly suggestion about it, which would be more appropriate if made concerning the reception that the tariff will be given at the hands even of friends of hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. gentleman read the poem nicely, and, no doubt, that made up for many of its other defects.

Now, the hon. gentleman made a remark that I think was entirely uncalled for. He expressed regret that Manitoba had not sent back a solid contingent in favour of the Liberal policy as a result of the general elections of 1896, and he gave as his reasons that Manitoba was practically taken by the throat and a full and free expression of popular opinion prevented by what he was pleased to term " wholesale ballot stuffing." It will be necessary for me to make some reply to that particular part of the hon. gentleman's speech. I feel like extending every indulgence to the hon. member for Lisgar in any statements he may present to this House on subjects of a political nature. The hon. gentleman's training as editor of the Winnipeg " Tribune " has not been conducive to placing facts in a fair, impartial and perfectly accurate manner before this House. As to stuffing ballot boxes in Manitoba, there were many charges, but how many convictions ? Out of all the arrests—some eighteen or twenty, there was but one conviction, and that on the gentleman's own evidence. And that, if I mistake not, was not so much a case of ballot-stuffing. He initialled some ballots after the election, acting in concert with the stool-pigeon of the Liberal party, the man Freeborn. Freeborn was to take these to the Conservative committee, and try to levy blackmail, and, if successful, to divide the spoils with the deputy returning officer. But the Conservative committee refused to be blackmailed, and Freeborn handed over the ballots to the Liberals. And it was a strange thing that the bondsman of the man who was arrested was the Liberal candidate, Dr. Rutherford. There was only one conviction, and that is how it happened. But how would the hon. gentleman explain what has taken place in the same constituency within the last week or so. Another election took place in Macdonald, and the Conservatives did not put up a candidate. An old-time Liberal, Mr. Mackenzie, appeared as the Independent candidate, his opponent being Dr. Rutherford. The Conservative newspaper was in financial difficulties, its hands out on strike. The editor, without the knowledge of the proprietor, went to the committee room of the Independent candidate and offered, for a consideration, to come out in the paper in favour of the Independent candidate. The offer was indignantly refused. He then walked across the road to the Liberal committee room and made the same offer to come out in favour of Dr. Rutherford, and the offer was immediately accepted. That is the difference between the two parties. And that very night, the type already set up was brought in from the Liberal office and thus the Conservative paper appeared with editorials in favour of the Liberal candidate. That in itself would not have been so bad, but that was not all. The Independent candidate had his election address in the paper, and some parties, acting in the interest of the Liberal candidate, actually forged a paragraph trying to leave the impression that the Conservatives had combined with the Patrons to support the Independent candidate. Ballot stuffing was charged against the Conservatives, but not proved. But here was a case of forgery on the part of some one in the interests of the Liberal candidate. Immediately the Independent candidate took steps to have the editor arrested, and he was arrested as he was boarding the freight train to skip

the country. And since then he has skipped the country. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) would not lay these facts before Parliament. With him it depends on whose ox is gored. He pointed to the Winnipeg election as evidence that the people of that city were enamoured of the Liberal policy. The people of Winnipeg, and I give them credit for it, look out very carefully for No. 1. They did not put up a candidate against the Liberal nominee.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Why ?

Mr. ROCHE. I will tell you why. An Independent labour candidate ran against the Liberal nominee who is a renegade Tory. The Conservative party decided that they would not seek to prevent the election of a supporter of the Government. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) has paid a visit to Manitoba and to Winnipeg since last session. He has had some surveys made by an engineer of the Red River and estimates made of the probable cost of certain works which the people of Winnipeg and of Manitoba generally are very desirous should be gone on with—the St. Andrew's Locks. The people of Winnipeg thought it would be right to give the Liberal party an opportunity to prove the value of its professions, and so did not oppose the Liberal nominee. But, at the end of five years, if they have not fulfilled the expectations of their friends, those people will have something to say.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he will state how many surveys of the Red River were made by the engineer of the late Government ?

Mr. ROCHE. That is the hon. gentleman's usual way of arguing : "You're another." That has nothing whatever to do with the merits of the present case. Now, Mr. Speaker, hon. members on this side of the House, who are in favour of the policy of protection to our agricultural, manufacturing and labouring population, the principle underlying the tariff introduced by the Finance Minister, should not prove so disappointing. But to those hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who vainly imagined that in tariff revision the principle of free trade would be adhered to the result must have come as a most painful surprise. But, above all, among those deluded electors who gave their support to the Liberal candidates and put their trust in them on the distinct understanding that with the return to power of the Liberal party the whole fabric of protection would be torn up and destroyed, root and branch, that, irrespective of any action that might be taken by any other country, on tariff matters the guiding principle of the Liberal party of Canada would be free trade. The fact that this Government adopts the much abused policy of their predecessors in office will create a feeling of resentment at the duplicity which has been practiced upon them. Confidence has been so shaken that in future any promises emanating from the same source will be taken cum grano salis, and with a very large grain at that. Nothing is more calculated to destroy confidence in our public men than to see the promises held out to the electors unfulfilled, principles abandoned and the very things that the present Government had so decried announced as the policy of the Government. When the Minister of Public Works, in addressing this House, touched upon the tariff issue, he said that we on this side expected that the Government, in dealing with tariff issues, would make fools of themselves, but that is where we got left. I presume the hon. gentleman meant by that that we on this side of the House naturally expected that as honourable men they would keep their pledges to the electors, but they were not such fools as to do so. They had the option of keeping their pledges and making fools of themselves, or of violating their pledges and making fools of the electors, and they chose the latter alternative. This may be good politics on the part of the hon. gentleman, but it does not bespeak a very high standard of public morality. However, the hon. gentlemen who have been inured to the cold shades of Opposition for eighteen long years, and who have been growing more reckless in making pledges upon each successive occasion, whose sole aim and object appeared to be to gain power by hook or by crook, and having gained it, to retain it at all hazards—to be sure, to such hon. gentlemen public morality does not count for much, except, like their free trade doctrines, it is all well enough in theory, but in practice they, as a party, have no use for it. Now, those hon. gentlemen must take the people of Canada for a very gullible class indeed. They must be imbued with a good deal of what my hon. friend from Durham (Mr. Craig) declared to be the Barnum idea, that the people like to be humbugged. But there comes a time, even to the most obtuse, when he catches on to those humbugging him, and then woe betide those who have been instrumental in befooling the victim. Now, the Liberal party have been in power but a short time, and still not so short a time but that they have given evidence of their intention to violate almost every pledge given to the electors upon which they secured power. A number of those pledges have been referred to by hon. gentlemen beside me, and it will not be necessary to enumerate them all, nor will it be necessary for me to enter into lengthy details touching any of them. Suffice it to say, that prominent amongst them was the promise to reduce the expenditure and the public debt. In neither case have they done so ; they have increased both items. They promised if they were given opportunity that

they would successfully negotiate a reciprocity treaty with the United States. They declared that the Conservatives in office heretofore had never been sincere in their attempts in this direction ; they declared also that the Conservative public men did not stand in high favour with the American public men ; that the Liberal party had always been more friendly disposed towards the Americans than the Conservative party, and if given an opportunity they would send a commission to Washington who would undoubtedly succeed in negotiating successfully a reciprocity treaty with that country. Indications do not point in that direction at the present time ; on the contrary, the very best evidence we have that these hon. gentlemen know in their inmost hearts that there is not the remotest possibility of negotiating a reciprocity treaty with that country that would be fair to Canada, is the fact that they are, to use their own expression, discriminating against the United States. They thundered their eloquence against the Canadian Senate, and declared that if given an opportunity they would reform that institution. Well, Mr. Speaker, I must tell you that that is one pledge they seem in a fair way of fulfilling ; they are reforming that body politic about as quickly as the law will permit, by placing as many Reformers in that institution as there are vacancies ; but I do not think that is the kind of reformation that they promised the electors of Canada. While condemning their opponents for having, as they said, abused the Superannuation Act and superannuated a lot of officials unnecessarily, in the few short months they have been in office they have brought down already a long list of superannuated officers, and if they keep up their present pace, they will soon have the Civil Service depleted of all save the younger element. They railed against that portion of the Conservative policy which provided for a fast Atlantic service, and told the farmers of the province of Manitoba that their hard earned dollars were being wrung from them in order to carry a few passengers between here and the old country in a little less time than heretofore ; they declared that to subsidize such a line of steamers would be directly prejudicial to the interests of the Canadian farmers. What do we see to-day ? This portion of the Conservative policy has also been adopted by that party, and to-day a contract is signed for a fast Atlantic steamship service. They waged bitter warfare against what they were pleased to term the grinding monopoly of the Canadian Pacific Railway, its high freight rates, and declared their opposition to having the construction of a road through Crow's Nest Pass handed over to that monopoly. But we see to-day that members of the Government are hand in glove with that so-called monopoly, and are about to hand over, I believe, if rumours be correct, the construction of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway to that company. When they were in Opposition they ridiculed the idea that the duties imposed by the Conservative Government upon wheat, peas, barley and other products of the farm, were in any respect a benefit to the Canadian farmers. They stated that the old country markets ruled prices the world over, and that those duties might as well be abolished for all the good they were doing the Canadian farmer. But the best evidence that those hon. gentlemen were not sincere in railing about those duties, is the fact that they are retained in their new tariff. If, as they declared, the duties on agricultural products were of no benefit, why did they not abolish them entirely. To be sure they have reduced the prtoection afforded to the farmers heretofore to a certain extent. The duty upon wheat has been reduced from 15 to 12 cents a bushel, and I suppose that was done to compensate the millers for their reduced protection on flour from 75 to 60 cents a barrel. So what they took away with the one hand they appeared to give with the other, but all at the expense of the farmers. It is a well known fact that the price of wheat in the province of Manitoba, many times during these past two or three years, has been above an export basis ; that many times the price in Manitoba has been greater than that across the boundary line, plus the duty. And still they have reduced the duty upon wheat from 15 to 12 cents per bushel. There were two items of especial interest in Manitoba that have been mentioned already in a number of speeches, that is the item of agricultural implements and coal oil. The Liberals told the Manitoba farmers that that was essentially an agricultural country, and why should they be taxed to keep up those bloated manufacturers of the east ? They tried in this way to set one class of people against another, one province against another, cultivating the idea that the manufacturer was the natural enemy of the farmer. But notwithstanding all those professions, we find to-day that the manufacturer of agricultural implements is in the enjoyment of higher protection than he had under the old tariff, for the raw material that enters into the composition of his machines is allowed to come in at a reduced duty, the manufacturers get the benefit, but the farmer does not, and the protection of 20 per cent is kept on just as it was. One would imagine to hear the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) last night when he spoke on agricultural implements, that he held a brief in favour of the manufacturer of American implements. He was trying to impress this House and country how much superior American-made machines were to Canadian-made machines. I think the hon. gentleman took a very unpatriotic stand in that particular line, for there are a great number of men more practical than either he or I who hold a contrary opinion. Dur-

ing my campaign I met with as many farmers who declared that the Massey-Harris binder was equally as good as I did of farmers who favoured the McCormack binder.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I gave both sides.

Mr. ROCHE. The cotton lords also came in for a great deal of abuse at the hands of the Liberal party. The high protection they had enjoyed was pointed to as evidence of the injurious effects of the tariff; but the cotton lords to-day are in the enjoyment of a higher protection than they had under the old tariff, in many lines the protection has been raised, and their old cry falls to the ground in that respect as well. The people of the west were told how heavily they were taxed to maintain the employment of a few hundred men in the coal mines of Nova Scotia, and that was described as another iniquitous tax, embodying the vicious principle of class legislation, that would have to go with the advent of the Liberals to power. But has it gone? No, and not likely to go; but, on the contrary, in view of expressions made by the Finance Minister, both in this House and out of it, in the event of the Dingley Bill going into force with a coal tax of 75 cents per ton, there will not only be a tax on bituminous coal, but also on anthracite, which is now admitted free, and this would be necessarily a retaliatory tax which the people of Canada would have to pay through the nose for. And this is from a Government who were supposed to be opposed to retaliation in any form and who were going to legislate irrespective of any action taken by any other country. Why, Mr. Speaker, that love of change, so indigenous to the Liberal breast, which characterized their actions while in Opposition, still clings to them now that they have assumed the responsibilities of office. Their many-sided ante-election policy has undergone another change during the last few weeks; and is not this very fact of a great political party changing their policy at every election, no sooner having met with defeat with the one cry than they hatch out a new policy, trot it out and advocate it with all the gusto imaginable, to be met with the same result and have the same process repeated, and having at last been fortunate enough to delude the electors into returning them to power—is not this instability in itself sufficient to condemn any party in the eyes of intelligent people, and pronounce them unworthy to occupy positions of trust and incapable of managing successfully the affairs of a young and thriving nation like Canada.

The Finance Minister declared that no person imagined that the Liberals ever advocated the immediate adoption of free trade, and he travelled all the way to England for an authority to bolster up his arguments in favour of getting here by easy stages.

Now, that was rather hard on some of his colleagues who declared it was the intention of the Liberal party to use their own words—and it was the declaration of an hon. gentleman who occupies a specially high position—that they would not get there by easy stages, but by one fell swoop wipe away every vestige of protection.

The Finance Minister also expressed his admiration for the good old-fashioned method of doing business on the small scale. Well, the hon. gentleman is rather contradictory, for in another portion of his speech he said the world moves. And so it does, and Canada is moving with it, and with the modern and improved methods of doing business, the old style is not in it. You would imagine the hon. gentleman to be living in an ante-deluvian age. Canada cannot afford to be doing business on a back street, and must keep abreast with the progressive spirit of the times; so I see nothing in our present condition that should make us yearn for the non-progressive days of the past.

The speech of the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) the other night contained, in my opinion, an undercurrent of disappointment and dissatisfaction. That hon. gentleman knew the many promises of reform that were made to the people in the western country, and with which the practices of the Government thus far do not tally; but while not at all enthusiastic in his praise of the Government, for party reasons, he did not desire to say anything calculated to injure them. He declared his intention of supporting their policy, because in none of the speeches delivered on this side of the House was there any better policy formulated. Does the hon. gentleman not remember the words of his leader while occupying the Opposition benches, that it was not the province of an Opposition to propound a policy for the country, that it was time enough to prescribe for the patient when he was called in, and now that he has been called in he prescribes for his patient in homeopathic doses on the instalment plan; and I presume if that is good logic when applied to the then Opposition, it is equally good when applied to the present Opposition. But the late Government, led by Sir Charles Tupper, had a policy and a good policy for the western country, and had they been permitted to carry that policy into effect it would have resulted in great benefit to that country. The hon. gentleman did not always think that the Liberals were friendly disposed to the west, as is evidenced by the following remarks delivered by him a few years ago:—

> The reason that the people of the Territories do not kick more vigorously when election day arrives, is because they have no assurance that if the Opposition obtained power to-morrow, they would do any better in these respects than the Government is doing. The Liberals have never made a study of the North-west or its affairs, have never championed its cause or that of its settlers—more than to score a point for the party, when opportunity offered—and, indeed, have per-

mitted themselves to rest under the libel that they are anything but friends of the North-west. Whatever may be the shortcomings of the Government party, they at least profess an interest in the Territories, which the Opposition does not even profess. Under the circumstances, the people of the Territories can hardly be expected to enthuse much over a prospective change of government, or to give a majority in favour of it.

So there are others who change their views pretty frequently besides the members of the Government. But there was one remark made by the hon. gentleman in which I heartily concur, namely, that there are other more important matters than even the tariff —the question of freight rates, a subject on which the Government may not have much influence, but it was one of the questions which the Liberals declared they would take up for the purpose of relieving the burdens pressing on the people of the North-west. I hold that freight rates can never be satisfactorily settled in that country until there is secured that nearer outlet for the products of the North-west to markets of the world via Hudson Bay. That country will never prosper to the extent nature intended it to, until we have a road to that Bay. The hon. gentleman said the late Government had no policy. The late Government of Sir Charles Tupper had an intelligent policy towards that country, and if ultimately it had been carried into effect it would have been productive of undoubted benefit, and if the present Government adopts that portion of the late Government's policy as well, and build a road to the Hudson Bay they will secure the everlasting gratitude of the people of the North-west. But I fear the expedition to be sent to test the navigation in Hudson Bay is not sent there to promote but rather to condemn the enterprise. Why should the Government have declined the offer of a vessel of 2,000 horse-power, fitted for ice navigation, and proposed to send there a whaling vessel with 70 horse-power that is not adapted for ice navigation; and considering that leading Liberals have cast doubts on the enterprise, and that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who is superintending the sending of this expedition entertains doubts as to the route, I think the present expedition is not intended so much to test the navigability of the straits as to condemn the enterprise for all time to come. Of course, I may be mistaken in this view, but if so, present appearances are deceptive.

Mr. CASEY moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. WILSON. I should like to make a few remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER. I suppose that strictly the hon. gentleman is in order.

Mr. WILSON. I will not detain the House very long.

Mr. ROCHE.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilson) is, in strictness, in order, but when an hon. gentleman moves the adjourment of the debate so as to get a preaudience on a future occasion, it is an exceedingly unusual thing for another hon. gentleman to intervene.

Mr. CASEY. I will withdraw the motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion has not been put, so that no consent is necessary to withdraw it. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey) give way?

Mr. CASEY. Certainly.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am not in the habit of speaking very often in the House, and as a matter of course I will not take up a very great deal of time. I wish to say a few words with reference to this new tariff that has been introduced by this new Government, and if there is 90 per cent of the old Conservative tariff left in it, I must say that the tariff is not as bad as we might have anticipated from this Liberal Government. However, before I enter into a discussion of the tariff I wish to say a few words about the history of this matter. Those of us who had the honour of a seat in the old Parliament, will remember then the unusual course pursued by the Liberal party at the last session. We know, how in every possible way, they obstructed the passing of the estimates, and that some of those hon. gentlemen spoke for five and six hours in order to obstruct. We know that the Finance Minister of that day made a proposition, that the Opposition should allow the estimates for two or three months to be passed, so that it would not necessitate the calling of the House immediately after the elections, but the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) then protested, that he would not allow a single cent to pass the House. I have no doubt that at that time, the leader of the Opposition and his followers had very little idea that they would succeed in the then coming elections. They expected that the Conservative Government would be returned to power, and the Conservative Government also expected the same thing, and so the Liberal opposition intended to embarrass the Government in every way. It was found after the general elections, that Mr. Laurier had a majority of members in the new House, and would be called upon to form a Government, and he found himself in a very awkward position. He had begun a new fiscal year without any estimates, and about the 8th of July he was called upon to form a Government, he knew that he could not possibly get his Ministers elected and meet the House on the 16th of July, when it was called for the despatch of business, and so he decided on two things. In the first place he further prorogued Parliament till the 19th of August, and then he caused Gov-

ernor General's Warrants to be issued to provide the necessary funds to carry on public affairs. Those of us who were here in the first session of this Parliament remember the discussion on the issue of these Warrants, and I do not believe there was a single legal gentleman, who might be said to be well up in his profession, who tried to justify on constitutional grounds the conduct of the Government in this respect. They all said it was a matter of expediency, and that the Government being in such an awkward position, they were bound to raise the money in some way or other. I distinctly remember that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) justified the Government on the ground of expediency, and he stated, that if it were shown that a single cent had been spent corruptly he would vote against the Government. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) said that the Government was in a tight place, and that they had to issue Governor General's Warrants, but he did not want it to be taken as a precedent for others to follow. I believe that the Government made a great mistake in adjourning the meeting of the House until the 19th of August, because after they had decided on issuing Governor General's Warrants, it would be better for them to prorogue Parliament until October or November, when they would have had time to mature their fiscal policy and lay it before the House. They would then have avoided this long delay and this uncertainty, which during many months have interfered greatly with the business of the Dominion. Then, Sir, the Government was embarrassed at the close of last session. They had promised a very great deal to the people; they had told the people that the protective tariff was a villainous system, and that it had robbed them; and in their emergency they hit upon the plan of appointing a commission to interview manufacturers throughout the country. They did this, although they had led the people to believe that they knew all the time what was the best for the country, and that they were ready at any moment with their fiscal policy. Well, Sir, this commission went first to Toronto, and they interviewed the pork packers. I remember very well that Mr. Fearman, who is a large pork packer, told the Finance Minister that that was the time of the year when they had to buy their supplies, and that if the tariff was to remain in a state of uncertainty, they would not be able to pay the farmers so much for their pork as they otherwise would. The Minister of Finance was not quite so generous to the pork packers as he was to the coal men, but perhaps there was not the same occasion for it, and so he threw out no hint to them as to what the tariff in this particular line would be. Mr. Fearman also told the Finance Minister, that he had tried the pork packing business for two years under a free trade policy, and that he found at the end of these two years, that he was a poorer man than he had ever been in his life before, and had to sell his factory and take the machinery out of it. Then, the tanners interviewed the commissioners, and the tanners told them, that they were all Liberals, that they had always been Liberals, that they were free traders, but that unless the Government did something to prevent the Americans selling leather in this country at less than cost, they would have to close up their tanneries. I am glad to see that neither in the leather nor the pork industries, have the Government reduced the duties. Then, the furniture manufacturers waited upon the commissioners, and I shall read to the House the opinion of a gentleman who said he had been a Liberal all his life time, and had voted for Mr. Mowat for twenty or twenty-five years. My hon. friend (Mr. Sutherland) knows a good deal about Woodstock, and he will probably know Mr. James Hay, to whom I refer. Mr. Hay said:

> He could remember when elm was not used in the manufacture of furniture, but only as staves for barrels. Now it was utilized in every factory in Canada. The material was bought from the farmers, and largely increased the price of elm. "The results have, to my mind, justified the use of the National Policy," said the speaker. "I have been a Reformer all my life, and have voted for Sir Oliver Mowat for twenty or twenty-five years; still I think, and I would advise that the policy be not upset. There are a large number of unemployed in this country. It would be a mistake to increase that number. If there was one reason, when Mr. Mackenzie's Government went out of power, why the duties should be increased, there are twenty reasons to-day why more duties should be maintained at a reasonable figure. I think, also, the National Policy has been the means of drawing together the different parts of Canada."

That is the opinion of a gentleman who has been a Reformer all his life, and who I dare say at the inception of the National Policy was strongly opposed to it. However, after Mr. Hay had had an experience of 18 years of the National Policy his opinion was that it was a benefit to the country, that it afforded employment for labouring men and for mechanics, and that it drew the different parts of this country closer together, and tended largely to the development of our natural resources. Now, I think the evidence of this witness ought to weigh somewhat with the Government, and I am glad to see that it did, for so far as I know there has been no reduction in the duties on furniture. They listened to Mr. Hay, possibly because he was an old Reformer, and they had more faith in him than they would have in a wicked Tory. He gave his evidence:

> Witness went on to point out that the introduction of the National Policy forced the Singer

Sewing Machine Company to manufacture their goods in this country. If the duties were reduced, it would be in the company's interest to manufacture their machines in the United States and pay the duties. There had been no increase to the consumer, generally speaking, as a result of the protection to the manufacture of furniture.

Reverting again to the subject of furniture, witness said the productive capacity of the United States was far in excess of the demands of the country.

Now, hon. gentlemen talk about reciprocity with the United States; but I would like to know what we are going to send to them. On every hand they seem to be producing very much more than they want for their own use, and they are anxious for what we are anxious for, to get an outlet for their surplus. That is one of the reasons why I think this preferential clause should not apply to the United States. While I have great sympathy with the policy of preference to Great Britain, and would be willing to give every reasonable preference to the mother country, I certainly have no sympathy with the view that it should apply to the United States. For, so far as I remember, the United States has at no time in our history shown us any favours or any disposition to deal with us on fair terms. Another gentleman who gave his evidence at that meeting was a Mr. McMullen—I do not suppose it was the hon. member for North Wellington—a member of the firm of McMullen & Harris. This is his evidence:

Since July he had been making bedsteads, and was importing his raw material from the United States. If the tariff of 20 per cent were continued, he hoped to have forty or fifty men making bedsteads alone. They were the first in Canada to start making bedsteads of brass entirely.

There was a meeting of the commission in the city of Montreal, and at that meeting a gentleman by the name of Mr. Brown appeared. I have no doubt that the Finance Minister will remember the little incident that occurred on that occasion. Mr. Brown was evidently a very strong free trader, and had been reading the speeches and the literature of hon. gentlemen opposite. In the statement he said:

The first thing that should be placed on the free list is agricultural implements, which are protected by duties ranging from 20 to 35 per cent. Under present conditions, the most improved implements are almost as necessary to the farmer as the soil itself.

Implements might be placed on the free list without injuring anybody. The United States tariff has placed them on the free list from countries levying no import duty on similar articles from the United States.

This statement seemed to be news to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), and he turned to the gentleman sitting next to him and asked where Mr. Brown had got his information. Then, I believe, he plucked up his courage a little, and asked Mr. Brown himself where he had got the information, and that gentleman elicited roars of laughter by replying: "I got it from the campaign literature of the Liberal party, and I have it here." That gentleman was a free trader, a man who believed that the best interests of this country would be served by free trade pure and simple; and he had got this opinion from the speeches of his leaders, and supposed that those speeches were to be depended upon. Whether that is the case or not those hon. gentlemen who know them best will be able to judge. Then the workingman appeared before this same commission. A Mr. James M. Ramsay, representing more than five thousand workingmen employed in iron industries at Lachine, asked that, in the interests of the mechanics and workingmen, no change should be made in the present tariff. Further on, the resport says:

Sir Richard endeavoured to catch the witness in some explanations, but the witness replied: "If you had a little money invested in it, you would catch on sooner."

Now, I will refer to only one other witness, Mr. Dobie, manager of the business of E. W. Gillet, manufacturer of crystal yeast cakes and baking powder. He said:

The firm's headquarters was in Chicago. If there was a material reduction in the duties, they would manufacture in Chicago instead of in Toronto. They employed fifty hands in Toronto, one half men, one half women. Men were paid from $8 to $15 a week, and women $5. The firm paid out $100,000 a year, and their output from $140,000 to $150,000 a year. Duty on baking powder was 6 cents per pound. Same on yeast. This was equal to 100 per cent ad valorem. If the duty was reduced to 20 per cent, it would pay the firm to do its manufacturing in the United States and pay the duty, and simply sell in Canada. The price of the firm's goods manufactured in the States and here are the same. The price to the wholesale and retail grocers and the other consumers was the same as if there was no duty.

To Sir Richard.—We have the principal business in the United States, and there is no trust.

To Mr. Fielding.—They are all the same. Package sells for 10 cents.

This is one of the ways which these hon. gentlemen took, I believe, to get out of the difficulty in which they were placed. They had promised the people free trade pure and simple, and they hit upon the scheme to go round and inquire of the different industries to ascertain exactly what they wanted. I remember distinctly the ridicule that was heaped upon the late Government because they pursued a similar course, a course that was very much more appropriate to them than to hon. gentlemen opposite, because they were protectionists, and they wanted to know what was in the best interest of the country from the gentlemen who were manufacturing the goods and from the farmers who were tilling the soil. At that time hon. gentlemen opposite did not want any such information. What they wanted was free trade pure and simple. This brings me to the statement of the Finance Minister. He lamented very much the departure from

our country of the small factories. I do not know exactly what the hon. gentleman meant. Surely he could not have meant to say that if the Reform party had been in power from 1878 to the present, we would have gone on manufacturing our carriages, buggies, sleighs, cutters and carts at the little wagon shops, and that the blacksmith would have gone on making his own horse-shoes and nails as in the past, and that we would have made no progress. And if he desires to have those days brought back to us by legislation, he would find very few supporters in this House. The fact is it became a serious question for us whether, in our own cities, we would manufacture in the large way our own carriages and our own boots and shoes and other articles we require or whether we should go on importing them from the United States. I think that the policy of the late Government tended very largely to develop the best interests of the country, although, in any event, no matter what kind of legislation we had, I believe we would still have made some progress, because I do not believe that it is possible to hinder the progress of a country like ours.

I now come to another statement made by the hon. Finance Minister which is a little peculiar. He said:

> The question arises as to how far we shall be able to apply at once, or at an early day, these principles of tariff reform which we have in the past declared we wished to carry out. * * * No man who ever spoke in the name of the Liberal party of Canada, ever announced that we were going at one step to adopt the principles of free trade to that extent.

I do not understand why the hon. Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) made such a statement, for I give him credit for reading the speeches of his colleagues and knowing what they have said on the subject. He must surely be aware of the very strong statement which the hon. gentleman who sits beside him (Sir Richard Cartwright) made, and which I shall read for the benefit of the hon. gentleman and this House:

> We will collect a revenue by duties placed upon articles which we cannot produce in Canada. * * It is the only possible method of taking every vestige of protection out of the tariff and still raising a revenue.

It seems to me that that looks very like free trade. I am very glad that the hon. gentleman has not carried out that policy, but has joined the protectionists, because I believe that our industries should be protected, and that we should not raise a revenue on the lines therein indicated. But he made another statement on the 25th of October, 1894:

> The time is ripe for very extensive and far-reaching reforms. I, for my part, would be sorry to see the issue dwindle down to a mere question of revenue tariff. We need, among other things, a radical readjustment, not only of our tariff, but of the whole system of taxation.

I do not think that these hon. gentlemen have carried that out very effectively. I do not know whether the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) took a very active part in the revision of the tariff or not, but if he did I would have expected a much more free trade tariff than the one he has, and to that extent, I am very glad that he was ignored. There was, in fact, a rumour at one time that possibly he might resign, and I am surprised that he has remained in a Government whose principles are evidently protective. It is true that up to six o'clock the hon. Finance Minister treated us to a purely free trade speech, and there may have been method in his madnes. He may have spoken under the impression that the people would read his speech and not look into the tariff. A good many comments have been made on the tariff by newspapers friendly to the Government. The Toronto "Globe" last Saturday, said that the only justification for the duties being kept on soft coal and of the likelihood of a duty being charged on hard coal was that it might lead to reciprocity in the coal business, and then the "Globe" went on to say that it could not understand why the duties were raised on cottons. I think the hon. Finance Minister did not make that very clear, but it is difficult to explain the speech of the Finance Minister unless on the theory of the ex-Controller of Customs (Mr. Wallace) that the Government first put up the duty in order that they might afterwards give a preference to Great Britain and other countries. Then they did not eliminate all the duties on iron, because, according to the "Globe," the bounty will continue until 1902, and the "Globe" says:

> The changes made will provide cheap raw material, and at the same time protect the best producing interest of the Dominion.

I thought that when the Liberals were returned we would lose all the protection, but that has not been the case I am glad to say. Let me quote a very strong reason given by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce why this tariff should be a free trade tariff. It was because the people were being robbed on every hand by the villainous system of protection. This will be found in "Hansard" of 1893, page 710:

> We are obliged every year, either on account of individual or general indebtedness, to pay a sum of $25,000,000 or $30,000,000 to our English creditors. Further than that, Canada is an enormously-taxed country. First of all, there is a tax of $30,000,000 which goes into the Federal Treasury; next to that there is a tax, as I believe, about quite equal, which goes into the pockets of the protected manufacturers; and, thirdly, there is a very heavy tax paid to the United States Government under the operation of the McKinley tariff.

Then at page 717 of "Hansard" of 1893, he said:

Now, Sir, what is the character of the tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite? By means of it they take twice as much out of the pockets of the people as goes into the Treasury.

If that be true, this Government is criminal in allowing such a tariff to remain on our Statute-books during the last ten months, and not only that but in continuing it to the extent of 90 per cent, at least, for a considerable time to come.

This tariff has been attacked within a few days by the Montreal "Witness," but of course the opinions of that journal have not very great weight because you do not know where to find it. Sometimes it supports the Government and sometimes it criticises. But as an evidence that the Reform party agreed to give us, let me quote a few extracts from the speeches made by the hon. leader of the Government.

Mr. KAULBACH. Will it be in the shape of the Wilson Bill?

Mr. WILSON. No, there is no such Bill in this country as the Wilson Bill. This is a speech delivered by the leader of the present Government (Mr. Laurier) at Newmarket, in September, 1893:

I will not be satisfied until the last vestige of protection has been removed from the soil of Canada. This is the aim towards which we are progressing, the aim which we have in view, and we will not rest until we have achieved that object. When that will be, I do not profess to know, but, at all events, I say that the Reformers of Canada have reforms to carry out, but that our great reform is to put away from the soil of Canada the last vestige of protection.

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, but the platform fell down.

Mr. WILSON. I should think so. We have the strongest evidence that the platform fell down, and their principles with it, if they ever had any. I have another short extract, in reference to a speech made by the leader of the present Government in 1895 at Grand River, Que. He told the people that:

If he were Prime Minister, he would make it his duty to remove the duty on pork and flour.

And in carrying that out, he went so far as to take 15 cents a barrel off flour, and nothing whatever off pork. But the most extraordinary article that I have seen is the one that appeared in the Toronto "Globe" on the 26th April. A man reading it would naturally look two or three times to make sure he was not reading the "Mail and Empire." It is long and I will only read a portion of it.

Mr. GIBSON. Read it all.

Mr. WILSON. It is good literature, but the hour is late and the House is very impatient.

Mr. GIBSON. We are all satisfied.

Mr. WILSON. All right; we will try it. I have no doubt it will be very interesting to the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson). This is from an editorial of the Toronto "Globe" of the 26th inst. It is a very long article but it is well worth perusing, and I would advise the hon. Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) to read it all.

The FINANCE MINISTER. After the session.

Mr. WILSON. It would be too late then for the hon. gentleman to profit by it.

If we gave our market to the manufacturers of the United States and allowed American goods to come in as a flood, many of our factories must be swept away in the deluge, and widespread commercial disaster must result.

An hon. MEMBER. What is that from.

Mr. WILSON. It is from the "Globe" of the 26th instant. It is worth any gentleman's while to read the "Globe" now because there are some good articles in it. I almost think they must have changed the editor and taken a good Tory.

The real danger lies in the fact that Canada and the United States are contiguous countries, that we have to make long hauls and pay heavy freight charges in order to supply the home market, while, if we threw down the tariff barriers, the American manufacturer, enjoying the great national advantages of the short haul and the consequent low freight rate, could swamp us from one end of the Dominion to the other. For example, if there were no taxes on American goods, the manufacturer of New York State could control the market of Ontario as easily as he controls that of his own state, while the factor of distance and the burden of freight charges would make it impossible for us to meet American competition in the other provinces, where the American manufacturer could as easily, and as cheaply, throw his goods across the border into Canada. Therefore, in view of the physical configuration of this country, to reduce our tariff to a free trade basis in face of the high tariff of the United States and the low freight charges across the border into Canada, would be to doom even the most deserving of Canadian industries to decay and to send our young men in ever-increasing droves to the United States. We assert as strongly as ever the advantages of free trade with the neighbouring country. But we must consider self-preservation, and we must have national self-respect, and there does not appear to be any escape from the conclusion that, under all the circumstances, it is impossible for the moment to give any large measure of free trade to an adjoining country from whose markets we are effectively and determinedly excluded.

I had intended to read an extract from a speech by the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards), but he is not in his place and I do not think I will bother with it at this time. There is one thing that strikes my riding, and which, I think, will strike a great many ridings in the province of Ontario, and that is free corn. What I am surprised at is that the Minister of Finance has not been as generous to the people of the province of Ontario as to the people of his own province. He said he was willing to reduce

the duty on soft coal from 60 cents to 40 cents if the Americans were willing to leave the duty under their tariff at 40 cents. But, he says, if they do not, I will not only keep up the duty on soft coal but I will put a duty on hard coal as well. But, when he comes to the question of corn, he says to the Americans: You may enter it here free for everything except for making whisky: it will not make good whisky and we do not want it for that. This removal of the corn duty, in my opinion, will seriously affect the price of the coarse grains grown in Ontario. How can we afford to sell these grains even at present prices, to say nothing of a reduction. I know that oats in my riding are hard to sell at 17 cents a bushel. Before I came to attend this session, barley was quoted at 21 cents and they would not pay more. We are one of the best barley-growing sections in Ontario. The Bay of Quinté barley is noted as being the best in the American market. It used to be $1 a bushel and even more. But it dropped to 75 cents and so on down to the present price. It had to be used for feed, for no man can afford to sell it at present prices. Why should the Government allow corn to come in free to compete with the farmers who are getting such low prices for their coarse grains? I feel that it is unfair and unjust and I most earnestly protest against that part of the tariff, because I feel that it is opposed to the best interests of the Dominion. I think that will be almost the unanimous opinion of my people. As a matter of fact, the farmers in my riding are the strongest protectionists we have. I know that personally, because I have visited them from house to house a good many times. It is only once in a great while you can find among them a hard-shell Grit who is sufficiently "hard-shell" to take the position the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), who used to say: If other people have a mind to be fools and tax themselves, why should we follow them in that? The Government did not take that view and I am glad of it. They do not take the position that they are free traders like the English free traders. The Englishman does not tax the things he can make but the things he cannot make. The result is that Great Britain raises about one-quarter of her revenue from customs duties, while we raise fully two-thirds of our own in that way. But I am very glad to know that our Government does not take that position. I think it is much better that a dozen men, or even a whole political party, for that matter, should lose their reputation and be regarded as not overtruthful and as men who would not keep their promises, than that the whole country should suffer. Hon. gentlemen opposite used to say that protection must be abolished. I have shown that by the quotations I have given, and these could be multiplied by any number you like. They declared protection to be a villainous system and said that if they got into power they would eliminate every vestige of protection from the tariff. I am glad they did not do it; I am glad for my country's sake, because it is very much more to us that our country should be prosperous, that the best interests of the country should be considered, than that any particular party should be in power. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry for having trespassed so long on your patience, and I have to thank you and the House for your courteous attention. I again express the hope, in conclusion, that the Government will be able to reconsider this free corn question, and re-impose the duty of 7½ cents a bushel.

Mr. CASEY moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 30th April, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 76) to incorporate the British Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Oliver.)

Bill (No. 77) to incorporate the Hudson Bay and Yukon Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Oliver.)

Bill (No. 78) to amend the Act incorporating the Ontario Accident Insurance Company.—(Mr. Osler.)

Bill (No. 79) to incorporate the Dominion Portland Cement Company.—(Mr. Britton.)

Bill (No. 80) respecting the Quebec Bridge Company.—(Mr. Lavergne.)

Bill (No. 81) respecting the Great Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Lavergne.)

Bill (No. 82) to incorporate the Mining Development and Advisory Corporation of British America, Limited.—(Mr. Maxwell.)

Bill (No. 83) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Mycenian Marble Company, of Canada, Limited.—(Mr. Rosamond.)

Bill (No. 84) to incorporate the Continental Heat and Light Company.—(Mr. Rosamond.)

Bill (No. 85) to incorporate the Hull, St. Louis Dam and Victoria Springs Railway Company.—(Mr. Brodeur.)

Bill (No. 86) respecting La Banque du Peuple.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

Bill (No. 87) to incorporate the Columbia River Bridge Company.—(Mr. Bostock.)

Bill (No. 88) to incorporate Les Cisterciens Réformés.—(Mr. LaRivière.)

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Mr. DAVIN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 89) to amend the Mounted Police Act, 1889.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Explain.

Mr. DAVIN. The object of the Bill is to effect a purpose that no other Bill which has been introduced in this House could effect, and the object sought to be effected is that embodied in the Bill introduced by me in a previous session. What it would accomplish would be this: It would enable the department in case a policeman who had served ten years was disabled, to give him a pension. At present under the Pension Act a policeman who is disabled, is entitled to a pension only after he has served fifteen years. I think that is unjust; if a man who has served ten years is disabled during service, he should be entitled to a pension. The old Pension Act provides that a man who has served twenty-five years, and who leaves the service, shall be entitled to a pension. That, I think, is a little too long a time. I propose that if a man has served twenty years, he shall be entitled to a pension, but with the same provision that exists in regard to his possible service of twenty-five years. There is nothing to prevent him going on and serving twenty-five or thirty years, but if he wishes to leave after serving twenty years, and is in good health and strength, there is no reason why he should not have the small pension which is calculated on the basis laid down in the old Act. That old calculation is preserved in this Bill.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I have no desire at this moment to interpose between my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) and his Bill; but has he considered whether this legislation is in order?

Mr. DAVIN. A private member will probably be debarred, but the Government should take up this Bill. But I may say this to the Prime Minister: It is only by a very close and critical judgment that I can be held in any way to be enhancing the burdens on the public. The same remark will apply to a Bill which is already before the House, which does not make the same provision, but which errs in the same way. Of course, if the Government object to the first reading, I cannot help that. I am perfectly aware that when it comes to the second reading, if the Government says: we cannot take it up, I will have to forego the legislation because it is outside the powers of a private member.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS AT HAMILTON AND NIAGARA FALLS.

Mr. CAMPBELL (for Mr. Gibson) asked:

Is it the intention of the Government to provide in the Supplementary Estimates for the payment for extra services rendered by Mr. Hugh Murray and Mr. John C. Bartle whilst acting collector of customs at the ports of Hamilton and Niagara Falls, Ontario, respectively?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). I am not able to answer "yes"; at least at present, to that question.

STATION-MASTER AT ST. CHARLES, INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked:

1. Has one Castonguay, station-master on the Intercolonial Railway at St. Charles, county of Bellechasse, been dismissed from the service?
2. If so, for what reason?
3. By whom has he been replaced?
4. Upon whose recommendation was he dismissed?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Yes, the services of Mr. Castonguay, station-master on the Intercolonial Railway at St. Charles, were dispensed with. 2. He was dismissed for taking an active and offensive part in the late elections. 3. He has been replaced by Mr. O. Bouchard, of St. Valier. 4. He was dismissed as the result of charges preferred against him by Mr. Talbot, M.P.

ARBITRATOR—SOULANGES CANAL.

Mr. BERGERON asked:

1. Have Messrs. A. McKuown, Duckett, of Coteau Station, in Soulanges county, and Dr. Lalonde, of Rigaud, in Vaudreuil county, been appointed arbitrators on Soulanges Canal?
2. By whom were they appointed?
3. On whose recommendation?
4. What is the amount of their salary or fees?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. Messrs. A. McKuown, R. Duckett and Dr. Lalonde have been appointed valuators on behalf of the Government to value lands taken for the Soulanges Canal. 2 and 3. By Order in Council on the report and recommendation of the Minister of Railways and Canals. 4. Their fees are ten dollars per day for each day so employed, as has been the customary allowance, and reasonable actual travelling expenses.

W. B. MOORE, EMPLOYEE ON THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked :

1. For what reasons were the services of W. B. Moore, fuel inspector on the Intercolonial Railway, dispensed with?
2. When were they dispensed with?
3. Has a successor been appointed?
4. If so, when was he appointed and what is his name?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The services of Mr. W. B. Moore as fuel inspector on the Intercolonial Railway were dispensed with as the office has been abolished. No one has therefore been appointed in his place.

MUNICIPALITY OF AMQUI.

Mr. FISET asked :

Whether it is the intention of the Government to return to the municipality of the parish of Amqui the sum of one hundred dollars, which that municipality was compelled to pay for the construction of a railway crossing within the parish?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). My attention has only been recently called to this matter, and I have not been able to look into it. I shall take pleasure in doing so at the earliest possible moment.

MR. DOBSON, POSTMASTER.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked :

What is the date of the resignation of William Dobson as postmaster at Head of Tatamagouche, Colchester, N.S.? Has any one been appointed in his place? If so, what is the name of his successor, and when was he appointed? If no successor has been appointed, who keeps the office, and what are the charges, allowances or expenses for rent and services up to date?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). 1. He resigned on the 29th May, 1896. 2. The office has been offered to Hugh Macdonald and John Dobson, who successively declined it. 3. There has been no successor. 4. The office is understood to be in charge of John Dobson at the present date. The salary attached to it is $28 per annum, which includes all charges, allowances and expenses.

THE BAIE DES CHALEURS RAILWAY.

Mr. PREFONTAINE (for Mr. Lemieux) asked :

Whether it is the intention of the Government to give effectual aid towards the extension of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway to Gaspé Basin? If so, is it the intention of the Government to cause the necessary surveys to be made as soon as the weather permits?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). When any responsible person or company submit to the Government a proposition for the extension of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway to Gaspé Basin, the Government will be disposed favourably to consider the project, with the view of determining how far it shall receive material assistance.

J. SPROTT STEWART, POSTMASTER.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (for Mr. Borden, Halifax) asked :

1. Has J. Sprott Stewart been dismissed or removed from the office of postmaster at Upper Musquodoboit, in the county of Halifax?
2. If so, has he been dismissed or removed for any, and what cause?
3. If he has been dismissed or removed for cause, has any, and what complaint or charge been made against him, and by whom has such charge or complaint been made?
4. Has any, and what investigation been held respecting the matter of any such complaint or charge, and what opportunity has been afforded him of answering any such complaint or charge ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). 1. He has been dismissed. 2. For offensive political partisanship. 3. He was dismissed on representation of Mr. B. Russell, M.P. 4. There was no investigation.

RAILWAY SUBSIDY, NOVA SCOTIA.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (for Mr. Borden, Halifax) asked :

Has the Government given any promise or other assurance of a subsidy in aid of the construction of a railway from Sunny Brae, in the county of Pictou, to any and what place in the county of Halifax or in the county of Guysboro', in Nova Scotia?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). No action has been taken by Government on the application for a subsidy in aid of the construction of a railway from Sunny Brae, in the county of Pictou, to any place in the county of Halifax or in the county of Guysborough.

COPYRIGHT ACT, 1889.

Mr. OSLER (for Mr. Ross Robertson) asked :

Has the Government further considered the Copyright Act of 1889? If so, what action has been taken in reference to the same?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). In view of the many objections advanced by the Colonial Office in permitting the Act of 1889 to go into operation, the Government have not, up to the present, further pressed the subject on the attention of the Colonial Office.

IMPORTS FROM BELGIUM.

Mr. QUINN (for Mr. Monk) asked :

1. Have representations been made to the Government by the Belgian Consulate in Canada with

a view to obtaining the reduction of customs duties now granted to British goods, upon all Belgian importations to Canada under the terms of the Anglo-Belgian treaty of 1863?

2. What action does the Government intend taking in regard to the claims put forth by importers of Belgian goods in Montreal that they are entitled to a reduction of duty in virtue of the above treaty?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The answer to the first question is "yes." In answering the second question, perhaps it would be satisfactory to the hon. gentleman and to the House, if I answered it by reading a communication that has been sent to the Belgian Consul, in reply to a letter received from him :

Ottawa, April 29th, 1897.

Consul General of Belgium, Montreal, P.Q.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 24th instant, addressed to the Honourable Controller of Customs, with reference to a reduction of one-eighth of the duties on Belgium goods imported into Canada.

In reply, I am directed to state that the resolutions introduced into the House of Commons respecting the Reciprocal Tariff, provide :

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

(a) That any questions that may arise as to the countries entitled to the benefits of the Reciprocal Tariff, shall be decided by the Controller of Customs, subject to the authority of the Governor in Council.

(b) That the Controller of Customs may make such regulations as are necessary for carrying out the intention of the two preceding sections.

The Hon. Controller of Customs is not satisfied that the customs tariff of Belgium is such as to entitle the country to the benefits of the Reciprocal Tariff, but he will be pleased to receive any information that you may wish to furnish on that subject.

The Hon. Controller is advised that the treaty to which you refer, relates to a condition of affairs which does not arise under the tariff resolutions now before the House of Commons.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

That letter is signed by the Commissioner of Customs.

GOVERNMENT COMMISSIONERS AND POLITICS.

Mr. QUINN (for Mr. Monk) asked :

1. Has D. A. Lafortune, advocate, of Montreal, been commissioned by the Government to hold an inquiry into the administration of the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary?

2. Has Wilfrid Mercier, advocate, of Montreal, been commissioned by the Government to inquire into charges laid against Mr. Daoust, superintendent of St. Ann Lock, in Jacques Cartier county?

3. How much per day do these commissioners receive for expenses or otherwise?

4. Is the Government aware that both these commissioners are taking an active part in the provincial campaign in Quebec, and does the Government approve of such a course?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). G. A. Lafortune, advocate, of Montreal, has been commissioned by the Government to hold an inquiry into the administration of the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary. Wilfrid Mercier, advocate, of Montreal, has been commissioned to hold one of the inquiries, I cannot say whether it is into the case of Mr. Daoust or not. I cannot state at this moment the rate of remuneration they receive. The Government is not aware that these commissioners are taking an active part in the provincial campaign in Quebec.

INFRACTION OF INLAND REVENUE LAWS.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON (for Mr. Dugas) rose to ask :

Why was the sentence of imprisonment carried out against J. Jobin, of Pont Rouge, for an infraction of the Inland Revenue laws, and not against George Vézina, of Quebec, convicted under the same laws?

Mr. SPEAKER. Before this question is put, I assume, as it makes two positive statements, that these statements are the result of some answers already given in the House. Otherwise the question would not be in order.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). I am ready to answer the question. J. Jobin was sentenced to imprisonment in January, 1896, and sentence was carried out in April, 1896, under the late Government. George Vézina was sentenced to imprisonment in March, 1896, and the sentence was not carried out. I am unable to explain why the late Government did not insist in carrying out the sentence in both cases.

DR. NAPOLEON LAVOIE.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON (for Mr. Dugas) asked :

1. Was Dr. Napoléon Lavoie, of L'Islet, commander of the SS. "Aberdeen," ever in the employ of the Government of Canada before in any other capacity?

2. If so, in what capacity?

3. Was he ever in command of the SS. "Lady Head" ?

4. If so, was he dismissed from said position after investigation, and for what reason?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. (Mr. Davies). 1. Yes, as commander of schooner "La Canadienne" and steamer "Lady Head." 2. Fishery officer in charge of the gulf division and commander of above named vessels. 3. Yes. 4.

Yes, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in 1879, reported that Commander Lavoie being vested at the time with supreme control of the ship "Lady Head" and directly responsible to the Government for the efficiency of the service it was his duty to secure qualified assistants, as his discretion in the choice of officers was unlimited and that he had selected and retained officers shown to be incompetent and inefficient, and failed to report their inefficiency, and that while the Minister recognized that Commander Lavoie, for many years had satisfactorily fulfilled important duties, it was deemed necessary in the public interest to visit his neglect of duty in not reporting the inefficiency of his subordinates with exemplary severity.

IMPORTS OF VENEERS.

Mr. WILSON (for Mr. Hughes) asked :

1. Have "veneers made from woods native to Canada" been entered at Bowmanville, Ont., during recent months by the Dominion Organ and Piano Company at less than the regular rate of duty?
2. What was the rate of duty previous to April 23rd on such articles?
3. What is it now?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). 1. It has not been brought to the attention of the Department of Customs that the Dominion Organ and Piano Company have entered veneers made from woods native to Canada at Bowmanville, at less than the regular rate of duty within recent months. 2. The rate of duty previous to 23rd April, 1897, on veneers of wood not over one-sixteenth of an inch thick, made from woods native to Canada, was 10 per cent ad valorem—vide Item 368. 3. In the new tariff the classification of veneers is changed. Item 367 of the old tariff read as follows :—

Veneers of wood, n.e.s., not over one-sixteenth of an inch in thickness, 5 per cent ad valorem.

Item 368 of the old tariff read as follows :—

Veneers of wood, not over one-sixteenth of an inch thick, made from woods native to Canada, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Item 321 of the new tariff is the only item referring to veneers of wood, and it reads as follows :—

Veneers of wood, not over three-thirty-seconds of an inch in thickness, 10 per cent ad valorem.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—EXTENSION TO MONTREAL.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to draw the attention of the Government to the following statement contained in the Speech from the Throne :—

I have much satisfaction in informing you that arrangements have been concluded which, if you approve, will enable the Intercolonial Railway system to reach Montreal.

I would like to ask the hon. leader of the Government, a long time having elapsed since we had this positive declaration from the Throne that these arrangements had been concluded, if he would be good enough to lay on the Table of the House the papers in relation to the matter.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). As my hon. friend is aware, the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) has been laid up for some time, and is not perhaps able to give an answer now. I shall be able at the next sitting of the House to say whether or not the papers will be brought down.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I think I may say to the hon. gentleman that the documents, which are in course of preparation, and which will have to be submitted, as between the two contracting parties, are not yet quite completed. Some of the important details of the negotiations are not finally agreed upon. We are making all possible speed in bringing matters to a head, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that there will be no unnecessary delay in presenting the whole matter to Parliament. At the earliest possible moment the papers will be laid on the Table. They have been somewhat delayed by my indisposition of the last three or four days, but I think perhaps towards the latter end of next week I may be able to furnish the House with the desired information.

"OUR LADY OF THE SNOWS."

Mr. DAVIN. A number of Canadians have requested me to bring before the House a protest on their part against a description of Canada that has now acquired world-wide fame ; and if it be necessary, I shall put myself in order by making a motion. It is now of record in "Hansard" that a great poet, one with the finest ear for English music of any poet of the century, has designated this great Canada of ours, so varied in her resources and so manifold in her gifts, as "Our Lady of the Snows." A protest has appeared against that, written by a young Canadian poet in the "Star," and I have been asked to place it in "Hansard" as an antidote to what some, perhaps oversensitive among our people, consider the unjust, though well meant, description which has emanated from the great English poet :

"OUR LADY OF THE SNOWS."

A poet sung of a nation
  In words that were kindly meant,
And his song on ethereal pulses
  Throughout the Empire went.
It breathed the Imperial spirit
  At which the bosom glows,
But he slurred the land that he fain had praised
  As "Our Lady of the Snows."

She has lands unknown to summer,
But she keeps them for a park
For such as find little Europe
Too small for ambition's mark.
She keeps them to pleasure Nansen,
For a Franklin to repose,
But they lie remote from the marts and home
Of "Our Lady of the Snows."

True, she has somewhere, sometime
Winters when keen winds bite,
And in the frosty heavens
Gleams the auroral light;
When in the drifted forest
She counts the ringing blows
Of the axe that reaps a harvest
For "Our Lady of the Snows."

But while the sturdy Briton
Still shivers in east winds,
The winter flees, and the rivers
No more the ice king binds,
And blossom calls unto blossom
And each its fair form shows
In the land that is called by Kipling
"Our Lady of the Snows."

She has woods of pine and maple,
Where England might be lost;
She has ports that are ever open
To ships that are tempest tossed;
She has fields of wheat unbounded,
Where the whole horizon glows,
And the hot sun laughs to hear her styled
"Our Lady of the Snows."

She has vineyards hanging heavy
With clustering purple and white,
And the velvet peach in its swaying nest
Fills the gardener with delight.
She can pluck, if she will, at Yuletide
In the balmy air, the rose,
And her people smile when they hear her called
"Our Lady of the Snows."

The wire that brought that message
On lightning under the sea
Had been too short to bear it
To her furthest boundary.
Not by a heedless phrasing
Of catchword, verse or prose,
Can the truth be told of the vast domain
Of "Our Lady of the Snows."

This country has in the past suffered from the idea prevalent in England that Canada is a land of snow, where one has to go around the whole time clad in furs to avoid being frozen, instead of a country endowed with the finest climate in the world. Canada is peculiarly attractive for many reasons, but for me—and that is the experience of every healthy man—her greatest attraction is her climate. Much as I enjoy her summer, I can safely say that her winters are no less enjoyable. Of course, when a great genius, one of the most marvellous literary men that England has produced, one of the most variously gifted literary men in the Empire, sends out a poem describing Canada as a country whose chief characteristic is that she is snow-bound, and describes her as par excellence, the Lady of the Snows, the designation cannot fail to have great influence. Why, it would be more correct, if one could find an apt and concise phrase, to describe her as rich in vineyards, rich in mines, rich in cornfields, rich in harbours, rich in broad and deep-flowing rivers and inland seas. It would require something of the felicitous genius for expression of the hon. First Minister to do full justice to the climate of Canada, and when a member of this House gives this poem a place in "Hansard," and title "Our Lady of the Snows," as though it were a fitting and correct description, I feel it necessary—and I do it at the request of prominent Canadians—to enrich "Hansard" with Mr. Weir's reply. It is not necessary to do it. The words of Lord Salisbury, if he spoke of Canada, would be widely read, as would the words of any of the leading masters of prose in England, but they would not be as universally read as the words of Rudyard Kipling, who has become one of the most widely welcomed writers in modern prose or poetry. I do not wish to be understood as resenting Mr. Kipling's song, which after all has a true inspiration, but it is absolutely necessary that we should protest against Canada being described to England and the world as Our Lady of the Snows, when we know she is rather a lady that basks in the brightest of summers, and who, either in winter or summer, is dowered with all that can render a country attractive and make life pleasant. I move, Mr. Speaker, the adjournment of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I do not know that Mr. Rudyard Kipling's description of Canada as Our Lady of the Snows is the most apt he could have selected, but we are all accustomed to poetical exaggeration, and even this House has occasionally had evidence of it. We know that poets are very much given to license, and if they exaggerate or take license no one objects very seriously. So far, at all events, no one has objected, but I think I should interpose an objection now, and that is to allowing the business of the House to be taken up by the poets. We have had too many motions of adjournment similar to the present one during this session. In fact we have had some men, other than poets, rising to move the adjournment of the House and then taking their seats and forgetting the purpose they had risen for. I earnestly hope that we shall have less poetry and more business.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Is it not a fact that this phrase, "Our Lady of the Snows," applied to Canada, which the hon. gentleman regards as libellous, originated with a very distinguished member of the Conservative party?

Mr. McNEILL. I desire just to say a word with reference to what has fallen from my hon. friend on the other side of the House (Mr. Laurier). He referred yesterday to me

as not having moved the adjournment when I said I would conclude with a motion, and he did so in terms which were not such as my hon. friend generally employs with regard to one who differs from him. He spoke as though I had deliberately failed to do something which I had promised to do. I wish to explain that yesterday the reason I did not move the adjournment was that you had called me to order, and I was obliged to sit down. At the first opportunity when my hon. friend referred to the matter, I at once rose and expressed my desire to comply with the promise if I had had an opportunity of doing so. Now, with regard to what my hon. friend has said——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried, carried.

Mr. McNEILL. Mr. Speaker, if one is not allowed to make a few observations——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. McNEILL. We have certain rights here, though we are in Opposition; and I do not think the business of the House will be in any degree advanced by unseemly interruptions——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. McNEILL. At least, it will not so far as I am personally concerned, I can assure my hon. friends very distinctly of that. I was going to make a very brief observation in relation to this matter, but if my hon. friends desire I can make a number of observations, and make them at length. I do not wish to do so. I was about to say simply this—that whether the expression "Our Lady of the Snows" be the happiest expression or not, at all events, it would seem from the verses that my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) read here to-day that Canada may well be described as the lady in whose breast patriotism glows. But I would say that I do think, for my own part, that we have been, perhaps, a little too sensitive with regard to these remarks as to the snows of Canada. I do not think that when Kipling referred to Canada as "Our Lady of the Snows" he indicated in any degree that the fact of our having snow here was a disadvantage to this country, because I know that the feeling of many in England is that our winters are most enjoyable winters, that the feeling is that this snow of ours is something the enjoyment of which they would like to participate in. I venture to think that we have been just a little too sensitive in reference to this matter.

Mr. QUINN. In answer to the inquiry made by the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding). I think that I can safely state that the expression "Our Lady of the Snows" did not originate in Canada at all. It is quite true that it was immortalized in verse by a renowned Canadian statesman, Hon. Thomas D'Arcy McGee, whose fame, not only as a poet but as a statesman I am sure will last. We are proud to recognize him as a Conservative statesman and we hope that the present Government and the party it represents will give to the country somebody who will lay as high a claim to be held in the honoured and grateful memory of the people as the departed statesman —McGee.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am happy, indeed, to find that the poetical expression and the title given by the great poet to one of his last songs, has been the cause of a very interesting debate, and a very interesting half-hour given by the House of Commons to a discussion of the last work of Mr. Kipling. I also feel very glad, indeed, to know that this is one of the occasions which has brought back to the memory of the Parliament of Canada, the name of the Hon. D'Arcy McGee. We were proud of him when he was living amongst us; he did a work which nobody can possibly forget, and in view of the manner in which his career was brought to an end, it is to patriotic Canadians always a pleasure to hear the name of D'Arcy McGee spoken in this House. But I do not think that my hon. friend for Montreal (Mr. Quinn)—almost his successor in parliamentary life—has even yet reached the real source of the name given by Kipling to his last song. I will read, on that point, an extract from the Catholic "Register":

> The poet Kipling's greeting to Canada, published in the London "Times" and cabled over on Wednesday, is an inspired production. But—do not mention it in Gath—the inspiration is decidedly Romish. The phrase "Our Lady of the Snows" is one familiar to every Catholic, as the name of one of the popular feasts of the Church in the Eternal City, and as recalling one of the most poetic and beautiful narratives of simple faith to be found in religious literature. There can be no doubt that Mr. Kipling went to Rome for the title and chord of his song; but we should not say he is a plagiarist, because we are delighted to know that a familiar Catholic phrase can inspire him to one of his best efforts.

Now, Sir, that is what I wanted to bring before the notice of the House. I see no reason at all why Canada should not be called the Lady of the Snows. She is the lady who is known throughout the Empire as being one of the progressive nations on this continent. I think that so far as our winters are concerned, we have, as my hon. friend has said, no reason to complain. I am quite satisfied to find that in this Jubilee year, Mr. Kipling, in singing a song in praise of Canada, has selected for the title of his song, Our Lady of the Snows.

Motion to adjourn, negatived.

LOBSTER FISHING IN CAPE BRETON.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of the Marine and Fisheries to a matter of

some importance in the island of Cape Breton. No doubt he has seen a very numerously-signed petition which has been forwarded from that district in connection with the proposal to extend the season for fishing lobsters. I recollect in my time that this was a subject of considerable difficulty; and I have no doubt that the Minister will find in his way some of those difficulties which I had to encounter. But, taking into consideration the very peculiar hardships on that coast in connection with the drift ice, the department, in my time, was enabled, on several occasions, to make an exception in connection with the duration of the season. The season, I believe, ordinarily ends about the 15th of July, and the petitioners are anxious to have that extended to the 1st of August, so that they really ask fifteen days additional. But, in order that there shall not be too much drain on the lobster fishery in that district, I understand that they are willing to submit to a regulation by which they are not to begin so early as the fishermen in the other districts, that is to say, they will cut off from the earlier part of the season until the 1st of May, provided they get those fifteen days additional. Now, the hon. gentleman, of course, is in possession of information of considerable importance in this matter to which I have no access, that is to say, the reports of his officers. Since my time I can quite understand that the subject is placed more clearly before him by the great experience of the officers of the district, in so far as investigation has gone, touching the condition of the lobster fishery for that particular time. It is, of course, a point to consider whether, in those fifteen days, the berried lobsters are in such a condition that it would be destroying or affecting the permanency of the lobster industry. I therefore rise in order to impress upon him, by calling attention to the subject in this manner, the great importance of dealing with that subject as promptly as possible. No one knows better than the hon. gentleman himself, coming as he does from Prince Edward Island, how important it is that the parties interested in this matter should have an early intimation of the decision of the hon. gentleman. If the hon. gentleman can see his way to do it, I should be obliged if he would bring down such recent reports as he may have in his possession touching upon the condition of the fishery in that district, and any points touching the condition of the lobsters during the month of July, and particularly the last fifteen days of that month.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The question the hon. gentleman has raised is one of supreme importance, and I have not yet reached the conclusion that it would be in the public interest to extend the open season which the law now fixes at the 15th of July, although I do not mean to say that my mind is absolutely closed upon the subject. But the hon. gentleman is aware that last year I called a meeting of a number of the lobster packers for the purpose of ascertaining, if I could, what their view was upon the subject, and what the real facts were which could be gathered from practical men. There was a great deal of difference of opinion. We are now in this peculiar position, that this enormous industry which brings in so much wealth to Canada, is in danger of being destroyed. Our American cousins to the south have absolutely destroyed their lobster fishing industry along the coast of Maine by recklessly permitting lobsters to be caught at all seasons of the year. I would impress upon the hon. gentlemen from the maritime provinces the great importance, the supreme importance, in my humble opinion, of maintaining, even at the risk of temporary unpopularity, those provisions which are essential for the preservation of that great industry. Personally, I would like very much if I could see my way —and I am in almost daily consultation with my adviser upon that subject, Mr. Prince— I would like very much if I could see my way to grant the request of those gentlemen. But I have never yet been able to bring my mind to admit the justice of the claim they put forward, that there must be the same number of days allowed to the fishing industry in each locality. Nature will prevent the fishermen in some localities from beginning as early as nature permits them to begin in others; but it does not follow, to my mind at all, as a sequence that they should be permitted to continue beyond that limit. And there is this very grave objection which I state now frankly to the hon. gentleman and to the House— for I have no doubt the matter will be discussed by maritime men before the session is much older—that if I grant a concession to the fishermen along the eastern coast of Cape Breton, I will be forced to grant a similar concession to a great many lobster fishermen in other places. The department is inundated with petitions and demands from fishermen along the north shore of New Brunswick, the south shore of Prince Edward Island, as well as the east shore of Cape Breton, asking for this same concession. I know the difficulty of resisting it, I am overwhelmed with personal appeals and official applications from day to day, and week to week.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Circumstances are very different in different localities, are they not?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, circumstances are very different. In the examination that I made of that question last year, I found that before coming into office, I think I came in on the 13th of July, that my predecessor had extended the time to the 1st of August—I think it was. Of course, not being in possession of the official information on which

I could act, and being a new-comer there, I simply continued his decision, I enforced his decision, and gave them the continuation. If that had not been done, there were many fishermen along the north shore of Nova Scotia and the south shore of Prince Edward Island who would not have caught any fish at all, their season's work would have been absolutely fruitless. There is no doubt that they caught an immense quantity of fish during the fifteen days that the open season was extended, but I am afraid they caught this number of fish to improve their personal position very largely at the expense of the lobster industry. We are now reaching this crucial point in the discussion and the decision of this question, whether we will conserve the industry as a whole at the expense of individual interests who desire the extension, or whether the continuance and maintenance of the industry is to be the paramount object we have in view, although the continuance of that industry and the refusal to extend the time may personally injure a number of those who at present have their money invested in it. The hon. gentleman is aware that last year we had a scientific gentleman, Dr. McPhail, of Montreal, who, I think, was appointed by my predecessor, but whom, at any rate, I was pleased to be able to confirm in the appointment, and to give him all the assistance I could after I came in, and he has made a very scientific and exhaustive examination of this question. I have not got his report in a condition to present it to Parliament yet, but as soon as I am in a position to do so, I will be very glad to bring down all the reports that I can. I may conclude with repeating the remark that I made at first, that while I have not decided against granting the petition, still my mind leans in that direction, because I feel that if I grant the extension in that place I will have to grant it all round the coast, excepting along the south-east coast of Nova Scotia, where they do not ask it, because they could not use it profitably. The matter is a very important one, and I can assure the hon. gentleman it is engaging my very best attention.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman refers to the scientific reports. I would be very much obliged if he could allow me to see any reports that he may have in regard to these past extensions: for instance, the character of the lobster taken in those last fifteen days, whether they were in a berried condition or not; and also as to whether the size of the lobster is running small or maintaining the average. Those were features that weighed with the department, and no doubt weigh with it now. Some of the best coast lobsters run very small-sized, indeed, showing depletion and exhaustion. In Cape Breton, the cases that used to come before me showed that the fish there, for obvious reasons, one being that they cannot fish with the same advantages in all the mouths open to other districts, were maintaining their size fairly, and if he has any information of that kind, it would be very useful to the House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The evidence before the department on that point is most conflicting. We had the opinion of a great many gentlemen, but I have not found any preponderating weight of evidence in one direction or another. I have no objection whatever to furnish the information to the hon. gentleman. The subject is one of great importance, and I should be delighted if the hon. gentleman will give me the benefit of his great experience in the matter.

QUARANTINE MEASURES AT VICTORIA, B. C.

Mr. PRIOR. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the Government, and especially of the Minister of Agriculture, to a paragraph which appeared in this morning's Ottawa "Citizen," and which I will read:

Vancouver, B.C., April 30th.—William's Head Quarantine, off Victoria, is to-day a village with a population of over one thousand persons, including two doctors, the Marquis of Breadalbane, and many hundred Chinese, all living in an atmosphere laden with sulphur. The place became populated very suddenly yesterday, on the arrival of the steamer "Empress of China" from the Orient, flying a yellow flag at the masthead, indicating there was small-pox on board. Every one who came in contact with the steamer, as well as passengers and crew, numbering over three hundred, and eight hundred Chinese, were at once transferred to quarantine by the health officer, Dr. Watt, who has telegraphed to Victoria that the whole outfit will be kept prisoners for fourteen days. The accommodations, in spite of the recent improvements, are ridiculously short for the enormous crowd. Large consignments of provisions were sent over at once, but there is much grumbling and growling.

Every precaution known to science is being taken to prevent the spread of the disease. The steamer will not be allowed to move, unless the company secures a new crew two hundred strong to man her. This is impossible on short notice, consequently, as the steamer is heavily freighted and the passenger list is unusually large, the expense will be enormous, and the shipping interests of every city on the coast, as well as many inland, will be affected.

Later.—Owing to the crowded state of quarantine, the authorities have allowed a steamer to be chartered to accommodate the first-class passengers, chiefly the ladies.

I am sorry to take up the time of the House, but this is a matter which I think of some moment to the country. I may say there is a feeling of insecurity on the coast at the present time in reference to quarantine matters, owing in large measure, I think, to the fact that the last ship that came into Victoria flying the yellow flag, showing that small-pox was on board, was quarantined, and a very short time afterwards a few

cases of small-pox were found in Victoria, Port Townsend, and also in Seattle, and naturally very many people believed, and I believe myself, that the small-pox came from that ship. I am not at all prepared to say that the present superintendent of quarantine, Dr. Watt, did not do his duty. I do not know; I sincerely hope he did so, and carried out the instructions and regulations of the department in a vigorous and strict manner. But I should like to know from the Minister of Agriculture whether strict orders have been given to that officer to carry out the quarantine regulations in their entirety. William's Head quarantine station is, as the Minister knows and many other hon. members know, the most important quarantine station in Canada to-day, not excepting Grosse Isle, in view of the rapidly increasing communication with China and Japan, and the large trade existing between those two countries and British Columbia. There are many large vessels running regularly, there are at the present time three important lines of steamers running from Victoria regularly, once a month; the Canadian Pacific Railway vessels go up to Vancouver, but the others go only to Victoria, and there is always small-pox latent in China and Japan. The quarantine buildings were constructed two or three years ago by the late Government; they are very fine buildings, the site is a magnificent one, and in fact there could not be better buildings or a finer site. But I am sorry to say there is not properly furnished accommodation for a large number of first-class passengers, such as are now quarantined at that station. The accommodation for steerage passengers is, I believe, pretty good, there being plenty of room; but for first-class passengers it is very bad indeed. I do not know whether there are sufficient beds and bedding and proper facilities to maintain a large number of first-class passengers there, and it is unpleasant to think that delicate ladies, many of whom have suffered from sea sickness from the long voyage, and men accustomed to all the luxuries of the day, should be suddenly quarantined in a station without any accommodation beyond bare boards. I only hope the Minister will see that as quickly as possible the quarantine station is placed in first-class condition. It may cost some money, but it is an expenditure that would not raise a debate in this House. I wish to say also that it was rumoured in town yesterday that owing to the influence of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the Minister of the Department of Agriculture had telegraphed that first-class passengers might be allowed to go free. I know that every one is very sorry indeed that the Canadian Pacific Railway, with its magnificent steamers, should suffer tremendous loss from those steamers being kept in quarantine; but beyond and above all this, we must first think of the public health, and I am sure the Minister will be ready to attend to it. I would ask the hon. Minister whether the superintendent at the quarantine station has strict instructions to carry out the rules, regardless of the expense that may be entailed on the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or any other company?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) informed me a little while ago, almost immediately on my return to the city after a few days' absence, that he would bring this matter up. The matter has been dealt with by the department in my absence, I think efficiently, so as to show that the department is well able to manage affairs of this kind, however important they may be or however suddenly they may arise. The statement which the hon. gentleman read from a morning paper is one which reflects great credit on the ingenuity of the publisher of that paper in putting forward a flaring and attractive heading and article; but at the same time the statements therein contained are hardly consistent with the facts of the case, as I think the hon. member must be very well aware.

Mr. PRIOR. No.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The facts as they appear from the telegrams, are as follows:—The "Empress of China" arrived with two cases of small-pox on board. There were 106 first-class passengers, 34 intermediate, and these, together with the steerage passengers and the officers and crew, made a total of 963. As a matter of fact the regulations require that when vessels arrive with contagious disease on board, they shall be detained. The regulations require that the officer in charge of the quarantine station at the port shall exercise his discretion, within the regulations and under certain rules, as to how much detention shall be made, and what passengers shall be subjected to that detention. It is well known that as regards small-pox the period of incubation is about 12 days. It happened in the present case that small-pox was found on the ship nine days before its arrival at Victoria. The passengers afflicted with the disease were immediately isolated, and the other passengers and crew, and indeed all on board were vaccinated seven days before the ship arrived in Victoria. The result was that, practically speaking, the other passengers were liable to supervision and careful watching until the ordinary period of incubation would be passed, which is, according to the dates I have received, to-day. The officer in charge did detain the vessel. He investigated the cases, he examined carefully to see whether all the passengers had been vaccinated, as was stated by the officers of the ship, and he found, as I understand, that they had been all so vaccinated. It is necessary for him in order to

ensure the safety of the people of the city and of the country that contagious disease should not be allowed to spread; but it seems that the period of incubation having passed over, and the individuals affected having been entirely isolated, the rest of the people might safely be allowed to pass on with freedom. The doctor in charge of the quarantine at William's Head decided to keep the vessel there until the period of incubation of the disease should have been passed. He was given instructions from here to use his judgment, as to what danger there would be and to see that all precautions were taken. That judgment, I believe, he will exercise and act according to. I may say, that the gentleman who is in charge of the station is one who has for a long time occupied an official position in the province of British Columbia. It is true, that it is only a short time since he has been in the position which he now holds. Circumstances which occurred there required a change of officer in the quarantine service, and as a consequence this new officer was appointed not long since. Dr. Watt who now holds the position, was the provincial health officer for the province of British Columbia.

Mr. PRIOR. He was not the provincial health officer; he was the secretary of the Provincial Board of Health.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes. "Secretary of the Provincial Board of Health," was the exact designation of his office. As a matter of fact, he was in charge of the public health of the province. He was appointed to the office which he now holds, and has gone to reside at William's Head, the quarantine station at Victoria. The officer who was in charge before did not reside at William's Head, but resided in the city of Victoria.

Mr. PRIOR. You are a little off there.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) says I am wrong, but I think the hon. gentleman himself is mistaken. Dr. Macnaughton Jones, who was for a number of years the quarantine officer at William's Head, resided at William's Head, but Dr. Macnaughton Jones died a year ago, and the friends of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) appointed Dr. Duncan to that position, but Dr. Duncan never resided at William's Head.

Mr. PRIOR. I beg your pardon, Dr. Duncan did reside at William's Head. I should know a little about it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My information is to the contrary.

Mr. PRIOR. Your information is wrong upon all points.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That remains to be seen. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) can prove that my information is wrong upon all points, I will be glad to give him an opportunity of doing so, and I will bring the documents to show that the information I am giving to the House is correct. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) has spoken about the importance of William's Head as a quarantine station. I fully realize that. I believe it is one of the most important quarantine stations in the Dominion. In consequence of the fact that we have constant communication between Victoria and China and Japan, where unfortunately there is more danger of acquiring contagious disease than there is from most of the countries with which we have communication. As a consequence of this, a few months ago, I sent Dr. Montizambert, chief quarantine officer of the Dominion, to carefully investigate this station and to see that every possible improvement both in the apparatus and in the buildings should be carried out, so as to put that station on a perfectly satisfactory basis. Dr. Montizambert made a report to me, which I have in my hand, asking for certain improvements, and I am informed that these improvements have already to a considerable extent been carried out. They were extensive in their nature and somewhat costly, but they are being carried out as rapidly as the officers of the Public Works Department in British Columbia can carry them out. A hydrochloric tank has already been put there. There has been erected a shed upon the wharf for the accommodation of passengers when they land, and where their baggage may be examined and, if necessary, disinfected. The steam chamber in the disinfecting house on the wharf has been lined so as to make it more effective in its work; trolley cars have been supplied, and a number of small matters in the way of lighting the wharf, and supplying necessary material for the apparatus, have been attended to. The shower and needle baths for the saloon passengers, and for the Chinese and Japanese passengers, are at present in process of construction. In addition to that, iron bedsteads of a particular pattern (which have been used for some years at Grosse Isle quarantine station with great advantage, being very easy to disinfect and keep clean), have been ordered to be sent out to the William's Head quarantine station, and some furniture for the station is also under order. The result is that in a short time the quarantine station at William's Head will be most effective and most complete in all its arrangements and all its apparatus.

It is true that one or two instances of detention have occurred there in consequence of the epidemic of small-pox which has been in existence in Japan. I am sure that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) who represents the city of Victoria, would be the last to wish that anything should be done which would endanger the health of the people of his city or of the province of British Co-

lumbia. It is true that representations have been made by the Canadian Pacific Railway, asking that as little detention as possible should be given to their steamers on arrival at that port, but neither the Canadian Pacific Railway nor anybody else of authority in the country has asked that anything should be done which would at all endanger the health of the people, or give any opportunity for the introduction of disease into that country. I may tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) that whatever he may think, or whatever rumours he may imagine have been started, there is no foundation whatever in the idea which he seems to insinuate has been expressed, and perhaps thinks is true, that through the influence of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, exceptional privileges have been given to anybody at the quarantine station at William's Head, or elsewhere. This explanation is perhaps complete enough to satisfy the hon. member (Mr. Prior) that everything calculated to make the quarantine station at William's Head complete, is being carried out as rapidly as possible. A great deal of the improvements have already been accomplished, and there will be nothing done to interfere unnecessarily with the traffic between China and Japan and the city of Victoria.

But at the same time, in the interest of the public health, it is absolutely necessary on certain occasions—and I think this occasion is one—that a proper period of incubation of the disease should be allowed to pass before even the saloon passengers should be allowed to land, and perhaps occasion danger to the community in which the hon. gentleman lives.

Mr. PRIOR. Might I be allowed to make an explanation. The hon. the Minister must have known that I made no charge whatever against Dr. Watt. I specially stated that I was not prepared to make any charge against Dr. Watt, and I do not see why the Minister made out that I had. The hon. the Minister stated that I knew this account was exaggerated. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; I simply read it in the newspaper, and I knew nothing else about it, and that is the reason I asked for information. How could I know it was exaggerated? I thought it was a correct account of what had taken place, and that is the reason I asked for information upon it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) also said that I insinuated that the Canadian Pacific Railway influence had been brought to bear. I simply said that I had heard the rumour. As this was of such tremendous importance to my constituents, I thought I was right in saying that I heard the rumour, and in asking what action had been taken by the Government.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The rumour is unfounded.

Mr. MAXWELL. Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might be allowed——

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Maxwell) must bear in mind that no general discussion is possible at this stage of the proceedings. This was a very urgent matter, and it has now been referred to in the House at considerable length by the hon. member who raised the point and the Minister who replied. No general debate can possibly be allowed upon it now. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maxwell) has a mere question to ask, or a statement of a very brief character to make on this matter, perhaps the House would hear him, but it must not be enlarged into a discussion or debate.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND MAILS.

Mr. MARTIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the Government—I am sorry the hon. the Postmaster General is not in his place—to the fact that we have had no mail from Prince Edward Island for about a week. I would like to ask if the Gocernment is aware of this condition of things? It is not very often that we are a week behind in getting news from that part of the Dominion at this season of the year, especially as we have a new boat, the "Petrel." What has happened her? I would like to ask if the Government have any information as to the cause of the delay?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). In the absence of the Postmaster General, I may simply say that it is impossible for an answer to be given to the hon. gentleman, but I have no doubt that every precaution is being taken to overcome as rapidly as possible the difficulties he has pointed out.

BANK NOTE CONTRACT.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the acting Prime Minister if that note contract is brought down yet, or is in a position to be brought down? I am very anxious to have it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I cannot say in the absence of the Prime Minister, when it will be brought down, but I have no doubt that it will be as soon as possible.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, the prolongation of the debate on the Budget may perhaps be excused, considering the number of incidental proceedings that go on each day

before we arrive at it. On some days those proceedings consist of boring operations. On other days we strike a gusher. This has been one of the gusher days, and perhaps not so tedious on that account.

Coming to the actual question before us, I may say that this is not the time to discuss it in much detail. It is the general policy of the Government which is before us. To my mind the strongest justification of that policy is the manner in which it has been received by the Opposition. To use the language of the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) on another occasion, this policy appears to have fallen like a bombshell in their ranks. They have been at a loss how to criticise it. In fact, up to date there has been hardly anything worthy of the name of criticism from that side of the House.

The hon. member for York, N. B. (Mr. Foster), the financial leader of the Opposition, has taken a sneering tone. The hon. leader of the Opposition, who has to play second to him in a financial discussion, has taken the growling tone. The member for York has taken the yah-yah line of opposition; the leader of the Opposition has taken the bow-wow line. The two hon. gentlemen seem to have different conceptions of their own individuality and of the line they ought to take in this discussion. The member for York has been long misled by his own natural advantages. His undoubted resemblance to the ordinary stage presentation of Faust's creation of Mephistopheles in the drama of Faust has led him to belive for a long time back that he could play the part of a sneering spirit in that immortal drama. It seems to have been his opinion for years back that he is the very Mephistopheles in debate—that he could play the very Mephistopheles with the arguments of his opponents.

Mr. DAVIN. There is no such work as "Faust's Mephistopheles."

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend has tripped me up when I did not trip, for I specially mentioned the drama of "Faust," written by Goethe, in which this character occurs. This hon. gentleman, who plays the part of Mephistopheles with the arguments of his opponents, works up his sarcasm in his hands just as a farmer's wife might work up a pat of butter in the old days before we had the latest butter working machinery; he rolls it and pats it between his palms; and finally offers it to the House on the tips of his fingers, and expects that to end the whole question. That is the line of the Mephistopheles of debate.

The leader of the Opposition, on the other hand, seems to fancy himself in the character of the favorite old watch-dog, who growls whenever the interests of our poor suffering industries are in his opinion attacked. He is always on the watch to bay the Government, or the moon, or anything else that he thinks threatens the interests of those suffering industries. We have seen him on a former occasion ready to fight—yes, ready to die—for a particular principle which was before the House. It is hardly more than a year since on the floor of this House he declared himself ready to die for the sake of carrying the Remedial Bill then before us, the policy which since the opening of this session he has dropped his interest in, and surrendered it to the enemy. So the sincerity of his growl in defence of the suffering industries may be subject to a little doubt on this occasion.

These gentlemen see ghosts in the tariff, because, as they see opposite things in it, the things they see can not really be there. The member for York believes that this is a protectionist policy. He thinks he sees in it the ghost of the old clothes he used to wear when Minister of Finance—the ghostly rags and tatters of the National Policy clinging about the form of this tariff; and he objects to that. He does not like to be revisited by the ghost of the National Policy. The leader of the Opposition, on the other hand, thinks he sees in it free trade in sheep's clothing, so to speak. He thinks he sees in it the introduction of the thin edge of the wedge of free trade. About twenty years ago I had the pleasure of hearing that hon. gentleman denounce a policy introduced by a Liberal Government on this side of the House, because he said it introduced the thin edge of the wedge of protection. So that it seems he is always seeing the thin edges of wedges in any policy introduced by a Liberal Government; and his opposition does not depend on what the nature of the wedge is, so much as on the personality of those who introduce it. I am happy to agree with him in this particular instance to some extent. I believe this tariff is a step in the direction of freer trade, at all events, though it can scarcely be called a free trade tariff; and for that reason I am the more inclined to give it my support.

But all this discussion around and about the tariff, for we can hardly call it a discussion of the tariff, leads us to speak of the methods of tariff making employed by the two parties who have had control of the business of this country. The National Policy, as introduced by Sir Leonard Tilley in 1879, was admittedly the product of Yankee experts imported from Washington for the occasion. There was nobody in Canada who knew the ins and outs of protection sufficiently to frame a tariff for the Conservative party at that time. The tariff endured in substantially the same shape until 1887. In that year the tariff was the sole production of the autocrat himself who now leads the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), a man, I cannot say of blood and iron, although that tariff was emphatically an iron tariff, but it may be correct to

say, having due reference to the nature of the proceeding by which iron is smelted, that he was a man of blast and iron—an autocrat of iron furnaces. It was he who framed the tariff of 1887, and he framed it all apparently out of his own head, just as the cook on board a ship on which I once travelled made his puddings, because there was not the least sign of any other influence in it than his own.

The tariff of 1894 introduced by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) when Finance Minister, was admittedly not framed by the Government at all, but by the Manufacturers Association of Canada. At any rate that was the assertion made at the annual meeting of the association in 1895. At that meeting they stated that they had sent a brief to the Finance Minister, and that he had accepted it and carried out what they had told him to do, and they published this statement in a circular which they sent to the members of this House. I read that circular in this House in the session of 1895, and it was afterwards read by other members, and the then Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) never ventured to contradict the statement of the Manufacturers Association that it was they who practically had made his so-called revised tariff.

Now, what about the tariff of 1897? The method of that tariff making has been already discussed, and I shall merely say in general terms, that it was the result of a prolonged search for information, in the first place. As I had the pleasure of being present on several occasions where the tariff commission was sitting, I am able to bear witness to the fact that the business men in the localities where the commission held sittings, were, without exception, satisfied with the manner in which that inquiry was conducted. They were convinced that they were dealing, not only with members of the Government, but with business men as well, fully capable of appreciating all the facts and arguments put before them in connection with the framing of a new tariff. The sittings of that commission were open to farmers and consumers of all kinds as well as manufacturers. There was full inquiry, followed by long conferences between the members of the commission and the members of the Cabinet; and judging from the fact that our Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) was so overwhelmed with work, in the last few days before the tariff came down, I do not suppose he and his colleagues were able to finish the work absolutely until within a day or so of the delivery of the Budget speech. These gentlemen had obtained full information and given it mature consideration before coming to a conclusion.

The tariff, on the face of it, bears traces of mutual concessions on the part of those who wished to retain high protection and those who wished to approach very closely to free trade or at least a tariff for revenue only. The making of mutual concessions was inevitable under the circumstances. We had been for eighteen years under a policy of protection, a policy of isolation, a policy which enervated and stunted the business life of this community. After having been submitted to eighteen years of that system, the business of this country was not in a position to stand that degree of freedom which it might have stood otherwise. Concession, therefore, was necessary. Protection for eighteen years, as I have said, had enervated and stunted the national life of Canada, and the stunting of the early growth of a nation, like the stunting of the early growth of a man or an animal, is something very hard to remedy in after years. If a colt, or a calf, or a child, or anything else is stunted while small, it is very hard to enable it to ever attain its natural growth. I say, therefore, that after eighteen years of protection, the national life of Canada became not only stunted and narrowed for the present but seriously injured as regards the possibilities of our attaining to the full growth of a nation.

I claim that in the period of protection which so injured us, no great natural industry, no new national industry, sprang into life, that the only industries which flourished were the natural ones which were not protected, and that its only effect on the existing manufactures of the country was to create monopolies in the hands of a few rich manufactures rather than to extend our manufacturing trade or build up anything new. But the worst of it was that it left us in a condition unfit for full freedom of action. The manufacturers are not the only people of Canada who were injured by it in their manhood. All the Canadian people had acquired the habit of waiting for Providence, or, in other words, the Government of the day, to do something for them. They had lost the habit of individual enterprise; they had lost the ability to struggle in free competition with the rest of the world. Protection has often been compared to a hot-bed system or the growth of tender plants under glass in a conservatory. That is a very appropriate comparison. We have also heard our industries described as infants, and we are to suppose these infants to have been in the nursery for eighteen years. What has been the effect on these infants and tender plants of fostering them in this way for eighteen years? Sir, they are not able to stand a draught of cool air, not to speak of the cold air which should blow upon them in order to render them really strong and vigorous. An infant puffed up with fat, it may be, but weak in vitality, is not fit to play in the same yard with other infants of the same age. The hot-house orchids or exotic pets, which have been the favourites of our hon. friends opposite for so many years, cannot stand the ordinary

climate of Canada, about which we had so much discussion this afternoon. They have to be protected still longer, at the risk of losing them altogether, and, Sir, though I am a free trader on principle, and if we cannot get free trade, a revenue man on principle, I still have to admit the force of the contention that these poor little industries, which have been protected nearly to death by hon. gentlemen opposite, are not fit to go out in their nakedness and stand the Canadian climate without some shreds of protection being lift on them.

Yet when I come to criticise the tariff on my own account, as I propose to do, though in a very friendly spirit, I shall have to contend that the Government of the day perhaps had a little too much consideration for these tender pets when they were framing their tariff. Looking at the maximum tariff, or general schedule, we find that a great many taxes are retained which are strictly protective and highly protective in their nature. I confess that I had hoped that the Government would have found it possible to make reductions in many directions in which they have not made them. If they have erred in this respect, however, I am satisfied that it has been from tenderness of heart towards the weanlings which have not yet been weaned, and from the fear that, if these were subjected to such treatment as the members of the Government individually would think wholesome and good for them, the poor children might possibly be lost in the experiment. So, although I think the Government might fairly have made a further reduction all round in that maximum tariff, I am inclined to give them credit for the best intentions and am by no means inclined to withdraw my confidence from them, even if we were to consider the maximum tariff by itself.

But the maximum schedule is not the whole of this tariff proposal, it is not, to my mind, the main portion of it. Even with the imperfect reductions which the Government have seen their way to make, it must be admitted that the new tariff gives us very considerable relief in many directions. The reduction of the duty on iron, will, undoubtedly, give most considerable relief to those who use iron, and that means, practically, the whole community. The reduction of the duty on coal oil, with regard to which a good deal has been said already, certainly gives a measure of relief—17½ per cent seems to be a very considerable measure of relief. Our friends of the coal oil industry tell us also that the regulations that have been removed effect a further reduction of 2 cents in the duty. So that, looking at it from a coal oil refiner's standpoint—and they ought to know the facts of the case—we have had, virtually, a reduction of one-half of the tax on coal oil. That, it must be admitted, is a very considerable and material relief to the users of this article.

Mr. DAVIN. How does my hon. friend (Mr. Casey) make that out? I would like to have him explain.

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend must excuse me, because I do not undertake to make it out at all. I have told the House that there is a reduction of 1 cent on the duty, and the manufacturers of coal oil say that the relaxation of the regulations about importation in tanks will compel a reduction as great as would have been effected by further reduction of 2 cents on the duty. This makes a total of 3 cents, or one half the duty, if the contention of the coal oil refiners is correct.

Referring to the iron schedule, I cannot pass over the question of bounty without a word. I am very glad to see that the Government have adopted the bounty system rather than a high protective duty as a means of encouraging our iron industries. That these should be encouraged in some way, I think even the strongest free trader must admit. We have vast deposits of iron ore, but it is a peculiarity of iron mining that these deposits can be developed in a paying manner only on a very large scale, and iron can only be produced cheaply on a very large scale. It is evident, therefore, that the people who have the necessary capital to go into the exploiting of mines and smelting of ore cannot be induced to undertake the work on that scale without assistance, and it is necessary that the public should do something for them. If the development of natural resources is to be promoted at all, I think it is much safer and much fairer and better in every way to do it by a bounty than a high protective tax. I am therefore pleased to find that the Government have found the way to encourage the production without taxing all the consumers of iron to the extent that was done under the former tariff. It is not fair that the consumers of any particular article should bear the whole cost of encouraging its production. The development of our iron mines is for the good of the country at large, and the people at large should contribute for it, and not only those who use specially large quantities of iron.

But, coming to the reciprocal tariff, or differential schedule, or whatever it may be called, I confess that I find in this the gist of the fiscal policy of the Government. I think that the introduction of this policy is nothing less than a stroke of genius on the part of those who framed this tariff, or on the part of those who originally evolved the idea that these gentlemen have had the courage to put into practice. For the policy is not a new one in principle, though it is new in the method of application. The policy of providing that goods coming from Great Britain should be especially favoured was adopted as the Liberal policy as long as five years ago. It was voted for by every Liberal in the House, in support of a motion moved by my hon. friend who is now the

Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies), and it has remained the policy of our party ever since. But this application of the principle to the tariff scheme is a thing for which the credit is due to those who have framed this particular tariff, and I think the method by which it has been applied justifies my statement that this tariff is a stroke of genius in this regard.

The first comparison that occurs to our minds for this preferential tariff is with the so-called preferential scheme with which our friends on the other side have seen fit to identify themselves. I say "identify themselves," for I take it for granted that when the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) moved a resolution the other day in the British Empire League to ask for preferential trade relations with the mother country, he definitely committed himself and his party to that as their platform. Now, let us compare the two platforms. The Liberal platform says to the mother country: You have been admitting our goods free for many years, you have been giving us favours in other respects —you have been protecting us with your army and navy, you have been standing between us and those who bully us or take advantage of us; now, it is our turn to do a little something for you, and we propose to do it by admitting your goods at a rate 25 per cent less than the goods of countries that have not shown us special favours. Here is a free offer of considerable privileges to the mother country. But, on the other hand, the British Empire League and the Conservative party seem to have limited themselves to the one idea that we must get something out of Great Britain. They have not been thinking of doing anything for England, but of asking England to do something for us. Their sole idea is that Great Britain should put a tax—I think it was figured down to 5 per cent on one occasion —on the breadstuffs bought from countries other than British colonies, and this at a time when we were doing nothing whatever for Britain, when we were, as a matter of fact, taxing the imports from Great Britain more highly than the imports from the United States. Now that the Government's preferential arrangement in favour of Great Britain is brought down to this House, where do we find the leader of the Opposition? We find him still sticking to his request for favours from Great Britain and refusing to endorse this scheme for giving favours to Great Britain.

Mr. McNEILL. I am sure my hon. friend (Mr. Casey) does not mean to be unfair, but when he says that the proposal was that England should levy a tax of 5 per cent on commodities coming from foreign countries while we should do nothing in return, he is unintentionally unfair. For the proposal was that we should also levy a tax upon the goods of foreign countries and should devote the proceeds of that tax to purposes of Imperial defence and intercommunication. So we were agreeing to do something.

Mr. CASEY. I think that was part of the scheme, but as this tax was to be put on food products, which we do not import from any other country, I do not see where the fund was to come from or where the benefit to England would be.

Mr. McNEILL. It was not on food products alone, but on all imports.

Mr. CASEY. That is a more extended scheme than the scheme as I understood it, when I had last to do with the affairs of the league. At that time the scheme was for preferential treatment of food products by Great Britain. It seems they now ask Great Britain to give us the preference in other goods as well as food products. I do not see that we are likely to send manufactured goods to England. So the scheme resolves itself back into what I said—that England was to tax her food stuffs for the benefit of the colonies that produced these things. That is what I have understood the real gist of it to be, and I still understand it so, notwithstanding the explanation as to the phraseology of the scheme by my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill).

Now, I think the policy urged by the British Empire League and the Conservative party is rather a mean policy. On the other hand, I think the Liberal policy is a generous one, and I think so notwithstanding the alleged objection that the German and Belgian and other treaties may interfere with the unique position of Great Britain in relation to this tariff at the present time. We have heard to-day the answer given by the Department of Customs to the Belgian Consul, who asked that goods from his country might come in under this arrangement. It is quite clear that our Government does not admit that our tariff propositions compel us to admit German and Belgian goods under that preferential schedule.

If it did, I do not see how my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition could urge anything against it. The proceedings in connection with the French Treaty, which was ratified in 1895, although it was made sometime before, must be fresh in our minds. We remember how that hon. gentleman, when High Commissioner in London, negotiated a treaty with France, a treaty which not only bound us to admit reciprocally certain articles from France at a low rate of duty, but to admit also any goods from France at the same reduced rate of duty which we might grant to any other country. The hon. gentleman negotiated that treaty himself. That treaty was a little too strong for the then Finance Minister (Mr. Foster), who was the hon. gentleman's superior for the time being, and he told the House so:

On the other hand, as the treaty is signed, Canada agrees to give France "most-favoured-nation" treatment, not only on the articles men-

tioned, but on any articles of her tariff in which she gives better terms to any other country. That was not the intention of the Government, as will be seen by a telegram which was sent to our commissioner in January, in which it was expressly stated that we agreed to the "most-favoured-nation" treatment, so far only as articles named in the treaty are concerned. Our commissioner, either through error or for reasons which he explains in his correspondence, signed the treaty with the clause in it as I have read, giving "most-favoured-nation" treatment to France in all articles of our tariff.

Now, that is the gentleman who objects to the present tariff because it might possibly give most-favoured-nation treatment to Belgium and to Germany. I should say that the speech from which I have quoted was delivered in the session of 1893, at a time when the Minister of Finance refused to ask the House to endorse the treaty which his subordinate, at that time, and his present chief, had seen fit to make with France. But at a later date the Minister of Finance saw fit to adopt that treaty, and asked the House to agree to it, and the House did agree to it. Under that treaty which is now in force with France, we are committed to a vast deal more than this present tariff commits us to, even if the present contention of the leader of the Opposition is correct, that we would be forced to admit Belgium and German goods. That is the bug-a-boo which is now held up, that this tariff will allow German and Belgian goods to come in at reduced rates. What are we committed to by the present treaty with France made by this hon. gentleman who raises that objection at the present time? On May 29th, 1895, Mr. Edgar asked:

What foreign powers have become entitled, under treaties with Great Britain, to like commercial privileges with Canada as those granted to France by the treaty of 6th February, 1893, known as the French Treaty? 2. Do each and all of such foreign powers become entitled to all the reductions proposed by Article 1 of said treaty?

Mr. IVES. 1. From the best information at the moment attainable, it appears probable that the following foreign powers will, under treaties with Great Britain, become entitled to like privileges in Canada as those granted to France by the treaty of February 6th, 1893, on its ratification, &c., viz.:—Argentine, Austria-Hungary, Belgium, Bolivia, Chili, Columbia, Costa Rica, Germany (Zollverein), Muscat, Russia, Salvador, Sweden and Norway, and Uruguay. * * * It is also possible that the treaties with the following countries might be held to be binding on Canada in like manner:—Egypt, Montenegro, Mexico, Persia, South African Republic, Venezuela, and Zanzibar.

Now, here is a gentleman who negotiated a treaty with France under which we are compelled, without any reciprocal consideration from those powers, to give most-favoured-nation treatment to twenty other nations besides France. This gentleman objects to the present tariff proposal because it might possibly include Belgium and Germany alone. The inconsistency of his position is such as would be only possible on the part of the hon. gentleman himself, such as we have learned to expect from him, and therefore hardly worth special notice.

But I will say for those of us who lean towards a lower rate of tariff, that the possibility of other nations as well as England at some future time coming under this reciprocal schedule, is one of the things we like best, in this tariff proposal. This is an offer of reciprocity to the world. If Britain is at present, and likely to remain for some time, the only country who is to get the advantage of it, it is due to her own good sense in making the tariff arrangements she has made. But we hope to educate the world gradually to understand the value of Canadian trade and to induce other nations to come in under the same terms.

Now, Sir, this reciprocal scheme is objected to still further by the leader of the Opposition on the ground that it leaves too much power in the hands of the Controller of Customs. I cannot agree with him there. I do not see where else the power is to be left than in the hands of that particular Minister, charged with the administration of customs, subject, as he always must be, to the control of the whole Cabinet. I think that is one of the special advantages of the scheme, that, without any further legislation on our part, without negotiating a treaty, without going to any expense or cost, or giving any new or extraordinary advantages to a foreign country, we can simply admit from time to time other countries to this reciprocal arrangement whenever they have been wise enough to reduce their tariff towards us to a reasonable figure.

Then the clause which is meant to smash combines is objected to, because that leaves too much power in the hands of the Governor General in Council. Why, Sir, I consider that is what the country will consider about the best clause in the whole proposal. Such an able man as my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace), the late Controller of Customs, tried his hand at smashing combines some years ago by legislation. It was not very successful. The people of the United States have tried to smash them by legislation, but it has not been successful. You can drive a coach and four through any Act of Parliament; but here the whole matter is left in the hands of the Governor in Council, that is, the Government of the day, who will be responsible to Parliament for any action that they may take, and responsible to the public at the same time, and who are bound to act in such a way as may defy criticism in dealing with a case of this kind. All that is required in order to destroy existing combines or to prevent new ones from coming up is, that the Government of the day should be satisfied, from evidence which they have obtained, that there is a combine and that it can be broken up by a reduction of the tariff or, if necessary, by placing the

particular article in question on the free list. That is the only possible way of getting at the combines, and I hope it will be successful and that it may be freely used. So much for some of the objections that have been urged by hon. gentlemen opposite.

I wish to point out some further special advantages arising out of the tariff, from my point of view. The tariff—apart from the resolutions to which I have been referring particularly—gives us the benefit of a 25 per cent lower duty on nearly all the goods we wish to import. Let me take the two items of cottons and woollens merely as examples. There is grumbling because the duties on certain lines of cottons have been raised a little. But these kinds of cottons can be purchased from Great Britain, which is the great cotton factory, and so it is not fair to say that as a matter of fact, the cotton duties have been increased when there will be a reduction of 25 per cent within a year on all cottons imported from England. Instead of the duty having been increased, it has really been decreased by reason of this 25 per cent, which will come into force a year from July 1st.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. Then the hon. leader of the Opposition endorses that statement?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I call attention to it.

Mr. CASEY. Then the leader of the Opposition emphasizes this statement.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. If the hon. gentleman is satisfied with the accuracy of that statement, he must have been mistaken the other night——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. I must be excused if I have confounded some other statement with his last speech, for the hon. gentleman has made so many contradictory utterances. The hon. gentleman said that this was the thin end of the wedge in the direction of free trade. I agree with the hon. gentleman that this is a step towards lower taxation; at the same time, I am satisfied that the reduction of 25 per cent on cottons imported from England is not a greater reduction than should be made, and is perhaps not as much reduction as should be granted.

It has been possible to make combines in cottons; it has not been found possible to make combines in woollen goods, which I chose for my other illustration. Woollen goods have, therefore, not been so close a monopoly as cottons; at the same time, the duties on the cheaper goods have been so enormous as to be practically prohibitive, and the producers of cheap woollen cloths have had the market almost entirely to themselves. Woollen manufacturers state that this 25 per cent reduction, which will come into force a year from now, will create considerable competition on the part of English manufacturers in regard to the cheaper classes of goods required by our people who are not over-rich, and will remove the scandal of duties reaching 50, 60, 70 or 100 per cent, which were hidden under the form of specific duties.

Then leaving those particular items, I desire to call attention for a moment or two to the great general advantage of the fiscal course that has been pursued by the Government. The encouragement of importations will, first, give some increase of revenue. It is quite clear that prohibitive taxes yield no revenue, and that allowing importations by making slight reductions in the tariff will furnish revenue. Second, it will change the course of trade, directing its course largely to trans-Atlantic countries rather than towards the people on this continent. Apart altogether from any feeling of loyalty, let us see what advantages it will give us. When we trade with the United States, our carriers get comparatively small profits. When our trade is across the ocean, we furnish trade to Canadian vessels both ways across the Atlantic. The high freights on exports to England during the past eighteen years have been largely caused by the fact that the ships have had freights only one way, and the result has been a high rate for our cattle, cheese and other products. Once you establish a stream of importations from England, you at the same time reduce the cost of exports from Canada.

As an advertisement for Canada, the publicity recently acquired is something for which it is worth while to pay a large amount, instead of getting it free, as we are doing, along with other benefits derived from the tariff. One instance of the value of this advertisement has been brought to our notice to-day in the reference to Rudyard Kipling's poem. Correspondents of the New York papers have declared that for the first time in many years Canada is attracting attention in England, and is being talked about. All the display we can make in the Jubilee procession, with our military and everything else, will not do one-twentieth as much to advertise the Dominion in Great Britain as a field for the investment of capital and for immigration, as the reduction in our tariff, made in England's favour. It will touch every business man in England and lead him to know that there is such a country as Canada, that it is a good place for investment and as a market for goods. It will induce immigration and capital to come here. One argument used in favour of the National Policy in the old days was that millions of English capital were waiting to be invested here so soon as it was definitely known that the fiscal policy of the country was protection to Canadian manufacturers. Like so many other promises made by hon. gentlemen opposite,

in this House, it was not fulfilled and came to nothing. But I venture to predict now that not even our gold mines, which are already causing an influx of capital, will create such a favourable impression of Canada as a field for investment as will the preferential duty given to English goods, and this fact is turning the attention of all English people towards this colony. Wherever trade goes capital will go, where the flag goes capital will follow. When the people are talking about a certain country there emigrants will go. Any circumstance that makes Canada well talked about will turn the minds of investors as well as other people to this country, and the result will be money in our pockets. I just wish to say in general terms, that I believe this is the first sign of a new and better future for the country. We have come out of the chrysalis of protection ; we have ceased to try and flock all by ourselves, like Dundreary's little bird. We are going to breathe a freer air ; we are going to have freer trade ; we are going to have freer enterprise ; we are going to have freer aspirations ; and, Sir, I believe that from this day forth, we are going to take up a fuller citizenship in the Empire, a fuller citizenship in the world, than has ever before been known in our history.

With these prospects in view, which I believe will spring to a large extent from the broader liberal policy that has been inaugurated by this Liberal Government, I have abundant hope and confidence in the future greatness of Canada.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 26) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Gibson.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 64) to incorporate the British Yukon Chartered Company.—(Mr. Fraser, Guysborough.)

Bill (No. 65) respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Landerkin.)

Bill (No. 66) relating to the Canadian Power Company.—(Mr. Gibson.)

Bill (No. 67) to incorporate the Pilots serving between Quebec and Montreal.—(Mr. Guay.)

Bill (No. 68) respecting the American Bank Note Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Bill (No. 69) respecting the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway Company.—(Mr. Langelier.)

Bill (No. 71) respecting the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

Bill (No. 72) respecting the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company.—(Mr. Richardson.)

Bill (No. 73) to incorporate the Kaslo and Lardo-Duncan Railway Company.—(Mr. Bostock.)

Bill (No. 74) to incorporate the National Life Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Lount.)

GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. RICHARDSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 70) respecting the Great North-west Central Railway Company.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman explain to the House what this Bill is ?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I understand that it is for the purpose of extending the time of the company's charter. I might also say that while my name appears on the Order paper as the mover of the Bill, I did not consent to move the second reading. A local barrister asked me to present a petition for it in the absence of the gentleman he had selected. I did so, and he came to me and asked me to move the second reading of the Bill. I demurred, but said I was willing to do so in order that the Bill should get before the Railway Committee, where it would be fully explained.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Where is the railway ?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Some fifty miles of it, I think, have been built, from a point near Brandon to Hamiota. It has been in litigation for a number of years.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I know now what it is.

Mr. DAVIN. I have received communications from my own constituency and other parts of the North-west, and also from Manitoba, pressing me strongly to oppose this Bill. I myself know nothing about the merits of it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think it had better go to the committee, where it will be threshed out.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure I shall be pardoned for asking the indulgence of the House for a very few moments, not with any hope of throwing any new light on the subject under discussion, but to offer my protest against the resolution, or a por-

tion of the resolutions, now before the House. I need hardly say that probably no question likely to arise during this Parliament, at all events during the present session, will be of more importance than this question, nothing has been looked for with greater interest, or with greater uncertainty, and no question has been more unsettled, perhaps, than the question of the tariff. Before the elections we said justly that our friends on the opposite side had no policy; and I think we are justified in saying that up to this moment, with all that has been done, they have not given the House or the country any striking evidence of having a policy, beyond one of such elasticity and of such a shifting character, that neither the House nor the country have any conception where these hon. gentlemen are going to lead us to in the end. Hon. gentlemen claim that they have redeemed their pledges. In fact, the hon. Finance Minister said that the resolutions before the House afford complete evidence that the Government have redeemed their pledges to the people, in essence and in fact. Now, I wish to call the attention of the House for a few moments to the position that was occupied by hon. gentlemen opposite before the election. They had no policy; they had only a set of small cries with which they went to the country. They claimed, in general terms only, that the policy of the Conservative party was bad; but they did not propose to remedy it in broad sense. Before I sit down I hope I shall be able to make it clear that they have not redeemed one solitary broad pledge, but have simply redeemed what they went to the country with—a few small cries. Now, what were those small cries? One was the question of binder twine; another was the question of coal oil; another was the question of rice, and another the question of barbed wire. Now, I would like to ask, Mr. Speaker, whether, when we consider the tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite in its details, it can be looked upon as redeeming the pledges of hon. gentlemen opposite? Let me take first the question of coal oil. In that article these hon. gentlemen made a reduction somewhat disappointing to their own friends, but which cannot fail, on the other hand, to be far-reaching in its effects upon the country. They have made a reduction of 1 cent a gallon. Now, I would like to ask any hon. gentleman in this House—I care not how ardent a free trader he may be or how economical he may be in his own habits—if in this reduction there are any compensating advantages to the country which correspond at all to the blow that has been struck at that industry. Let us take the average consumption at the maximum estimated by hon. gentlemen opposite, namely 20 gallons to each family per year, and the reduction in the tax will simply amount to 20 cents on the consumption of one family. I should like to know whether it is worthy a great party to have struck so severe a blow at an important industry in order to give the small benefit to each family of 20 cents per year. Some hon. gentlemen may say that that is a very important thing in itself. I would admit that it would be if it were only one item out of hundreds of others in which reductions were made, but when you can only point to such a small measure of relief, I say that it is unworthy of the dignity of a great party to plume themselves on such a slight reduction, which strikes a blow on an important industry without giving the people any substantial relief.

Let me take the question of iron. I am pretty sure that public opinion would be very slow in coming to the conclusion that hon. gentlemen opposite have given any substantial relief to the people by way of a reduction in the specific duties on iron. I have it upon the authority of several gentlemen, in whom I have the most implicit reliance, that a ton of iron upon which a duty of from $4 to $10 was paid, when manufactured and when it goes to consumer, is, in fact, worth about $400. Now, just let me see if there is any relief given to the people by the reduction on the specific duties. If that statement be correct, and I have no doubt it is, it would seem that the duty imposed, putting it at the maximum of $10, would not amount to more than 2½ per cent. Is that giving the people any substantial relief?

It is impossible for any hon. gentleman who thinks out clearly this question to say that the lowering of the specific duties upon iron is anything but a sham. But that is not the worst of it. Those gentlemen have thought it wise to grant a bounty upon the iron manufactured in this country, which, to my mind, is a very proper thing; but when the Minister of Finance states that he is unwilling to grant a bounty upon the iron manufactured in Canada, except in so far as it is consumed in Canada itself, that seems to me the most extraordinary doctrine ever enunciated. The enlightened policy would be to give a bounty to encourage exports. What would cheapen iron in this country would be to manufacture for export twice as much as we can consume. We live in an age when men must trade on small margins, and if anything would have a tendency, as a stumbling-block, to render the encouragement utterly worthless, it would be to provide that the encouragement to be given to the iron industry in this country can only apply to the products which are consumed in this country. I am pretty sure the people will vigorously object to this policy, because after all it is only shifting the burden of taxation. If we lower the specific duties for the purpose of letting in on the one hand, and then give a bounty on the other hand, on the iron consumed in the country, we are taxing the people unnecessarily. We are taxing them in such a way that they are

not going to have any compensating advantages. And after all does it make much difference, so far as dollars and cents are concerned, whether you tax the people by way of specific duties or whether you tax them by paying bounties out of the treasury of the Dominion.

Let me turn to the other side, which is the most deplorable, and that is that we have struck the iron industry a fatal blow. If there is any pledge which hon. gentlemen opposite have kept in a substantial manner, it is their pledge to knife the National Policy in every way possible. They may not have gone a great way, considering the great number of items, but they have gone far enough to affect the industries of this country, and we are told that this is only an instalment. What is the state of things in the country to-day? We have the most explicit declaration of hon. gentlemen opposite that this is only an instalment. One hon. gentleman after another rises on that side and says he is not quite satisfied but is promised that this is only the first blow and that the others are coming soon. I would like to ask what the impression must be in this country under such a state of things? Who is going to invest his money in the country? Where is the possibility of people manufacturing and giving labour to our people and thus affording a solution to that question the most dangerous of all questions, that is growing up not only in this but in other countries. One of the great difficulties has been the labour question, and in times of depression that is a most disturbing element. It seems to me that the plain solution of the labour question, the plain manner of dealing with what seems to be a false notion of hostility between labour and capital, is simply this. You find a day's work for every man in the country at some price, I care not how much, how large or small it is, and there you have a solution of the question which is without doubt a leading one and a real solution of a difficulty of that kind.

Another question is that of binder twine. I am pretty sure that in the province of Ontario, or in any other province, no one will think that the taking off a duty of 12½ per cent and making it free, will make the least difference to the farmers. Any person who takes the trouble to look at the returns of imports, will see that the small sum of $19,000 has been paid into the treasury of Canada in duties on imported twine. This importation is mainly in one province, and it is imported, not because binder twine is cheaper in the United States than here, but simply because the twine mills in the United States are nearer to some parts of our country than are the twine mills in Canada. It is simply a question of freights and not of duties. Hon. gentlemen opposite will not admit, although it is the fact, that this binder twine question is only one of the little shams with which they have tried to humbug the people. But I will give some evidence on the subject which hon. gentlemen on this side may not value very highly, but which hon. gentlemen opposite will no doubt receive as authoritative. I have here the statement of Mr. Noxon, who, I believe, is chief inquisitor for hon. gentlemen opposite, who, though in the pay of the province of Ontario, is the henchman of gentlemen opposite to coerce and harass the officials of the Dominion. He will furnish a conviction in any case in which it is desired. This will not detract from the weight of his evidence in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite. He was examined before the Public Accounts Committee of the Ontario legislature two or three years ago with regard to binder twine, after the establishment of the industry in the Central Prison at Toronto. This is what he said with regard to twine:

Q. Will other manufacturers, this year, sell at less than they did last year?—A. I think so.
Q. Will they undersell it?—A. I don't think so.
Q. Have you seen any prices quoted?—A. Yes.
Q. Where?—A. I have seen the prices of American manufacturers.

And, later on, he says:

Q. And you say you will be able to produce for half a cent less a pound this year than last?—A. Fully that.
Q. According to that, you will still be able to compete with the lowest quotation you have for this year, this at 7¼ before the duty is paid from the American side?—A. Certainly.
Q. And you will be still in a position to offer to the farmers of this country pure manilla twine equal to any on the market, so far as present quotations go, as cheap, or cheaper, than any other?—A. Yes.

An hon. MEMBER. Where is the twine made?

Mr. CLANCY. In the Central Prison, at Toronto. Now, Mr. Noxon was the inspector; was, in fact, the manager of that department, and in this statement he was defending the institution and defending his own conduct. He gave this as evidence that twine was being produced in the Central prison with prison labour—which is dearer than free labour—and we have Mr. Noxon's evidence to the effect that twine was as cheap or cheaper than elsewhere. I am not sure but that Mr. Noxon was right in that. No doubt a good quality of twine was produced there, and I think that at Kingston a good quality is produced. I regret that the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) is not present, for I would like to call his attention to these points. But what I wish mainly to point out is that taking off the duty on binder twine is really not a relief to the public and that the pretense that it is so is only a sham.

But these are the small things that hon. gentlemen opposite went to the country with in order to raise a party cry. They went through the country with a coal oil can in one hand and a pound of rice in the

other, and they never rose above petty questions of the price of such articles. I venture to say that my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Macdonald) made capital for his party in just about that way.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). You are guessing now.

Mr. CLANCY. Though it is only guessing, it is not hard to guess what hon. gentlemen opposite will do under such circumstances. I regret that the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) is not in his place. But I can tell you that that was the cry he raised. He made a personal canvass in the houses, and on the platforms he talked of nothing else than the villainy of the Government in Ottawa that imposed an enormous tax on coal oil and robbed the people on their rice. Is rice cheaper to-day? They have dealt with the matter, and, as a matter of fact, there is far greater tax on it than before.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). No.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) must have a strange way of calculating duties. I thought that rice came in before at 3-10ths cent per pound, and that now it comes in at ¾ cent. If I am wrong in thinking that the present duty is higher than the old, perhaps the hon. gentleman will enlighten me.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I shall be glad to enlighten the hon. gentleman. Uncleaned rice came in formerly at 3-10ths of a cent per pound, and it comes in now at ¾ of a cent per pound. But the manufacturer gets no more for the cleaned rice than he got before, for the duty on cleaned rice remains as before, 1¾ cents per pound. The increased duty on uncleaned rice comes out of the manufacturer.

Mr. CLANCY. I am sure that the House is now enlightened. The hon. gentleman has told us what we knew before—that 3-10ths cent was paid formerly on the uncleaned rice, while the duty now is ¾ cent. But he seems able to convince himself—but I believe not an hon. gentleman on that side, and I am sure not an hon. gentleman on this side is convinced—that this increase does not come out of the pockets of the people. It is a perfect absurdity. But I do not wish to speak in harsh terms. It would be curious to know where the hon. gentleman would land in arguing about duties in such a manner as he does. But he has been distressed for fear that a rice mill would live in Canada. That is what has exercised the hon. gentleman and his friends more than anything else. But now he is in peace. He has discovered in his mind, and only in his mind, that this duty can be raised and still the people pay no greater tax.

These are the small cries raised by hon. gentlemen opposite. But the questions that the people expect to find raised at the assembling of Parliament are questions of greater magnitude. On these questions hon. gentlemen opposite gave no specific pledges, but only stated in broad terms that they were going to make reforms. One of these was the reduction in taxes. Has there been a reduction in taxes? The effect of this tariff is the very opposite. We were told, also, that there would be a reduction of expenditure and no further increase of public debt. These were the great questions before the country, and not these small points upon which hon. gentlemen opposite compliment themselves for having redeemed their pledges. On these greater questions, how have hon. gentlemen opposite redeemed their pledges?

As I stated a moment ago, taxation has been materially increased, but it has been increased in such a way that the burdens are heavier upon the people than they were before. The policy of the Conservative party was never to impose taxation without some compensating advantages, where it was possible to do so. What were the compensating advantages? Where duty was imposed as a protective duty in order that we might foster the interests of this country, it meant that if the people were taxed, they would have a day's labour for it; it meant that if the people were taxed, they traded with each other; it meant that if they were taxed, it was for the purpose of giving them the first right of a day's work, the first right of selling their own commodities, the first right of keeping their own country for themselves, so far as enjoying its fruits was concerned. Now, those were the compensating advantages for the taxation imposed under the National Policy. But now we have what is called a new National Policy. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald) last night adopted the phrase of the new Liberal National Policy; I do not know whether his friends will be disposed to adopt it also. They have had their knife in the National Policy so long that I am afraid that if they adopt that name, it will not be received very well by the country. The National Policy, either upon the tongues or in the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite, is a thing that is very ill-fitting. Their National Policy has been one of tearing down, the National Policy of the Conservative party has been one of building up; and if the hon. gentleman and his friends can get the country to accept the proposition laid down by him last evening, then we are willing to accept that, and let it be the dividing line between the two parties in this country. Now, in the matter of additional taxation how much have these hon. gentlemen built up? I candidly admit that it is not very easy to build up, but we have the assurance that there would be no disturbing results from the reformation of the tariff. But I wish to say while upon that point that the whole revision of the tariff, so far as it has gone, has been not only a dangerous one, but it

has been one purely of expediency, one answering in a faint way to the pledges that they are unable to redeem, but that they promised to redeem, and redeem, probably, at the cost of this country. Now, Sir, I wish to call attention for a few moments to what will be the effect of the policy of these hon. gentlemen as regards this two-sided shield that is held up to the people. One is that the people are told that notwithstanding that taxation of this country has been materially increased, there is a prospect at least of a substantial reduction in taxation from what is called schedule D. But let me point out that the hon. gentlemen showed great ingenuity, I admit a good deal of ingenuity, in the plan that they laid down for themselves, and one that they hoped to deceive the people with. The very first thing that the hon. gentlemen did was to impose an increased tax of at least one-fifth upon the class of goods that come into this country from Great Britain. The hon. gentlemen raised them from 30 to 35 per cent and from 20 to 25 per cent, and so on, and they prepared themselves for a a standard in order that they might have a chance of knocking it down. Now, let me call attention to this fact. Suppose there was a large portion of the goods, and there will be a large portion of English goods coming into this country, the most that people could hope for under any circumstances, is that as they have increased the duty by one-fifth, they will be able to reduce it by one-fourth. The most that people could get out of it would be that they would have a difference of one-twentieth. Now, I am sure that hon. gentlemen, letting that stand alone by itself, cannot boast very much over it. But there is another question. Now, let me point out that the class of goods that come in with a reduction from England, particularly so far as the consuming classes in this country are concerned, is that class of goods that are not consumed by the masses of the people, but are consumed by a class of people who have wealth, who have money more plentifully, and who are better able to buy. Now, they have a decided advantage. I wish to call attention for a moment to a few items of that kind. I will take the item of silk and silk manufactures, condensing them. The fine clothes, carpets, curtains, embroideries and other fine goods, imported from England and coming in under that schedule, would be $6,699,000, while from the United States and other countries there would be only about half a million dollars' worth. Now, that means that the poorer people of this country are obliged to pay taxes for the wealthier class, that is the inevitable consequence of a policy of that kind; because the high-priced goods, the goods that are only consumed by the wealthier classes, come in with a reduction, while the goods imported from other countries and the United States are a class that are consumed entirely by those less able to pay duties. Now, I will consider the effect of this policy upon the farmers and the great consuming classes in this country, for whom hon. gentlemen have had such great solicitude in the past. Why, Sir, they were the champions of the farmers and the poorer classes; they were constantly computing the heavy duties that were imposed upon the consumers of cheap goods in this country, and they went to the country largely upon a cry of that kind. Now, I will mention a few articles in which the farmer is particularly concerned, taking the whole class of farming implements. There will be cultivators, seed drills, hay forks, harrows harvesters, horse rakes, mowing machines, ploughs, plough plates and moulds, rakes, reapers, scythes, spades and shovels, and all other agricultural implements; nails and spikes, wrought hardware, locks of all kinds, pumps, sewing machines and all other kinds of machinery; woodenware, trees and shrubs, seeds, garden and field, and bituminous coal that is largely consumed now in Canada in consequence of the disappearance of other fuel. Why, Sir, all these articles are consumed by the farmers, they are the principal articles that the farmers buy, they are those that constitute the great burden upon the farmers of this country, and they are the class of goods that come in almost exclusively from the United States. The policy of the Conservative party is that they should be produced in this country, but if they have to come from a foreign country, if we were unable to shut them out in the past as effectually as we desired to do, then is not the difficulty multiplied as one could well imagine, when we find that the poorer classes must pay the higher rate of duty on that class of goods. Now, what is the amount of all those articles that come from England? Of all those articles, something like $304,000 worth came from England, while from the United States they amount to considerably over six millions. I am sure hon. gentlemen cannot close their eyes to the fact that if they were to apply the schedule, if they were to confine it alone to England, as they profess, and as they state now that they are going to do, I am not prepared to say that that is going to be the case, but if it were the case, and if it were applied alone to England, no greater injury could be inflicted upon the poorer classes, more particularly the farmers in this country, than to subject them to the burden of taxation that hon. gentlemen are proposing to place upon the people of this country. No policy seems to me is so just as the one that leaves it a voluntary matter to every taxpayer to be not only a taxpayer but at the same time a tax collector, paying taxes to the extent to which he is able and willing to consume goods.

But let me turn to another phase of the question with respect to the position hon. gentlemen have taken upon schedule B. So

far as the resolution before the House goes, it will let in other countries as well as England. The resolution does not specify England, and the Government may bring in other countries or invite them to come in under that schedule. What would be the position supposing the United States, Germany and other countries competing with Canada were permitted to send in their goods under that schedule? Such concessions could only have the effect of destroying Canadian industries, and driving away the people employed in them. We are told that the tide of immigration would at once flow to Canada, that an impetus would be at once given to business. For what purpose would people come here, if there were no manufacturing industries and little employment obtainable? It is clear that capital and employment would diminish under a policy of this kind. It is almost impossible for the people here now to drag out an existence, and it would be strange indeed if people in England and other countries could not understand the question, and the consequences of such a policy being adopted in this country, or at all events evidence would be soon forthcoming in this country as to the impracticable nature of the tariff.

With respect to the question of preferential trade, which is involved by the resolutions now before the House, I may say that this is no new question in Canada. It is a question respecting which hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House have been anxious. It cannot be monopolized by hon. gentlemen opposite or considered as a question on which political parties have been divided. I believe that the sentiment in the Liberal party as well as the Conservative party has been favourable to preferential trade.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLANCY. I want the hon. gentleman's "hear, hear" when I now say that the Liberal party placed itself in a position in the past from which it was utterly impossible to approach the question in this light. They advocated other means of relieving the ills of the country. Their remedy was not preferential trade; they took a position which put preferential trade out of the question. They adopted a policy of unrestricted reciprocity. I have evidence of this from the mouth of an hon. gentleman, a colleague of the First Minister and occupying a high and distinguished position. I refer to a letter written by Sir Oliver Mowat to Hon. Alexander Mackenzie. It was after the defeat of 1891 at the general elections of the Liberal party, and grew out of the policy the party then pursued, that policy on which Mr. Blake was unwilling to follow his party and to which some reference is made in this letter, but which I will not trouble the House with to-night. This is what Sir Oliver Mowat had to say on this question:

> At the last general Dominion elections we lost some votes in Ontario, from a fear, created by Conservative management, that Liberal leaders were looking to political union; and many more Liberal votes would have been lost but for the confidence of Liberals generally that the charge was false.

So much as a matter of party tactics and the policy of the Liberal party. That hon. gentleman came from Toronto to Ottawa, and he brought his policy and his warning with him. Further he said:

> As a mere matter of party tactics, therefore, and in addition to all other considerations, it is our policy to see that our party shows itself on all occasions to be as true to the British connections, and as little disposed to surrender this great Dominion to our neighbours, as the most British of Conservatives are.

I am not sure but that this letter was the birth of the preferential trade policy, or at all events gave rise to it, and followed the advent of the introduction of new blood in the Liberal party at Ottawa.

There was another fact that stood in the way, and which yet stands in the way of the Prime Minister of to-day, and which justifies the position of the Conservative party, and that is the speech made by the Prime Minister, in Boston. The Conservatives have been rather ridiculed and sometimes shouted at whenever they quote from Mr. Laurier's speech at Boston. It is always said that this is done to injure him; but this expression of opinion comes from the Minister of Justice. This is what Mr. Laurier said:

> In the very nature of things, from the sole fact that Canada is growing, developing and progressing, the interests of Canada and the interests of England must be divergent, and whenever the interests of Canada are on one side and the interests of England are on the other side, the only consideration to me is what is best for Canada, leaving it to the people of England to consider, and do, what is best for England. This is not a question of sentiment, and, for my part, I am firmly convinced that the economic interests of Canada lie with this continent, and it is on the broad basis of continental freedom of trade that I place the question.

We have been told that this preferential trade policy has been most favourably received by the people of England, that they are grateful for the position taken by the Liberal party of Canada, that it is a duty on the part of the Canadian people to make some concessions, and the Government have given some evidence of the loyalty of our people. I make no apology for saying that I believe that the intelligent policy for the people of this country to pursue is not one of sentiment. Sentiment is very good in its place and we are as desirous of being moved as much by sentiment as any enlightened people should be moved. This is entirely a question of dollars and cents, and it is absolutely distinct from sentiment. The concessions offered by the Liberal party to the people of England have not been de-

manded by them. Great Britain does not ask her colonies to give her something for nothing. Very true, the English press and the English business men, and members of the Imperial Parliament, laud this proposition, and they laud it because they are anxious that not only Canada, but that any country on the face of the globe should give them trade advantages. The business men of England are too shrewd not to recognize that this proposal of the Liberal Government here, gives them valuable concessions. They are not applauding the Liberal party of Canada on the ground of patriotism, but they are applauding them on the grounds of their giving advantages to English trade in the Canadian market. That is not true patriotism, and it is not a true Canadian view either. It is a false proposition for hon. gentlemen opposite to say, that we should hold out the olive branch to the motherland. England demands no such thing from Canada, and if she did make such a demand I am prepared to say, for my part, that it would be hardly fair. It is not a progressive proposition for any one to make. What do hon. gentlemen opposite propose to do? They propose to open the markets of Canada to the manufacturers and workmen of England, and for that they get absolutely nothing in return, because England has nothing to give. England cannot afford under present circumstances, to give us any special privileges, and, Sir, neither can we afford to give England any special privileges. I say that the people of Canada would show that they were not an enlightened and progressive people, if they were prepared to shape their fiscal policy upon the ground of sentiment.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Hear, hear.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend says "hear, hear." Let me make myself perfectly clear, and I am sure I will have his approval again. I say, that when it is a question of the vital interests of the people of Canada, when it is a question of destroying the industries of this country, we should not allow sentiment to enter into the calculation. I should like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, if he thinks that sentiment should be considered in a matter of this kind? I am sure the hon. gentleman would not make any such assertion. Sir, this proposition of hon. gentlemen opposite, will have the effect in this country of favouring the wealthier classes and of taxing more heavily the poorer and the larger consuming classes. Hon. gentlemen opposite have done this for the mere sake of waving the banneret of preferential trade to England. Hon. gentlemen opposite may be applauded in England, but I tell them that they will not have the plaudits of the people of Canada.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Your leader advocated that.

Mr. CLANCY. Let me tell my hon. friend what my leader does advocate. He has advocated in the past, and I hope he will continue to advocate in the future, an intelligent and progressive policy. What was the position taken by the leader of the Conservative party in the past in regard to preferential trade with England? Under the Conservative policy, preferential trade did not mean that Canada was to make all the sacrifices, but it meant, that within the Empire, we should have some advantages that foreign countries would not have.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). The Conservative party were to be sturdy beggars, giving nothing in return for what they got from England.

Mr. CLANCY. There are none so blind as those who do not wish to see. I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Wood) to consider for a moment what advantages his party are giving under their preferential resolution, and then to consider, what they are getting in return. The policy of the Conservative party was, that Great Britair and her colonies should enter into such trade arrangements as would be mutually beneficial to all, and that could only be accomplished by concessions on all sides. The business men of Canada never thought of preferential trade on any other ground, and I am sure that the business men of Canada will not be carried away by the proposition made now, although no doubt hon. gentlemen opposite hope they will. I would like to ask my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, why does he not make more concessions to England, if he thinks it right to make one. If this is a question of sentiment, then sentiment is very cheap, and gentlemen opposite can go on and do a great deal more for England. There is absolutely no limit to the extent to which you can go in the matter of sentiment. The Conservative party base their policy on a sounder ground. We say that concessions can only be made to the extent that we get an equivalent in some direct or indirect manner. I repeat that the people of Canada cannot afford to make any concessions to any country, without obtaining some compensating advantages.

I wish now, Mr. Speaker, to refer briefly to the proposition which confers such extraordinary powers on one individual, to give force and effect to this preferential resolution. I venture to say, Sir, that no Government in any enlightened country, under our modern notions of parliamentary government, ever came to a free Parliament, asking such extraordinary powers as the Liberal Government ask for I think that resolution. Members on both sides of the House will agree with me in that. The Parliament of Canada is for the first time in its history asked to surrender its power, and to place it in the hands of one man. If such a proposition were carried to its logical conclusion,

it would mean that the conduct of affairs in this country, legislative and executive, might be delegated to Cabinet Ministers, and that there would be no necessity to call the representatives of the people together to sanction their acts. I hope that the people of Canada are too intelligent to consent to a thing of that sort. Judging from the acts of this Ministry up to the present time, I do not think that the people of this country have been inspired with sufficient confidence to warrant them placing this power under the control of the Government. Sir, the Government ask for a power which should not be placed in the hands of any Government, whether it be Liberal or Conservative. It is too important a question to be decided by other than the representatives of the people in Parliament, and too important to be left to the judgment of the present Cabinet, even in the light of all the wisdom they claim credit for. If the majority of the members of this House place such an extraordinary power under the will and wisdom of the Controller of Customs. I say that it means that our notions of parliamentary government in Canada have gone. It means that the members of this House have been willing to surrender a right which no Parliament should surrender—a surrender so dangerous and so far-reaching in its effects that I am sure the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches will hesitate before asking it from the members of this House, even on their own side. Why, Sir, with such a power in their hands, the Government could make commercial treaties with the United States, with Germany, with Belgium, or with any other country, without calling Parliament ? The executive here in Ottawa are to be the judges. At their own sweet will they might bind this country, and do it untold injury. Even if they were prompted with the most honest motives, I say that the wisdom of no set of men is so great as to warrant them in assuming a power of that kind, a power which should not be placed in the hands of any executive in any country having responsible government.

There is another provision of this measure which is equally dangerous. Hon. gentlemen have discovered, since they got to the Treasury benches, a means of curing combines. When they were out of office, they never thought of such a thing. My hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) did perhaps more than any other man in Canada in striking at what is an admitted evil. Nobody pretends to justify combines. There is a complete consensus of opinion in Canada that combines should not exist, and that every effective means should be adopted to prevent them and bring them to an end. Having said that, let us adopt not only a rational means, but an honest means, of dealing with them. My hon. friend from West York put on the Statute-book an Act dealing with them which may be tardy, but which is the only safe method in our enlightened age; and he has pointed out in this House, more than once, that the present Minister of Justice, whose duty it was to enforce the law in the province of Ontario as the Attorney General of that province, turned his back upon it. He was never friendly to Dominion laws while in the Government of Ontario. He has stated on more than one occasion that it was not especially his duty to enforce federal laws. Though he had the constitution of the courts and all the necessary machinery in his hands, he made no effort in that direction. I do not know whether that hon. gentleman has insured the present method of striking at combines. If it were proposed to place in the hands of a Conservative Government such a power, these hon. gentlemen would justly make their protests ring through Canada against such a proposition. Even Liberal papers, though saying that combines should be struck down wherever possible, have raised the warning that this would be a very unsafe power in the hands of a corrupt Government. Well, if anything is dangerous in the hands of a corrupt Government, it should not be placed in the hands of any Government. The belief that a Government will administer an Act properly and honestly is no security to the people. We want the security of the laws. We want a better security than the profession or the outward practices of any Government. In some circumstances you must trust men, but this is not a case where you should be obliged to trust men. This is a case of taking an extraordinary power by means of which hon. gentlemen can hold the hatchet over every honest manufacturer of this country. They could go to a manufacturer and say: "You have combined." The manufacturer might say: "No, there is nothing in that." They might reply: "Never mind, we are on to you, and if you do not support us or put up for us, we will come down on you."

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, they would not do that.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend says they would not do that, but I am sure that the people of Canada would not wish them to have the power to do it. I am afraid that some tolls would have to be paid, and that if they were not paid, a man's business would have to go to the winds. I say the people want better security than that, and I doubt whether even this Parliament will commit itself to so extraordinary a proposition as to place so dangerous a power in the hands of any Government in this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite have not defended that proposition so far. The hon. Minister of Finance might be excused for not referring to it, for he had a long speech to make; but I doubt whether hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to give up their rights as members of Parliament, and to

hand over that extraordinary power even to a Liberal Government, knowing well, as they do, that if the Conservative party came into office, they could not, if consistent, do other than charge them with having the power to coerce any manufacturer in this country and make him their slave.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have only to thank the House for the very patient hearing they have given me, and I hope that hon. gentlemen will see their way to withdraw or modify that proposition. The House is a unit in favour of striking down every combine in Canada; but the House, I hope, is not a unit in favour of adopting the means prescribed by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, in rising to address the House on this very important occasion, let me say that there is one thing we can claim, and that is that this is the tariff of the Finance Minister and his colleagues, and not the tariff of the Manufacturers' Association of the province of Ontario. The ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) has stated that during the past nine months a flaming sword has been held over the heads of the business men of Canada by the present Government. Does he know that a fiery sword was held over him when he was trying to revise his tariff in 1894, and that it was wielded with effect, for the next morning after that tariff was brought down to the House, a clerical error was found in the items of democrat wagons and starch, and before the tariff was passed, there were over a hundred more items discovered in which there were clerical errors. But not one single clerical error has been found in the present tariff during the time of this debate.

I have been very much amused by the various lines of argument advanced during this debate. The first thing we were told was that this tariff was illegal and unconstitutional, such a tariff as would not have been brought down by any Government in any civilized country. But that line seems to have been abandoned, and I have been wondering whether or not the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) has got new light. The line now taken is that we are giving something to England for nothing. Can it be possible that the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) has taken advice and has learned that the Government are perfectly correct in the position they have taken, that this preferential tariff does not affect the favoured-nation-clause in any respect, and that it can only take effect as regards the nations which enjoy the advantages of that clause, when they give Canada corresponding advantages?

I was rather amused at the slick way in which the hon. gentleman who last spoke tried to get around the reduction of duty on binder twine. He said the farmers were not going to be benefited by our taking off the duty of 12½ per cent. Well, if that duty were of no benefit to the manufacturers, why should it remain there? I say that we ought to get rid of every duty which gives any opportunity to anybody to take an unfair advantage of the community; and I further say that the manufacturers of binder twine have not been injured, because not only the raw material which went into the composition of that article, but the oil, coal and all the machinery for making it comes in free, so that in reality a benefit has been conferred upon the manufacturers. When hon. gentlemen opposite talk of binder twine, they ought to think of that page in the history of binder twine made in the Kingston Penitentiary, which was laid bare to the House last session, and which ought to make every Conservative blush with shame.

Then we were told that it was unworthy the dignity of a country like Canada to bring down a tariff of this description. And we were criticised for the small amount of duty taken off coal oil. Well, we know it took a considerable length of time to bring the tariff up to what it was under the late Government, and that it would be in the interests of the country that that tariff should be removed slowly and gently. As one who has been a farmer for the last forty-three years, I accept this instalment in good faith, as the beginning of the end, and I believe that the Government will do yet all it has promised. The Government never promised to take the duties off all at once; but they promised to give us free trade as hon. gentlemen opposite say it was given in England. How was it given in England? The agitation for the abolition of the corn laws began in 1824. The first line of duties, apart from the corn laws, was removed in 1845, when the duties on over 300 articles were reduced or abolished. In 1846 another list of duties was abolished, and so it went on until 1874 when the last duties were removed. Give the Government of Canada an equal length of time, and I have no doubt they will gradually pull down the tower of high duties built in this country, and in so doing will act both in the interests of the people and of the manufacturers. Why, in England the very same cries went out that are going out here to-day. There the alarm was raised that the people of Germany and France and other countries would manufacture the goods that would be consumed in England, but the events have falsified these predictions, and to-day England is one of the most prosperous countries on the face of the earth.

Now, let us take that question of rice that is so much talked about. 13,000,000 pounds of rice came into this country, and the duty paid on that rice, which was to be cleaned, amounted to $40,000, because there was 3-10ths of a cent of duty only, and that left nearly 1 cent per pound upon the rice to the manufacturer. But now that the duty is ¾ of a cent per pound,

it only leaves half a cent per pound to the manufacturer. What is the effect of that? Instead of $40,000, there are $99,000 duties collected, and that extra $59,000 goes into the treasury of the Dominion and not into the hands of those who cleaned the rice. That is what we want, we want every industry kept in its proper position, and we want the treasury to get all the money to which it is entitled, and which should not go into the pockets of the manufacturers.

With respect to the statement that we have given something for nothing to Great Britain, I asked hon. gentlemen opposite what they would do. Is it not a fact that, when the Intercolonial Commission sat at Ottawa, a resolution was introduced before that commission asking Great Britain to put a duty on the imports of foreign breadstuffs in order to protect the colonies? Lord Jersey was there as a representative of the British Government. What did he say? He told the commission that only 17½ per cent of the trade of Great Britain came from the self-governing colonies, and if he took in the Crown colonies, the proportion did not exceed 25 per cent. Of breadstuffs, only $29,000,000 came from the colonies, while over $140,000,000 came from foreign countries, and Canada some ten years ago only supplied 3·2 per cent of the breadstuffs imported into the British Islands. I believe to-day that she supplies something like 5 per cent of the breadstuffs that Britain requires. Is it to be expected that Great Britain would impose a tax upon the food of the people of that country for the sake of a paltry 5 per cent of breadstuffs from Canada. Why, Lord Jersey told them plainly he could not be a party to any such arrangement.

Now, the preferential part of the tariff with Great Britain is nothing new. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) introduced a resolution into this House that the duty upon British goods should be reduced, and hon. gentlemen opposite voted it down. I believe that the only way we will ever get any advantage in the British market is the way the Government of to-day have taken, that of giving preferential trade to Great Britain. We can now ask Britain to give us some advantage, if possible in her market, but it required a considerable amount of audacity for a Canadian Government to go to the British Government and ask them to abolish those treaties containing the most-favoured-nation clause without having taken some steps to show that there was an absolute necessity for their abolition. The Government of Canada has to-day taken a position that is looked upon all over the British Islands favourably by all classes of the community. We have been told that that is not surprising because we are giving something for nothing, but that something which we are giving for nothing is something that will yet redound to the benefit of Canada to an enormous extent. I believe it is the entering of the thin edge of the wedge and which will bring about a condition of prosperity in Canada such as we have not seen for the last twenty-five years.

Then hon. gentlemen opposite speak about agricultural implements. Well, is it not a fact that these have been reduced to a considerable extent to the farmer. I have here a list that shows the benefits that the farmer is getting from the present tariff. My hon. friend who has just resumed his seat (Mr. Clancy) asked what the farmers would say in respect to those duties. We have been told by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) and by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that there was no reduction in agricultural implements. On the contrary, there is a greater reduction under the present tariff than that there was under the tariff that was passed in 1894. The late Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) seems to have wakened up from his Rip-Van-Winkle sleep. In 1895 he told us that the farmer paid none of these duties. The farmer, according to the hon. gentleman, took his wheat to the mill and had it ground, and carried home his flour, without paying a tax. And he built his house of timber grown in his own country, and so paid no tax. And even this farmer's agricultural implements were to be made out of timber. The hon. gentleman did not know that the country was in a progressive condition until he was awakened out of his dream by the present Finance Minister when he described so graphically the progress made in this country in all sorts of manufacturing. And now the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) tells us that there is no relaxation of duties in favour of the farmer, that the only relaxation that was given under the tariff of 1894 when agricultural implements were reduced to 20 per cent. But that reduction was entirely nullified by the fact that the Government employed an agent (Mr. Hawthorne), the manager of one of the biggest hardware manufacturing industries in Canada to go to the United States and learn the prices at which they were selling goods. The result of that gentleman's mission was that the invoice prices of goods coming from the United States were increased for duty purposes from 15 to 30 per cent, thus neutralizing the reduction of the duty. Here is a list of implements on which the duty was 35 per cent and is now 25 per cent: Axes, scythes, hay knives, forks, rakes, land-rollers, straw cutters, root cutters, pulpers, fanning mills, potato diggers, hay tedders, hay loaders and horse forks, scufflers and hoes, post hole diggers, picks, corn planters, corn cutters and ditching machines. Then there are such machines as threshing engines, separators, horse-powers, and windmills, all farmers' machinery which have been reduced from 30 per cent to 25 per cent under the new tariff. Many of these implements are of as much

importance to the farmer to-day, when he is farming upon an advanced system as we have got to do as are the implements the duty on which was reduced in 1894.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman say what the imports of these articles amount to ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Under a 35 per cent tariff, they could not have been much.

Mr. CLANCY. They were all made in Canada.

Mr. McMILLAN. No ; I myself have got a tread-mill and a straw-cutter that I had to get from the United States and pay freight and duty on because I could not get them to suit me made here. Whether these are made in the country or not, the effect of this reduction is to reduce the price to the farmer and that is what we believe should have been done long ago.

Then I was amused when my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) got up and asked us what would be the result if the United States and other countries should take advantage of this preferential tariff in the same manner as England did. I would answer him with the speech of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) who dwelt upon the effect of this reduction of duty upon our trade with the United States. He evidently had in his mind the idea that this new tariff brought us a step nearer to reciprocity with the United States. These hon. gentlemen think these things, but they try to conceal them from the people. I see my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) smile. He told us that the farmers get no benefit from this tariff. He spoke out of the fullness of his ignorance, trying to mislead the people whom he represents. No doubt he counts on the gullability of those who sent him here as their representative. In this speech of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), there is a large list of goods which he fears will be imported into Canada from the United States under this tariff. This will accomplish much what Sir John Macdonald told us the National Policy was to do. One of the great reasons for adopting the National Policy was to secure reciprocity with the United States. I believe the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) told us that it would compel the Government of the United States, within few years to give us reciprocity. But it was like a good many other of the prophecies made by the hon. gentleman. We have been told of late that for a Government to take the reins of power upon false promises was one of the worst things that could happen to a country. If ever a Government assumed office under false promises, it was the Government that came in in 1878. One of the promises made by the present leader of the Opposition on behalf of that Government was that the country should be run upon a smaller expenditure than was deemed necessary by the Government of the late Alexander Mackenzie, that they had run the country upon a smaller expenditure before and were prepared to do it in the future. We were told also that for the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway not one cent was to be taken out of the public treasury permanently ; all the money was to be returned. By 1890 we were to have a million population in the North-west and 360,000,000 of bushels of wheat was to be exported out of that country. These were promises that were never fulfilled. Again we were promised that the surplus products of the farm were to be consumed here in Canada, even our butter and eggs and small fruit. This was to be accomplised by the great increase in the industries of the country. Has that increase taken place ? When the duty was put up on iron we were told that we should have iron furnaces at Weller's Bay, Toronto, Kingston and elsewhere and an increase of 20,000 in the number of our workmen, and if they went on and manufactured rails and steel billets and hardware and other things, that additional population would be increased three-fold, making 300,000 of a population dependent on our iron industries. And the fact is that we have one little iron furnace in Hamilton, and that is not due to the National Policy. We were told that the putting on of the iron duty would represent a burden of $500,000 imposed upon the people, but it was to be wiped out by taking the duty off coal. All these things proved delusive, and I am astonished to find hon. gentlemen decrying the present Government on the ground of unfulfilled promises. I feel and know that those who occupied seats upon the Treasury benches in the late Government recognized in their inmost souls that the Government that rules Canada to-day are fulfilling as rapidly as possible the promises they have made to the farmers, the manufacturers, and the people of this country. I have had communications from western portions of Ontario that all classes are accepting this as one of the brightest days in the history of Canada for the last twenty years. And let me repeat that this is the tariff of the Minister of Finance and not the tariff of the Manufacturers' Association. I am sure the late Finance Minister will be happy to hear the large amount of assistance that he got in framing the last tariff, and the way the flaming sword was held up over his head at the time that the tariff was before the House. Let me read from the annual report of the Manufacturers' Association, so that the fact cannot be gainsaid that the Manufacturers' Association influenced the Government of this country in framing the tariff of 1894 :

> In accordance with the usage of this association, previous to your last meeting the tariff committee of the association, in the discharge of their duty, entered upon a close and careful examination of all matters brought before it by members of the association relating to the tariff.

The situation at that time was critical. An excitement, amounting to a furore, had been worked up by the enemies of protection, and some who had previously declared themselves staunch adherents of the National Policy, weakened. It was evident, however, that some changes in the tariff were imperative, and that, if they were not inaugurated by the friends of protection, the Government could not survive——

A plain indication that the Conservative Government is an organized hypocrisy, as it was once described in England by the late Mr. Disraeli, because they never intended to reduce the tariff, they only intended to deceive the country.

—that the enemies of protection would accede to power.

It was under these circumstances that the tariff committee entered upon their labours, having the counsel and assistance of many of the most experienced members of the association,——

It was not a meeting of Ministers in Council that rigged up the tariff of 1894.

—the result of which was the embodiment of their views in a communication to the Finance Minister (a copy of which is here before you), which elicited from him a kindly letter, in which he alluded to it as a well-prepared brief in which all the matters therein discussed had been done full justice. Perhaps it might be going too far to even surmise the effect these recommendations of your tariff committee to the Minister may have had in the final arrangement of the tariff; but it is but an act of justice to the committee to direct attention to the large number of changes that were made in the tariff along the lines suggested in the recommendations, and that in many instances the language used in both are substantially identical. This is particularly noticeable as regards the iron schedule, the duties upon textiles, the duties upon drugs, chemicals, alcoholic preparations, &c., as well as upon an extended list of miscellaneous articles, and large and most important additions to the list of non-dutiable articles. It is also to be noticed that, in many instances where the recommendations suggested that no changes be made in the duties upon articles therein enumerated, no changes were made.

What credit do the Government and Finance Minister deserve for bringing down a tariff like this to the House when the manufacturers of this country that entered into an association to influence the Government in framing their tariff? Let me say that I am happy to be able to state that many honest and intelligent manufacturers would not enter that association or have anything to do with it, but those who did enter it used such language as I have been reading to you with respect to the revision of the tariff, and those who did not agree with them were to be hung up by the neck, and that was to be the end of them. A statement of that kind was made at a meeting of the Manufacturers' Association:

One of the objects of this association is to influence public opinion to appreciate the necessity of the imposition of adequate duties upon imported products by which to protect Canadian labour.

Mr. McMILLAN.

Now, I think there is another statement somewhere with respect to this association by an ex-president. He says:

A popular superstition is, that the association is the vehicle by which an immense fund is collected to corrupt the electorate, than which nothing could be further from the truth. We have in the past, and it is to be hoped will in the future, devote any small surplus of our membership fees to spreading the truth by means of campaign literature and campaign speeches, following the manner, but not the matter, of the English Cobden Club.

What did the English Cobden Club do when they were agitating against the corn laws. They sent subscription lists throughout England and got £250,000 subscribed, so that if they were following the manner of the Cobden Club, the first thing they did was to bring influence to bear upon the Government as well through their literature as by the advice they gave the Finance Minister. Thank God, Mr. Speaker, we are out of the hands of the combinsters in Canada today. No wonder that their friends fight a hard battle for them when they see that in all likelihood a law will be put upon the Statute-book of Canada that will put an end to these combines. They said that law of a different description should be passed. Well, they had been in office since 1878, and after that Combine Committee sat, a Bill was brought into this House which was afterwards killed in the Senate. They have had ample time to bring in another law, but have they ever attempted to do so? No, and this explains why the funds of that association was brought to bear upon them so that they would legislate in their interest and not in the interest of the country.

Now, there is one question that I want to take up specially, and that is the question of corn. We have been told by the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Sproule) and by the hon. gentleman who spoke last, what the effect would be of allowing free corn to come into this country. The hon. member for East Grey stated that in 1877 so large an amount of corn came into this country that the Government had to take hold and pass the National Policy in order to protect the farmers. Now, let me say that after the National Policy had been in existence in Canada for four years, there was a commission appointed that went to Chicago, that went to Toronto, that went to Montreal, and collected all the evidence they possibly could with respect to the influence that the Nationl Policy had had upon the agricultural interests of Canada. Let me say that I was astonished when I first came to Ottawa and called for the Sessional Papers for the session in which that report was made, and the Sessional Papers of the next year, but I found that the statements with respect to coarse grains were eliminated, or had never been entered on the Sessional Papers, because they were not

favourable to the Government of the day. I went and got a copy of the original report. The Trade and Navigation Returns show that in 1877, the very year that my hon. friend mentioned, there were 8,260,079 bushels of Indian corn brought into Canada and entered for consumption, of which Ontario took 6,719,000 bushels. Now what was the price of oats and the price of barley and coarse grains at that time, in Chicago and Toronto? Oats in Toronto, as shown by the report of the Commission in 1877, were 43 cents a bushel; in Chicago they were 31¾ cents, a difference in favour of Toronto of 11½ cents. When we come to 1881, how much corn came into Canada for consumption during that year? Just 2,043,000 bushels, as against 8,260,000 bushels four years previously. The price of oats in Toronto was 39¾ cents per bushel; the price in Chicago was 37 83-100, or within about 2 cents per bushel of the Toronto price. At this time 2,000,000 bushels of corn were brought into the country annually. Let me now give the prices when 8,000,000 bushels of corn were imported. They were as follows:—

—	Toronto Price.	Chicago Price.	Difference.
Rye, 1877...	70c.	$ 62¾c.	7¼c. in favour of Toronto.
" 1881...	89	91·75	2¾c. in favour of Chicago.
Barley, 1877.	73¾	58 4/16	15c. in favour of Toronto.
" 1881.	91	1.09	18c. in favour of Chicago.

I have another statement showing how the National Policy works injuriously to the farmers as regards coarse grains. Take the years 1874-75-76-77 and 1878; the average price of oats was 33 cents, on October 20. The average price in 1878-79 and 1881 was the same, although a larger quantity of corn had been consumed during the first period and a smaller quantity during the latter period. The average price of barley during the first five years mentioned was 88 cents, and it was only 80 cents during the second period. The hon. members will notice that there was this reduction in the price of barley when a smaller quantity of corn was being consumed, the date of this report being November 20. The average price of oats in June during the years 1874-75-76-77 and 1878 was 45 cents; the average price at the same dates for 1879-1881 was 40 cents. These figures shows conclusively that the price of oats has not been injured by the large importation of corn into Canada, and the same remark applies to barley.

I take a statement from the "Globe" of March 29th, 1897. The price of oats was quoted at 22 cents in Toronto and 22 cents in Buffalo, corn being then quoted at 27 cents in Buffalo. A farmer sells 50 bushels of oats at 22 cents and receives $11. He buys corn at 27 cents a bushel and for the $11 he obtains 40 bushels and 20 pounds of corn. The 50 bushels of oats at 34 pounds per bushel give 1,700 pounds of feed. Forty bushels and 20 pounds of corn at 56 pounds to the bushel give a total of 2,260 pounds of feed. If you deduct the 1,700 pounds from the 2,260 pounds, there is a balance of 560 pounds of feed. One bushel of oats being equivalent to 34 pounds of feed, there is a gain of 10 bushels of corn, which is equivalent to the value of $2.70. I have already stated that western corn has been selling at 18 cents and oats at from 15 cents to 18 cents in Windsor. Will any hon. member who knows anything about farming tell me why a farmer should not sell a portion of his oats and buy corn, because it is well known that better results are obtained from a variety of feed. So why should not the farmers have the privilege of selling their oats and buying corn in return on the best possible terms. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) stated the other day that corn sold in Toronto at 25½ cents, and oats were selling at 26 and 27 cents. Under such circumstances, would not a farmer be foolish if he did not sell a portion of his oats and purchase corn. I consider that one of the greatest benefits that can be conferred upon the farmer is to give him cheap feed, and I know of no other feed that can be obtained that will give better results for stock than corn. The day has come when every farmer in the country has to economize as much as possible and I think the farmer will benefit by selling part of his coarse grains and purchasing corn, because we must return to the land all we take out of it and even a little more if possible. In my opinion no greater benefit could have been conferred on the farmers of Ontario, Quebec, and the other provinces, than that of giving them free corn. The Government have taken the position that they were justified in favouring the farmers against the distillers. Formerly the distiller obtained free corn but not the farmer; the distiller obtained practically a rebate on his whisky, while the farmer had no advantage in regard to the beef he exported. It has been stated that the farmers will purchase corn and sell it to distillers. I am glad to say that the statement was not made by a farmer but by a member of some other class of the community, for I do not believe any farmer would take such a step. The farmers want a fair field and no favour, for we believe we are able to compete with the people of any nation. Britain has been referred to, and reference has been made to the distressed condition of the agricultural classes.

Mr. CLANCY. Before the hon. gentleman proceeds further will he tell this House whether he grows corn or buys it.

Mr. McMILLAN. I sell a portion of my oats and buy corn, and have done so for many years. I cannot ripen corn, but I raise a large quantity and use it in silos. I have done exactly what I have advised other farmers to do. I have heard a great deal about injury being done by free trade to England. I never heard such a slander as was uttered by a prominent member of the Conservative party with respect to England, I mean the hon. member for Pictou. Here is what the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) said:

> What is the whole policy of the motherland to-day? Driven from the civilized markets of the world; steadily and every year finding their output to these markets decreasing, they spend millions on their navy and millions on their army to force their wares, and their goods, and their merchandise into the uncivilized markets of the world, which they are endeavouring to occupy, to settle and to control, driven there by the deadly effect upon them of the tremendous competition coming from the protected nations in the rest of the world.

Referring to the present Minister of Marine, he says:

> The hon. gentleman himself laughs at the idea that Great Britain is the best market for most of our products.

Sir that is a slander perpetrated on England. There is not one scintilla of truth in the whole statement. England has not been driven from the civilized nations of the earth, but on the contrary her trade is daily increasing. In 1886 the total imports of Great Britain amounted to £350,000,000 sterling, and her total exports amounted to £269,000,000 sterling, or a total of £619,000,000 sterling. In 1895 Englands imports rose to £418,000,000 sterling and her exports to £286,000,000 sterling, making a total trade of £703,000,000 sterling. This was notwithstanding the reduction in values and the severe commercial depression that has been felt in all civilized countries. I saw a statement in the "Citizen" this morning, that the trade of Great Britain has risen from £703,000,000 sterling to £738,000,000 sterling this year. That shows that England is still leading the van among the nations of the earth, and that she is still holding her own. She is holding her own even with Germany, and although she may not be increasing her trade in the same percentage, yet she is increasing it by larger amounts than Germany. These gentlemen opposite are the men who talk about loyalty to the British Empire, and who taunt gentlemen on this side with being disloyal. Was there ever a more disloyal sentiment uttered on the floor of Parliament, than that uttered by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) with respect to the British Empire. I see the hon. gentleman is laughing, but he laughs at the wrong side of his mouth sometimes. Those gentlemen opposite have attempted to delude the people of this country. They told the farmers that they paid no taxes, but the farmers knew to the contrary. The late Finance Minister stated in North Ontario during an election campaign, that all the butter bought at 20 cents per pound had been sold and all the money returned to the Treasury without the loss of one cent to the country. But that same gentleman had to answer me across the floor of the House afterwards that they only received 14·38 cents. No wonder that his party considered him an able Finance Minister, because it must have taken some sort of financering and legerdemain to make 20 cents a pound and expenses, out of 14·38 cents. That is the way the late Government tried to delude the people of this country. Long may the farmers bless the day when the hon. members who now occupy the treasury benches were returned to power. When the history of Canada is written, the tariff Bill of our noble leader. Hon. Wilfrid Laurier and his Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), and of Sir Richard Cartwright, and of Mr. Paterson, the Controller of Customs, and of all the gentlemen who assisted them will go down to posterity as the dawn of a brighter day in the history of Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I may say, that the salt industry hardly receives justice in the tariff as it stands at the present time.

Mr. FOSTER. Ah, ah.

Mr. McMILLAN. You may say "Ah, ah," but you were the father of the present tariff on that industry, and you have got to father it, whatever it is. I may say that there has been more money lost in the salt industry in the county I represent, than was ever made. A large number of salt wells in that county were closed up on account of the depression of trade, and we all know that if a salt well is run for a few years, and if the plant is left unused for a short time, it rots more rapidly than if it were kept in operation. We have to complain of the large quantity of salt that comes into this country free of duty. Let me quote to you the number of pounds of salt that are imported free of duty:

From	Pounds.
Great Britain	163,579,132
Dutch West Indies	707,780
French West Indies	2,823,430
Italy	13,123,800
Spain	6,371,800
United States	5,349,120

Now, while that large amount is imported into Canada I think it is the duty of the Government to amend the tariff Bill. It may be of benefit to import from Great Britain as the salt is brought in ballast in the vessels, and it enables them to take

back their freight a little cheaper than they otherwise would ; but there is no such benefit in the case of the foreign countries. This free salt bears very heavily upon the province of Ontario. All the salt produced in Canada is produced in that province, and in view of that fact we might expect to see that the province of Ontario would pay less upon salt than any other province of the Dominion. Such, however, is not the case. The total duty collected on salt imported into Canada is $4,580 and of that, the province of Ontario pays $2,848, and the rest of the Dominion only $1,737. While Ontario pays $2,848, Quebec only pays $184 ; Manitoba, $779 ; British Columbia, $554 ; Prince Edward Island, $131 ; Nova Scotia, $63 ; New Brunswick, $8. Therefore, the province of Ontario although, she has the largest salt deposits of any province in Canada, pays the largest amount of duty. That is not as it should be. There are several reasons for this. One is, that because of the enormous railway freights our manufacturers have to pay, they cannot send their salt from the western part of the province of Ontario to the eastern markets. I will give some instances of these enormous railway freights. In Canada it costs 10 cents per 100 pounds to carry salt 110 miles from Seaforth to Niagara, and in the United States, it costs only 2⅓ cents per pound to carry salt from Warsaw to Niagara, a distance of 60 miles. From Syracuse to Hamilton, 215 miles, the rate is 7½ cents per 100 pounds or $3.48 per 100 pounds, per hundred miles. Salt is a very weighty commodity, and so our salt manufacturers cannot send their salt to the eastern provinces to compete against the salt that comes in bulk in British vessels. From Seaforth to Hamilton, eighty-four miles, the rate is 9 cents per hundred pounds or 10·71 cents per hundred pounds per hundred miles, against 3·48 cents per hundred pounds per hundred miles in the United States. So that our salt manufacturers have no chance with the large amount of salt that comes into this country free, and with the heavy railway rates against them. I have letters in my possession to prove every word I have said with respect to this matter, which I think should be taken into consideration. If nothing else can be done, and if the gulf and sea fisheries are to have their salt free, let a duty be put upon that salt, and let a refund be given to the fishermen ; but do let the other provinces have the advantage of free salt, which they have not naturally, as against us in the province of Ontario.

Now, the farmers of Canada have a just grievance in respect to railway rates. I have a list of the carrying rates in operation to-day in the whole United States, east of the Mississippi River, as compared with those in operation in Canada. There are six classes of freight in the United States, and ten classes in Canada. The following table gives a comparison between the two countries in regard to first-class, middle-class and lowest class freight, the rates being per hundred pounds in each case :

Miles.	United States.			Canada.		
	1st Class.	3rd Class.	5th Class.	1st Class.	5th Class.	9th Class.
	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.	cts.
65.....	22	15	8	28	14	11
115.....	24	19	8½	38	19	14
160.....	28	20	10½	42	21	17
335.....	37	23½	13	66	33	26
475.....	45	30	18	78	39	29
565.....	76½	52	31½	86	43	32

These are circumstances which certainly tell very hardly against the Canadian farmer as compared with his brother farmer across the line ; and I have been strictly informed that these are the prevailing rates to-day.

Now, I would like to draw the attention of the House to one little transaction which I was a party to. A car-load of apples was shipped from Seaforth to Price Albert to Mr. Davis, the representative of Saskatchewan, and I had a son at Prince Albert who purchased three car-loads of cattle, and had them shipped to Montreal. Now, the freight on the cattle was $190 per car, while the freight on the carload of apples, although the haul was thirty or forty miles shorter, was $518. I have in my pocket the receipt for the money that was paid. Certainly a car-load of apples does not give a railway company so much trouble as a car-load of cattle. The cattle have to be taken out of the cars at different stations to be fed and watered, while a car-load of apples is simply carried to its destination without being disturbed ; and yet the freight on the apples was nearly three times as much as that on the cattle. Thousands of dollars would have been saved last year to the farmers of Ontario if the railway companies had been willing to carry apples to the North-west for a dollar a barrel, and the farmers of the North-west would have got apples at $2.50 or $3 a barrel ; but as it was, the apples had to be left rotting in the orchards of Ontario, and we could do nothing with them. Now, so much money has been spent by the people of Canada upon the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the Grand Trunk Railway is so indebted to the people of Canada, if it ever pays the debt, that we should have some consideration from these railroads: but these railway companies are only soulless corporations, and do as little as they can for the farmer of this country. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the House, and I apologize for trespassing so long upon your time.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, at this late hour of the evening I do not intend to trespass upon the time of the House at any great length. In fact, I had intended to reserve any remarks I had to make for the specific debate on the differential or reciprocal resolution. As I shall be absent from the House during next week, I thought it only proper that I should place upon record my own views in respect particularly to that feature of the tariff which has been brought down. For eighteen years the Liberal party have been decrying the Conservative party and the National Policy. Certainly the Government's own friends have been considerably disappointed at their unexampled vaulting. They have not attacked the National Policy in principle, but they have meddled with it in detail sufficiently to disturb the industrial development of the country seriously, I fear.

As my remarks are to be directed particularly towards the reciprocal feature of the tariff, I will proceed immediately to discuss that feature. I presume that there is not a man occupying a seat in this House who is not anxious to recognize in some way or other the debt of gratitude we owe to the mother country. We owe the mother country considerable that is not recognized by the people of Canada generally. Just in what way that debt should be paid, I am not prepared this evening to suggest. For the immense advantages we derive from the oversight which Great Britain exercises in distant quarters of the globe over our commerce, and for the benefits conferred upon us by her consular agencies in every corner of the world, we have hitherto paid nothing. There is not in contemplation any provision that we shall in the near future pay anything, but I scarcely think this the proper way to recognize this debt of gratitude. Great Britain is extending to her colonies no favours; she is extending no favours to any country. She simply pursues a line of policy that, under the peculiar circumstances of the case, is adapted to the development of her industries and the extension of her trade. Still, as we owe her a debt of gratitude, which has never been recognized in any way, I, for one, am prepared to give my support to any special and reasonable recognition of that debt of gratitude and repay it in some way, and I think that there is throughout the country a feeling that England should have, in return for the favours granted us, as far as the colonial world is concerned, some differential treatment, some special favour in matters of trade. But while I recognize that as the correct principle to adopt and am strongly in its favour, yet I think that the principle incorporated in these resolutions is a bad one—bad, not because it shows any special favour to England but because it shows no special favour to England. Before I take my seat I think I can successfully show to this House, that not only does this Government's policy not differentiate in favour of England but it hands over to England's commercial enemies—aye, Sir, and her political enemies as well—favours equally as great as it extends to the mother country. If these resolutions are constitutional these favours must be extended to Belgium and Germany. Now, I express no opinion as to whether or not these particular resolutions discriminate against those countries which have the benefit of the most-favoured-nation clauses in their treaties with Great Britain. I am not going to rest my case upon that particular view. But what I claim is that this Parliament has no power to pass those resolutions on other grounds. If we pass these resolutions they must be disallowed, or rather if we implement them in a statute, that statute must be disallowed by Her Majesty. So far as the most-favoured-nation clause in treaties like Belgium and Germany's treaties with England is concerned, there have prevailed two diametrically opposite opinions. There is the American view and there is the European view, the one diametrically opposed to the other. The American view has been asserted by the United States time and time again, and it is this: that in a treaty between two sovereign powers, those mutual agreements contemplate, not obligations in the ordinary sense of the term, but simply that one high contracting party shall extend to the other the same degree of comity it extends to other nations. That view was adopted, in the first place, by a very clear-headed statesman, eminent in the councils of his country, John Quincy Adams. Since that time it has been reaffirmed by Clay, by Livingstone, by Gallatin, by Frelinghuysen, by Evarts, by Bayard, and by different American foreign secretaries, from time to time, and it received an authoritative recognition from the highest court of the United States of America in the year 1886. In the judgment which was given in the case of Bertram vs. Robertson, will be found this authoritative statement of the American view, and according to that judgment, the most-highly-favoured-nation clauses in a treaty were agreements that a parity of comity should be extended by the one high contracting party to the other—that there should be no differential treatment so far as mere comity is concerned, but that they did not concern concessions made by one of the contracting parties for valuable consideration or a return for concessions made in order to obtain the same. In accordance with the American view, these most-highly-favoured-nation clauses in treaties do not prevent either party entering, for a valuable consideration, into a special treaty with another power for reciprocal concessions, and neither of the high contracting parties is entitled to claim the special favours extended by that special treaty to the other. But while that is the American view, they also hold that if either of the high contracting

parties should extend to a third outside party gratuitous favours, that would be a violation of the treaty containing the most-highly-favoured-nation clause. I will read the judgment of the Supreme Court on the construction of the treaty with Denmark, by which Denmark was entitled to the most-highly-favoured nation treatment at the hands of the United States. In this treaty was a stipulation that if either contracting party granted a particular favour to any third nation in respect to commerce, that favour should immediately become common to the other party who should enjoy the same freely if freely made to the third party, or upon allowing the same compensation if the concession were conditional. Subsequent to that treaty, the United States entered into a treaty with Hawaii by virtue of which reciprocal concessions with regard to trade were made between the two powers, allowing a certain schedule of articles to be admitted into the United States free of duty in return for a like concession on the part of the state of Hawaii. A merchant in New York claimed on an importation of molasses from St. Croix, one of the West Indies, a part of the dominions of the King of Denmark, a reduction of the duty, on the ground that he was entitled to it under the special agreement between the United States and Hawaii, which he claimed should apply also to importations from St. Croix. He paid the duties under protest and sued the treasury officer for the money received. The case was transferred from the ordinary court of New York to the Circuit Court of the United States, and finally came up before the Supreme Court of that country and the judgment was delivered by Mr. Justice Field. It is unnecessary for me to read the whole judgment and I shall read only some extracts. Speaking of this particular provision in the treaty, Justice Field said :

> These stipulations, even if conceded to be self-executing by way of a proviso or exception to the general law imposing the duties, do not cover concessions like those made to the Hawaiian Islands for a valuable consideration. They were pledges of the two contracting parties, the United States and the King of Denmark, to each other, that, in the imposition of duties on goods imported into one of the countries which were the produce or manufacture of the other, there should be no discrimination against them in favour of goods of like character imported from any other country. They imposed an obligation upon both countries to avoid hostile legislation in that respect. But they were not intended to interfere with special arrangements with other countries founded upon concession of special privileges. The stipulations were mutual, for reciprocal advantages. "No higher, or other, duties" were to be imposed by either upon the goods specified; but, if any particular favour should be granted by either to other countries, in respect to commerce or navigation, the concession was to become common to the other party upon like consideration, that is, it was to be enjoyed freely, if the concession were freely made, or on allowing the same compensation if the concession were conditional.

According to that judgment, a nation enjoying the most-highly-favoured-nation treatment, was entitled to enjoy freely benefits which were granted freely by the other contracting power to an outside party, as a matter of comity. Mr. Justice Field said the clauses were to be considered together, and that the merchant was not entitled to a return of the duties for the simple reason that Denmark had not up to that stage offered to give to the United States, the benefit of the specific tariff that Hawaii had extended to the United States, and until she did that she was not in a position to claim the benefit of the treaty to that extent.

Now, the other night, during this debate, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) who is well versed in these matters, did not venture to express the opinion that the United States view supported his at all, in fact, if I may so say, he damned the United States view with faint praise. The United States view is also expressed in the second volume of Wharton's Digest of International Law, pages 37, and following. That view is there summed up in a few words which the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce read to the House as follows :—

> A covenant to give privileges granted to the "most-favoured nations" only refers to gratuitous privileges, and does not cover privileges granted on the condition of a reciprocal advantage.

Let me call the attention of the House for one moment to the weakness of the argument of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce. He has invoked the aid of the United States authorities to the destruction of the Government's contention. We extend this benefit of a reduced schedule of customs duties to England, not expressly by name, but it inures to the benefit of England. If it inures to the benefit of England, is that concession made to England as a matter of comity or gratuity, or is it extended to England in return for certain concessions made by England to Canada ? We all know that England's tariff is a free trade tariff, and we do not get in exchange for our concession any consideration. It is a pure gratuity. Therefore, if the most-favoured-nation clause applies to this case at all, by the American view the concession to England violates the treaty, as we do not extend it in return for any concessions made by England to us. Now, there is the English, or, rather the European view. The European view of these treaties has been maintained persistently by England down to the present time. I shall not go into a historical resume of the times or occasions England has asserted it. That would be unnecessary. But I will state that she has claimed it down as late as 1895. In the report, extracts from

which were read to the House by the ex-Minister of Finance the other day, it is claimed. A succinct statement of England's views is given in his report so far as the German and Belgian treaties are concerned. In that return, Grey said :

These treaties (1) Do not prevent differential treatment by the United Kingdom in favour of British colonies. (2) They do prevent differential treatment by British colonies in favour of the United Kingdom. (3) They do not prevent differential treatment by British colonies in favour of each other.

This view was conveyed to this Parliament in the year 1882 in response to an application by the Parliament of Canada to have closer trade relations with England discriminating against other colonies. The despatch to the Home Government contains the report of the committee of the Privy Council which was approved by the Governor in Council, October 26th, 1882. In it we find two clauses in which Canada protests against the English view of these treaties :

The Minister observes that although the Canadian Government are not at present prepared to propose any plan for the commercial convention with Jamaica or the West Indies generally, they feel it necessary to record their dissent from the principle hereby laid down, that as between portions of the said Empire no duties discriminating in favour of British as against foreign industry can be sanctioned by Her Majesty's Government.

He goes on further :

That, in accordance with this precedent, the Canadian Government claim that it is competent for any of the colonies possessing representative and responsible governments to enter into mutual agreement for their partial or absolute free trade with the mother country or with each other or with both, discriminating against other countries.

The same principle should also apply to the Crown colonies ; but, as their action must be through Her Majesty's Government, it is evident that their wishes cannot be carried into effect without the sanction of the Imperial Executive. Negotiations with such colonies does not seem to promise any beneficial results until this principle is conceded—that trade should be rendered as free as practicable between the various portions of the Empire, having regard solely to their own interests, and unfettered by any obligations to treat others with equal favour.

In reply to this despatch, England denied to Canada the right to legislate as Canada proposed to legislate, with respect to trade with Great Britain, discriminating against foreign countries. Afterwards, in the year 1891, England interposed in the case of a treaty that had been made between Spain and the United States, interposed at the very instance of Canada herself ; and this country is estopped from disputing the English view, as it is on record as our construction of the most-favoured-nation clause. England urged our claim and urged it successfully. Now, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) referred to this digest the other day, citing the text in support of the proposition that Germany had abandoned that contention. Germany has done no such thing. I will read the text :

Your despatch of the 8th ultimo has been received. You report that Mr. Carter, the special envoy from Hawaii to England and Germany, had succeeded in inducing the German Government to yield the point assumed by those governments, that the most-favoured-nation clause in their treaties with Hawaii entitled them to equal privileges in regard to imports with those obtained by the United States by the reciprocity treaty with the same country, and that no definite understanding had been reached with England, although it was probable that the proposition made by that government would be accepted.

Now, it is true that Germany waived it, but Germany waived it as a matter of arrangement with the United States. She did not waive it as a principle, she did not acknowledge for a moment that it was not borne out by international law, but she waived it simply as a business arrangement with the United States, and in order that goodwill should be maintained between those countries, and rather than have a long diplomatic contest with the United States. But we have another instance of the German and Belgian view of these clauses that is contained in a despatch from the Home Government to our Government. It will be found on page 12 of the Sessional Papers of 1883. The despatch is as follows :—

Downing Street, 27th Feb., 1882.

Sir,—With reference to my letter of the 7th January last, I am directed by the Earl of Kimberley to acquaint you that His Lordship is informed by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, that Her Majesty's Minister at Brussels and her Majesty's Ambassador at Berlin, in accordance with their instructions, placed themselves informally in communication with the Belgian and German governments as to the exemption of the Dominion of Canada from the stipulations of Article XV. of the Anglo-Belgian Treaty of 1862, and of Article 7 of the Commercial Treaty of 1865 with Germany.

That, I may say parenthetically, is the particular section that creates the difficulty in the present instance.

Her Majesty's Minister at Brussels has now reported that, in the opinion of the Belgian Government, the exemption desired by the Dominion of Canada would necessitate the denunciation of the Treaty of 1862, and the negotiation of a fresh treaty to replace it, and Her Majesty's Ambassador at Berlin has learnt that, in the opinion of the competent German authorities, it would not be either convenient or desirable to abrogate single articles of the Treaty of 1865, apart from a general revision of the whole instrument, for which, however, there did not appear to be any immediate necessity.

So far for the statement of the American and continental views of the most-favoured-nation clause. But I do not rest my argument that we have no power to pass this resolution on the ground that it discriminates against these countries ; I do not rest it

there, although I do not concede that it does not discriminate, but I rest it on the ground that this resolution is a violation of the terms of the treaties by curtailing the rights which are guaranteed thereby to Belgium and Germany. The right which Belgium and Germany have under these treaties is an absolute and unconditioned right, and this Parliament proposes to take from those powers an absolute and unconditional right, and substitute therefor a conditional right. Now, in order to understand this fully, let us turn to the particular clauses of the German treaty. There are four or five clauses which bear upon this case. The first I shall read is as follows :—

II. The produce and manufacturers of the dominions and possessions of Her Britannic Majesty which may be imported into the Zollverein, and the produce and manufactures of the States of the Zollverein which may be imported into the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, whether intended for consumption, warehousing, re-exportation, or transit, shall therein be treated in the same manner as——

Now mark the particular words :

—and in particular shall be subject to no higher, or other, duties than the product and manufactures of any third country, the most-favoured in these respects.

There you will see that there is nothing said about treaties made with other powers. Goods coming from England into Canada should be admitted at no less customs duty than goods coming from Germany. It does not depend upon any special contract with any nation, but the stipulation in that treaty is this, which by the British view is binding, that goods coming into Canada irrespective of the country from which they come, shall not be admitted at less customs duty than similar goods coming from Germany. Now, there is another clause relating to the exportation which it is unnecessary for me to read, because it does not bear upon the case before us. I may say that there is a later clause which brings all the British colonies within the scope of this section.

V. Any favour, privilege, or reduction in the tariff or duties of importation or exportation, which either of the contracting parties may concede to any third power, should be extended immediately and unconditionally to the other.

Now mark those words. Remember that although it says "other powers," other high contracting powers, there is a later clause which applies all these cases to the British colonies. It is as follows :—

VII. The stipulation of the preceding Articles I. to VI. shall also be applied to the colonies and foreign possessions of Her Britannic Majesty. In those colonies and possessions the produce of the states of the Zollverein shall not be subject to any higher or other import duties than the produce of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, or of any other country of the like kind. Nor shall the exportations from those colonies or possessions to the Zollverein be subject to any higher or other duties than the exportation to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

Article V. reads :

Any favour privilege, &c., &c., should be extended immediately and unconditionally to the other.

Now let us look at that for a moment. Under that section we find that if British goods come in here—I do not care what arrangement may have the effect of letting them in, the fact of their coming in is what we must look to, the fact of their being admitted—if British goods come into this country at a 25 per cent rate, we will say, then we have got immediately and unconditionally to extend that privilege to every state that comes within this most highly-favoured-nation clause. What does the Government propose to do ? Do they propose to extend it unconditionally ? No, Sir. English goods come in at 25 per cent. What about Germany ? Can she get her goods in at 25 per cent absolutely and unconditionally ? No. But you say to her : We will give England the privilege of bringing in her goods at 25 per cent, and we will give you the same privilege provided you do the same, or as the Government contend, provided we made as much out of the arrangement as you do. But there is no such condition in the treaty. Germany and Belgium are entitled to it entirely and unconditionally, yet the Government has attempted to read conditions into this treaty. But not only have they read conditions, but they have read conditions which no self-respecting state on earth can accept. Now what are they ? What has been done whenever there has been discrimination heretofore made by one country in favour of another ? I have looked through all the treaties that have been entered into since commercial treaties were made by Great Britain, and all that were ever made by the United States, and I fail to find any provision in principle like this. They have all proceeded on the principle of giving either absolute free trade in certain articles, or giving a schedule with certain duties annexed, on the terms of which the United States or Great Britain or other states centralized with another state would admit goods into their country, and specifically naming certain articles and certain duties in accordance with which the other contracting power would admit into their territory goods from either Great Britain or the United States or other first power. But that principle is not adopted here. Now, I say that this resolution annexes conditions to Germany's rights and other favoured-nations' rights that no self-respecting state can accept. What are those conditions ? We do not give to Germany and Belgium the right to come in here provided their tariff is reduced to a certain maximum the same in all cases. Their treaty right is that unconditionally they shall have the privilege

of putting their goods in here at the same rate that goods from any other place come in. But we say to them: You can bring your goods into Canada provided you disarrange your whole fiscal system and make the Controller of Customs of Canada dictator as to your tariff, and impose as a maximum rate whatever the Controller of Customs of Canada says. What self-respecting power for one moment would enter into an arrangement like that? Imagine for a moment astute men like those of Germany negotiating such a treaty with Great Britain, or an astute man like the Belgian Minister negotiating such a treaty, if for one moment it was contemplated that their goods should only be admitted into the colonies provided they gave up the control over their own tariff rates and allowed foreign controllers to fix the maximum rate of the tariff for exportation to Great Britain or to her colonies. I therefore say that if the reciprocity resolution is good and does not discriminate it must inure immediately under the terms of those treaties—not under the terms of the Belgian treaty, but under the German treaty—for the benefit of Germany and all other nations entitled to most-favoured treatment in commerce and trade. But I do not wish to be understood as conceding for one moment that this tariff does not discriminate against countries entitled to the benefit of the most-highly-favoured-nation clause. There is an element of discrimination in it. This resolution may mean many things. If it has one meaning, it discriminates indirectly, although it may not do so directly. The Minister of Finance, the Prime Minister and the Controller of Customs have been asked in regard to the interpretation to be placed on this clause, but they have maintained a perfect reticence. The interpretation must be put ultimately by the law courts of the country, and the Crown officers of Great Britain who will advise Her Majesty in regard to it. The particular resolution reads as follows:—

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

(a.) That any question that may arise as to the countries entitled to the benefits of the Reciprocal Tariff, shall be decided by the Controller of Customs, subject to the authority of the Governor in Council.

(b.) That the Controller of Customs may make such regulations as are necessary for carrying out the intention of the two preceding sections.

I humbly submit that as a matter of treaty construction and international law, the meaning of that clause is this: that if you take the total imports into Canada of the products of any other country, and it is found in Canada that the duties levied on them is a certain per cent, and after reducing that percentage by 25 per cent, one-quarter of itself, it is equivalent to or above the percentage of duty levied by such country upon the products of Canada, then is that country entitled to the benefit of the reciprocal tariff. To take a specific case: Our tariff on those articles in respect to which we propose to reciprocate is eighteen and a fraction, and in Germany the tariff on those articles is 9·5. These are about the respective rates on the articles which are to be looked to in order to bring into force that reciprocal tariff. If we throw off from the Canadian tariff the 25 per cent provided for in the reciprocal tariff, our tariff will be reduced to a shade under 14 per cent. Germany's tariff is 9·5 per cent. I claim as a matter of construction of this diction, apart from the matter of treaties and most-favoured-nation clauses entirely, that Germany is within the clause. If you grant it to Germany, you grant it to a commercial enemy. But it must not only be given to that nation, but also to the Netherlands, which is practically a free trade country, to Belgium, which has an average tariff of 10 per cent on these, and also to Switzerland, and I do not know how many other countries. If this clause has not the meaning which I have attributed to it, it may have another meaning—if under all the circumstances the impetus to be given to trade and manufacture by the privilege of exporting the articles of the reciprocal tariff list that can be produced in Canada and the benefit to be derived therefrom is in the opinion of the Controller of Customs equal to the similar benefits to be derived by any other country from the privilege of exporting like goods to Canada then the reciprocal favour applies to that country. This which I infer is the construction the Government puts upon this resolution is an untenable one. Germany has treaty rights and is entitled to be heard, and the Government proposes by an ex parte judgment of the Controller of Customs to annihilate virtually Germany's rights under the treaties. One view or the other must be accepted; the latter is grossly absurd, and if the first is accepted then these different countries are entitled to reductions under the tariff and the claim of favouring England is false and hollow. Indirectly there is discrimination, if the latter view be taken. Why? Because this country is not saying to France, Belgium or Germany: We will let your goods in on precisely the same terms as those of other countries—but on terms which may be fundamentally different from the terms on which we allow another nation to come in. We must bring this matter down not to the question of benefit which a nation will derive, but on

the basis of tariff alone. If English goods come to a certain percentage compared with German goods, then they are to be admitted; otherwise we are discriminating against different nations. The same set of conditions must entitle every nation to come in otherwise we are discriminating between countries. These conditions must be absolutely fixed and not contingent on advantage to be derived by Canada. The power given is an extraordinary one. There is no power more jealously guarded by the people of a country than the treaty-making power. Take for example the United States to the south of us. They have never placed in the hands of the President the treaty power, but it rests in the hands of men elected by the people directly and indirectly. In Great Britain the same principle applies. What is the case here? We are asked to place in the hands of the Controller of Customs and he alone, subject of course to the approval of the Governor General in Council, a power that may bring this Dominion, yes, in fact, the mother country and the Empire into serious conflict with other nations. Every one is aware how jealous nations are in regard to trade. In fact nine-tenths of the wars have arisen out of trade disputes or trade demands. Nevertheless it is proposed to give the Government powers which foolishly or stubbornly exercised may result in peace or war, powers which it is absurd to place in the hands of any man or any set of men. England cannot for one moment endorse such a proposal.

Turning to the matter of the tariff I will say this, that I in common with many hon. members on this side of the House rather feel like congratulating ourselves, that after eighteen years of attack and denunciation, these people who have been attacking and denouncing the Conservatives and their policy, tried to get as near as they could to it, and at the same time to give some pretext to the country for the claim that they have departed from it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. So near and yet so far.

Mr. POWELL. So near and not so far. Under the Conservative administration and the beneficial results of the National Policy, this country, during eighteen years sprang forward by leaps and bounds, and made progress unparalleled in the commercial history of any country in the world, if we except England's development for the decade following the adoption of free trade.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Particularly in the population of New Brunswick.

Mr. POWELL. That matter has been threshed out time and again. The method of taking the last census failed to reveal increases to the population where the most reliable statistics showed large increases. Both the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries know the truth of what I am going to state as an illustration. Take the census of 1881, and the census of 1891, and compare them in respect to the parish in which I live, the parish of Sackville. Any man who knows, will tell you that this parish has made greater progress during that decade, than probably any other portion of New Brunswick. It has increased in wealth and increased in population. In the lower portion of that rich and populous parish, there are to-day two houses and more, for every house there when the National Policy was introduced in 1879. Notwithstanding this the census of 1891 shows only a very trifling increase over the census of 1881. There is something wrong on the face of the census returns, and what is wrong has been explained over and over again to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. He knows it, but he has the figures of the census before him and persists in his unfair course. He is at liberty to make whatever he can out of this cheap device.

Now, if this trade policy of the Conservative party was a bad thing, if it was decimating the population of our country, why was it not immediately wiped out of existence when the Liberals came into power? If protection is a poison, why was not the antidote at once applied? The Liberal Government is holding to the Conservative policy to-day, because they know that it was the greatest stimulant that was ever applied to the trade of this or any other country. During the last campaign the Minister of Marine (Mr. Davies) had two or three stock arguments. One of these was, that it was greatly in the interests of the country and the maritime provinces especially, that they should have free coal oil. From one end of Prince Edward Island to the other, he tried to lead the farmers to believe, that under a Liberal Government all duty would be wiped out and coal oil would be so much cheaper than daylight, that the people would put up the shutters on their windows and burn it even in daytime. But, what has the Liberal Government done with regard to the duty on coal oil? They have reduced the duty by a paltry cent a gallon. The Minister of Marine also told the people that he was going to do away with the iniquitous duty on flour; a duty which the Prime Minister declared to be imposed—he even said "corruptly" imposed—in the interests of the farmers of Ontario, in order to buy their votes; and which he further declared was a tax that should be immediately wiped off the Statute-book, and should not be incorporated in the tariff of any civilized nation except under the extreme financial exigencies of war. But the Liberal Government is in power, and still the duty on flour substantially remains. Is this near to it and yet so far? I do not wish, Mr. Speaker, to take up the time of the House

further at this late hour. When the debate on this particular clause comes up, I shall not have the pleasure of being here, as I said at the opening of my remarks, and I wished to place on record my views as to the constitutional features of this resolution. I believe this resolution bad in the light of international law, bad in the light of commercial principle, and that it is a cheap subterfuge to deceive—as this Government have been deceiving since their accession to power—the electorate of this country.

Mr. MACDONNELL (Selkirk). Mr. Speaker, I desire to address myself for a few moments to a paragraph in the speech delivered last night by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche). Speaking of the editor of the Winnipeg "Tribune," the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche) said:

The hon. gentleman's training as editor of the Winnipeg "Tribune" has not been conducive to placing facts in a fair and proper light here. As to stuffing ballot boxes in Manitoba, there were many charges, but how many convictions? Out of all the arrests—some 18 or 20—there was but one conviction, and that on the gentleman's own evidence. And that, if I mistake not, was not so much a case of ballot stuffing. He initialled some ballots after the election, acting in concert with the stool-pigeon of the Liberal party, the man Freeborn. He was to take these to the Conservative committee and try to levy blackmail, and, if successful, to divide the spoils with the deputy returning officer, Freeborn. But the Conservative committee refused to be blackmailed, and Freeborn handed over the ballots to the Liberals. And it was a strange thing that the bondsman of the man who was arrested was the Liberal candidate, Dr. Rutherford. There was only one conviction, and that is how it happened. But how would the hon. gentleman explain what has taken place in the same constituency within the last week or so?

This latter statement refers to recent transactions about which I know nothing. After accusing the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) in this way, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche) in the succeeding sentences becomes himself a brilliant example of that very fault which he attributes to my hon. friend the member for Lisgar. As to the statement that Freeborn was a stool pigeon of the Liberal party, the evidence in the election trials proved that Freeborn was sent by the Conservative organization of Ontario to the province of Manitoba, to work in conjunction with the Conservative organization there, for the purpose of stuffing the ballot boxes in that province, and for the purpose of instructing the deputy returning officers, appointees of the Conservative Government, as to the best method of stuffing these ballot boxes. It is a little bit peculiar—but I suppose we are not to be surprised—that, whenever the sins of the Conservative party find them out they at once seek to make it appear that the Liberal party is responsible for them. However, in this case we have the proof, that the Conservative organizers were guilty, for we have a telegram from Robert Birmingham to Nat Boyd at Neepawa. The date of this telegram is the 20th of May; it was sent from Toronto, Ont., by Robert Birmingham to Nat Boyd, and it refers to this same man Freeborn. It reads as follows:—

He was a first-class man in North Bruce.

(Sgd.) ROBERT BIRMINGHAM.

That telegram came out in evidence at the election trial, and I think that it disposes of the charge that Freeborn was a stool pigeon of the Liberal party. The facts in this connection were that, after the election, the Conservatives failed to make good their agreement with Freeborn, failed to pay him for the dirty work he had done for them, and Freeborn having been betrayed by the Conservative party, felt that he was justified in placing the information in his possession in the hands of the Liberal party. This was done by placing in the hands of certain officials ballots taken from the polls at Carberry—ballots which should have been placed in the ballot boxes, but for which others were substituted, and these ballots he gave to the Attorney General of Manitoba with the statements of the facts. Now, I propose to quote at length, in order to place it on record, a statement of the facts as contained in the speech of the Attorney General of Manitoba. This speech was delivered in the Manitoba legislature on Monday evening, the 29th of March, of this year:

Hon. Mr. Cameron said he had told the House some time ago of his intention to make a statement in connection with the election prosecutions. Possibly, an apology was due the House for it being delayed so long, but a variety of circumstances had prevented until now. In speaking on the question generally, there was very little to say, because he thought the whole House, irrespective of party considerations, would agree with any remarks that might be made with regard to keeping the ballot system free from any suspicions of party manipulation. He believed it was hardly necessary to make the statement that the members of this House and the public generally looked upon any tampering with the ballot box, any method of thus taking away votes, as akin to treason. A blow struck at the ballot box was a blow struck at the liberty of the nation. Under our system of government, the will of the people was expressed at the ballot box, and if that was tampered with, it would be impossible to know what the will of the people was. When these prosecutions were first undertaken, some objection was made because of the violation of the secrecy of the ballot, but the discussion that had taken place since had removed that objection. It was true that one of the objects to be secured in the vote by ballot was the secrecy of the vote, for the purpose of preventing intimidation, but that was not the only object, and if there was some evidence of a crime in connection with the ballot box by which the views of the electors were being misrepresented, it would be a remarkable thing even on general principles if individual electors could not be called and asked in the witness box how they voted. That this was quite in keeping with the principle of the ballot was shown by the fact that in England

each ballot is numbered, so that, should an inquiry arise, each ballot can be traced to the man who polled it. Such was also, he believed, the case in Ontario. However, the matter had lately not been heard of, as the chief justice at Portage la Prairie decided to admit this evidence after consultation with his brother judges, and it was, therefore, admitted.

Shortly after the election in June, information came to the Attorney General which led him to believe that there had been a deliberate conspiracy entered into with the object of stealing the constituency of Macdonald in that election, that the method by which that was to be done was to employ as deputy returning officers men who would manipulate the ballots so that the ballot cast for one candidate would be destroyed, and a ballot already prepared and marked for the other candidate substituted therefor, and placed in the box. The theory of the Crown was that there was a conspiracy, and it was believed to be so widespread as to cover the whole constituency and to extend to other constituencies as well. He did not need to remind the House of the size or configuration of the constituency of Macdonald, stretching about 50 or 70 miles from east to west, and about 85 or 90 miles from north to south. It is traversed by three lines of Railway—the C.P.R. main line, the Glenboro' branch, and the M. & N. W. Railway. On each of these lines are incorporated towns and villages, besides a number of villages not incorporated. Information received from various sources then showed a conspiracy embracing these towns and villages, and so widespread in its operations as to lead to the formation of the theory of which he had already spoken. So much had appeared in the newspapers regarding this part of the question that it was unnecessary for him to say anything further. He would say, in passing, that so far as the new ballot was concerned, the Durocher ballot, experience had proved that it was a failure, especially in preventing tampering and substitution when the counterfoil was removed. In regard to its shape, size and matter of the counterfoil, the new ballot was very much easier to conceal in the hand and manipulate than many other ballots, say for instance, that in use in the provincial elections. Nor need he say anything of the gravity of the offence, which is admitted by men of all parties. The office of deputy returning officer is a very important one. He is the custodian of the ballot box, and the judge of election. He should do his duty faithfully, without respect to party leanings or affiliations. In fact, his oath deals clearly with the nature of his duties and how he is to perform them. Hon. Mr. Cameron then read the two oaths which the deputy returning officer must take before the opening and after the closing of the poll. He pointed out that this showed the serious manner in which the law regarded the office of deputy returning officer.

In pursuance of the information originally received, a persistent attempt was made to obtain further evidence. The Dominion Government was notified of the case and of the information of the Attorney General as to a conspiracy. The Dominion Government was naturally interested in this matter, because it was a federal election, the returning officer was an appointee of that Government direct, and the deputies were appointed indirectly, through him. Moreover, the Dominion Elections Act contemplates the intervention of the Dominion Government in cases which come under that Act. It was quite in accordance with that Act, that communication was opened up with the Dominion Government, and, as he had more than once informed the House, the Department of Justice at Ottawa had fully sanctioned these prosecutions. To speak of the prosecutions in detail might take some time. However, he would endeavour to be as concise as possible.

THE G. B. ANDERSON CASE.

He would deal first with the case of Anderson, which was dealt with at the last assizes, when the jury twice disagreed, and which was postponed on the application of the Crown officers. He would not say more on this, because he had spoken on it before, and because the case was held over for the next assizes, on the statement of Judge Killam, that the case was of a very serious character, that there was important evidence, and that the Crown was within its rights in asking that the case stand over till next spring.

EVIDENCE IN THE HENRY WALLER CASE.

Leaving aside this case, he would go on to take up one brought at Carberry, on the main line of the C.P.R., against Henry Waller. In this case, the accused was committed by the magistrate, but the grand jury returned "No Bill." And here he might speak of a difficulty which presented itself in all these cases. In a case where it is alleged that forty voted for a candidate and only thirty ballots are found in the box, these forty men must be called and put in the box to tell how they voted in order to make a case. But in the lapse of months these voters move away to Ontario, England, Australia, and other places, some die, some become ill, some never having disclosed how they voted are not on hand to give evidence. The first thirty may be easy enough to get, but the evidence of the last ten is always extremely difficult to obtain. In the Waller case, he would read to the House a portion of the evidence which was given at the preliminary investigation when he was sent up for trial. He alluded to the testimony of Freeborn. Freeborn was a witness there, and testified that "the accused had got this scheme in a letter from Robert Birmingham, of Toronto. That he saw Mr. Boyd, the candidate, about midnight, the evening before he saw Waller, the accused. Boyd said not to go out, that a party would be in to see me in the morning. Boyd mentioned no name, but Waller came to my bedroom on Saturday morning, and proposed the ballot scheme."

They then went through the various phases of instruction. In addition, however, to the evidence of Freeborn, there was the evidence of one Scammell. Scammell had been arrested with the others. He had acted as deputy returning officer at Rathwell, on the Southwestern Branch, and gave evidence at the preliminary trial of Waller and also before the grand jury. Scammell said: "Mr. Waller asked me to go up to a room in the hotel with him. The first thing he asked was 'Can you play cards?' I said yes. He said, 'You'll do.' Next he said, 'I want to show you something.' So he took a small piece of paper, folded it up and showed me how to exchange one ballot for another."

Scammell confessed his guilt, and admitted that he himself had substituted six ballots in the ballot box at Rathwell. Mr. Speaker, this is some of the evidence on which Waller was committed, and that evidence was known to the Crown before the prosecution against him was commenced. It was substantially the evidence put in before the grand jury, and yet the grand jury reported "No bill" against Henry Waller.

There was also a deputy returning officer named Brooks, Poll 41, arrested at Carberry, and the

following facts were disclosed at the investigation before the magistrate :—

" At the close of the poll, 36 ballots were shown to be marked for Rutherford, while 41 voters swore before the magistrate that they had voted for Rutherford."

There was no direct evidence against Brooks, but the circumstances were so suspicious that the magistrate committed him for trial.

JAMES WALLER.

James Waller, a brother of Henry Waller, was also arrested at Carberry on a similar charge. The charge was, however, abandoned by the Crown before any evidence was taken. It appeared that James Waller had made statements to various persons that he could have made the majority for Boyd at his poll as big as he liked. Although it was believed he knew all about the transactions, the evidence was not obtainable, and the charge was abandoned in this case. Possibly, the man was boasting when he made the statements he did, though he may have known all about it.

FINKELSTEIN'S CASE.

One Finkelstein was another deputy returning officer who was arrested at Carberry. In his poll 38 ballots appeared for Rutherford. There was but one rejected ballot, and that was marked for all three candidates, but it was shown that this was put in by a man named Webb. Forty-two voters appeared and swore that they marked their ballots for Rutherford, and there were several witnesses who refused to answer the necessary questions while in the box, and gave evident impression of having been tampered with at the preliminary investigation.

ANDERSON'S TRIAL.

Another Carberry case was that against Thomas Anderson, who was committed for trial and against whom the grand jury found a true bill at the assizes. The case came to trial before the petit jury, and they disagreed. The Attorney General proceeded to quote the following from the charge of the chief justice to the jury in this case :—

" The return made shows that there were 49 ballots cast for Boyd, 29 for Braithwaite, and 15 for Rutherford. The case which the Crown seeks to make before you is, that it brings here 24 persons who say that they voted for Rutherford, and that these 24 persons did, in fact, vote for Rutherford, but that only 15 ballots were found in the box at the close of the poll marked for him, and the Crown asks you to draw the conclusion that certain of these ballots for Rutherford were withheld and ballots substituted, to the number of nine."

There was some question as to whether the accused was the deputy returning officer before whom some of the witnesses voted, but there is no doubt Anderson was the man appointed to act at Arizona poll. There were 93 ballots in the box, 93 names on the list, and every ballot initialled by the prisoner ; so the chief justice left it to the jury to say whether the accused was the man or not. The jury disagreed.

CHARGE AGAINST CLARKE.

Another case at Carberry was one against William Clarke. This man was committed by the magistrate, and a true bill found against him by the grand jury, and he was tried at the Portage la Prairie assizes, with the result of a disagreement. The speaker read the following extracts from the charge of the chief justice to the jury in this case :—

When the box was opened at the close of the poll there were found in it 121 ballots of which eighty three were marked for Boyd, ten for Braithwaite, nineteen for Rutherford, and nine were spoiled. Spoiled ballots they were called, but they were really rejected ballots. Four of them were properly good ballots, being marked for the candidate in the square at the end of the name instead of in the disc placed there for that purpose; two of the ballots were marked for both Boyd and Rutherford ; two for Boyd with the counterfoils not torn off ; and one ballot was not initialled by the deputy returning officer. The others were initialled, which, with the eighty-three, ten and nineteen make the 121 found in the box, but in the poll-book only 119 names of persons were entered as having voted. Where, then, did those other two ballots come from ? There is something curious there, at all events. Two ballots two many, and one of these initialled by the accused, so it must have come from him. We are told that while Clarke was out no votes came in, so that the whole of the votes and the only votes in the ballot box were put in while the accused was there. There were in the ballot box, as I say, nineteen ballots for Rutherford, then there was one which was marked for Rutherford which was rejected. That would make twenty, and there were two marked for both Boyd and Rutherford, and that would make twenty-two ballots apparently marked for Rutherford by some person or other. There were 31 who swore that they voted for Rutherford, and that would leave nine, at any rate, unaccounted for. Then we come to the evidence of a conversation with Freeborn by the accused. Freeborn says Clarke came up to him while he was going along the street and said to him : " How did you get along with the ballots up where you were ? ' And he said, ' All right,' and that then Clarke made the reply, ' We gave them a pretty good dose,' or ' We gave them a pretty good shot of it down here.' Freeborn cannot remember which of these expressions he used, but he says that is the conversation as far as he remembers it."

The jury disagreed, but the Crown considered the circumstances such as to ask for a remand until the next assizes, which was granted, the accused being released on bail.

MALCOLM ORR.

On the south-western branch there were three arrests at Glenborough, and the Attorney General dealt first with the case of Malcolm Orr, who was committed for trial by the magistrates. Orr's return at the close of the poll was : Boyd, 121 ; Rutherford, 70 ; Braithwaite, 2 ; and spoiled ballots, 5. Of these spoiled ballots, one was marked for all three candidates, and initialled; one for Boyd and Rutherford, and initialled; one marked for Rutherford and initialled and with counterfoil on ; one not marked, but initialled, and with with four lines across and initialled. The evidence showed that 78 voted for Rutherford. Of these, one (Ashby) voted for both candidates spoiling his ballot ; Grantham spoiled ballot No. 3, and got another, so that his ballot need not be deducted ; ballot No. 1 has to be deduced, leaving 76 Rutherford ballots to be accounted for as against seventy in the box. In addition, four witnesses believed to have

voted for Rutherford refused to answer. W. H. Robertson is in England, R. Steele in Ontario, Thomas Kenyon in England, William Bell could not be found, Wm. Atkinson is in Montreal, W. Thornborough at McGregor, Wm. Robinson in Brussels (Ont.), S. Ezard not known, R. J. Davison in Detroit, and L. F. Kingsley in Winnipeg. These fourteen men were all supposed to be Rutherford voters, and could not be got to the trial. Evidence was also given to show that the accused was under the influence of liquor during poll day.

Robert Roberts and Abram Denison were also arrested, but the cases were abandoned for want of sufficient evidence, though it was known that they interfered with the ballot box and carried it away to the hotel with them.

PARKER AND MAWHINNEY.

In the case of W. J. Parker, of Treherne Poll, there were found in the ballot box at the close of the poll, 52 ballots for Boyd, 46 for Rutherford, 16 for Braithwaite and two rejected ballots. The two rejected ballots were apparently intended for Rutherford, so that it may be said 48 men voted for Rutherford. In this case 49 voters swore before the magistrate that they voted for Rutherford. In this trial, also, there were a number of absent voters unobtainable. Parker received from Anderson, who was deputy returning officer at Arizon, a few days before the election, the sum of $100, but Anderson swears that he intended it for Alexander, the postmaster at Treherne, and that Parker agreed to give it to Alexander for election purposes.

There was also on the south-western line the case against William Mawhinney. A man named Maxwell had for a long time usually acted as deputy returning officer at Holland in Dominion elections, and so far as known to the speaker, had always been a satisfactory official. Maxwell, however, had, unfortunately for himself, a mutilated right hand, most if not all the fingers were off the right hand. Curiously enough, therefore, this Maxwell was not appointed deputy returning officer last June, but Mawhinney was sent all the way from Portage la Prairie to take the poll at Holland. Mawhinney was commited for trial and a true bill was found against him by the grand jury. Notwithstanding the evidence, however, the petit jury acquitted him. The following are some extracts from the charge to the petit jury by His Lordship the chief justice.

"The charge which the Crown makes against him is, that he unlawfully and wilfully destroyed certain ballots which were complete ballots, by having been in the hands of the electors of that district, marked by them and returned to the deputy returning officer to be placed by him in the ballot box. Now, as to the blank ballots, there seems to be some uncertainty as to the exact number sent out to that poll. Mr. Richardson, the returning officer, does not seem to have properly counted them before sending them out, but he has, however, entered in his book the number as being 245. From the return of the ballots used and unused, there would seem to have been 246, and we find an entry in the poll-book used as if there had been 263. This seems to me to go to this length, at any rate, to show great carelessness in the way this part of the work was done, no doubt about that. There is also a want of signature to one of the returns which should have been made in the poll-book, and the accused says it was an oversight that it was not put there. Now, at the polling place there were 160 persons who voted. According to the ballots produced here from the clerk of the Crown in Chancery, there were 84 for Boyd, 34 for Braithwaite, 38 for Rutherford, and 4 rejected. The charge of the Crown is, that a much larger number of people voted for Rutherford than 38, and that, therefore, their ballots must have been destroyed and made away with by the accused. We have called here 46 witnesses who swear that they voted for Rutherford, and you have also heard read the depositions taken before the magistrates of one other, who is too ill to come to this trial, but whose evidence I have admitted, who swore before the magistrate that he had voted for Rutherford. We have, then, 47 who swear that they voted for Rutherford, and, as only 38 ballots were found for him in the box when opened, no doubt, according to that statement, there are 9 ballots for Rutherford unaccounted for. But of these 47 a number of the witnesses seemed to be uncertain whether they marked their ballots in the first, second or third compartment, and counsel for the defence has built a strong argument on this fact. But, in considering that, you must take into account that that is a thing that works both ways, because, if persons intending to vote for Rutherford made a mistake and voted for another person, there may be people who intended to vote for one or other of the other two candidates, but who by mistake marked their ballots for Rutherford. Then, we have the evidence of this man Freeborn, whose character needs to be defended, as I said before. He is a man who has been engaged in a great deal of crooked work. He admits that he was engaged in crooked work before and about that time in the month of June. He, after that, turned round and disclosed the crooked work that he had been engaged in to another party, and he says he did it from a motive which may be a very improper one—a motive of revenge, certainly not a proper one—because he did not get certain moneys which he claimed he should have received for the work which he had been engaged in, and not having obtained these, he says that he determined to unseat Mr. Boyd, and gave the information which he possessed to other parties for the purpose of an election petition to unseat Mr. Boyd; but he says that, when he did so, he had no idea of criminal prosecutions resulting therefrom. At any rate, he is here, and has given the evidence which you have heard, in which he says that he met Mawhinney. He did not know him before that, and Mawhinney came up and spoke to him, and they then had a conversation over election matters, and he seems to have given the accused the impression that he had been a returning officer himself, and he says the accused said to him, 'I don't think the Grits will get on to me unless Sharpe gives me away," or something like that, and he says that the accused also told him the number of ballots that he had withdrawn and substituted others for, but he cannot remember how many the accused told him had been disposed of in that way."

Mawhinney himself declared that he had never met Freeborn, and His Lordship advised the jury to be careful about accepting the evidence of the accused person in his own behalf.

M'DOLE'S PETITION.

Another case on the same line of railway was that against James McDole, who was committed by the magistrate for trial. McDole was committed on the evidence very largely of Freeborn, and also on a document which was put in signed by McDole himself. This document is in the form of a petition to Boyd, asking him to resign the seat for Macdonald, and thus save many of his supporters from being proceeded against.

RENWICK AND HAMILTON.

There was also a series of prosecutions undertaken along the line of the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway. At Poll No. 8, Fred. M. Brown acted as deputy returning officer, and was arrested. In this case, it was proved that Freeborn went to Richardson, the returning officer, who directed him to Brown ; that he saw Brown and got 30 blank ballots from him, ten of which he gave to Sanders, of Gladstone. Brown was arrested for manipulating ballots at his own poll, but, owing to the absence of a great number of witnesses in Ontario, the case was not gone on with.

William Renwick, the deputy returning officer at Poll No. 45, near Arden, was arrested and committed by the magistrate for trial. The count at this poll was : Boyd, 56 ; Braithwaite, 51 ; Rutherford, 27, and 1 rejected ballot. The deputy returning officer himself voted on a certificate signed by J. H. Howden, of Neepawa, who produced as his authority for that act a letter from Richardson, the returning officer. This was a clear and flagrant violation of the Election Act. It was with great difficulty that Reeve McGregor could get the deputy returning officer to take his oath of office. Thirty-two voters swore they voted for Rutherford, but McNair, Rutherford's agent, and a number of others who voted for Rutherford, were away in Ontario and could not be present.

W. J. Hamilton, of Neepawa, was deputy returning officer for Poll 47. It is alleged that this individual had made the remark at the close of the day that, "Gentlemen had voted during the day for the Conservative ticket, who had never done so before." At this poll, the ballots counted were as follows :—Boyd, 46 ; Braithwaite, 36 ; Rutherford, 31 ; ballots objected to, 2. The evidence showed that William Goodman, the poll clerk, was only here on a visit, his home being in Ontario. He was appointed by the deputy returning officer, but performed none of the duties of a poll clerk, except to write the first name in the book. All the other names were written by Hamilton ; in fact, all his other duties were performed by the deputy returning officer. A ballot was given him in a hasty manner by the deputy returning officer, and he had almost proceeded to the polling both when Rutherford's scrutineer challenged his vote, as he was not on the list. The deputy returning officer stated that Goodman's name was on the poll at Glenboro'. It was proven that the name of William Goodman did not appear on the Glenboro' poll or any other poll in the electoral district of Macdonald. The certificates on which R. A. Bruce and the deputy returning officer voted at this poll, were signed by J. H. Howden for the returing officer.

THE McFADDEN CASE.

Moses McFadden was deputy returning officer at poll No. 48, and conducted his poll in a most arbitrary manner. When Rutherford's scrutineer objected to the vote of Alexander McKenzie, he was threatened with arrest. There was something very suspicious about the vote of this Alexander McKenzie. Alexander McKenzie does appear in the poll list at poll 52, but he was at that time acting as hired man for the deputy returning officer, and as he was by no means a man of sufficient substance to have been the owner of the property set down opposite the name of Alexander McKenzie in poll 52, his vote was objected to. Nevertheless he was set down in the poll-book as being in poll 48. One John Robertson voted at this poll, but his name is not on the list, nor is there a certificate to him as agent. As the difference between the count and the proved vote was only one, the case was abandoned by the Crown. A number of other witnesses were not obtainable on account of absence, and it was deemed advisable, under the circumstances not to press for a committal.

SANDERS'S CASE.

Another case on this railway line was the one against George W. Sanders, the deputy returning officer at Tupper. Sanders was tried before the magistrate at Gladstone, committed, and sent for trial at the Portage la Prairie assizes, and the jury there found him guilty. The following extracts are taken from the charge to the jury by His Lordship the Chief Justice, in this case :

"What number of blank ballots were sent out? It is said to be 161. It is remarked that that is rather an odd number—161—as they were done up in pads of 50's and 100's. It is said they counted on the morning that the ballot box was opened to see that there was nothing in it except what should be there, and that they were taken out and counted by different people, and that they may have made a mistake." Continuing, the chief justice refers to Freeborn, one of the witnesses, as follows :—"Now, you saw Freeborn and heard him give his evidence, and I must say there is nothing about his character to be commended. The only thing about it is that he frankly owned up to having been engaged in crooked work. He tells you that he was a Conservative, that he acted for the Conservative party, and that he was engaged in crooked work in connection with elections. Then, after the election was over, not having been paid certain expenses that he thought he was entitled to, he thought he would get the better of the candidate for whom he was working, and have him unseated, and he went and disclosed to the opposite party what he professed to have been engaged in for the purpose of having an election protest, and he tells you that he has been engaged working up evidence in connection with that matter, but that he did not expect criminal prosecutions in connection with it, but that the unseating of Mr. Boyd would be the result. Now, it is very often necessary to use such persons in connection with such matters. Frequently criminals who have been engaged in such matters, and who 'split' on their associates, come forward, and the Crown has to use them for the purpose of bringing other criminals to justice, as the saying is : When knaves fall out, honest men get their own.' He, Freeborn, was subjected to a strict cross-examination, and he told a consistent story, but whether that is true or not is for you to say. He tells you that he gave 10 blank ballots to the accused and he returned nine. Now, all these ballots are produced here and are all initialled by the accused as you will see. * * * Now, the Crown's theory is that a certain number of persons voted at that election and in place of some of the ballots which those people gave to the deputy returning officer he substituted others, really the ballots in place of the nine which he afterwards gave Freeborn, and which are now produced here. There were 20 witnesses called and they all swore they voted for Rutherford. In the box there were only 16 ballots marked for Rutherford, one rejected marked for Rutherford and Braithwaite, so that there are, according to the theory of the Crown, four ballots at all events which were given for Rutherford for which other ballots were put in the box. The accused differs with Freeborn as to the times Freeborn saw him and showed him how to

do it, and also as to the place and says it was on the street, not in the hotel, and says that he told him he didn't care to do it. It was curious the reason that he gave why he refused to do it—because he was not used to sleight-of-hand. It was not because he had any horror of it, or anything of that kind, but that he was not used to sleight-of-hand work and that his hands were too small. Now, we have the evidence of this witness, who shows you how the ballot, after it was given to the accused was folded up, making it very much shorter than its full length, and these nine ballots produced here seem to have all been folded in that way. Now the Crown suggests that is the way he succeeded with a small hand in doing it; folded the ballot up in that way, and it would not then project further than the hand and be noticeable. The accused when in the box made no denial of having folded the ballot for this man Stewart who was the witness before him."

In this case Sanders was found guilty, and after being found guilty such, it had been said, was the horror of Mr. Boyd and his friends of the offence with which Sanders was charged that he, Boyd, at once washed his hands of Sanders and refused to provide bail. But it must be remembered that two bondsmen were required and that one of the two gentlemen on the bond was Mr. McKelvie, president of the Conservative association at Gladstone.

HERRIMAN CASE.

There is still another case, that known as the Herriman case, and a great deal has been said about the terrible injustice which has been inflicted upon this man. Let the circumstances be recalled, and he would prove to the House and the electors of the province that, on the facts as they were known to the Crown before action was commenced, that the prosecution was justifiable. Herriman did not live, and was not an elector in the constituency of Macdonald. He is a gentleman whose record is to be found in the police court and the Superior Court, and in the reported case of the Queen vs. Herriman, Manitoba Law Reports, vol. 8, page 630. Herriman was arrested in 1892 on a charge of gambling and vagrancy, and was sentenced by the magistrate to three months in the common jail. The prisoner appealed and the appeal came before Mr. Justice Killam, and he upheld the conviction made by Police Magistrate Peebles. The learned judge said: "Why, then, should effect be given to the opinion of a witness whose means of forming it and the reliability of whose judgment are unknown? Such a course would be to substitute the judgment of the witness for that of the court. I know of no principle of the law of evidence which would justify this. There was, however, evidence which would justify the magistrate in finding the following facts:—The prisoner practised gaming extensively; he had no other ostensible profession or calling (if gaming can be termed such), by which to support himself. The prisoner was a member of what is called in the evidence of one witness 'a combination' for purposes of gaming; although the nature and purposes of this combination are not shown, at least, it can be inferred, they shared together in some way the profits resulting from their gaming. This combination, within eighteen months, won as large an amount as $3,000 from one party; much of the gaming was carried on in a room leased to the prisoner and another party; in the room was kept a table of a character peculiarly suited for the purposes of gaming, and particularly for a game called 'faro'; in some cases the prisoner or the combination took a 'rake off' or a percentage of the stakes; in a few isolated instances, the prisoner made use of marked cards or fraudulent dice; the prisoner lives in a house apart from the room mentioned and very inexpensively."

That was the individual, Mr. Speaker, who was selected by Wm. Richardson, the returning officer for Macdonald, to act as deputy returning officer at a poll in that electoral district. Now, taking it for granted that the theory of the Crown that there was a conspiracy, is correct, then, there was no place where a skilful operator like Herriman was much required as at the poll at Beaver Creek. The figures at the close of the poll stood this way: Rutherford, 49; Boyd, 27; Braithwaite, 49, and rejected, 4. These figures, on their face, show it to be just the very place where a man who used marked cards and fraudulent dice, should be sent. He, therefore, went to Beaver Creek, which is about 9 miles north of the McGregor station. The original arrangement was that Dr. Eaton, of Carberry, was to act as deputy returning officer, but two or three days before election day, Eaton's appointment was cancelled, and Richardson came to the city of Winnipeg and swore Herriman in there. On June 22, he arrived on the train at McGregor. He was recognized there immediately by an old resident, who knew something of the antecedents of Mr. Herriman, and the people there became very much alarmed that he had come there to practise some nefarious work in McGregor. At once a special constable was sworn in, and Herriman was very closely watched. To the surprise of every one, the next morning, Herriman took a buggy and drove northward, and he appeared at the poll at Beaver Creek to the great astonishment of everybody, and produced his credentials to act as deputy returning officer, and so angry were the electors and the representatives of Rutherford and Braithwaite, that they very plainly informed Mr. Herriman that if they caught him engaged in any crooked work, they would make it extremely lively for him. Under the circumstances, there is no doubt whatever the Crown would have failed in its duty, if, with these facts before it, it had not instituted the prosecution. Although a prima facie case had been made which would justify a committal, it was felt that the evidence was hardly strong enough to secure a conviction at the assizes, and the Crown, therefore, withdrew the proceedings.

There has been a great deal of criticism indulged in over the evidence of Freeborn, and, without speaking at length upon that point, he would once more refer to the statement of the chief justice, that it is in some criminal cases absolutely impossible to secure conviction without the evidence of just such men as he. The Crown feel that they have done their duty in this matter, and the circumstances proven at the various trials show their justification.

It has been stated by one hon. member, that Herriman left the court room with his character cleared. There was no such thing. It was no finding of the magistrate that dismissed Herriman, but it was on the statement of the Crown alone that he was let go, and for the reasons stated. The Crown was in duty bound to probe every case of suspicion to the bottom, and to spare no expense in bringing guilty parties to justice, but events have shown that charges like these are very difficult to prove, and, on account of the extreme difficulty of procuring such clear evidence as would secure a conviction, Herriman was let go, and the proceedings deliberately abandoned by the Crown cousel. Having gone over all the cases where there were arrests, he would just touch upon one again, the Scammell case.

Scammell was the deputy returning officer at Rathwell, and he confessed, and the proceedings against him were abandoned. He (the Attorney-General) had been subjected to a very great deal of criticism in connection with these cases, and it had taken the shape of an organized attack upon himself and his department in connection with a motion by an hon. member, because the department had not commenced proceedings for perjury against a certain individual. He took the stand then, and now, that his department only took hold of such a case after the accused had been committed by the magistrate. The hon. member claimed that in the well-known Chamberlain case, the department had taken the initiative. Such was not the fact. Chamberlain was arrested on June 22, 1893, at the instigation of W. R. Talbot, a private individual, but not on a charge of perjury; he was arrested for personation, and brought before the magistrate on that charge. The case was conducted by Mr. Monkman on behalf of Mr. Talbot, and, after having been remanded from time to time, some evidence was taken in the case. Suddenly, Chamberlain broke his bail and, while the case was still pending, took refuge across the boundary. Two or three months afterwards he reappeared, and was seen in the city of Toronto. It was due to the administration of justice in this province that he should be brought back and punished. A warrant for perjury was accordingly sworn out, executed at Toronto, and Chamberlain was brought back for trial. He was indicted for perjury, and after surmounting several technical objections, he was found guilty and sentenced to three years in the penitentiary, although he was released by the then powers at Ottawa, after serving about a year and a half. That case in no way affected the rule of the department, and no case of perjury has ever been taken up until it has first been brought before the magistrate by some individual.

Some time ago, he was replying to the hon. member for Woodlands, and took occasion to remark, in the Marquette election case, that the counsel for the respondent, Mr. Tupper, admitted to the counsel for the petitioner, that corrupt actions sufficient to void the election had been committed. He had lately received the following letter from Mr. Tupper :—

"Winnipeg, March 23, 1897.

"The Hon. J. D. Cameron,
"Attorney-General, Winnipeg.

"Dear Sir,—In the Winnipeg daily "Tribune" report of your speech on Mr. Roblin's resolution of censure respecting the failure of your department to prosecute Wm. G. King, the petitioner in the Marquette election case, the following appears :—

"'Hon. Mr. Cameron—The counsel for the respondent admitted to the counsel for the petitioner, that corrupt actions sufficient to void the election had been committed.

"'Mr. Roblin strongly protested against this, and said Hon. Mr. Cameron should not make statements which were not true. He had never heard of any such admission. Hon. Mr. Cameron said he was telling what was absolutely the case in every particular, and Mr. Roblin might rest assured of it.'

"As you are aware, I am Dr. Roche's counsel, and I am at a loss to understand how you ventured to make the above statement, as it is absolutely untrue that I ever admitted to the counsel for the petitioner that any corrupt act had been committed in connection with the Marquette election by any one, and I may add that in November last, four months after the petition was served, Dr. Roche informed me that, not only was he not personally guilty of any corrupt act, but that, after the most careful inquiry, he was unable to find a single case in which an agent of his had violated the Election Act by the committal of any corrupt act. Under these circumstances, I hope that I shall not appeal to you in vain to state on the floor of the legislature that you find, upon inquiry, that you were not justified in making the above statement respecting myself.

"Yours truly,
"J. STEWART TUPPER.

"P.S.—I am sending a copy of this letter to the 'Free Press' and the 'Nor'-Wester' for publication."

While he (Mr. Cameron) was not very familiar with the rules of etiquette as they relate to open letters, yet it seemed to him (the Attorney General) that when a member of the same profession as himself sends a letter to two newspapers in addition to one directed to himself, that he was called upon to answer it, though he must confess that letter had the appearance of a political manifesto about it.

Continuing, he said he had known for some time the terms of agreement between the two counsel in the Marquette election case. Mr. Ashdown had been defeated by some 60 or 70 votes, and upon asking Mr. Ashdown for further information upon this subject he sent the following letter :—

"Winnipeg, March 26, 1897.

"Hon. J. D. Cameron, city :

"Dear Sir,—In answer to your inquiry regarding the Marquette election protest, I would say that originally I declined to go into a protest until I had facts laid before me that rendered it certain to my mind that I had been done out of my seat by very unfair means. I was not prepared to fight the question if it was only one of technicality, but when I was satisfied that we had good ground on the merits of the question to go ahead, then I instructed that to be done. The mass of evidence which we finally gathered was very considerable, and when the verbal understanding between Messrs. Tupper and Howell was come to regarding the vacating of the seat, I was a consenting party to same; but was not willing that the matter should be left to the memory of those two gentlemen, and therefore at my suggestion a letter dated the 14th December, of which the inclosed is a copy, was written by Mr. Howell after suggestions and changes by myself. Subsequently under date of the 16th Mr. Tupper replied, as per copy inclosed. I thought at the time that Mr. Tupper, having gone over some, at least, of the evidence which we were prepared to offer, was thoroughly satisfied that on the merits of the case his client had no show whatever, and consequently he agreed to the terms set.

"Yours respectfully,
"J. H. ASHDOWN."

The following is the letter of Mr. Howell, and D. Tupper's acceptance of the terms of same :—

"December 14, 1896.

"Stewart Tupper, Esq., Q.C., city.
"Re Marquette.

"My Dear Tupper,—Mr. Ashdown has just been with me and has asked me if we have made binding arrangements respecting the settlement in this matter. I think, therefore, it is better that we should have everything in writing, so that there may be no mistake.

"As I understand our arrangement, it is as follows :—

"If the appeal to the full court now standing for judgment herein is decided in your favour, of course that disposes of the whole matter and the petition drops, unless I desire to take it to the Supreme Court. If, on the other hand, the appeal is not allowed, then when the trial comes up on the 16th of January, you or your client will admit such bribery by agents as will void the election. No order is to be made as to costs.

"Please write me confirming these terms, and oblige.

"H. M. HOWELL."

On the 16th of the same month, the following was sent to Mr. Howell :—

"H. M. Howell, Esq., Q.C., Winnipeg :
"Re Marquette.

"My Dear Howell,—I have your letter of the 14th instant, and beg to confirm the terms of our arrangement as therein stated subject, of course, to the trial being postponed until judgment is given on our appeal to the full court.

"Yours truly,
"J. STEWART TUPPER."

Under the circumstances, and with this proof in hand, the Attorney General repeated that what he said on the former occasion was absolutely true. He could not understand Mr. Tupper's denial, in the face of his written agreement, unless that gentleman was trying to draw a fine distinction between admitting bribery by agents and agreeing to admit such bribery when the trial occurred. A distinction evidently without a difference.

Before concluding he would like to say a few words on the difficulties that were encountered in these election cases, and this without reflecting on one party any more than the other. The Chamberlain case was a case in point, and those above mentioned show the extreme difficulty in obtaining convictions in these election prosecutions. It had been said by a great English statesman that an average man's political and partisan feelings are to-day a stronger force than his religious convictions. Be this true or not, we must admit that they are potent and that they invade the jury room, and, what is worse, the witness box. We cannot be blind to this fact, and the speaker was quite aware of it when these prosecutions were started, yet the facts which have since then been made public have amply justified the proceedings which the Crown has taken. He was sure the actions of the department of Justice at Ottawa, and of the Attorney General's Department here under Hon. Mr. Sifton and himself have the approval of the vast majority of the people, including the best elements of the Conservative party, and he hoped it would be the means of securing purity of election throughout the whole province.

In dealing with these election cases, he had confined himself thus far to the district of Macdonald, with the exception of the case of Anderson, whose offence was supposed to be committed in Winnipeg and was tried there. There were evidences of gross wrongs committed in other constituencies. Take, for instance, the electoral division of Lisgar, at poll 45, Barnsley, at which W. O. Taylor was the deputy returning officer. Under the Dominion Election Act two agents and no more are allowed for each candidate and for these alone can certificates be issued if they vote at any other poll than that at which their name appears on the list, but at that poll three certificates were granted to agents. In poll 58, at Swan Lake, where Arthur G. Hawkins was the deputy returning officer, four certificates were granted to agents, although objection was taken to such action.

In Provencher, the officials under the Dominion Election Act simply ran riot, and, as a sample of their doings, he would recite that in Poll 1, where E. J. C. Buron was deputy returning officer, the returning officer granted seven certificates to agents of Mr. LaRivière to vote, and all voted, though objected to. In Poll 4, where Miles McDermott acted, the returning officer had granted no less than twenty-three certificates to agents of Mr. LaRivière to vote at this poll. These were objected to, but the votes were all taken.

In conclusion, he could assure the Speaker and the House that nearly all, if not all, the facts mentioned this evening to the House were known to the Crown, either through Hon. Mr. Sifton or himself, and, in view of that knowledge, there was no other possible course open to the department here, or the Department of Justice at Ottawa, than to institute these prosecutions, and, if possible, bring the guilty parties to justice ; and he believed that the people of this province, and in fact the whole of the Dominion, including, as mentioned before, the best elements of the great Conservative party, approved of the duty which had been performed with so much trouble and patience.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have concluded, and I think this statement of facts presented here to-night will prevent a repetition of any such statement as we heard last night from the representative of Marquette (Mr. Roche).

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I move the first resolution pro forma, and without any intention of keeping the House longer.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Very well.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. With that understanding, I now move that the committee do rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would ask the Prime Minister to adopt the usual course under those circumstances, of allowing the same latitude of discussion of the resolutions in committee, as there would be on the general question. A number of hon. gentlemen who were anxious to speak have deferred their remarks in order to let the House go into committee to-night.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). That has always been understood.

Motion agreed to.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.30 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 3rd May, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CONTROVERTED ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, a certificate of the election and return of Firman McClure, Esq., for the Electoral District of Colchester.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 23) to incorporate the Methodist Trust Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Britton.)

Bill (No. 27) to incorporate the Royal Victoria Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Quinn.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 76) to incorporate the British Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Oliver.)

Bill (No. 77) to incorporate the Hudson's Bay and Yukon Railways and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Oliver.)

Bill (No. 78) to amend the Act incorporating the Ontario Accident Insurance Company.—(Mr. Osler.)

Bill (No. 79) to incorporate the Dominion Portland Cement Company.—(Mr. Britton.)

Bill (No. 85) to incorporate the Hull, St. Louis Dam and Victoria Springs Railway Company.—(Mr. Landerkin, for Mr. Edwards.)

Bill (No. 87) to incorporate the Columbia River Bridge Company.—(Mr. Bostock.)

QUEBEC BRIDGE COMPANY.

Mr. FISET (for Mr. Langelier) moved second reading of Bill (No. 80) respecting the Quebec Bridge Company.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like the hon. gentleman to explain this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Langelier) who has the Bill in charge is not here.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not want to prevent the Bill getting a second reading, but we should know what it is about.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I presume that the object of moving the second reading is to give the Bill a stage. I do not myself know what the Bill is.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Is this to build a bridge across the St. Lawrence at Quebec?

The PRIME MINISTER. I have not read the Bill, and I do not know what it is.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Bill is not printed, and the order had better stand.

MINING DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION.

Mr. MAXWELL moved second reading of Bill (No. 82) to incorporate the Mining Development and Advisory Corporation of British America (Limited).

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to have the hon. member (Mr. Maxwell) explain this Bill.

Mr. MORRISON. I intended to have presented this Bill, but in my absence it was put on the Order paper by my hon. friend (Mr. Maxwell). I have not the Bill with me to-day, but I will be able to explain it later.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I suppose the hon. gentleman will be able, later, to tell us in general terms the object of this Bill.

Mr. MORRISON. Quite so.

Mr. SPEAKER. The order stands.

MYCENIAN MARBLE COMPANY.

Mr. ROSAMOND moved second reading of Bill (No. 83) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Mycenian Marble Company of Canada (Limited).

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. ROSAMOND. This is a Bill to empower the Commissioner of Patents to grant a patent to the above-named company; the time in which they could apply for the patent and pay the fees having elapsed through some neglect of the clerk.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

CONTINENTAL HEAT AND LIGHT COMPANY.

Mr. ROSAMOND moved second reading of Bill (No. 84) to incorporate the Continental Heat and Light Company.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like the hon. member to explain that Bill.

Mr. ROSAMOND. This is the usual Bill for a private company, granting the ordinary powers to enable the company to establish works for the lighting of cities and towns, and also for heating.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

LES CISTERCIENS REFORMES.

Mr. LaRIVIERE moved second reading of Bill (No. 88) to incorporate "Les Cisterciens Réformés."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. This is to incorporate the Trappist Fathers, who have an establishment in Manitoba, and who intend to have other establishments in Manitoba and the Territories. Their object is to have model farms, and to teach agriculture and other pursuits in that line, and they only ask for powers to have a legal existence as a corporation.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SASKATOON AND BATTLEFORD AND ONION LAKE MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan) asked :

Has the contract for carrying the mails between Saskatoon and Battleford and Onion Lake been let? If so, what are the names of the contractors, and what is the contract price in each case?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The contract for this service has not yet been let.

DOMINION EXHIBITION IN TORONTO.

Mr. WALLACE (for Mr. Clarke) asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to grant any financial aid to the Dominion Exhibition to be held in the city of Toronto during the months of August and September of the present year?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I have reason to believe that the promoters of the Dominion exhibition have been informed by the Minister of Agriculture that the Government does not see its way to give any financial aid to the Dominion exhibition this year.

JOSEPH MERCIER, OF STE. FAMILLE.

Mr. GILLIES (for Mr. Casgrain) asked :

1. Is one Joseph Mercier, of Ste. Famille, Island of Orleans, employed in any capacity by the Government?
2. If so, in what capacity?
3. What is his salary?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). It is impossible yet to give the answer. We shall have to look over all the departments. I would request that the question be allowed to stand till the next sitting.

JOHN IRVINE.

Mr. GILLIES (for Mr. Casgrain) asked :

1. Has one John Irvine been appointed keeper of the Red Island Lightship?
2. If so, is his appointment a permanent one?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). John Irvine has been placed in temporary charge of the lightship referred to.

MR. BAZINET, OF JOLIETTE.

Mr. GILLIES (for Sir Adolphe Caron) asked :

Are the Government aware that Mr. Bazinet, assistant collector of customs at Joliette, P.Q., has made in a Liberal convention the nomination of the Liberal candidate chosen to contest the election for that district in the Quebec Legislative Assembly? Are they also aware that the same Dominion official is making political speeches in every parish of the district in favour of the Liberal candidate?

The PRIME MINISTER Mr. Laurier). The Government have not been informed that Mr. Bazinet is taking any part in the elections now going on.

THE RATE OF DUTY ON COAL.

Mr. McDOUGALL asked :

1. What was the rate of duty on Scotch and English coal imported into Canada under the old tariff?
2. What is the rate under the new tariff for the first year?
3. What will the rate be after the first year under the new tariff?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The rate of duty, as my hon. friend knows, was 60 cents a ton, and he knows the rate under the present tariff; but he knows also that the Finance Minister made the announcement a few days ago, when he delivered the Budget speech, that the whole question was under consideration, and that a further announcement would probably be made on the subject.

SASKATCHEWAN MAILS.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan) asked :

What amount does the Regina, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway Company receive for carrying the mails to Saskatchewan, N.W.T.? How often are they supposed to deliver the mails at Prince Albert, Saskatchewan? What time of day is the mail supposed to be delivered in Prince Albert? Has the mail been delivered on time in the months of February and March, 1897?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The Canadian Pacific Railway is paid $2,053.38 for the conveyance of the mails over the Regina and Prince Albert Railway, and the service is semi-weekly. The trains are due to reach Prince Albert at 9.35 p.m., Tuesdays and Saturdays. The Department have no knowledge as to the degree of regularity of the service during February and March.

KINGSTON PENITENTIARY.—BINDER TWINE.

Mr. McDOUGALL (for Mr. McLennan, Glengarry) asked :

1. What was the cost of establishing the manufacture of binder twine in Kingston Penitentiary,

including machinery, labour and all other expenses connected therewith?

2. How many were employed in the manufacture of binder twine each year since its commencement, their position, and the total cost to the country?

3. What was the quantity manufactured in the year 1896? The cost of manufacture per pound in that year, and the price at which it was sold per pound in the province of Ontario in 1896?

4. Have any sales been made this year? If so, to whom sold? What quantity, and at what price per pound? What are the terms and conditions of the sales and payment?

5. When sold in large quantities, at a reduced price, has the Government made conditions and stipulations with the purchases that the consumer will be protected in getting twine at the same price as formerly sold by the Government?

6. Do the Government intend to further manufacture binder twine? If not, why? What has been done, or what is to be done with the plant used for the manufacture of binder twine?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). In reply to the hon. gentleman I beg to say: 1. $40,280. 2. In 1894, four officers, aggregate salaries $3,620, and about 40 convicts; in 1895, four officers, aggregate salaries $3,620, and about 40 convicts; in 1896, three officers, aggregate salaries $2,800, and about 40 convicts. 3. The preparation of this statement would require considerable time and the question should therefore be put in the form of a motion for a return. 4. Yes. To the Hobbs Hardware Company. The sale includes the actual output up to August 1st—approximate quantity sold, 500 tons. As the goods have not yet been placed upon the market the price cannot be made public at present. The terms and conditions of sale are cash on delivery. 5. No conditions have been exacted. The keen competition of the past few years and the lowering of the duty in 1894 have made this unnecessary. 6. The matter is under consideration.

POSTAL REGULATIONS.—UNITED STATES AND CANADA.

Mr. LANDERKIN (for Mr. Britton) asked:

It is stated that under the postal laws and regulations of the United States, the sender of a letter may have said letter returned to him at any time, before its actual delivery to the person to whom such letter is posted, provided the sender fully identifies himself to the postmaster at the office at which the letter was mailed, and deposits with the postmaster to defray any expenses made in recalling the letter. Is there any such law or regulation in Canada? If not, has the matter been considered by the Postmaster General, or in his department?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The only way I can answer this question is to give to the House the regulations of the United States and those of Great Britain. The regulations of the United States are as follows with regard to withdrawal of mail matter:

UNITED STATES.

381. Before Despatch.—After mailable matter has been deposited in the post office, it cannot be withdrawn except by the writer thereof, or the sender, or, in case of a minor child, the parent or guardian duly authorized to control the correspondence of the writer. The utmost care must be taken to ascertain that the person desiring to withdraw the matter is the person entitled to do so. If necessary, the postmaster should require the applicant to exhibit a written address in the same hand as that upon the letter, and such description of the letter or article mailed, or other evidence, as will identify the same and satisfy the postmaster that the applicant is entitled to withdraw it.

The postmaster acts at his peril in permitting such withdrawal, and would be liable, however honest his intentions, were he to deliver it to an imposter or one not entitled to it. He should in no case delay the mail or retard the business of his office in order to search for a letter desired to be withdrawn.

Withdrawn by Sender After Despatch.—After a letter has passed from the mailing post office, the delivery of the same may be prevented, and its return to the writer secured, by an application by the writer to the postmaster at the office of mailing, stating reasons therefor, identifying the letter, and supporting such application with sufficient proof in writing. Upon such application and evidence, and upon a deposit being made by the writer of a sum sufficient to cover all expenses incurred, the postmaster shall telegraph a request for the return of such letter to his office, if it has been forwarded, to the postmaster at the office of address, carefully describing the same, so as to identify it and prevent the return of any other matter. On receipt of such request, the postmaster at the office of address, carefully describing the same, so as to identify it and prevent the return of, will deliver it to the writer upon payment of all expenses and of letter rate of postage on the matter returned, on the envelope of which postage-due stamps of the proper value must be placed and cancelled, and upon the prepayment also of a registered parcel, addressed to the First Assistant Postmaster General, Division of Correspondence, Post Office Department, in which the postmaster shall inclose and transmit the application of the writer and all proofs submitted by him, together with the writer's receipt for it, and the envelope of the returned letter.

CANADA.

Property in Post Letters and Other Mailable Matter.

(Sec. 43, 49th Vict., Chap. 35.)

From the time any letter, packet, chattel, money or thing is deposited in the post office for the purpose of being sent by post, it shall cease to be the property of the sender, and shall be the property of the person to whom it is addressed, or the legal representatives of such person; and the Postmaster General shall not be liable to any person for the loss of any letter, packet or other thing sent by post.

GENERAL POST OFFICE REGULATION IN UNITED KINGDOM.

Postmasters are not allowed to return any letter, parcel or other postal packet to the writer or sender, or to any one else, or to delay for-

warding it to its destination according to the address, even though a request to such effect be written thereon.

SUBSIDY TO REGINA, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RAILWAY.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan) asked:

1. What amount of cash subsidy did the Regina, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway Company receive from the Dominion Government?
2. What amount of lands did they receive per mile?
3. Are the lands located, and if so, where?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The company do not receive any direct cash subsidy from the Government. All they get is a bonus of $80,000 a year for twenty years contingent on the transportation of men and supplies. The land subsidies are 6,400 acres per mile.

QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked:

1. Is the Government aware that, speaking at a public meeting in the city of Quebec, on the 27th of April instant, Mr. S. N. Parent, Mayor of Quebec made the following statement, according to the newspaper "Le Soleil":—"He (Mr. Parent) held in his hand a letter from Ottawa, giving him the assurance that the building of the bridge (meaning the bridge across the St. Lawrence at or near Quebec) would soon begin"?
2. Has the Government, or any of the members thereof, given Mr. Parent any such assurance?
3. Since the Premier announced the policy of the Government in reference to the bridge across the St. Lawrence, at or near Quebec, on the 9th of September, 1896, in reply to the inquiry by the member for Montmagny, has the Government in any way altered its policy in relation to the said enterprise, and if so, in what way?
4. Have any assurances, other than those already stated, been given in relation to the said bridge to anybody, and if so, what were the assurances?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The Government are not aware that Mr. Parent made the statement referred to and reported in the newspaper "Le Soleil." There is no change of policy with regard to the bridge, and the Government have taken no steps since the answer given to this House by myself on the 9th of September, 1896.

Mr. GILLIES. The hon. gentleman has not answered the second paragraph of the question.

The PRIME MINISTER Mr. Laurier). I am not aware that Mr. Parent has any such letter.

GEORGE VEZINA.

Mr. BERGERON (for Mr. Dugas) asked:

1. Is it not a fact that the present Controller of Inland Revenue gave orders to have George Vézina, of Quebec, imprisoned under conviction of having infringed the Inland Revenue laws?
2. If he did not, why did he not give the necessary instructions to carry out the sentence of the court?
3. If he did give instructions, why were they not carried out?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). When the present Government came into office they found the case had been disposed of by their predecessors in office and they did not deem it at all advisable to disturb the disposition of that case.

LAND OFFICE AT ESTEVAN.

Mr. DAVIN asked:

1. Whether the land office at Estevan has been removed to Alameda?
2. Whether any change has been made in the boundary of the agency?
3. Were the services of Mr. A. E. Hetherington dispensed with?
4. If so, why? Was there any complaint against his efficiency?
5. Has his position been given to Mr. D. A. McEwan?
6. What training or experience has D. A. McEwan had?
7. If the position has been given to McEwan, why was it not given to an official already in the service?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). In reply to the hon. gentleman I beg to say: 1. The land office at Estevan has been closed. A new office for the district has been established at Alameda. 2. No. 3. Yes. 4. When the office at Estevan was discontinued the Minister decided not to re-employ Mr. Hetherington, for reasons which he considered to be satisfactory and conducive to the public interest. Mr. Hetherington had only been employed by the Department for a few years. 5. Yes. 6. Mr. McEwan's training and experience were of a character to satisfy the Minister that Mr. McEwan had the ability to perform the duties of the office satisfactorily. 7. Because the Minister thought Mr. McEwan the best qualified man for the position.

MR. PIERRE BEGIN'S DISMISSAL.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked:

1. Has Pierre Bégin, of Lévis, been dismissed from the position of section man on the Intercolonial Railway?
2. If so, for what reason and at whose request?
3. Was an investigation held in his case? If so, what is the nature of the report, and by whom was it made?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Pierre Bégin has been dismissed from the position referred to. He was dismissed for active and offensive partisanship in the last general election. No investigation was held, the department having acted on the representation of Dr. Guay, M.P., made on personal knowledge.

MR. EUGENE BLANCHET'S DISMISSAL.

Mr. GILLIES (for Mr. Casgrain) asked:

Is the Honourable Minister of Railways and Canals aware that Eugène Blanchet, of Fraserville, is actually employed as section foreman between Rivière du Loup and Cacouna, and that he was paid as such in the course of April?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Yes, I am now informed that Eugène Blanchet of Fraserville is employed as section foreman between Rivière du Loup and Cacouna, and I believe he was paid in April for work performed as section foreman during the month of March.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would suggest, that, as usual, we run through those notices of motion on which there is no discussion.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Very well.

MR. WILLIAM McCARTHY, FENELON FALLS.

On motion for:

Copies of all correspondence between the Department of Railways and Canals, or any officer or officers thereof, and Wm. McArthur, of Fenelon Falls, in regard to the dispensing with his services.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I may inform the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) that the passage of this resolution would be entirely useless. There is no correspondence in the department relating to this officer, and the hon. gentleman will see, therefore, that there will be no advantage in pressing the motion.

Mr. HUGHES. All I have to say is that the hon. Minister must have given a very peculiar answer to my question some time ago, because he distinctly——

Mr. SPEAKER. We cannot discuss the matter at present. The motion must stand.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE LATE GOVERNMENT.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved for:

Copy of Schedule B, showing recommendations of the Treasury Board as submitted by report of Council to His Excellency the Governor General on the 6th and 7th July, 1896, and intended to be approved by him, laid upon the Table of the House last session, with a statement of the action taken by the Government on each of these appointments as made by the said Order in Council approved by His Excellency, or, where no action has been taken, the reason for such a course.

He said: I regret to say that any necessity should have arisen for making this motion, which I certainly do not think should have been required. The House will remember that this matter was the subject of a discussion between the First Minister and myself; and I am quite sure that the House will be surprised to learn by a paper laid upon the Table of the House by the First Minister, stating the appointments which had been approved by His Excellency the Governor General and thus making public to the House and to the country the fact that His Excellency the Governor General had sanctioned this Order in Council—the House, I say, will be surprised to learn that these appointments have been treated, I think, in a very extraordinary manner, the most extraordinary manner which any appointments ever emanating from the Government of Canada, have been treated before. The House will remember that on the occasion of that discussion in reference to the change of Government, I showed to the House that on the occasion of the defeat of Mr. Mackenzie and his Government, of which the present First Minister was a member, Lord Dufferin, in the discharge of his duties as Governor General, sanctioned every appointment suggested or proposed by the Government of Mr. Mackenzie of which, as I say, the present First Minister was a member without any exception or qualification whatever. The hon. gentleman knows these appointments, 116 in all, if I remember aright, in addition to 17 promotions, were made by a Government that had just sustained a defeat at the hands of the people by one of the most overwhelming majorities that ever overturned an Administration in Canada, or perhaps relatively in almost any other country. The majority by which Mr. Mackenzie's Government was defeated will be found, I think on reference to the Journals, to have been between 80 and 90 in a House of 215 members. A reference to the character of the appointments, the details of which were laid on the Table of the House last session, will show that they were of the most important nature, that they included a large number of the most important appointments that could be made in Canada, ranging from Judges, of the Supreme Court down to County Court Judges, also a large number of officials holding very high and important positions, one of the hon. gentleman's friends being appointed as Deputy Minister, although he had been quite a short time in the public service. Every recommendation by the Government of which Mr. Mackenzie was Premier, although that Government was defeated by an overwhelming majority, was sanctioned by an able Governor General, in fact one of the most able and experienced Governors General that Canada ever had, without any exception whatever. I will not refer to other recommendations made, although they included large additions to salaries which had not previously been sanctioned by Parliament; but every

appointment and every recommendation was approved, I hold in strict conformity with Imperial precedents and precedents established on former occasions when the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald resigned in 1873—all those appointments and recommendations made by the leader of the Government and his colleagues were sanctioned by Lord Dufferin who was then Governor General. Acting under the well-known rule that in the absence of any previous rule, it is the duty of the Governor General to follow English precedents, all those appointments were properly sanctioned by Lord Dufferin as Governor General. When the Government of which I had the honour to be the head was defeated by a majority insignificant in comparison with that which had defeated the Government of which Mr. Mackenzie was the First Minister, made, as I hold properly, 92 recommendations, a much smaller number than were made by Mr. Mackenzie's Administration, 26 were refused, as I hold entirely in violation of the principles of parliamentary government and all English precedents, and as I hold in the strongest possible violation of the principles established by Lord Dufferin on two similar occasions, namely, the resignation of the Administration of Sir John Macdonald, in 1873, and the defeat of the Mackenzie Government in 1878.

The hon. gentleman knows that the reports of the Treasury Board recommending a large number of these appointments were submitted to the Governor General; that he, in the exercise of his discretion or indiscretion, took the extraordinary course of undertaking to judge as to what appointments should be sanctioned and what should not. His Excellency signed those Treasury reports with a qualification. That signature was the most valid and complete authority the Governor General could give to all those appointments that did not come within the category of the exceptions he took as to the recommendations. The decision as to those appointments which came within the category to which the Governor General took exception was submitted to the judgment of the hon. the Prime Minister and his colleagues. They exercised that judgment, and subsequently brought down and laid on the Table of the House a report of those appointments, which, under the signature of the Governor General, had been made valid and complete according to his own declaration. My hon. friend was asked, what was the position of those appointments? His answer was, those appointments will stand. It was not possible for my hon. friend to give any other answer, because it was perfectly obvious that having, as a leader of the Administration, brought down those appointments and declared they had received the imprimatur and sanction of the Governor General, it was quite obvious that those parties held those positions by the most indefeasible tenure possible. I quite admit that it was perfectly competent for the hon. gentleman to exercise his judgment, and to review any appointments that were made. The fact that the appointments were made within parliamentary rule does not take them out of the category of appointments which can be reviewed by the Government, if they are able to show any reasons why such appointments should be changed or recalled. But no greater publicity could be given to those appointments than the fact that they were embodied in the statement laid on the Table of the House as appointments proposed by the previous Government and sanctioned by the Governor General, and the addition of the emphatic declaration by the First Minister that those appointments will stand. The House will be a little surprised to learn, hon. members ought to be surprised to learn if they are not, that down to this day an extraordinary, I do not hesitate to say an unprecedented course has been pursued in regard to a large number of those appointments. I do not say in regard to every one that those parties have been left without any communication whatever from the Government down to the present day. I cannot imagine that greater disrespect could be shown to the Crown or to the Governor General of Canada than to lay on the Table of Parliament a statement of appointments with the declaration made by the First Minister, and that those parties should be left without receiving any communication whatever from the Government respecting their position. I am not prepared to say that this has occurred in every case, but I know that in several cases it has occurred.

At the outset, I may say that the whole of the recommendations made by the Government of which I had the honour to be a member, had reference to insignificant positions, with the exception of the names of four gentlemen who were nominated for seats in the Senate. Instead of there being appointments of judges to the Supreme Court, or the county courts, or of persons to positions with large salaries attached, they were all appointments made in the ordinary course to fill vacancies in the public service, and with comparatively small salaries, as any person who takes the trouble to run his eye over the list will see. I do not intend to go into this matter fully, but I shall give one instance. A gentleman came to me a short time ago and said: The House and the country were notified that I had been appointed collector of customs at a salary of $800, but I have not received a word of communication from the Government up to the present time; I assumed that I was appointed, and I am not in a position to take up any other employment, because I daily expect that the published decision of the Governor General in Council will be given effect. I have been left in a condition of expectancy and doubt ever

since, and I do not yet know whether I am to receive the office or not. I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) if he thinks that a proper mode in which to treat an appointment made under those circumstances? Does he think it justice to the individual? The hon. gentleman has the advantage of being a lawyer, and I am not in a position to speak as to the question of law, but every one knows that under ordinary circumstances this gentleman who was appointed to the office would have the right to a fiat to compel the Government to pay him the salary that had been proclaimed to the country as attached to the appointment which had been signed by His Excellency. I hold that this Government were bound to do one of two things. They were bound to install every one of these appointees in their offices and communicate the fact to them; or, if from any reason that subsequently occurred they felt that they were justified in cancelling the appointment, they should have cancelled it by Order in Council, and notified the person that he was not to receive the office. My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier), will, I think, admit that the humblest individual in the country is entitled to at least that at the hands of the Government.

Another case occurs to my mind. I was informed of a vacancy which had taken place in the Library, because of a resignation, and in virtue of the right which belonged to me I nominated a gentleman for that position. He was appointed by His Excellency the Governor General, and his name appeared in the list of those whom the Premier said, had been absolutely appointed, and as to whom there was no qualification whatever. That young gentleman, down to this hour, has never received the slightest intimation from the Government, as to whether he is to be called upon to discharge these duties or not. It is a question of only $400 a year, but it was a matter of great importance to that young man. If the Government were inclined to cancel these appointments, the least they could do in justice to themselves and in justice to the parties concerned, was to have given these persons notification. My attention has been called to many similar cases, and so far as I am able to learn, many of those appointees have been superseded by the appointment of other persons. I should fail in my duty to the House if I did not give the Prime Minister an opportunity of stating on what grounds his Government pursued this entirely unprecedented course.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) so far forgot himself, in the discussion to which I refer, as to allude to me as an office grabber. On what grounds was I an office grabber? If it was office grabbing for the head of a Government to make ninety-two recommendations, I ask him how he characterizes himself and the late lamented Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, the leader of his Government, when, after they had met with an overwhelming defeat at the hands of the people, they grabbed no less than 116 appointments, and 17 promotions. I am quite sure that had my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) reflected he would not have used that term in reference to me. If it were worth the time of the House I could vindicate myself most emphatically, from the first hour of my entering into public life down to the present moment, from the charge of being an office grabber. I believe, if there is a public man in this country, who can vindicate himself against such a charge as that, it is myself.

Mr. CASEY. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Some hon. gentleman says "hear, hear," and I am quite sure that if he be acquainted with the past history of this country and with my own history, he does not intend that as anything else than an emphatic endorsement of what I am saying.

Mr. CASEY. Hardly.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not desirous to take up the time of the House at length, but as I had not an opportunity of replying to my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) on a former occasion, I want to call his attention to a very grave error into which he fell. The hon. gentleman then said in reference to the Senate:

> I charge here against him (meaning myself) and against his party, that, in so far as the Senate of Canada is concerned, they have all along, for the past eighteen years, disregarded the constitution of Canada in the nature of the appointments which they made to that branch of the legislature. It was one of the well-understood principles at confederation—and the hon. gentleman referred a moment ago to the debates of the Quebec Convention—it was one of the well-understood principles then, that if the Senate was not elective, and if it was to be appointed by the Crown, then both political parties should be equally represented on the floor of the Senate.

I have no doubt that my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier made that statement in good faith, but he was entirely mistaken. No such principle was ever established, and the very authority he quotes to prove it, disproves his statement, as I shall show. What occurred was this. The House is well aware, that when the question of the constitution of the Senate came to be considered, for many years an elective legislative council had existed in Old Canada—the province of Quebec and the province of Ontario united—and that in the other provinces, the legislative councils consisted of persons appointed by the Crown. Well, Sir, as I need not remind any member of this House, confederation was accomplished by a combination of the Liberal party and the Conservative party. It was a coalition Government, and there was at Quebec, the Hon. George Brown, the Hon. Mr. Howland and the Hon. Wm. McDougall representing the Lib-

eral party, and Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir George E. Cartier and Sir E. P. Taché representing the Conservative party. The delegation from Nova Scotia consisted of three supporters of the Government of which I was the head, together with the leader of the Opposition in the legislative council and the leader of the Opposition in the House of Assembly, who had been named by me as delegates to represent Nova Scotia. The same took place in the province of New Brunswick. The delegation was composed of members of the Liberal and Conservative parties, and Sir Oliver Mowat was almost the only person who raised the question of an elective Senate. It was by common consent of the delegates, supported in the strongest manner by the late Hon. George Brown, that the policy of having a Senate nominated for life by the Crown was adopted. Connected with that policy was the understanding that in the first appointments to the Senate due regard should be had to a fair division between the Liberal and Conservative parties. That was done. The gentlemen nominated for the position of senators were selected from the old legistive councils to a very large extent, if not to the entire extent, in Canada, and they were nominated so as to represent fairly the two parties. The same thing was done in the province of Nova Scotia. Before a single appointment was offered to any Conservative, one-half of the senatorships to which the province of Nova Scotia was entitled were offered to leading gentlemen in the old legislative council of that province who were Liberals; and no appointment was made until they had the opportunity of accepting or declining it. So the hon. gentleman is quite right, so far as the first appointments to the Senate were concerned; but he is entirely wrong in supposing that there was ever contemplated any limitation to the power of the Crown in regard to appointments to the Senate after the question of these original members had been disposed of. I am not able to say with absolute certainty, but I think my hon. friend will agree with me that, to a very large extent within the last eighteen years, there were no members of the old legislative council who had not been brought into the Senate or who were left unprovided for. I think I am safe in saying that. I say emphatically that there was no understanding, which the hon. gentleman charges as a breach of faith on the part of the government of which I had the honour of being a member. I will read what Sir John Macdonald said in the statement the hon. gentleman quoted. He said:

He (Sir John) wrote a name, choosing from his own party, and they selected their man, and the consequence was twelve Reformers and twelve Conservatives were elected to sit in that Chamber, and no one knew better than his hon. friend that it was a fair understanding that the claims of members of the legislative council of Old Canada to seats in the Senate should be considered as vacancies might take place, and that had been faithfully carried out.

That, instead of supporting the statement of the hon. gentleman, that we had violated the principle which had been established in regard to the Senate, entirely disproves it, because it shows that that principle was confined to the existing members of the old legislative council of Canada, and was faithfully carried out. That statement was made by Sir John Macdonald in 1872. The hon. gentleman knows that a year afterwards the power to appoint to the Senate passed from the hands of Sir John Macdonald to the hands of Mr. Mackenzie, and I have yet to learn that Mr. Mackenzie was in any way limited in regard to filling any vacancies in the Senate by anything except the general principle that they were to be appointed by the Crown, and for life.

Now, I do not intend to take up more time on this point. But I see by the newspapers that the Hon. Mr. Power has been discussing questions in relation to myself, and he has placed before the public the following statement:—

There was an election in Nova Scotia in 1859, and the Conservative government, which had been in power, were defeated in that election, as happened in the election which took place in 1896. The government did not accept their defeat, but called upon the Representative of Her Majesty, Lord Mulgrave, to forthwith dissolve the House which had just been elected. They found that they were in a minority of four, and they claimed that there had been certain irregularities in the elections of some members and asked that the House should be dissolved. The Lieutenant-Governor of Nova Scotia very naturally and properly declined to do that. He said that that was not his business—that the trial of those elections was a matter for the House and its committees. This happened in the beginning of the year 1860—this refusal to dissolve. The House met in 1860, and the government were defeated, and as the governor would not give them a dissolution, they had to resign. They resigned, I think, about January, or February, 1860, and they sent a very strong memorial to the Duke of Newcastle in connection with the Lieutenant-Governor's conduct. The action of the Lieutenant-Governor met with the cordial endorsation of the Duke of Newcastle; and after all this had taken place, on the 29th October, 1860, months after the whole thing had been disposed of by the Duke of Newcastle, the gentleman who now leads the Opposition in the House of Commons addressed a long letter to that nobleman, from which I propose to quote to the House two or three extracts. Speaking of the refusal of Lord Mulgrave to dissolve, this gentleman said to the Duke of Newcastle:

"A decision has been made which cannot fail to induce, in these colonies, the impression that what has been supposed to be self-government, is but a delusion and a snare."

A little further on he said:

"The people of this province have been content, my lord, to pay a salary of fifteen thousand dollars a year to a governor sent from England, besides a large additional sum to keep up his establishment; while the State of Maine, with twice our population, has the privilege of electing

that officer from among her people, and pay him but fifteen hundred dollars.

"Can such a condition of things be expected to give satisfaction, with the evidence forced upon us that we have no rights worthy of a moment's consideration, when weighed against the interest or convenience of a gentleman who has been useful to the Imperial Cabinet before coming here?

"Destitute of representation in the Parliament of Britain, with our most eminent men systematically excluded from the highest position in their own country, and for which their colonial experience and training eminently fit them, it is impossible that the free spirit of the inhabitants of British North America can fail soon to be aroused to the necessity of asserting their undoubted right to have their country governed in accordance with the well understood wishes of the people. * * * *

"In conclusion, Your Grace will allow me to add, that should it prove true that the Colonial Office has determined to sustain the Lieutenant-Governor in the unconstitutional course pursued by him, it will become necessary to lay the subject before the Imperial Parliament, and this country will then learn whether the time has arrived, when important constitutional changes have become indispensable for the acquisition of British institutions, as enjoyed in the parent state.

"I have the honour to be,
"Your Grace's most obedient servant,
"CHARLES TUPPER, M.P.P."

That was pretty strong language, all because the government had not chosen to dissolve a newly-elected assembly.

A gentleman in the audience interrupted Mr. Power by saying, "All pointing to federation as a remedy."

Hon. Mr. POWER. There was not a word said about federation, and nothing thought about federation. It rather pointed to independence, or annexation, so that we could elect our own governors, and pay them only $1,500. That is rather ancient history; still, the leopard does not change his spots; and a few months ago, in the summer of 1896, this same gentleman was the leader of a government which appealed to the country and which was defeated upon that appeal; and the language which he used in another place towards the Representative of Her Majesty, was nearly as strong as the language contained in that document of 1860.

An hon. gentleman interrupted that statement by saying, "Not a whit too strong."

Mr. SPEAKER. Is the hon. gentleman quoting from the debates of the Senate? I gather from the nature of the last interruption he quoted that he is doing so.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I said an hon. gentleman in the audience interrupted.

Mr. SPEAKER. There can be no dispute as to whether the hon. gentleman was quoting from the debates of the Senate or not. If so, I shall have to check the hon. gentleman.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then I can only bow with the greatest deference to your ruling, Sir, and shall not quote from the Senate Debates in any other place. But I wish to draw the attention of the House to what the facts were. It is quite true that, upon the conclusion of the elections in 1859 in Nova Scotia, the government of which I had the honour to be a member, felt that a very grave question arose, and it arose in this way. A Bill had been passed, previous to the dissolution of the House, declaring that any person holding office under the Crown was disqualified from sitting or voting in the legislative assembly—a law similar to that which exists here. It transpired that five gentlemen at least who were elected in opposition to the government were notoriously holding offices under the Crown, to the knowledge of the Lieutenant-Governor and of every other intelligent person in Nova Scotia. The Lieutenant-Governor, under those circumstances, wrote to the Colonial Office, stating the facts, and asked the Colonial Office what he should do, if a majority composed of those gentlemen, notoriously disqualified as they were by the Act of the legislature from sitting or voting, created a majority and took charge of the government. That despatch of the Lieutenant-Governor was referred to the law officers of the Crown in England, and when I mention that Sir Richard Bethel was at that time the Attorney General, afterwards the distinguished Lord Chancellor, the House will understand that the opinion sent out had the very greatest weight and authority. That opinion of the law officers of the Crown, taken by the Colonial Office at the request of the Lieutenant-Governor of Nova Scotia, was sent out, as I consider, for his guidance, and it declared that if the attempt to govern were made by a majority notoriously disqualified from sitting or voting in the House, it would become the duty of the Lieutenant-Governor to appeal to the people. Those were the circumstances under which I maintained that it was necessary, for the vindication of the law and the constitution of the country, that there should be a dissolution. I do not think that it will require any elaborate argument to show that I had good ground and that the government of which I was a member had good grounds for drawing the attention of the Colonial Office to the position that was then taken. But I may say that the declaration of Mr. Power, that confederation had never been heard of or thought of until then, is entirely unfounded. Before that letter was written by me, I had been invited to open the Mechanics' Institute in St. John, and on that occasion I chose for my subject the political condition of British North America, and I propounded precisely such a scheme of government as exists in Canada to-day, as the solution of all our difficulties, as the means of opening up these positions of Lieutenant-Governors to men belonging to our own country, who were eminently qualified to fill them. Was I right or wrong? The last thirty years have vindicated my policy and shown that

we are as able to furnish men fitted to discharge, in all the provinces, that high position—men from both parties—as worthily as any who could be obtained from the old country. Not only is that the case, but the reduction of salaries to which I pointed has been accomplished in the same way. I did challenge the act of the Lieutenant-Governor of Nova Scotia as a gross violation of the constitution of the country—and I was supported by the law officers of the Crown in England as to what was the proper course for him to pursue—and we called upon him before resigning and asked him to carry out what we regarded as the instructions from the Crown, and give the people of Nova Scotia the opportunity of electing a Parliament of which the majority would not be composed of persons notoriously disqualified from sitting or voting or otherwise taking charge of the public business. I probably used quite as strong language and stronger than I have been permitted by you, Sir, to use in another direction. Well, the Governor declined. He was advised to withstand that appeal, and he refused to give that dissolution which we asked. Then I carried the case before the country, and I may tell Mr. Power, if he does not know it, that I had the support of nine-tenths if not nineteen-twentieths of his co-religionists in Nova Scotia, who sustained me in my declaration that the constitution of the country had been violated by the Lieutenant-Governor. When we got to that ultimate tribunal, where the voice of the people could declare itself, the Government which had sustained the Lieutenant-Governor in that unconstitutional course was swept out of existence. The Hon. Joseph Howe, who was the leader of the government, was defeated in the county of Lunenburg. The members of his government, right and left, all over the province were driven out of office, and we came back to power with one of the largest majorities ever obtained in the olden times in that province. I think I had a majority of twenty-five at my back in that House. I give these particulars as showing what really took place. I may say that the Lieutenant-Governor accepted his defeat and took an early opportunity of retiring from his office and going back to England. But before he did that, he had the mortification of being obliged to call back to office the men whose advice he had refused, and also to restore to their positions, before he left the country, every official whom he had dismissed on the advice of his former Ministers. I do not intend to carry the parallel further, but I think, as the hon. gentleman has gone out of his way to give his version of this story, it is just as well we should clear up these historical records. I did not intend to say more on the question than I have said, and as this came up necessarily in connection with the action I have taken in this House on this very question, I felt it was my privilege to draw attention to it, and I am very much obliged to you, Mr. Speaker, for not having, at an earlier moment, interfered with my statement of the facts.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I am sure I shall not surprise my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) if I tell him that I have no intention at all of discussing, on this occasion, issues arising out of events which took place forty years ago, almost, in the province of Nova Scotia. I do not know whether those issues are alive yet in the province of Nova Scotia or not. But if we are to judge of the feeling of Nova Scotia by the last verdict given by the people at the general election, they are not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend cannot say that as to the views expressed, whatever he may say as to myself, seeing that the province was carried on my policy.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not at all intend to question the statement of my hon. friend, or to consider whether it was upon his policy or not that it was carried. I suppose that the questions to which I have referred were settled about forty years ago. I do not know whether these questions are still alive in the province of Nova Scotia, but if they are alive at the present time, then the people of Nova Scotia must have reversed the views they held. I do not care to go into the many controversial questions upon which my hon. friend entered upon this occasion, with the single exception of that concerning the Senate of Canada. That is still a vital question, and it may be as well to know where we stand in regard to it. The hon. gentleman challenged the statement I made that it had been a settled policy of both parties at confederation, when the Senate was made a nominative and not an elective body, a policy agreed upon by Hon. George Brown and Sir John Macdonald, representing both great parties of Canada, that both parties should be represented on the floor of the Senate according to the proportion in which they were represented in the country. My hon. friend admits that this was the case, that this rule was admitted so far as the first appointments to the Senate were concerned.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, Sir, if this was understood to be the rule when the first appointments were made, will he pretend to the House that it was a rule to be applied only once and after that disregarded? What would have been the opinion of the people of Canada if they had been told that this rule was a good rule for the appointment of the first Senate, but that it would not be afterwards followed? Any man of common sense would say that if it was a good rule for the first appointments it was a good rule for all times. If it was proper to have both parties represented according to their respective forces in the country

when the Senate was first established, would it not be equally just, equally fair, equally reasonable, that this same rule should apply to the Senate in later years. Can my hon. friend give any reason why this rule, being acted upon once, should not always been acted upon ? Can he give any reason why this rule having been once observed should be disregarded afterwards ? Why, Sir, the Senate is of such a character that rule should be maintained at all times. Let me call again the attention of my hon. friend to the statement we find in the memoirs of Sir John Macdonald by Mr. Joseph Pope, which bears directly upon the contention that I lay down. I quote from the second volume of this work, page 235 :

We have already seen Sir John Macdonald's opinion of the constitution of the Canadian Senate, which is largely the work of his own hands. It is true, that at an early period of his career he favoured an elective Upper House, but eight years' experience of this system was sufficient to change his views, and to convert him into a firm upholder of the nominative principle. Every year since confederation strengthened the conviction of his matured judgment and showed him more and more clearly the advantage of the nominative over the elective system. To his mind, the chief among the objections to a Senate chosen by the popular vote was the ever-present danger of its members claiming the right to deal with Money Bills, and the consequent possibility of disputes with the House of Commons. The proposal that the provincial legislatures, whose members are elected for purely local purposes, should choose the senators to legislate on matters of general concern, was also objectionable, being opposed to the spirit of the constitution, which confined the local assembly to a strictly limited sphere of action. He held that the system unanimously agreed to at the Quebec Conference had worked well, and should be undisturbed.

Thus we see that Sir John Macdonald's mature judgment, after many years of experience of confederation, led him to the conclusion that the system which had been adopted at confederation, that of senators being nominated by the Crown, but so chosen as to represent both parties upon the floor of that body in proportion to their power in the country, should remain undisturbed. This is a strong argument in favour of the view which I represent. I leave to the judgment of any man in this House or out of it to say whether any other rule could be wisely followed. There is a reason why the two parties should be represented in the Senate, but what reason could be given why the Senate should be filled with representatives of only one party ? So long as we have party government it is surely well that both parties should be represented not only in this House but in both Houses of the legislature. No reason could be given why there should be a departure from the view which was laid down at confederation except party exigencies, except that it was found necessary to make the Senate, for a long time, a refuge for defeated politicians. Therefore, I all the more adhere—fortified as I am with the opinion of Sir John Macdonald—to the opinion that the true construction of the nominative principle is that both parties which divide public opinion in this country should be represented in that House in a manner somewhat approximating their relative strength in the country.

With regard to the motion made by my hon. friend, I have no objection to offer to it. I think it is a fair motion, and the papers will be brought down accordingly. I think I understood pretty well the first of the hon. gentleman's argument in so far as this motion applied. He stated that after the defeat of his Government he had made a certain number of appointments——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Recommendations.

The PRIME MINISTER. Recommendations—certain of which were approved by His Excellency and others disapproved. It is no use going again into the discussion of the question—no good purpose could be served. But I would recall the statement made by His Excellency at the time giving the reason for disregarding certain recommendations made by his advisers after their defeat. His reason was that he was bound to accept their advice on matters of routine, but all other matters that departed from routine business, he thought had better be left to the incoming Administration. I had occasion afterwards to state that we accepted the statement of His Excellency which we thought laid down a fair and equitable rule. So far as concerns the recommendations made by the hon. gentleman which were approved by His Excellency, I stated on the floor of the House that it would be the duty of the Administration to respect all these appointments unless there was some cause to the contrary. We have gone upon this rule. We have respected, or intended to respect all the recommendations approved by His Excellency, except in a few cases, where we thought there was cause for removal or for different advice being given to His Excellency. The hon. gentleman says that in some cases parties have not been notified of their appointments, and, in others, did not receive their commissions. That may be in a few cases. There may be a few cases, I know there were, where the parties did not receive their commissions, though they came within that rule ; but the reason was that behind every one of those cases, as the papers will show when they are brought down, there were good reasons why the appointments should not be made. They required some inquiry, and no decision was come to at the time. We would not, and we could not, in fact, in consistency with the rules which we laid down for our guidance, dismiss anybody appointed under such circumstances, any more than we would have dismissed anybody else who had

been in office except for cause shown. In many of those cases, so far as I remember, we thought it was preferable to hold an inquiry, departmental or otherwise, and we came to no determination in such cases. These reasons may have delayed the notification to some of those gentlemen who were appointed; but that was the only reason, and when the papers are brought down my hon. friend will find that these cases are very few indeed.

Mr. FOSTER. The one point in which my hon. friend really touched the motion that was introduced by the leader of the Opposition, was in the last two or three minutes of his remarks. There was no contention between my hon. friend and the leader of the Government as to all that class of names with regard to which His Excellency had withheld his recommendation, or his signature. The point of contest between my hon. friend and the leader of the Government was as to those whose recommendations were signed by the Governor General, and who were, consequently, de facto appointed to office. Now, what is the excuse of the hon. gentleman with reference to those? Some, he says, may be held over till the present time, he does not know how many, that will be shown when the papers come down. That is very true, and as to how many have had no information, or as to how many whose appointments have been annulled, we shall not know until the papers are brought down. But the hon. gentleman, to parry the force of the statement made by the leader of the Opposition that up to the present time there were appointed, and he knew of them who had not received any notification, good, bad or indifferent, brings in this excuse, that the Government found it impracticable to dismiss them any more than they would dismiss officers who had already entered upon their duties, because they were really officers, and had been so appointed by Order in Council; but it was thought better to make an inquiry into them, and that led to delay. Well, now, that is rather hard upon the Government. It is now nine or ten months since the Government took office. These gentlemen have been waiting, their appointments having been signed by the Governor General, and these appointments have been made public through statements made here on the floor of the House; and yet these gentlemen have been left for nine or ten months without even the courtesy of a communication by the Government. An investigation surely should not take so much time as that; surely an investigation having been undertaken by my hon. friend and having been carried out very summarily and the results having been apparent in very few weeks, not to say a few months, I do not think it was a sufficient excuse for my hon. friend to state that inquiry was necessary when nine months had elapsed, and these gentlemen have received no word in any way with reference to their appointment. However, with reference to that, my hon. friend has covered the ground, and when the papers are brought down we shall know the exact state of the case. But my hon. friend the leader of the Government is singularly unfortunate in the other position he took with reference to the argument of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. He endeavoured gravely to argue before this House that the principle involved in the late election in Nova Scotia was the same as that which was affirmed by Sir Charles Tupper when he was in opposition in Nova Scotia, in 1859. In the latter case the preceding legislature had passed a law stating that persons holding offices under the Crown were disqualified for sitting as members of Parliament. An election was held, and when the election was over it came to pass that the Government of the preceding period was in a minority, that amongst the majority there were at least five or six who were elected as members, but who were disqualified by the very Act which had been passed by that legislature precedent to the election, and that, therefore, they could not sit if the law was to have the force of law at all, that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council at the time asked the Colonial Office for instruction, and the Colonial Office asked the law officers of the Crown for an opinion. The opinion of the law officers for the Crown was that those men ought not to be considered as members of Parliament. and that a Government ought not to be carried on with a majority, the prevailing part of whom were persons who had been elected in direct opposition to the statute law which disqualified them from being members of that legislature. What was the principle involved? The principle involved was the independence of Parliament, and my hon. friend tried to argue that in the province of Nova Scotia the principle of the independence of Parliament respecting a law of the legislature, had no life left there because, in the election which was held a month ago, Mr. Murray was victorious and the Liberal-Conservatives in that legislature were defeated. That was the argument, if there was any argument. It needs but to be stated to the House to show how far afield my hon. friend went in order to support a bad position. Well, Sir, my hon. friend is even more unfortunate in the second position. He asks if there is any reason at all why an arrangement carried out on the appointment of the first Senate of Canada should not be carried out all the way through. The arrangement at that time was that the first Senate should be made up of representatives of both parties, in equal or nearly equal numbers, and the hon. gentleman maintains that, therefore, this should follow as the rule under confederation, and so long as this country exists under a constitutional government. Now, Sir, who were the appoint-

ing parties in that case? What was that first Government in Canada? Was it a party Government, or was it a coalition Government? It was made up of members of both of the parties precedent to confederation, both of whom had friends, both of whom joined together to make the first Government and to carry on the affairs of the country for the first time. These two sitting down together, prominent Liberals and prominent Conservatives, stipulated amongst themselves that in the formation of the first Senate, the two political parties precedent to that time should be equally represented, and the appointing powers who were representatives of both parties sat down together and made the nominations upon the basis they had agree upon. It is here stated in the extract, a part of which was read by the leader of the Opposition, that the Hon. George Brown, although a party to that, and having gone into the Government, went out before the appointments had been actually made, but Sir John A. Macdonald carried out the appointments on the line which they had agreed upon before, and thus kept faith with the Liberal section of the party. Others of the Liberal party, of course, remained in that first Government and were there when the appointments were made. Now, Sir, if there is any basis I think which follows from the constitutional rule, which follows in Great Britain as well as here, it is that if there is an appointing power, and that appointing power is the Government of the day, the appointing power, that is the Government of the day, has perfect freedom as to whom its appointees shall be, and unless there is something in the constitution of the country itself to make it necessary that a certain portion of both political parties, or of certain creeds, or of certain classes, should be represented in the Senate, then there is nothing binding. The circumstances are as different as they could be. The first was a coalition Government, made up of the two parties, both of whom had friends in the Government, and there was this circumstance in addition. It was this, that there were a certain number of legislative councillors, friends of both parties, and every one knows that upon making the first change from the old Government to the new in every case, as much as possible, old rights or old privileges, whatever you may please to call them, are tenderly dealt with. What was more natural than when two great parties came together to establish confederation and sat down in order to make the first nominations to the Senate, that they should say to each other: Let us have both parties represented, and let us take them from the existing legislative councils, whose offices we have abolished by the Act of Confederation, and let us translate them in their proportions to the new Senate. There is a circumstance that is not present when nominations are made now and which was present then: and that makes all the difference. That arrangement was loyally carried out by Sir John A. Macdonald, and the Liberal-Conservative party, and it was that understanding alone which was carried out. The hon. gentleman has gone very far afield in order to make an argument, because what was actually done under that state of things was that the old legislative councillors were provided for by the two parties, who were acting in perfect agreement, and they were looking after prominent men to translate from the legislative councils to the Senate—a set of circumstances which then prevailed, but the circumstances now prevailing when the Government are called upon to make appointments are quite different, and we cannot argue from the first to the second, and can only argue on the constitution itself. Now as to the practice in Great Britain. Does the principle exist there that when a Conservative Government comes into power and makes appointments to the House of Lords, those appointments are made equally from both parties? My hon. friend knows it is not so. He knows it is exactly the opposite, and that the disparity in the representation of parties in the House of Lords is greater than it is in the Canadian Senate to-day. So I think my hon. friend is not very strong as regards the ground taken by him, and he is still less strong in the argument he has used in order to make his ground appeared more tenable.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I desire to say a word on the point referred to by my hon. friend opposite. The hon. gentleman has stated in the course of his remarks that the late election of Mr. Murray in Nova Scotia could have nothing to do with the point in dispute between Senator Power and the leader of the Opposition, inasmuch as the points which were determined by the people of Nova Scotia were altogether foreign to the points of difference then existing between the hon. gentleman and Lieutenant-Governor Mulgrave. I think if the hon. gentleman will refer to the remarks of Senator Power and if he will read the history of the time, he will find that the decision of the people of Nova Scotia given the other day had as much reference to the points in dispute as had the decision regarding the points in controversy with respect to the action of Lieutenant-Governor Mulgrave when the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) appealed to the people of Nova Scotia. I am not old enough to have taken any part in those elections, but I have read the history of that time, and if my memory serves me when the legislature became divided, an appeal was taken to the people——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That was three years afterwards.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Perhaps it was three years—

I thought it was four years—upon a distinct issue between the House and Hon. Mr. Howe arising out of the education question.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not at all.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will accept the hon. gentleman's statement of his recollection as to what took place.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The question was not raised at all.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is only a short time ago since I refreshed my memory on these points, and I think I am correct in saying that the issue before the people then had no more to do with the constitutional point the hon. gentleman has stated than the issue when Mr. Murray was returned. I do not intend to go into the general question, which was threshed out last year; but the leader of the Opposition will find in regard to the appointments, that nearly all the list has been disposed of, except perhaps one or two more cases on which action has not been taken.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend has spoken of a subject on which he does not profess to have any special knowledge—that of the conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor, and I am sorry he mentioned his name, as I did not do so, and he is not living; but the issue was so live an issue that I presented petitions signed by a majority of the electors of the province of Nova Scotia demanding, and it was kept a live issue down to the time of the elections.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That was not the issue on which the hon. gentleman went to the people.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was one of them.

Motion agreed to.

SOUTHPORT, BELFAST AND MURRAY HARBOUR PROPOSED RAILWAY.

Mr. MARTIN moved for:

Copies of all correspondence, petitions, resolutions and other papers in possession of the Government relating to the proposed branch railway from Southport to Belfast and Murray Harbour, and other proposed railway branches in the province of Prince Edward Island.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer a few remarks on the subject-matter of this motion. Early last session, I put a similar motion on the Order paper, but the debate on that motion was adjourned, and it was not again reached before prorogation. Last session I also asked from the Minister of Railways and Canals the following statement:—

A statement showing the amount of money contributed by the Government towards the building and subsidizing of railways in Canada since the first of July, 1873; the number of acres of land given as subsidies to railways in Canada since that time, with the estimated cost and price of such land; and also a statement showing the proportion of such expenditure made in each of the provinces separately, including the North-west Territories; deducting therefrom, for each province, any sums that may have been charged back against the province on account of such railway expenditure in their debt account with the Dominion.

I regret that the Minister of Railways and Canals has not yet brought down that return, because if we had it now it would be of great service to us in discussing this question which so intimately concerns the province of Prince Edward Island. Some hon. members may be aware that this matter has been discussed in this House for some years. Prince Edward Island has a grievance in that respect since confederation, and especially since 1883, when a departure was made from the compact with reference to subsidies to railways, which was arrived at when we came into the union. Since 1883, railways have been built by the Dominion Government, and others assisted by giving subsidies though not extending beyond our province, and that I presume was in order to relieve the provinces of the burden of paying for railways within their borders. The provinces were unequal to the task, and the Dominion Government came to their rescue and extended the system of granting subsidies to railways in the different provinces of the Dominion. That system has never been applied to Prince Edward Island, notwithstanding the fact that the province is badly in need of railway expenditure. The branch lines with reference to which I have given notice of motion, was contemplated before we entered confederation and in fact, in the 211 miles of railway which were under contract or in operation at the time of the union, it was proposed that these branches should be built, and especially this branch to the south. I doubt if the Railway Bill would have been passed in the provincial legislature unless it had been agreed to, that these branch lines should be constructed. I would remind the House that in 1896 the late Government brought down a project which included the building of this railway from Southport to Belfast and Murray Harbour. The carrying out of that project would render long-delayed justice to Prince Edward Island, and I trust that the present Government will carry it into effect. I may say, that in 1896 the proposal was endorsed by the then Opposition who now control the affairs of this country. The basis on which this claim was made was agreed to in 1888, when a demand was made by Prince Edward Island for the fulfilment of the compact of confederation. A delegation was sent up here, and a sub-committee of the Dominion Privy Council made a report, from

which I will give you the following extract :—

1st. That, from the insular position of this province, we, Prince Edward Island, did not receive the same benefit from the construction of the Pacific and Intercolonial railways that the other provinces had received. 2nd. That the said railways cost a great deal more than was anticipated when they were commenced, and, as the terms on which this Island entered the union were, in a great measure, based upon their contemplated cost at commencement, therefore, this Island had a right to some consideration on that account. And, thirdly, that the subsidies granted to the other provinces in carrying out the late railway policy of the Government, had not been made applicable in any way to this Island, whereas the other provinces had in this manner been largely benefited.

This statement corroborates the contention which I hold, and which the province holds to-day; and unless this claim, which was admitted by the sub-committee of the Privy Council, is satisfied, and the province of Prince Edward Island is put in the position demanded by the terms of union, there will be a great deal of dissatisfaction in that province. The people of Prince Edward Island will never be satisfied with the existing state of things, in which, while they are called upon to pay their share of the interest on the money expended on railways in every part of the Dominion, are debarred, or have hitherto, at least, been debarred, from partaking of any of the advantages accruing from that expenditure.

Last year, in addressing this House, I went pretty fully into this matter, and showed that since the 1st of July, 1873, there had been spent or contributed by the Dominion Government as railway subsidies in different parts of the Dominion the large sum of $153,981,234. On this sum Prince Edward Island pays her share of interest, though, being the smallest province of the Dominion, she is entitled to, not simple fair play, but even on account of its small numerical strength even more than that at the hands of this great Dominion. Giving the Dominion credit for $500,000, which was placed to the credit of the province, or $20,000 a year, there would be still due to the province on this basis the sum of $2,702,835. This statement or statements on the same lines has been made repeatedly in this House and in the other Chamber, and it has never been successfully contradicted. I think it has been made by the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies), by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Macdonald), and in the Senate by the hon. Senator Ferguson and the hon. Senator Prowse. There has been no reply to those statements. The question remains as it was before, and justice is not done to Prince Edward Island.

I intend on this occasion, Mr. Speaker, with your permission, to refer to some statistics which will go further to prove the claims of Prince Edward Island in this matter. I find, by looking at the public records of this country that at confederation, in July, 1867, the number of miles of railway in operation in the Dominion was only 2,278, while on the 30th June, 1895, there were 16,091 miles in operation, an increase of 13,813 miles in 28 years. Now, I find that in the province of Ontario there is one mile of railway for every 344 of the population; in Quebec there is one mile for every 442 of the population; in New Brunswick there is one mile for every 264 of the population; in Nova Scotia there is one mile for every 501 of the population; in Manitoba there is one mile for every 103 of the population; in British Columbia there one mile for every 122 of the population; and in the North-west Territories there is one mile for every 32 of the population; whereas Prince Edward Island has only one mile for every 517 of the population. This shows that Prince Edward Island has the least railway mileage to the population of all the provinces of the Dominion. That was not the case when we entered confederation. At that time the Dominion had only a mile of railway for every 700 people, while Prince Edward Island had built at its own cost a mile of railway for every 480 people. To-day the position is reversed. Prince Edward Island then held the first position in regard to railway expenditure, while to-day she holds the least favourable position. To-day, after 25 or 30 years in the confederation, she has only a mile for every 517 people, while the Dominion of Canada, instead of having a mile for every 700 people, has a mile for every 300. Is it fair, I ask you, that the small province of Prince Edward Island should be called upon to contribute to the increased mileage all over the Dominion, while she has not received the adequate share which properly belongs to her? I may point out further that in order to obtain this railway mileage, the Dominion has contributed up to the 30th of June, 1895, the sum of $153,996,778. And that is not all. Besides that the Dominion has contributed at least 50,464,186 acres of land. Thus, that large portion of the domain of Canada, a share in the profits of which would naturally belong to Prince Edward Island, has been absorbed in railway construction besides the amount of money I have mentioned. It will be readily understood that of this large increase in railway construction, from 2,278 miles at confederation, to 16,091 on 30th June, 1895, each province, as well as the Dominion, has contributed its share; and I wish to point out, from the statistics I have in hand, the amount of money which has been contributed by each province. I find, on reference to the Dominion blue-books, that up to June 30th, 1895, Ontario has, deducting the loans, contributed altogether, including her municipalities, $17,470,181. I am taking each

province, including the municipalities, because in some provinces the municipalities have contributed as well as the provincial government, and in order to make this statement as fair as possible, I have included in it the amount spent by the municipalities, as well as by the local governments, and I deduct the loans made, because I presume the loans are good and the interest and capital will be finally paid. The table I am about to read gives the amount contributed by each province, including the municipalities :

Ontario	$17,470,181
Quebec	14,615,233
New Brunswick	4,989,800
Nova Scotia	2,306,601
Manitoba	1,336,278
North-west Territories	.....
British Columbia	75,000
Prince Edward Island	3,150,000

It follows, therefore, that the different provinces have contributed, through their provincial governments and municipalities, the following sums per mile for railways, wholly within each of them :—

Province.	Miles of Railway.	Contributed Per Mile.
Ontario	6,403	$ 2,725
Quebec	3,139	4,656
New Brunswick	1,404	3,555
Nova Scotia	891	2,590
Manitoba	1,472	900
British Columbia	800	93
North-west Territories	1,772	.....
Prince Edward Island	211	15,400

Thus, Prince Edward Island has paid at the rate of $15,400 for every mile of railway she has, and the next largest amount paid is that paid by the province of Quebec, $4,656 per mile. Ontario has only paid $2,725 per mile, and New Brunswick, $3,555 per mile.

Railway building has, therefore, been a very expensive business for Prince Edward Island especially. That province has only 211 miles of railway, which have cost it $15,400 per mile, while the other provinces have a larger number of miles per capita and these have not cost them anything like that amount. Ontario contributed out of its provincial resources, per mile, only one-fifth as much as Prince Edward Island, Quebec only one-third as much, New Brunswick only one-fourth as much, and Nova Scotia about one-fifth or one-sixth as much. That statement shows, on the face of it, that little Prince Edward Island has been more than abreast of the whole Dominion in the way of railway enterprise. While the other provinces have not contributed over $4,000 each, and some only $2,000 and others $3,000 per mile for the railways built within their limits, the little island of Prince Edward has loaded herself down with a debt of $15,400 for every mile of railway we have to-day, with the exception of some eleven miles, which were built by the Dominion Government in order to make some show of carrying out the terms of the union as regards communication with the mainland. It will not be difficult to understand that where the provinces paid the least, the Dominion Government has paid the most, and vice versa. In Prince Edward Island, for instance, where the provincial government has paid largely, the Dominion Government has only paid a little, while in British Columbia and the North-west Territories and in fact all the rest of the provinces except Prince Edward Island, where little has been spent by these provinces themselves, large sums have been paid by the Dominion Government. And these eleven miles of railway to which I have alluded have no commercial value at all, but are there merely under the terms of the union, for the purpose of making some pretense of supplying winter and summer communication with the mainland.

On this matter I wish to make a further statement, and that is, that while the facts are as I have stated with regard to railway expenditure in the province of Prince Edward Island, any one taking up the blue-books of this Dominion and reading them would be led to believe that that province has never spent a cent for railway construction. Let me first refer to the Year-Book of the fiscal year of 1895, page 645, and in doing so I wish to state, in justice to the compiler of the statistical Year-Book, that he is not responsible for the statements therein, as he has compiled them from other blue-books of the Government—from the Railways and Canals Reports and other Government reports. What do we find in this book ? We find, on page 645, the expenses paid by the Dominion Government and by the provinces for railways in this Dominion, as follows, up to June 30th, 1895 :

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would suggest to my hon. friend that perhaps it would be well to move the adjournment. It is quite evident he will not get through before six o'clock, and by moving the adjournment he could go on and finish his very interesting argument when the House meets again.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. DAVIN. It is understood, of course, that my hon. friend will go on with his speech when the debate re-opens.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is the understanding.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all correspondence with the Government of Prince Edward Island, not already brought down, respecting the claims of said government on the Federal Government.—(Mr. Macdonald, King's.)

Copies of all letters, papers, correspondence, petitions, &c., relating to the dismissal of J. Albert Verge, fishery officer for the River Restigouche and its tributaries and the waters of the

Baie des Chaleurs, and the appointment of Charles Brown in his place.—(Mr. McInerney, for Mr. McAlister.)

Copies of all letters, papers and correspondence relating to the closing in March last of the post office at Oak Bay Mills, Quebec.—(Mr. McInerney, for Mr. McAlister.)

Copies of all correspondence in connection with the appointment and installation of George G. King to the postmastership of Marsh Hill, Ont., had with any member of the Government, or any officer of the Post Office Department.—(Mr. Foster.)

Return of copies of all letters, telegrams, petitions, reports and other communications with respect to the appointment and dismissal of David H. Price, postmaster of Aylmer West, and the appointment of his successor, Frederick Ashbaugh.—(Mr. Bennett, for Mr. Ingram.)

Copies of all papers, letters, documents, petitions, &c., relating to the dismissal of A. J. McNeill, as postmaster at Stanley Bridge, in Prince Edward Island.—(Mr. Martin.)

Copy of the Order in Council appointing Mr. A. D. Danis as collector of tolls at the Beauharnois Canal.

Also, for nomination of Mr. Danis as collector of customs at Valleyfield.

Also, for nomination of excise officer at Valleyfield.

For papers, correspondence, letters, &c., in relation to the dismissal of Mr. Danis as collector of tolls.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

Return showing the names of all persons dismissed from the service of the Inland Revenue Department since the first day of July, 1896 ; also the names of all persons appointed to the service of said department since the first day of July, 1896.—(Mr. Wallace, for Mr. Wood, Brockville.)

Copy of returns for Weller Bay while an outport, i.e., about eleven years :—

1. The value of dutiable goods and duty collected.
2. Value of free goods.
3. Total number of vessels entered and cleared.
4. Total salary paid.—(Mr. Hughes, for Mr. Corby.)

Copies of all correspondence, petitions and reports relative to the dismissal of T. P. Shields, postmaster of Upper Maugerville, and the appointment of Emery Sewel in his place, and in reference to any changes proposed in the location of said post office since 1891.—(Mr. Foster.)

Copies of all papers and correspondence relating to tenders for the mail contract between Shubenacadie to Dean, in the province of Nova Scotia, including a statement of the tenders received and the reason for awarding the contract to one Guild.—(Mr. McDougall, for Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.)

Copies of all papers relating to the release of Daniel Brien Sullivan, committed to gaol at Toronto on the 18th November, 1896, including the reports of the Police Magistrate of the 21st and 27th November, 1896.—(Mr. McDougall, for Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.)

Return of all correspondence, evidence, reports and papers respecting the dismissal of the car inspector and car oiler at Stellarton, Nova Scotia, under instructions of the mechanical superintendent, Intercolonial Railway, at Moncton, 5th February, 1897.—(Mr. McDougall, for Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.)

Copies of all letters, telegrams and papers that have passed between the Government and any person or persons in connection with the dismissal of Dr. George Duncan, late quarantine superintendent at William's Head Station, B.C.—(Mr. Earle, for Mr. Prior.)

Copies of all correspondence between the Department of Indian Affairs at Ottawa and the officers of the Indian Department at Regina and at Winnipeg, respecting the furnishing supplies to the St. Paul Industrial School ; also, the correspondence between the Department at Ottawa and the Hudson Bay Company at Winnipeg.—(Mr. LaRivière, for Mr. Davin.)

1. Copies of all correspondence and other documents relating to the creation of post office inspectorships at Stratford, Barrie and Kingston and the appointment of inspectors and other officials connected with such inspectorships.
2. The number of employees connected with each such office and the salaries paid, and all other expenses of each office.—(Mr. Cameron.)

Copies of all correspondence with the Government of Prince Edward Island relative to the Government's co-operation with the said government in the construction of a bridge across the Hillsborough River, at or near Charlottetown, in said province.—(Mr. Macdonald, King's.)

Copies of all correspondence and other documents relating to the appointment of the Rev. Mr. Fairlie to the position of superintendent of the Industrial School, Winnipeg, and all recommendations for such appointment, and all departmental orders or other papers having relation thereto.—(Mr. Cameron.)

Return showing : 1. Each contract for carrying the mails cancelled since 7th July, 1896, showing the locality covered by each contract and the county and province in which situated.
2. The name of each contractor.
3. The price of each contract at the time of cancellation.
4. If new contracts entered into, the contract price of each new contract.
5. The reason for the cancellation of each contract.—(Mr. Cameron.)

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 4th May, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House, that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, a certificate of the election and return of Richard Willis Jameson, Esq., for the Electoral District of Winnipeg.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Richard Willis Jameson, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Winnipeg, introduced by the Prime Minister (Mr. Laurier) and the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton).

PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. LANDERKIN moved :

That that part of the 49th Rule which affects the time for presenting Private Bills, be suspended, in reference to the following petitions, namely : the Georgian Bay Ship Canal and Power Aqueduct Company ; the Restigouche and Victoria Railway Company ; the Montreal Bridge Company ; the Great Eastern Railway Company ; the Sun Life Insurance Company ; the Columbia Western Railway Company, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders, as contained in their Seventh Report.

Mr. SPROULE. Before this motion is adopted, I wish to say, that it appears to me that we ought either change the 49th rule, or else have less frequent attempts in this House to suspend it. If the rule is of any value whatever, it ought to be adhered to as closely as possible, and it should only be departed from under very exceptional circumstances. Every year this motion is made over and over again, and it appears to me that the rule is more honoured in the breach than in the observance. The rule should be changed, or else when an effort is made to have it suspended, very strong reasons should be given for such a motion.

Motion agreed to.

HALIFAX LOAN COMPANY.

Mr. FRASER moved :

That that part of the 49th Rule which limits the time for receiving Private Bills, be suspended, in reference to the petition of the Halifax Loan Company, Limited, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders, as contained in their Seventh Report.

He said : I take for granted that the committee has looked into this matter. While the rule is a good one, it must in certain cases be suspended, and the committee are the best judges when that should be done.

Mr. SPROULE. That does not make it any more justifiable to violate the rule.

Motion agreed to.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. SOMERVILLE moved :

That the First Report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of this House during the present session, be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 90) respecting the Montreal Bridge Company.—(Mr. Boisvert.)

Bill (No. 91) respecting the Sun Life Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Rosamond.)

Bill (No. 92) respecting the Great Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Boisvert.)

Bill (No. 93) to incorporate the Columbia and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Bostock.)

SUPPLY

House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Charges of Management..... $150,650

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). The hon. leader of the Opposition will see that there is a considerable reduction in the total amount. There are very small increases in commission on public debt, in brokerage and in miscellaneous printing ; but in most of the other items, including the charge for printing Dominion notes, there are considerable reductions.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I see there is an increase in the charge for printing, inspection, advertising, &c., from $12,500 to $15,000. Will the hon. gentleman explain ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Last year they found that the item which had been reduced to its old figure was not quite large enough, and not wishing to be caught in that predicament again, we ask for $15,000. The hon. gentleman understands that, unless absolutely required, this sum will not be expended.

The Governor General's Office..... $11,150

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This is precisely as heretofore, with the exception of a very small statutory increase of $25 in the one case and $12.50 in another.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought the Government had stopped all the statutory increases this year.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. These were statutory increases that had been granted before. They are just balanced periods. They had been granted, in the one case, terminating on the 1st October, and in the other case, terminating on the 1st of January next.

The Department of Justice, including $4,000 for the Deputy of the Minister of Justice and $600 allowance for the salary of the private secretary of the Solicitor General, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act. $24,850

Mr. SPROULE. There is an increase in the first item of $450.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. If the hon. gentleman will turn over the page, he will see the thing given in detail. Heretofore the Deputy Minister of Justice was in the habit of receiving $4,000, but it was paid in two places, a part in his proper place as Deputy Minister of Justice, and $400 as solicitor of the Indian Affairs. Sir Oliver Mowat thought it more expedient to consolidate the two sums in one. There is a small statutory increase, however, for a second-class clerk.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the Deputy Minister of Justice act as solicitor for Indian Affairs ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. Is there a provision for a solicitor to the Indian Department ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There is a provision for a law clerk.

Mr. HAGGART. Then you are giving a deputy head $400 for acting as solicitor for Indian Affairs and providing for a law clerk as well.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We will take that up when we come to it, if the hon. gentleman will allow this to pass.

Mr. DAVIN. Has there always been a law clerk in connection with the Department of Indian Affairs ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). No, there has been a solicitor but no law clerk. The intention is to do away with the Deputy Minister of Justice acting as solicitor and appoint a permanent law clerk.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to me hardly possible that we should allow this to pass and take up the discussion of the item for the law clerk.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I do not object to the discussion, but thought it would come more conveniently on the other item.

Mr. FOSTER. But in the meantime you will have passed this. I take it that the Department of Indian Affairs, under its promises of economy, is not going to increase the expenses by the addition of a law clerk and then throw upon the Justice Department the $400 which was formerly paid by the Indian Department for a solicitor, and paid to the Deputy Minister of Justice. Either one or the other surely ought to be left out. If you are going to appoint a law clerk for the Indian Department, then you have no need to appoint a solicitor for the department. Heretofore the solicitor has done the business and done it well. With the clerks in the Indian Department, able and experienced clerks, to advise the Deputy Minister of Justice, everything heretofore has been done that is necessary as far as legal advice is concerned. Surely my hon. friend is not going to tell us that in the re-arrangements made in the Indian Department, serviceable clerks have been done away with so that they now require $2,000 or $3,000 worth more of legal advice.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) will look a little further down he will see that there is a reduction of $5,102 effected in the Department of Indian Affairs, so that the country will not be the loser even with an increase of $400 to the Department of Justice. As to the reasons that made my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Sifton) require a law clerk in the Indian Department, I think it would be better that they should be given by himself. The Minister of Justice held that he could not reduce the salary of the Deputy Minister of Justice, that that officer was well worth $4,000 a year. He was not an officer of our appointment, as the hon. gentleman well knows, and Sir Oliver Mowat considererd that he was not overpaid at $4,000 a year.

Mr. FOSTER. But it would be infinitely better if you want to pay your Deputy Minister of Justice $4,000 a year, to say so.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That is precisely what is done. If the hon. gentleman will look at the item he will see :

Deputy Head (heretofore $3,600 salary of the Deputy of the Minister of Justice and $400 salary of the law clerk of Indian Affairs).....	$4,000

Precisely what the hon. gentleman asks has been done.

Mr. FOSTER. Quite so. I did not notice the parantheses.

Mr. BENNETT. Has an appointment been made to the position of solicitor of the Indian Department at $2,000 a year ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). No.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask whether any of the clerkships in the Department of Justice, estimated for here, are vacant ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am advised that all these clerkships are filled.

Department of Justice, Penitentiary Branch $3,150

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This is a similar case of the increase of $50 being granted for the year, half of it falling after the 1st of July, which is therefore estimated for.

Mr. FOSTER. And these are the same clerks ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The same clerks, I believe.

Department of Militia and Defence..... $41,050

Mr. HUGHES. According to the estimate, there is a saving here. I would like to ask wherein the Minister proposes to make the saving ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I had not expected that this would come up. I have just sent for the Deputy Minister, and if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) wants, as he is justified in wanting, detailed information, that officer will be here in a few moments. In the meantime we might proceed to another item, passing over the next item, of Secretary of State's Department.

Department of Public Printing and Stationery $29,100

Mr. FOSTER. There is a slight increase here. We would like an explanation of the changes that have been made.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I believe that there are hardly any changes except a few increases in salaries of halves and quarters of the fifty-dollar increase, which have been allowed, some of them for broken periods. Otherwise, there is no change.

Mr. FOSTER. Are there any vacancies in the positions estimated for here ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I understand these are all filled.

Department of the Interior, including $2,000 to provide for the promotion of T. G. Rothwell and $1,900 for the promotion of K. J. Henry to chief clerkships, $1,500 for the promotion of P. G. Keyes to a first-class clerkship, and $850 for the salary of James Dunnet, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act.....$104,814

Mr. SPROULE. There is an increase of $370 here. Will the hon. gentleman give us some explanation of what has caused it ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The increases consist of certain statutory increases and of the increases indicated in the item—in the salary of Mr. Rothwell from $1,750 to $2,000, Mr. Dunnet from $650 to $850, and Mr. Henry from $1,800 to $1,900.

Mr. FOSTER. We could have seen that by comparing the figures. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Sifton) will have to give a more extended explanation than simply to subtract the old figures from the new. The House would like to know the reasons for the addition in each case. But, first, with reference to the deputy head, I would like to ask who is the present deputy head of the department, whether a change has been made, and if so, what the reasons for that change are ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The present deputy head of the Department of Interior is Mr. Jas. A. Smart. As the hon. gentleman is no doubt aware, Mr. A. M. Burgess was formerly Deputy Minister of Interior. A change has been made in the following way : Mr. Burgess has been transferred to the office of Commissioner of Dominion Lands, an office that was formerly held by Mr. H. H. Smith, of Winnipeg. But Mr. Smith has been superannuated, and it is the intention to abolish the office of Commissioner at Winnipeg, and Mr. Burgess will transact the duties of Commissioner at the head office in Ottawa. In answer to the hon. gentleman's request for the reasons of the change, briefly these reasons are : That under the former management of the Department of Interior, the affairs of the department were not conducted in a satisfactory manner. They were not conducted in a satisfactory manner, because it was apparent that there was no desire, or no strong desire, no effectual desire, on the part of the Minister of Interior, or of the deputy, or of both, to act in a reasonable way with the settlers of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, with whom, particularly, that department has to deal ; and it was deemed impossible by me as the responsible head of the department to secure a satisfactory administration of the department without at the same time making a change in the deputy head. I think it desirable that the deputy head of that department should be a man who is familiar with the affairs of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and not only familiar with the affairs of the country, but familiar with the circumstances of the people, one who would understand, not only the technical office details of the business that came before him, but understand the circumstances with which he was dealing so that he would know the effect of any decision, or would know what was likely to occur as a result of it. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman expects me to go into an extended discussion of the result of the late Government's policy in regard to North-western affairs, probably this would not be the best place to enter into a lengthy discussion of that matter ; but I have no objections, if the hon. gentleman so desires, at a convenient time to give him my ideas in regard to the manner in which the Depart of Interior as affecting the condition of the people of the North-west Territories, has been conducted. I fancy the explanation I have given, however, will be sufficient for the present.

Mr. FOSTER. What salary does Mr. Burgess get in his new place ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. $3,200. The ex-commissioner's salary was $4,000.

Mr. FOSTER. The chief clerk and secretary is the same who has been there before—any change in that office ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No change.

Mr. FOSTER. And the Surveyor General is the same ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The same.

Mr. FOSTER. And the Commissioner of Patents ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The same.

Mr. FOSTER. What accounts for the difference in the salary between the old and the new ? The proportion of the $50 increase ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. The Accountant is the same ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, who is this Mr. Rothwell, who is being made Law Clerk, and in whose behalf the Civil Service Act is violated by the hon. gentlemen—who always found most particular fault with having a law upon the statute-book and then coming down when the Estimates were put on and continually violating it ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The epithet is unfortunate—not violating.

Mr. FOSTER. If these principles were so sound when they were not in office, why are they violated now that they are in office?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I may say in reply to the hon. gentleman, that Mr. Rothwell was a second-class clerk in the department at a minimum salary of $1,100. Mr. Rothwell is a member of the legal profession, and on that account he was in charge of the legal matters in connection with the department since 1884. He has from time to time since that date been taking more and more control of matters appertaining to questions of title in the department where the services of a lawyer were required, and his services in that respect have become extremely valuable. The hon. gentleman is no doubt aware that in the Department of Interior a large number of questions of a legal nature arise, and sometimes they are of a very intricate character. They do not require the highest degree of legal knowledge, but they require a fair amount of legal knowledge, and a somewhat intimate and thorough knowledge of the statutes relating to the various matters and the details of the business that comes before him. It would be entirely unsatisfactory to be obliged to refer those matters to the Department of Justice, in fact it would probably mean that there would be much greater delay in issuing patents in disputed cases than there has been in the past, and I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me that that is quite unnecessary. It is my desire rather to facilitate the issuing of patents instead of delaying them ; and that is the necessity for a law clerk. Mr. Rothwell has been in effect law clerk for some time, and the fact that he is called a law clerk makes no substantial difference in his work. The one point really for discussion, is as to whether the increase which is suggested is a justifiable increase, the increase is from $1,750 to $2,000. Now, I may say that while I have had the honour of transacting the business of this department, I have found that Mr. Rothwell was an extremely valuable officer. The hon. gentleman knows that I came into the department without knowing anything of the officers, and I had to judge of them upon their merits, and from the way in which they transacted their business, and in view of the extremely efficient manner in which this gentleman discharged his duties, and of the value of his services to the department, I thought it would be a proper thing, and very much in the interests of the efficient discharge of the business of the department, that the value of his services should be recognized, and that he should receive an additional salary. I may say that in view of the knowledge of law which he has, and his ability as a professional man, I do not think $2,000 is at all excessive, in fact I think it rather a low salary for a gentleman of his ability and experience in those matters. It would be an extremely inadvisable thing for the Government to run any risk whatever of losing his services, because it would be some years before anybody else could acquire the same thorough knowledge of the business.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman give explanations now with reference to K. J. Henry ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Henry was appointed a temporary clerk upon the 30th of June, 1871, and he will complete his 26th year of service upon the 30th of June next. He has been employed almost continually as registrar of the correspondence and clerk in charge of the files of the department. His salary has been from time to time increased, until it has become $1,800, and the proposition which is before the committee now is that his salary be increased to $1,900. The increase amounts only to $100, just double the amount which, in the ordinary course of procedure under the Civil Service Act, would be the annual increment. I have thought it advisable to ask that Mr. Henry's salary should be increased by $100, in view of the fact that he holds an extremely important position in the department. I think it is advisable when officials are

differentiated in regard to their duties, one man holding an exceedingly responsible position and another man holding a less responsible position, who perhaps has been longer in the service and yet is not considered capable of holding the higher position, that the man holding the responsible position should be more highly paid than the other. I do not consider that this distinction has been sufficiently drawn in the Department of Interior—I do not know how it is in regard to the other departments—I think there has been too much disposition to give consideration to the length of service rather than to ability and satisfactory work. I consider Mr. Henry is a very efficient officer, and therefore I ask the House to increase his salary by $100.

Mr. FOSTER. Were both those men on the permanent temporary list?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No.

Mr. FOSTER. They were on the permanent list?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes. From information I have, Mr. Henry has been on the permanent list for twenty-six years.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the reason that no salaries appeared opposite their names in the estimates for 1896-97?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They were estimated for as so many first or second-class clerks; and as regards the special vote asked for, of course no corresponding vote was asked last year.

Mr. FOSTER. As regards the four technical officers, are they the same as before, and are their salaries the same?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They are the same officers—there has been no change.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of item No. 10?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The salary asked for Mr. Keyes is $1,500, his previous salary having been $1,400. He is the chief clerk of the branch of the department which looks after the disposing of ordnance lands and the collection of revenue derived from those lands. He was appointed on July 17, 1878, at a salary of $700, and has therefore been nineteen years in the service. He is now chief clerk of the branch, and my reason for asking the House to increase his salary by $100 is almost similar to the reason given in the case of Mr. Henry. Mr. Keyes being in charge of an important branch, I thought it well to recommend this slight increase in recognition of his efficiency. Of course, I take it that the House understands that when I ask the salary of an officer to be increased, it is done because I have made an examination of his work, and have found the officer efficient.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I wish to point out to the hon. gentleman that he is taking most extraordinary power, as head of the department, in violating the provisions of the Civil Service Act. I know very well that this is not the first time men have been advanced, notwithstanding the provisions of that Act; but the hon. gentleman has gone a long way beyond anything done by his predecessors in that direction. Not only has he recommended that a new status be given to Mr. Rothwell, but he has recommended an increase of salary in the present case, and all this is in the teeth of the Civil Service Act. I submit that this is a very dangerous position for the head of the department to take, because it leaves in his own hands a wider discretion than I think was ever contemplated by that Act. So while I do not object to what the hon. gentleman says, when he declares that the efficiency and work of the officials determined him to take this extraordinary course. I wish to point out to him and his colleagues that they are accumulating a good deal of trouble for themselves, because the exercise of this discrimination between the merits of members of the service will prove a matter of considerable worry to them hereafter. I fully agree with the hon. gentleman that there should be some officials in the Department of Interior possessing, if not a complete knowledge of law in the sense of being a lawyer, at least possessing that status, because the issuing of letters-patent requires the application of a legal mind, if not a legal knowledge. The same may be said in regard to other departments, but that is a rule not observed by the present Government in regard to some of the other departments.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to point out that here we have, as an initial step, the cost of the department increased by $1,900.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, look at the next page.

Mr. DAVIN. I observe it has been increased on the whole by $400; but in regard to items up to No. 10, the increase has been $1,900. I do not rise to object very strongly to this increase, but I wish to point out that this is the beginning of a policy of economy.

Mr. HUGHES. What is the superannuation allowance of Mr. H. H. Smith?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. $1,590 a year.

Mr. HUGHES. Were the ordinary ten years added to his time?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No.

Mr. HUGHES. Was any addition given to his time of service?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. An Order in Council was passed by the late Government—I cannot give the exact date of it, as I did not know the hon. gentleman would bring the matter up—but it was some time after the salary of Mr. Smith was reduced from $5,000 to $4,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Between the 5th and the 10th of January.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. An Order in Council was passed by the late Government during the month of January, in which it was provided, that when Mr. Smith should retire, the term of five years should be added to his superannuation allowance. The present advisers of His Excellency did not see fit to add anything to his term, although they did not see fit to rescind what seemed to them to be, after a manner, an obligation entered into by the late Government. It should be said, however, that the late Government had no power to bind their successors, nor to bind themselves, as to what they should do when Mr. Smith should be placed on the retired list. Although the Order in Council was said to have been passed when some of the former advisers of His Excellency were temporarily not performing their duties, still it was an Order in Council, and we therefore recognized it and permitted Mr. Smith to have the benefit of the additional five years.

Mr. HAGGART. Who has been appointed to the extra first-class clerkship which the Minister asks for?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have not created an extra first-class clerkship.

Mr. HAGGART. You have. You have taken Mr. Rothwell and Mr. Henry; you had eleven before and that makes twelve.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There has been no appointment.

Mr. HAGGART. Then there is a vacancy.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If Mr. Rothwell is appointed law clerk at a fixed salary, the effect will be to create a vacancy, but I have no intention of appointing any one to that vacancy, because I do not think it necessary to do so.

Mr. HAGGART. Then why do you ask for the vote?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will examine into the contention of the hon. gentleman later, and if he is correct I will ask to have the vote reduced.

Mr. HAGGART. Let the item stand.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Very good.

Mr. HAGGART. Is this gentleman who is appointed law clerk, and who the Minister says is a member of a legal society, a barrister or solicitor?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am informed that he is a solicitor for the province of Ontario.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. You ought to know, you appointed him.

Mr. HAGGART. Not as a law clerk.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister has not exhausted the list of explanations on these rather serious breaches of the Civil Service Act. There is a man by the name of Dunnet there. The Minister may have an explanation on that; he has "done it" too often.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will give a brief sketch of Mr. Dunnet's history, as I think it will appeal to the sympathies of the hon. gentleman. Mr. Dunnet entered the service in 1878; in 1893 he passed the civil service examination, and he has therefore been in the service as a temporary and permanent clerk for nineteen years. During that time he succeeded in getting his salary raised to $650. Mr. Dunnet came to me thinking that he had been—not exactly unfairly dealt with—but thinking that his merits as a servant did not receive that attention that they ought to receive, and after careful consideration of his case I thought he was entitled to a reasonable increase in his salary. After a gentleman has been a faithful servant for nineteen years, I do not think it can be said that the salary of $850 is excessive.

Mr. SPROULE. When was H. H. Smith superannuated?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. His superannuation took effect on the 1st of April.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice that in two of these cases, you have not only given the clerks a statutory increase of $50 each, but you have actually doubled that statutory allowance. Has the department adopted the new principle, that while withholding the ordinary statutory increases from civil servants generally, they will reserve to themselves the right to increase in any particular case and to any extent they like?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They recommend it to the House.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have come to the conclusion, which I think can be very well maintained to the satisfaction of the House, that the Minister in charge of a department is in a much better posi-

tion to decide, whether a man is entitled to an increase of salary or to a larger salary than the automatic action of the Civil Service Act. I give my opinion for what it is worth; that it is not conducive to the efficiency of the service, that every man who is in the service shall know that he is going to get $50 a year increase whether he is efficient or not. It is not conducive to efficiency that there should be no special recognition of merit, or ability, or diligence. As the hon. gentleman well knows, practically, for some years past, the $50 a year increase has been almost automatic. In fact, it is rather a fine point of law as to whether the Civil Service Act contemplates that there should be any discretion about it or not. The civil servants themselves think there is none, but the conclusion of the Government is, that they would not give the increase unless it is specially considered that the civil servant earned it. We considered it to be more in the interest of the efficient work of the departments, that the Ministers should exercise discretion in regard to increasing salaries, rather than that it should be entirely automatic, and that officers should get increases whether they were efficient or not.

Mr. SPROULE. It is at least pleasing to know that the hon. gentleman does not agree with his friends when they were in power before, because, if my memory is correct, they were the parties who adopted the principle of the statutory increase, and it has been acted upon ever since. But it is unfortunate that the hon. gentleman should have selected for promotion the two clerks he has selected, because, if my memory is not at fault, these two clerks were the subject of considerable controversy in this House a few years ago, and his friends behind him moved a vote of want of confidence in the Government because these same two clerks were not dismissed on account of certain irregularities which came out in 1891.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Which two clerks?

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Henry and Mr. Rothwell. There was a very long and very heated discussion over the matter in this House, and some very hard strictures were passed upon the Government because they did not dismiss these two men on account of the irregularities which were carried on in the department with their knowledge and consent; and now these same two men are selected for promotion. It is at least a justification of the late Government for what they did not do.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Would the hon. gentleman be more specific in regard to what these men were guilty of?

Mr. SPROULE. I could by bringing in the report of the Public Accounts Committee.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think the hon. gentleman is putting that matter fairly. The gentlemen who sat in the Opposition did not all agree that Mr. Henry should be dismissed. On the contrary, if he will turn back to the debates, he will find that Mr. Henry's conduct was defended by some gentlemen of the Opposition. I defended it myself.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not say all of the hon. gentleman's friends did so, but I take it the majority did.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I have some remembrance of the investigations which took place in reference to the Department of the Interior in 1891, and the conduct of Mr. Henry and Mr. Rothwell was such as to meet with the approbation instead of the disapproval of the committee. Mr. Rothwell came before the committee and gave his evidence in a straightforward, manly manner, and so did Mr. Henry. I do not think any reflection was cast on either in the committee or in this House. These two men were exempt from the criticisms of the committee, for the simple reason that they acted in a straightforward, honourable manner in giving their evidence, and no charge was brought against them that was sustained in any way whatever. I think they deserve credit for their conduct, and I am satisfied that in the discussion which took place in this House, neither Mr. Henry nor Mr. Rothwell met with the censure of any gentleman in the Opposition at that time.

Mr. SPROULE. Then the hon. gentleman must have a very bad memory. If he takes the trouble to look up "Hansard" he will see that he is entirely astray. I do not say that these gentlemen are worthy of condemnation, because we defended their conduct at that time. What I say is that the very fact that they are selected for promotion and an advance of salary is a justification of the late Government in defending them.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think it is unfortunate, if my hon. friend entertains that opinion about these gentlemen, that he should have mentioned their names in the terms he has; for every one who heard him would supposed that he disapproved of the promotion of these gentlemen because of what happened in 1891. I do not remember very much about Mr. Rothwell, but I do remember that when Mr. Henry's name was under discussion here, it was shown that he had been very unfairly treated. What he had done was perhaps technically open to condemnation, but he had done it in obedience to his superior officer; and when his superior officer asked him to commit a like offence, he objected, and in consequence he has incurred the enmity of that officer from that time to this. So I am glad that the hon. gentleman has stated that he does not mean by the observation he has made to

cast any reflection upon either of these gentlemen.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not, but I say that they are most unfortunate cases to be selected for promotion.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not see the force of that statement, if these gentlemen were not deserving of censure. The mere fact that some persons called their names before the committee is no reason why they should not be promoted if they afford cases which justify the Minister in recommending their advance of salary.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not intend to say a word with reference to these gentlemen whose names are now before the committee; but I want to draw the attention of the committee to what I think is a very serious and important matter. It was the policy of different Governments, under the Civil Service Act, to add $50 a year to the salaries of such clerks as performed their duties in such a way as to secure the recommendation of the head of the department for that increase, which was done on the report of the Deputy Minister, a gentleman who is not a political partisan, but a permanent official acting under all Governments. Not only have we that policy, introduced I am told—I do not remember myself—by hon. gentlemen opposite when in power before——

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No. I think it was in existence from 1867.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am right, at all events, in saying that it was the practice of the Liberal party when in power. It was a sound and salutary practice, provided it was properly carried out; and every assurance that it would be fairly and impartially carried out was implied in the fact that the statutory increase could not be obtained unless the deputy head certified that the official was entitled to it. Now, what has been done? It is declared that this practice has been swept away, and that the Minister of the Interior has adopted a policy of cutting off that statutory increase which under the law and practice of Parliament was awarded uniformly to all officials who performed their services in such a way as to obtain the recommendation of the deputy head, and has provided not only that the statutory increase shall be given to certain individuals, but that it may be doubled. Now, what is the position of all the rest of the civil service? The fact that you put the names of these two gentlemen in your estimates as entitled to double the statutory increase, and leave out the overwhelming body of the civil service, who under the law and practice were entitled to the increase of $50, is a censure fastened upon the character and standing of every officer in the service who is not treated in the same manner. In my judgment, it is opening the door to the grossest party favouritism. It is more than that: it is opening the door to the demoralization of the civil service by insulting all those gentlemen whose names do not appear. If the names of certain individuals are to be put before this House as entitled to consideration, then it follows that every man whose name is not put before the House in the same way is branded, as far as this Government can brand him, as inefficient, or as not so faithfully discharging his duties as to be entitled to that which all Governments have granted hitherto. I regard this as a most grave act, and open to the imputation of an attempt to introduce favouritism into the civil service, and to treat one official on a basis entirely different from that on which other members of the service are treated.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think the hon. gentleman has misunderstood entirely the probable results and the reasons for the action of the Government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope so.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is quite true that for a number of years an increase of $50 per man, until the parties had reached the maximum of their class, has been granted, without question or dispute.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But granted upon the evidence of the Deputy Minister.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am quite aware of that. An abuse had sprung up, an abuse which existed in the hon. gentleman's time, which existed in my time, and after my time, and which there was danger of continuing to exist with great injury to the public service. For a long number of years it has come to pass that every soul in the civil service, good, bad or indifferent, every man who was not absolutely a subject for dismissal, got this increase of $50, as a matter of statutory right. I submit that that was not the intention of the House, or the true intention of the statute, and not in the interest of the civil service. It is in the interest of the civil service that the men who have deserved this favour by their good conduct, should get it; but I think this matter should be regarded particularly with reference to the fact that our civil government expenditure has gone up by leaps and bounds from $700,000 or $800,000 in 1878 to about $1,400,000 in the present year, and that apart from the very large augmentation in the amount of superannuation charges, I think we are paying more for the civil service of Canada than our income warrants. We might, and possibly ought to have taken a different line; we might, and possibly ought to have dispensed with the services of a very large number of these people; we might, and possibly ought, to have dismissed 300 or 400 civil servants, but we did not do that, and

we determined that, in the present state of the finances of the country, the sum of $1,400,000 which, I think, was the vote asked for by the late Government, was all the country could stand for the civil service.

As a man of business, does not the hon. gentleman know that very nearly a million and a half of dollars is an enormous sum to pay for the civil service of a country like ours. It is more in proportion than is paid in the United States, taking their expenditure and revenue and population. It is more than is paid in England in proportion to their population, revenue and expenditure. I think it is our duty to keep that down, and the only way I can possibly hope to do so is by refusing to consider these statutory increases as a matter of course. If we are wrong in our law, it is for the hon. gentleman and others on that side to point out where we are wrong. Although it may be perfectly true that certain nominal checks were provided to be exercised by the deputy heads of departments, the hon. gentleman knows, as well as I, of what little use that check was. How often have I not risen and asked whether out of 200 or 300 employees in any department, it was possible that every mortal one of them should have deserved the statutory increase. And the hon. gentleman knows well that he told the House in reply that we had such an excellent service, we could not find a single man in it who did not deserve the statutory increase. He knows that the right of depriving them of the increase was not exercised and that the thing had become a regular abuse. There is not a banking or other institution which would have permitted this to go on as we have. The civil service at present, in proportion to the character and class of work done, is very largely paid, and overpaid in its lower branches. I never have contended that the higher officials were overpaid, and although it is rather foreign, perhaps, to the present discussion, I may say that it will be worth while, when we have time enough and the House has time enough to decide whether we ought not to revert to the English fashion which divides the civil service into two classes—the one confined to purely clerical work and the other having a very much larger scope and better salaries in proportion. I must tell the hon. gentleman that we cannot go on with these statutory increases over such a large service. It is on that ground, and not on the ground of desiring to insult the public service, that we have decided that, at present at least, we must bring these increases to a close.

Mr. COCHRANE. Where does the retrenchment come in in this department, when the expenditure is $430 more than before ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. If the old rule had been applied, it would have been $4,000 or $5,000 more that would have been asked for. There are about eighty-eight officials, and most of them would have been entitled to their $50 increase under the old rule. Generally speaking, all these big departments had a large increase of several thousand dollars a year, accounted for by the statutory increases. There is an increase of $400 which my hon. colleague endeavoured to explain. I think we should take the two departments together, and in the two will be found a considerable saving.

Mr. COCHRANE. I understand that. The hon. Minister wants to leave the impression that the present Government are economizing, but they are asking the House for $430 more than they should, and they are putting into the hands of the heads of the departments, the dealing out of justice, as they see fit, and not according to law. I am prepared to support every attempt at economy, but I do not want hon. gentlemen opposite to tell me and this committee that they are going in for retrenchment when they are increasing the expenditure.

Mr. McNEILL. I think there is a great deal of force in what has been said by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce regarding the necessity for great economy in the civil service, but there are certain principles which ought to govern us and which we should not violate, even to secure economy. It does seem to me that if a number of gentlemen have been induced to enter the service on a certain understanding, and if over many years a certain practice has been followed in the service, whether strictly in conformity with the law or not—and every one who enters the civil service is not supposed to be really and practically very conversant as to whether the deputy heads of departments are construing the law as it ought to be or not—it is hardly fair to treat them now on a totally different footing. These gentlemen have been induced to enter the civil service on the understanding that they were entitled to certain statutory increases ; and, while it may be right to say that those who enter the civil service hereafter shall not be entitled to that increase, I do think that we should maintain these principles of honour and justice, irrespective altogether of considerations of economy, which are required from honourable men and from an honourable Government. I think it is not a fair thing, I think it is a very unfair thing, to endeavour to secure economy by sacrificing these men in this way. It is all very well to say that you are going to make a saving in a certain department ; it is all very well for the Minister of Interior (Mr. Sifton) to come down here and tell us, as he did a few moments ago : I do not approve of the Civil Service Act ; I think it is a mistake not to give me the power to increase the salary of officials in my department ; and, because I do not approve of the Act, I am going to do what I wish irrespec-

tive of that law; and then to turn around and say: I have economized in my department. How? By violating a well understood agreement with the men who had entered his department; by violating a distinct understanding. Whether it is an absolute legal contract or not, I am not prepared to say; but it has been a well recognized understanding for years and years. But the hon. gentleman comes here and tells us that he does not approve of the Civil Service Act and thinks it unwise that he should not be allowed to select certain gentlemen whom he fancies, from among the officers of his department, to whom this increase shall be given, and to deprive others whom he does not approve of, of this statutory increase, which, when they were induced to enter the civil service they believed they were entitled to. I think that this is not just, I think it is such a course as no Government ought to be prepared to defend. I heard what my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) said with regard to the determination the Government had come to as between two alternatives. One alternative was to dismiss a number of men, and the other was to strike off the statutory increase, an increase to which the civil servant was entitled if he had not done anything improper. Surely my hon. friend does not mean to say that it was contemplated by the Government or that they ever allowed it to cross their minds, that they should turn out bodily without compensation a whole host of gentlemen who had entered the service with the understanding that as long as they conducted themselves properly in their positions and showed themselves to be efficient civil servants they would be retained there.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No such understanding has ever existed.

Mr. McNEILL. I think the understanding has always been that, except in special circumstances, the civil servant, when he was put upon the permanent list was really a permanent civil servant. Of course, we may go into technicalities and split hairs upon this matter, but what is the broad understanding with these men? The broad and distinct understanding is—and every member of the civil service has always held it to be so—that when they are put on the permanent list, they are there permanently; and if they are removed for special cause, if a man be superannuated for some special reason, the Act contemplates that (as I understand it), and provides that that shall not be done without giving to the civil servant a compensation therefor. I think that nothing more unfortunate for the best interests of this country could be imagined that it should be supposed that the permanent members of the civil servants are not permanent. I think that permanence in the civil service is one of the most essential principles that we can insist upon in the interest of the country—in the interest of any country. I am satisfied that you can do nothing more damaging to the best interest of any country than to instill into the minds of the civil servants of the country that they are not secure in their positions so long as they discharge their duties properly and well. And I think my hon. friend must admit that that is so. I think he will admit that every writer on the subject whose views are worthy of consideration has laid down that proposition and urged it as strongly as possible. That a good permanent civil service has been at times the salvation of a country, when the Government of the day has not been discharging its duty, is a fact that every one knows. I think that nothing could be more fatal to the best interest of Canada than that the principle should be laid down that our civil servants shall not be able to regard their positions as secure to them if they discharge their duties faithfully and well.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I should regret that hon. gentlemen opposite should come to any hasty conclusions on matters of this kind. I fear that my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) in the kindness of his heart has driven himself to adopt conclusions which his better judgment will not sustain. He is stating a proposition here evidently for the purpose of having it promulgated through the country that there has been an attack upon the permanence of the civil service.

Mr. McNEILL. I am sure my hon. friend does not wish to misrepresent me. I was simply referring to what the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) had said, and it was in regard to his observation alone that I spoke as I did. I think he said—and he will correct me if I do not represent him accurately—that two alternatives were open to the Government: one being to strike out statutory increase as it is called, and the other to dismiss a number of civil servants, in order to effect economy. And when I went on and referred to these gentlemen as being permanent civil servants, my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) corrected me and said he did not understand that there was any such understanding. I hope my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) will not say that I was discussing a question in order that what I said might go to the country. I called attention to it in order that it might be brought to the mind of the Government, and I am glad that it has been so forcibly brought to their minds as my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) shows it to have been.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot further follow the point, the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) having stated that he had no such idea as I thought he had. I wanted to point out that the facts of the last year have proved the

permanence of the civil service in Canada more than anything else that has taken place before. I need only remind the hon. gentleman of the facts. Here is a party coming into power after having been out of power for eighteen years. That party has now been in power almost twelve months and, in the majority of the departments of the civil service there has not been a single change made. The hon. gentleman says he did not mean to discuss that point, so that I shall not follow it further. I wish to show my hon. friend, however, that he is taking a position upon a false basis. The civil servant, after he takes a place in the service, has a reasonable right to assume that he will remain there on what is called the permanent list. But if the exigencies of the public service require that he should be dismissed—if, for instance, his place is no longer required—he goes without any breach of contract. And the law, in its wisdom, makes special provisions for cases of that kind. It provides that if the civil servant has been less than ten years in the service he shall be paid a gratuity of a certain number of months' pay according to length of his service; and, if he has been in the service more than ten years that he should be paid what is called a superannuation allowance. So the terms upon which he enters the service and the terms upon which he may be dismissed if the exigency of the public service require it, are perfectly well known to him on one side and to the Government on the other.

Now, my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, said truly that the party that came into power had to make its choice, either to make a large cut down in the number of civil servants who were engaged at Ottawa, and give them a gratuity which the law provides should be given to servants when they are dismissed in that case, or we had to provide that the statutory increase, so-called, should not be continued. I admit that there is a good deal to be said for both: I admit that it was a long time before we could make up our minds; but I say that after reviewing the whole situation we come to the conclusion that it was in the general interests of the public, and chiefly in the interests of the civil servants, and of the better class of civil servants, that we should resort to the scheme which we intended to propose to the House. Now, the hon. leader of the Opposition, I think, spoke without mature reflection. The hon. gentleman will see that it is not so much an understanding based upon the law that the civil servant should have $50 a year added to his salary, as it is an abuse which has grown up from year to year. I believe myself that the law originally contemplated such a state of facts as the hon. gentleman the leader of the Opposition depicted, that the deputy heads of each department should carefully analyse the work done by each civil servant, and having analysed it, should report the result of his judgment to the head of the department, and the head of the department, if he chose so to advise the Government, would then advise that the $50 increase should be given.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is the law.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman will excuse me, that has not been the practice, that has never been the practice.

Mr. COCHRANE. Why didn't you put it in practice?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Then we would have been breaking what the hon. gentleman says is the understanding which exists between the civil servants and the Government, that they should get $50 every year. I want to show that what we are doing is practically the same thing; we determined that the old system of granting $50 increases as a matter of course, should cease. It has been granted, year after year, it did not matter whether the man deserved it or not, it did not matter whether he was what is called a four-o'clock-civil-servant, who keeps his eye on the clock from five minutes to four, and is ready to run out as soon as the clock strikes four—or whether it applies to that still larger class, I am proud to say, of civil servants who are ready to work up till six o'clock, and ready to work up till ten o'clock, if need be, the former got his $50 increase just the same. Therefore, the man who worked hard and with an honest intention to serve the public, had no recognition at the hands of the Government at all; and the man who left his office at four o'clock sharp, aye, and sometimes was in the corridors so as to be out in the air when the clock struck four, just got his $50 increase the same as the man who worked up till six o'clock, and went back in many cases and worked up till ten or eleven at night. We thought that kind of thing was not fair between man and man, it was not fair in justice, and the injustice which had grown up year after year had been crystallized around the statutes. So, when we came in we had to decide upon one of two things, that all these increases which have been given as a matter of course for years back were wrong, in which case I suppose we would have had to withdraw them, or we had to declare that increases in the salaries of civil servants should only be granted on the express recommendation of the head of the department who is responsible for it, and that recommendation would have to be approved year after year in the House. Did ever any hon. gentleman hear any defence made for the statutory increase, so-called, in this House? Not at all; it was taken as a matter of course. What is the meaning of this in-

crease? Probably the Government says: There are the usual statutory increases. Nobody questions it, nobody questions whether the man deserves it or not, whether by his diligence and attention to his duties, he was entitled to it; it went as a matter of course. We said that kind of thing is unjust to the civil servants themselves, unjust to the hard-working section of the civil service; and I have the greatest possible pleasure in saying, after nearly a year's experience, that there is a very large proportion of the civil servants who work honestly, and work for long hours, and deserve at the hands of the Government special recognition from time to time. Now, we determined that this perfunctory system of adding $50 a year to every man, whether he was good or bad, should stop; and we determined that if there was a special case deserving recommendation, the head of the department should come into Parliament each year, give his name, and be prepared to give the reasons for the increase. I have no hesitation in telling the hon. gentleman that in my own department I have recommended two or three increases—they will come up directly; but I have recommended them after very careful examination into the merits of the different gentlemen. It is no reflection on those whom I have not recommended, for this reason, that the men whom I have recommended—and I assume it is the same in other departments—are men who, for one reason or another, were doing a very large amount of special work and were not receiving anything like adequate pay for it.

Mr. COCHRANE. Had they not been doing it without?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, they had. I won't anticipate the discussion which may come up when my department is under review; but I will show the hon. gentleman that there are men who, by this automatic system, were kept down to a scale of salary altogether disproportionate to the work they discharged for the public. I say that kind of thing ought not to exist. The Minister ought to be responsible to the House for the proposed increases he makes, personally and directly responsible. He ought to be able to explain to the House the why and the wherefore; and although it is open to the criticism which the hon. gentleman opposite makes, that sometimes partiality may creep in. I say that, taking it altogether, it will be found that if fair-play predominates in the mind of the heads of the department when he makes a proposition of that kind. I will venture to say that in nine cases out of ten, such increase will be found to be well deserved.

Mr. COCHRANE. You did not see the matter in that light when you were in Opposition.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman fails to follow my argument. I was pointing out to hon. gentlemen that when I was in Opposition there was no basis of criticism. We were told the man was entitled to his increase, whether he worked well or badly. There was nothing to criticise, the law gave it to him, it was the statutory increase, therefore we could not say a word, and no word was said. Now, we do not think that that was fair. Not only was it not fair to the taxpayer on the one hand, but it was not fair to the better class of the civil service on the other. I say that if you do not recognize merit in the civil service as you ought to recognize it, you won't get the same return that other businesses do where merit is recognized and appreciated; and we have got to put our civil service as much as possible upon a business basis. Let men who do the work, and do it well, and do the best work, be paid best, and let their services be recognized; and if there are other men who, from inferior education, or other causes are not as capable, not as qualified to do the work as others, of course they won't get the same recognition at the hands of the Minister, whoever he may be. I think it will be seen by the hon. gentleman that, taken as a whole, although it is open, as I frankly admit, to some criticism—you cannot conceive of any system which is not open to criticism, and in which some evils may not creep in—but take it as a whole, it seems to us the fairest and the best way of recognizing merit, and giving a deserving officer some recognition for the service he renders the public.

Mr. COCHRANE. I am somewhat at a loss to understand the hon. gentleman's retrenchment when I look at another item. The Minister of Trade and Commerce informed the committee that $1,400,000 was too much to expend on the civil service, and we should call a halt. But in looking on page 20, I find another item in connection with the Department of the Interior where the retrenchment goes on in the same way. We have retrenchment by asking the House for $897 which, added to the $1,430, makes $2,327 all through.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. gentleman will turn to page 12, at the foot of the civil service estimates, he will see how much increase there is for the past year in what we ask. There was a total increase during the year in the whole civil service of $1,635, and the decrease is $35,016; in other words, the decrease this year according to those estimates, is over $33,000. Now, what is the use of carping about $800, or $400, in one particular branch, when the decrease as a whole is what I have stated to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. McNEILL. I should be sorry if my hon. friend misunderstood me in any way. I would like to remove two misconceptions from his mind. In the first place, I had no reference, when I spoke, to political dismissals at all. Certainly so far as my hon. friend himself is concerned, I could not make any complaint as to that. On the contrary, I have to thank my hon. friend for the very straightforward course he has taken in reference to a matter which I brought to his notice some time ago in connection to a matter of that sort. The other misapprehension I wish to remove from the mind of my hon. friend is this. I should be sorry if he thought that the speech he has just made was an answer to the observations I offered. I did not say one word as to whether the granting of $50 a year increase was a good or bad system. I did not say whether it was a good or bad system to select some men for special reward. I was speaking of the understanding which existed when those men entered the service, and I ventured to think that hon. gentlemen opposite had violated that understanding.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman had better settle that matter with the leader of the Opposition, because that hon. gentleman said it was the duty of the deputy to make, in each case, a careful report.

Mr. McNEILL. The understanding was that the practice would be continued as it existed previously. It is only in special cases, as the hon. gentleman has admitted, that it is refused; and he said in the course of his remarks that when the question was asked in the House why the $50 was given, the answer made was that it was the usual statutory increase.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman was wrong in his contention. I do not admit that a civil servant has a right to a statutory increase of $50 annually. I grant that this was done by our predecessors and by the late Government, but I do not admit the increase as a matter of right or as anything more than a matter of grace. I contend it was not because of any right belonging to the civil servant in any respect that such an increase was granted. I hold it had become a very gross abuse, and was leading to gross abuses all the time. No deputy head could have stated, if he were examined on oath, that he had complied with the direct terms of the Act and had made a careful report. It has always been notorious that if this statutory increase were given to perhaps one thousand men, not one was found who would not deserve the $50 increase. Does any one suppose that out of a thousand civil servants a very considerable number did not render inferior service? We know better; we know that many should have been dismissed, and that a large number did not render honest eight hours' work daily to the country, and should not have had $50 increase yearly. I will show the practical result of this. In 1892, with eighty-eight officers, precisely the same number as at the present time, the annual charge to the department was $92,000. Then it sprang up to $95,000—statutory increases all the time. The next year it was $98,000—statutory increases and one or two men added. Then it advanced to $101,000, then it was $102,000, and so it reached the present figure. Is there going to be no end to this state of things? The civil service estimates amounted to $1,413,000, then $1,457,000 was reached, then the sum advanced to $1,475,000, and so on all the time under the operation of this rule. I say it is high time that this should be stopped. We have stopped it. Instead of asking for $1,475,000, we ask for $1,414,000. If hon. gentlemen opposite desire to promote economy, they will not criticise unduly that reduction. Civil servants have rights which will not be violated by us. We are not disposed to interfere with civil servants except for three causes: If a civil servant is found inefficient and incapable, we are entitled to discharge him, and we will not hesitate to do so: if he is guilty of malfeasance in office, we are entitled to discharge him, and we will not hesitate to do so; if he is guilty of active partisanship while he holds office in the civil service, we will most assuredly dismiss him. For these three causes we will dismiss civil servants. But as a Government, we must reserve to ourselves, as every man of business will do, the right if we find too many men in the service, more men employed than are required for the work of the department, to dismiss them. We break no covenant with them, we violate no arrangement entered into with them, but we simply carry out provisions made by law, which provisions hon. gentlemen opposite know well to be that if a civil servant has served less than ten years he is entitled to a certain gratuity, if he has served more than ten years and has paid the superannuation allowance, he is entitled to a certain superannuation in proportion to his salary. But I do not think the hon. gentleman is wise in talking about covenants entered into so far as civil servants are concerned. If the hon. gentleman is going to maintain that it is a great compliment on the part of a civil servant to enter the public service, I may inform him that I do not understand such to be the opinion of the people generally. Comparing the pay of the ordinary civil servants with that of the clerks of any bank—and with a bank I think a fair comparison may be made—it appears to me that the members of our civil service are exceedingly well paid. I have never held that the higher grades were paid as highly as they deserved. I draw a broad distinction between ordinary clerical work such as is done by a majority of the civil servants, and high grade work done by deputy heads or

officers in grades close to them. Many of those men have very important services to discharge; they occupy positions for which the best talent in Canada is none too good, and I have, time and again, when I have observed our civil list growing up to large sums for administration from a comparatively moderate sum, pointed out the desirability of making a reform. That was my individual opinion. Here we are trying to do the best we can under very difficult circumstances. It is our duty not to allow the expenditure of Canada to exceed a certain figure. We are endeavouring to do so as best we can. I do not pretend to say, and no one can pretend to say that objections cannot be offered; but I do most respectfully submit to the committee that it will not do to admit that a civil servant is entitled to have his salary increased $50 a year for his life. I do not grudge a civil servant or any man a fair day's pay for a fair day's work, but we must measure the pay by the remuneration for similar kinds of labour elsewhere. I do not think hon. gentlemen opposite, if they come to consider what is paid to civil servants, will consider they are underpaid, and most assuredly they cannot say that the vote of $1,500,000 for the civil service, irrespective of the very large sums voted for the payment of the outside service, is a small percentage for a country like Canada to spend.

Mr. SPROULE. It is not with any disposition to object to the hon. Minister carrying out a policy of economy in the various departments that I take exception to his remarks, but because we have always understood that the statutory increase was a matter of legal right. Why was it called a statutory increase? It was because it was fixed by statute, and because the statute controlled one man as well as another.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Minister of Justice advises that that was not a correct construction.

Mr. SPROULE. That may be, but it has always heretofore been taken that it was a statutory increase, and could not be altered. The Act says:

The minimum salary paid to a chief clerk shall be one thousand eight hundred dollars, with an annual increase of fifty dollars up to a maximum of two thousand four hundred dollars.

Again the Act says:

The minimum salary of a first-class clerk shall be one thousand four hundred dollars per annum, with an annual increase of fifty dollars up to a maximum of one thousand eight hundred dollars.

And section 26 of the Act is as follows:—

No officer, clerk or employee shall receive any increase of salary except by Order in Council passed on the report of the deputy head, concurred in by the head of the department, stating that such officer, clerk or employee is deserving of such increase.

That section of the Act was the authority under which the deputy head of a department acted, but we have no intimation from the Government that the deputy head so acted in the present case. The Act further says:

The increase of salary of any officer, clerk or employee authorized under this Act for the then current year may be suspended by the head of the department for neglect of duty or misconduct.

That appears the only provision for the suspension of the $50 a year increase; but yet, the Government have suspended it of their own motion without even an Order in Council. We ought to know the authority under which they so acted, and we ought to know if they can violate a statute with impunity, or whether the statute has been wrongly interpreted heretofore. It always did seem to me that there was no possibility of stopping this statutory increase unless we amended the law. I claim that the Government should have first repealed this section of the Act, and then they would have gone about it in a proper way.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In regard to the point raised by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart), I find that there were ten first-class clerks last year, and as we have estimated for ten this year, there is no discrepancy. My hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) is very much exercised by reason of the fact, that there is an increase of $370 this year for civil government, Department of Interior; but if he looks at the Estimates of last year which were prepared by a Government in whom he (Mr. Cochrane) had great confidence, he will find that there was an increase of $5,590.

Mr. COCHRANE. Your friends said that was wrong.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think my hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) can show that he protested very violently against that increase made by his friends last year. I was not then a member of the Government, but I understand that the Estimates prepared by the late Government were adopted by the present advisers of His Excellency.

Mr. DAVIN. I find in the Estimates of last year that there were eleven first-class clerks instead of ten.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have counted them again, and I find there are only ten. If my hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) will look at page 87 of the Estimates he will find under the item "Dominion lands chargeable to income" that we ask for a vote of $90,938.25, which is a decrease on the Estimates of last year of $27,283.75. I should explain to the committee, that although not technically, this is practically a

decrease of $27,283 in the civil government estimates for the Interior Department. It is a decrease for this reason. The largest portion of the expense of this department is in connection with Dominion Lands, and the economy which will be effected amounting to over $25,000 during the next fiscal year, will be brought about by the abolition of unnecessary offices in the outside service. It will be at once apparent that when these offices are abolished in the outside service, it will necessarily place upon the officers estimated for under the head of civil government, a considerable increase of work. Before it is discovered how that change will work out, it would have been imprudent for me to decrease the number of clerks in the inside service, and consequently there has only been a decrease of one third-class clerk. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cochrane) was evidently under a misapprehension as to the question of economy. When he comes to figure up the salaries paid by the Department of Interior, after these Estimates are passed, he will find that notwithstanding some small increases, there is on the whole a decrease of over $25,000.

Mr. FOSTER. The question that has been discussed—and I must say very fairly discussed on both sides of the House—is one which is of sufficient importance to engage more of the attention of the House. Its importance has been added to by the explicit declaration of two Ministers of the Crown which completely changes the basis upon which additions are to be made to the salaries of civil servants in this country. We cannot allow a complete change to be made in this way without comment, and without calling the attention of the House and the attention of the country, to what is involved. I listened particularly to the law as it was read by my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule), and I ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who is a lawyer: Whether he thinks that they can, under that rendering of the law, drop the statutory increase other than for cause; such cause being inattention to duty or some other reason which in the opinion of the department casts a stigma upon the clerk. If ever the words of a statute were explicit, these are. There is the general declaration that there shall be a minimum and a maximum salary, that the minimum shall commence at so much, and that there shall be a statutory increase of $50 a year. There is a very proper power placed in the hands of the Minister to prevent that increase being given, which the law says shall be given, if there is any cause which approves itself to the Minister, such cause being something which rendered the clerk either, from inability, or inattention, or carelessness, or bad habits not deserving of that increase. But outside of that I ask my hon. friend if he thinks that under the reading of the law they have the right to prevent the increase.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is not of much use for my hon. friend and me to discuss this matter, because I tell him that the matter was formally submitted to the Minister of Justice, and he gave a long reasoned opinion that it was not compulsory but entirely permissive.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it would be very interesting if the hon. gentleman would bring that down.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman should bring it down without a motion.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, I think we have got upon something else than legal ground. Civil servants have rights as well as any other good citizens of this country—as well as Ministers of the Crown. A Minister who enjoys his office and emoluments ought not to treat an official with anything but the fairest consideration. I think that is a principle which we will all agree to. No man goes into the civil service of this country without looking into it beforehand. There are in the civil service a great many young men of excellent education and excellent parts. When looking for a career for themselves, these young men looked to the civil service. They read the statute law, and besides that they had the custom of twenty-five or thirty years to guide them. I have no doubt that a member of Parliament on either side, when explaining the matter to an applicant for a position in the service, would say: The law is this: you go in at the minimum, and there is a maximum to which you attain, and you attain to that by increases of so much per year, such increases being given so long as you perform your duties well and get the commendation of the head of your department. The young man enters the service on this basis. He is not a lawyer, and is not looking for technicalities; but there is the plain meaning of the law, and the practice of twenty-five or thirty years. You may say there is no abstract right which the civil servant can claim. But he has taken his step outwards in his career on that basis, and that ought to be taken into consideration by any Government in discussing whether there should be changes or not. The law contemplated that in fixing a minimum and a maximum: it contemplated that there should be an increase in some manner. Was that left to hap-hazard, or to the will of the Minister? No; Parliament thought it best not to leave it to hap-hazard, and it prescribed in the law under what conditions and circumstances these increases should be made. We are all agreed upon that. But, my hon. friend says, it costs a great deal, this civil service. I admit that; I have always admitted it. I have no hesitation in saying that I think our civil service has cost us more than it ought to have

cost any time in the last fifteen years. I am not saying that, if possible, the cost should not be reduced. But when our hon. friends opposite say that there was open to them only one of two alternative courses, either to keep on the statutory increases without looking at the merits of each case at all, which they say has been the prevailing practice, or to sweep them away entirely, or to put them under the will of the Minister, I say they have not rightly stated the question. There was another course open to them, that was, to adhere to the spirit of the law as passed by Parliament, and to apply the safeguards which would make it imperative upon every Deputy Minister to place before his Minister the record of his department for the preceding year, on which the Minister, acting on his responsibility, would decide. I have no hesitation in saying that there has been laxity in this respect—that Deputy Ministers thought they should not look into the record at all, but should just recommend the increases as a matter of course. All Deputy Ministers did not do that; some were careful not to do it. I know that there were cases in my own department in which the statutory increases were kept back simply on account of lapses and lax conduct on the part of certain officers. There is where hon. gentlemen could apply the safeguards in carrying on departmental service. That was another alternative; but my hon. friends did not take that, or give the statutory increases as a matter of right, but they took the alternative of sweeping away all statutory increases, and substituting what? The law or will of Parliament? No, but the absolute and arbitrary will of the Minister of the department. Our civil service are not simply the dregs of the community; they are not simply third-class men. They are men of education, men of spirit, men of honourable instincts; they have feelings just as much as we members of Parliament have. In the course you are taking you are introducing the feeling amongst them that if they are to get anything more than they are getting to-day, they have to get it through political favour—nothing else. My hon. friend may shake his head as much as he likes; but he knows in his heart as well as I know, that the moment the Minister of the Interior promulgated this doctrine and he followed it, that moment they opened the door to his party followers to use their influence with Ministers to obtain promotions for certain individuals. My hon. friend may have the stiffest of backbones; but political influence is political influence, and he and every other Minister will yield to it. But beyond that there is the demoralizing effect upon the civil service, in the feeling entertained by every civil servant to-day, that if he is to get the $50 increase for himself and his family, he has no other way of getting it than by currying favour with the politicians or otherwise securing the good-will of his Minister. My hon. friend is unfair in a heated partisan discussion; but we are not having a heated partisan discussion. My hon. friend is a fair man now and he knows that there are men of great worth and great ability in his department who have been a long time there, and who are not in receipt of high salaries. Those men see that four men are selected by another Minister for advance in their salaries—one $250, another $200, and two others $100 each; and he says to himself: Why am I left out? From the 1st of July to the 1st of July I have done my duty in my office, and my conscience is clear; yet my $50 is refused to me. The man whom I have in my mind is as good as any man who has received these high increases. Take Mr. Rothwell, who has received an increase of $250. Did he do his work before? The Minister says he did it, and did it well. Will he do anything more than his work now, and do it well? No. But where is he to-day? Made a chief clerk at the will of his Minister and $250 added to his salary, while others have remained as first-class clerks without any addition to their salary, who are in every respect just as painstaking, steady and worthy members of the service—without saying anything against Mr. Rothwell at all—as Mr. Rothwell is. But from this moment out, there is no feeling of independence in the civil service. There is no feeling that they are to be treated on their merits. Every civil servant knows what partisanship is in this country. Every civil servant has heard it enunciated from the front benches here that an offensive partisan should be dismissed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. An active partisan.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, that an active partisan should be put out, and the spirit is encouraged everywhere throughout this country that those in power for the time being, put there by their friends, must give consideration to their friends. We might as well acknowledge that, we know it is so, and I tell you, Sir, it will be practically impossible for anything but political influence to have weight in making up the sum of the reasons that will influence a Minister's decision. For the Minister himself it is a bad place to be put in. In future, those who have influence with him will approach him and say: We want such a man increased, he is a real good fellow, and his father and family have always voted for us, and the Minister will be at a loss for a reply. Formerly he could have said: There is the law, this man has done his work, and he will get $50 per year increase until he reaches his maximum. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce says there is no way of rewarding a man. There is. The reward comes when a man has reached his maximum, and a Minister exercises his power of recom-

mending him for a higher grade. That is where the power of the Minister, under the old law, came in. I say that this principle, enunciated to-day, is a bad one for the civil service, and also for the Ministers. It will be taken throughout the country as a warning for civil servants to get political influence to work, or for politicians to bring influence to have their friends in the service given higher salaries.

But my hon. friend, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, said: Oh, this thing was getting too bulky, and it ought to be brought down. Is there no other way of bringing it down? I take my hon. friends opposite as witnesses. What have they been saying for the last fifteen years? They have been saying that there are too many civil servants in the departments, that they are tumbling over one another. I can tell you how hon. gentlemen could decrease the sum total paid without resorting to the means they have taken. They could do so by not filling the vacancies when they occur. A large proportion of vacancies occur every year, and if these hon. gentlemen were true to their convictions of a few years ago, and when an officer, for any reason, went out of office, let the office lapse, they could effect a saving greater than any they will make by the means they have taken. But my hon. friend did not give the past Government the credit he should. We took the very best means of reducing the cost of the civil service. Where was the chief difficulty? It was where my hon. friend said it was, that second-class and first-class and chief clerks were not too highly paid, and that there was a great deal of work done by first-class clerks which was really writer's work, the wages for which went up to a thousand dollars. Two years ago we introduced a Bill, which is to-day the law, by which no more third-class clerks were to be appointed. In their stead we appointed writers, who begin at a minimum of $300 and go to a maximum of $600, and did writer's work. In the natural course, the expenditure, under that system, would be very materially reduced, and the work just as well done, while the higher grades would be kept up to their present proportions.

I tell you what you are doing. The young men who have come into the service, and are the best class of men for the service, and who to-day have some hope that their conscientious labours will not go unrewarded—many of those men, with their growing families, who have been living economically on the basis that each year they can afford just a little more expenditure, because they will get the $50 increase, buoyed up by the hope of this increase, this year find it suddenly cut off; and I know, of my own experience, of men whose obligations, pared down to the utmost limit of economy, under their expectations, have to-day to look to a deficit of $50 and borrow the money to meet obligations incurred under the expectation of getting that increase. We cannot afford to demoralize our civil service. I put it to the Ministers generally, not from a partisan point of view, whether they are starting out in the right course by taking away the statutory increase from the deserving, and leaving it to the Minister alone to recommend that it be given to whomever he chooses. After all, Ministers are only mortal, and many of them are dependent on certain persons in their own department for forming their ideas, and thus they often get their impressions of the people under them from parties who are interested in making certain impressions on the Minister's mind. I ask them to think it over, whether or not it is not better to proceed on that principle of sweeping away the regular and permanent increase and making it simply dependent on the will of the Minister himself.

My hon. friend, the Minister of Interior (Mr. Sifton), has escaped criticism of his department, because the criticism was drawn away to the civil service generally, but he must not think that his department is not open to criticism, as he has explained its management. This Minister is only three or four months in office, yet he goes to work and assumes to know what are the qualifications of the fifty, sixty or eighty men who are in his department. I say that that is absolutely impossible. I entered my department with a good deal of young vigour and tried to get acquainted with the persons in it and measure their services, and I did not feel I was competent to do so when I had been there three or six months or even longer, and I think others will bear me out in that view. But this Minister had been there only four months, when he made up his mind as to who were deserving of $200 or $250 increase and who should not get any increase. It would have been better if the Minister had taken at least a year to make himself thoroughly acquainted with his department before attempting to gauge and measure the employees of his department, and from eighty or more single out four for preferment and increase and leave the others as they were. My hon. friend removed Mr. Burgess—because, no doubt, it was a removal, a degradation. Mr. Burgess was appointed by the hon. gentleman's own friends and was thoroughly acquainted with the working of the department. Though not a political friend of my own, he is a friend of mine in a general way. I have come in contact with him, and I know that as Deputy Minister of that department he proved himself always a man who thoroughly understood his work.

But my hon. friend shoves him aside after he has been there three months, or rather two months—and I believe he wanted to do it before he had been there three weeks. If rumour is correct, he did so. He fought a hard battle, and rather had a reverse, the story goes; but he insisted as an insistent Minister can, and carried his point, as an

insistent Minister will. But he said that Mr. Burgess did not show a willingness to promote the best interests of the North-west. I am sorry he said that of a Deputy Minister who is older than he is and who has been in the department under Ministers of both regimes for a long period of years, and has had the respected confidence of every Minister under whom he has served. Yet Mr. Burgess is set aside because forsooth he did not show a proper spirit of assistance to the North-west. I think that this criticism might have been omitted, because I do not think it was deserved by Mr. Burgess. But if Mr. Burgess, an able man, a man of many years' experience in the department, a man who knew the North-west—whatever my hon. friend may say—if he was not a man to be relied upon and to get information from with regard to the department, there was another man who was just the man for Galway. And who was that? A man who had never been inside the department; a man who cannot by any possibility have the history, the records, the atmosphere of the department. He must learn the affairs of the department—a totally untried man. I say nothing against him; he may be an excellent man for all I know. But it seems to me and to the country that to put aside an officer like Mr. Burgess and take in a complete stranger to the department, even though he be from the North-west, looks like forcing the position. Though the gentleman may not have the records of the department at his fingers' ends, he had the records of my hon. friend's (Mr. Sifton's) politics at his fingers' ends. It looks like a political appointment. The country is watching him, and it will be seen in the future whether the present Deputy Minister proves a justification for his appointment, I am not going to judge him now; that would be unfair; he has been in his position too short a time. But if he does not show himself the man for the place, then the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) has laid himself open to the strongest criticism and rebuke that this House and the country can give. With reference to Mr. Smith, the hon. gentleman says the Order in Council was passed by which Mr. Smith, when he came to be superannuated, should have five years added to his time. My hon. friend stated that, I think, but it cannot be too clearly understood that Mr. Smith at that time suffered a decrease of $1,000 in his salary.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It was some months before.

Mr. FOSTER. It was practically the same time. Mr. Smith assented to that decrease, and the recommendation was made by his Minister, but it was not acted upon in any authoritative way, that when he came to be superannuated, he should have five years added to his term of service.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman is wrong. I said the Order in Council passed, but it was not acted upon.

Mr. FOSTER. There are Orders in Council and Orders in Council, as the hon. gentleman knows.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not know. Does the hon. gentleman repudiate responsibility for an Order in Council?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is a little too fast. Who talked of repudiation? Did I say a word about it? My hon. friend knows I did not. It will be time enough to pick me up when I fall down. I did not say that there was to be repudiation, but I say there are Orders in Council and Orders in Council. This was an Order in Council, if it passed, on the recommendation of the Minister, that a reduction of $1,000 in salary be made in Mr. Smith's salary, and, as a consideration, when superannuation was given, if it should come, five years should be added to his time. That goes so far as a recommendation is concerned, but it has no executive force; what gives it that is the Order in Council for superannuation. But I want just to put this before the House: When a man voluntarily leaves off $1,000 of his salary, an old servant and a good servant, as Mr. Smith has always been, surely it is not asking too much, when the law gets the authority of Council and when it has been exercised in cases of superior officers who have shown merit, to add five years to his term of service. And I am glad that the hon. gentleman allowed this to Mr. Smith. Not many officers, as the hon. gentleman knows, would submit to a decrease of $1,000 in their salaries.

I do not know that I need extend the criticism to which I have referred. But I wish to again emphasize that my hon. friend by bringing these four cases down in which he has actually acted against the civil service law and has made large increases, has entirely negatived the position that has been taken by hon. gentlemen on the other side. I ask my hon. friend—my honest and honourable friend—from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) if he will not now assist me. He and I have been opponents, but still we have agreed on many things. But I ask him if, with his record in this House of having consistently, year in and year out, opposed any increase that was extraordinary and not strictly in accordance with the Civil Service Act, he is going to support four increases, one of $250, one of $200, and two of $100 each in the Interior Department at the beginning of this new regime. I confidently rely upon my hon. friend supporting my contention in this respect.

Mr. McMULLEN. I was not present while the Minister of the Interior was giv-

ing the explanations. I am sorry that I missed that part of the discussion. I will have to rely upon the reading of it in the "Hansard." I have only to say that I have generally opposed increases, and, unless there is a good, sound, justifiable reason for giving increases, increases should not be consented to for a moment. That is the policy I pursued when I was upon the side where hon. gentlemen opposite now sit; and I hope that every Minister when he rises in the House to defend any increases in his department or any other expenditures, will make a sound, logical defence. For my own part, I should hesitate to endorse what I condemned when proposed by my opponents, even when it is proposed from this side. I have confidence in the Ministers of the several departments that they will be ready to justify what they have done and give every explanation that may be necessary. Had I been present to hear the explanations of the Minister of the Interior, I should be ready to give my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) an answer to his question. But not having heard those explanations I am not in a position to say what course I would take upon this matter.

Mr. FOSTER. There is only one course for us. We must allow this item to stand until my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) has had an opportunity to read up this debate. It would be altogether unfair to put him in a false position. He ought to have the benefit of the reading of "Hansard" on this matter. Moreover, we are promised the report of the Minister of Justice on this subject, and if my hon. friend (Mr. Sifton) will allow the item to stand there will be no discussion on the items but only on the Minister of Justice's decision.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have sat in this House for a good many yeears, but I never had such a compliment paid me before by the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) as allowing an item to stand for the purpose of giving me an opportunity to read the explanation with regard to it. I am glad to see him taking that course, but I think it would have been much better if he had done it before, while he was in office.

Mr. FOSTER. I must always be ready to pay that compliment to the acting leader of gentlemen opposite. It is now six o'clock and perhaps the hon. Minister could bring this down and have it here after dinner.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will try to get it by the time the House re-assembles.

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

After Recess.

Department of the Interior..... $104,814

Mr. HAGGART. I would ask the Minister of Interior if the office of Superintendent of Mines is still in existence in his department?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Superintendent of Mines is an outside officer residing at Calgary. There has been no change in respect to his salary or position.

Mr. HAGGART. I see in last year's Estimates he was voted for as belonging to the department here.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman is in error. Last year there was an officer who was called a Chief Clerk of Timber and Mines, he was voted a salary of $1,400. The Superintendent of Mines is Mr. Pierce, who resides at Calgary and gets $3,000 a year, and he is paid out of the outside vote. This officer to whom the hon. gentleman refers, and whose salary is now asked for, is a first-class clerk, and is among the ten first-class clerks whose salaries we are now voting.

Mr. HAGGART. Before six o'clock I was reminding the hon. gentleman that there were ten first-class clerks down here, and a Mr. Henry and a Mr. Rothwell, who make twelve, and that there were only eleven provided for last year. I suppose amongst these twelve he includes the chief clerk of mines, and the extra clerk he is providing for is Mr. Keyes, who is moved from a second-class to a first-class clerkship.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman was, of course, entirely mistaken in the information that he gave before dinner, that there were only ten full clerks voted for last year. If it is true that there were only ten clerks voted for last year, the discrepancy would be greater this year. But he says now the eleven which are mentioned in the Estimates must include the chief clerk of mines.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I was not mistaken in what I said before. The facts were as I stated. I did apparently misunderstand what the hon. gentleman was asking about.

Mr. HAGGART. Then the discrepancy which I have pointed out was filled up. There was no vacancy, but Mr. Keyes was promoted from a second-class to a first-class clerkship?

Mr. WALLACE. Before this resolution passes I think we are entitled to a little further explanation from the Minister as to the reasons why he has asked this committee to set aside the law of the land in the Civil Service Act. The Civil Service Act says that the minimum salary of a first-class clerk shall be $1,400, with an annual increase of $50 up to $1,800, which is the maximum salary of a first-class clerk. These two gentlemen, who I am quite willing to concede are qualified gentlemen, are trans-

ferred from the first-class to the class of chief clerkships, which will enable their salaries to be increased over the amount of $1,800, although no first-class clerk can receive a higher salary by this Act than $1,800. Now, you propose in one instance, I think, to make the salary of one of these gentlemen $1,900 a year, and the other $2,000, and you place them in a further list which the law says they cannot be placed in until they pass a certain examination. I would like to ask the Minister if they have become duly qualified to become promoted to chief clerkships? If not, I presume they cannot be appointed. Of course this Parliament can make any law, and can set aside any law. In these cases that we have under review now, you increase the salary of one man who was appointed in 1893, at the minimum salary that the law provided for, because the law provides that they should be appointed at a salary of $400. This gentleman was appointed at a salary of $500, or $550, I am not sure which, because he is getting now $650. He got an increase in 1894 to $550; in 1895, to $600; and in 1896, to $650; and now you are proposing to give him a still further rise of $200 in one year. I do not know anything of the merits of this gentleman, but only the fact that has been stated here to-day by the Minister himself, that he passed the civil service examination in 1893, and the Government of that day placed him upon the permanent staff. He was a temporary clerk, it appears, but they placed him upon the permanent staff and gave him $100 more salary than those who go into the civil service are entitled to. The reason the Minister gave to-day was, in my opinion, no reason at all, and I think he should give us a sufficient reason when he asks this House to suspend the operation of the law and give this gentleman an increase of $200 when the statutory allowance is only $50. Now I remember very well when the hon. gentlemen, now on that side of the House, insisted that every clause in this Civil Service Act should be carried out; they went further than that, and made a declaration that this law was not sufficiently strict enough, that it was too favourable to the civil service, that it gave them too many advantages, that it was giving them too rapid promotion, and all the rest. Now these same gentlemen propose to this House, that this Act shall be suspended, that the law giving an annual increase to these clerks of $50 should be suspended, and that an increase of $200 shall be given; an increase that, according to the usual custom, would take four years to reach, is to be reached at once in the case of this man. Now what are the circumstances that justify that increase of salary from $650 to $850? It may be said that $200 is not very much, that he is a very deserving man. But just look at the effect it will have upon other members of the civil service, more particularly at a time when you are saying to others: You used to get your annual increase of $50, but this year there is no annual increase in the whole of the inside service. I am told that there is no annual increase in any of the departments. Of that I am not going to make any complaint, because at this time when every branch of business, when every industry, and every enterprise, is economizing, cutting down their expenses, when the cost of living is lower, perhaps, than it has been in the recollection of any of us in this country—this is a time when the Government may fairly consider whether they should give this annual increase if the power is vested in them to refuse giving it. But in face of that, in face of the members of the civil service standing still all round, you take up one man, two men, three or four men, in one department, and without any reason that has been given to this House that will justify it at all, you have increased the salary of these four members of the civil service in the Department of Interior by $200 and $100 per annum, respectively. I repeat that the Minister is bound to give the committee a reason for his action—the reasons the hon. gentleman gave this afternoon are no reasons whatever. What did he say? He stated that one gentleman was a very worthy man. Is he the only worthy man in the Department of the Interior; is he the only man who has done his duty in that department? Again, is he, in conjunction with three other gentlemen, only deserving consideration? If such be the facts, the Minister is unfortunate as regards the staff with which to do the work of the department. There are no less than eighty-seven or eighty-eight clerks in the department. According to the hon. gentleman's statement, there are only four men worthy of promotion; the balance are not worthy of the ordinary increases, but the hon. gentleman has increased the salaries of four men by twice or thrice and even five times the ordinary increase. The effect will be to create great dissatisfaction not only in the Department of the Interior, but in all the departments, because the officers in the various departments will ask the Minister and any one who may be supposed to give the information, what are the reasons that four gentlemen are selected in one department for increases and the other eighty-four are refused the ordinary increase this year. The Minister of Interior is bound to give the committee full explanation of his action, which he has not yet given. The hon. gentleman has given no reason which might not apply to sixty or seventy clerks in his department. Before he asks Parliament to increase this vote, when economy should be practised, when salaries shall be reduced to the lowest possible point, when advantage should be taken of all possible means of retrenchment and every opportunity seized to reduce the staff, the hon. gentleman should offer further explanations, es-

pecially as this is the largest amount ever asked in the history of the Department of the Interior. The hon. gentleman is asking this committee to vote $104,814. What has been the expenditure of the department during the last few years? In 1893 it was $98,000; in 1894, $101,000; in 1895, $102,000; in 1896, $98,000 and last year the estimate showed $104,440. That was the highest point reached up to this year. So hon. gentlemen opposite during the two years they have been in power, have asked Parliament for the largest amount ever needed for this department. I am satisfied that the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), who preached economy when on this side of the House, and will no doubt seek to practice it when on the other side of the House, will sustain me in the opinion that the expenditure is altogether too large, and cannot be justified. The whole expenditure of the department should be reduced, and we can fairly call upon the Government to do this. At all events, the Minister is in duty bound to endeavour to justify this proposed increased expenditure.

Mr. McMULLEN. There is one point to which I wish to call the attention of the committee, and it is this: We have not yet reached the items which show that a very considerable reduction has been made in the outside service.

Mr. WALLACE. Why has not a reduction been made in the inside service too?

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman should give the Government credit for the very large reduction in the outside service due to the abolition of the Land Board at Winnipeg, and from his knowledge of departmental matters, he should also admit that the business of the office here will be considerably increased. The work done by the Land Board must be done somewhere, and it has been transferred to Ottawa. The hon. Minister has been endeavouring to recast the entire service of the department, and I compliment him on abolishing the Winnipeg Land Board, for I did not think it performed any service whatever. By the abolition of that board, the country will save about $30,000 annually, except some increases of salaries due to the work to be performed in the department here. In order to meet such increased work, the hon. Minister, instead of employing new hands, has added somewhat to the salaries of two or three officials upon whom the burden of the work will fall. He considers the staff ample, not only to perform the work required of it in past years, but also to perform the duties of the Land Board at Winnipeg as well. If in recasting the department the hon. Minister can show that, taking the estimates throughout, there will be a saving of $27,000 on the vote, that will be a full answer to the questions put by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace). I have never been favourable to increases in salaries. There should be good and well defined grounds for granting increases in salaries of men already fairly well paid, and I was disposed at first to take exception to these increases; but owing to the explanations given this evening, I am of the opinion that the Minister made a fairly creditable start towards reductions in the department, and I think it should be satisfactory under the circumstances.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the Minister been able to obtain either of the Orders in Council I asked for?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I understood the hon. gentleman asked for Sir Oliver Mowat's opinion?

Mr. FOSTER. And also the Order in Council.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have been able to get the opinion, and I have sent it to a clerk to copy.

Mr. HAGGART. I see there is a decrease in the staff. Is the hon. gentleman getting rid of any officers in the department, and if so, what are their names? I observe there is a double allowance for private secretaries. There is a vote for private secretary to the Minister of the Interior and private secretary to the Department of Indian Affairs, whereas there was only one vote for this work last year.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There has been no officer in the inside service of the Interior Department removed, that I am aware of; if so, it entirely escapes my recollection at the present time. It is true, I am asking for the usual vote of $600 for a private secretary, but when we get to the item of civil government for Indian Affairs I will explain to the hon. gentleman why that is necessary.

Mr. WALLACE. Who is the private secretary?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. A. P. Collier; he receives a salary of $1,200.

Mr. HUGHES. In addition to the allowance for private secretary?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No; he gets $1,200 altogether.

Mr. FOSTER. Was he in the service before?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No.

Mr. BRITTON. It is perhaps a little premature to discuss the legal aspect of the question, before the opinion of the Minister of Justice is laid on the Table; still, I wish to call the attention of the House to the Civil Service Act as it is, and as I read it. It will be seen by any one who carefully

reads the Act, that this increase is not a matter of course. It seems to me that the interpretation is, as if the section was read something in this way.

> The minimum salary of a first-class clerk shall be $1,400, with an annual "possible" increase, &c.

It is a fair interpretation of the section to read it as if the word "possible" were there, because it must be controlled by section 26 of the Act, and which reads :

> No officer, clerk or employee shall receive any increase of salary except by Order in Council passed on the report of the deputy head, concurred in by the head of the department, stating that such officer, clerk or employee is deserving of such increase.

It follows, therefore, that if there is no such report by the deputy head, approved of by the head of the department, there can be no increase. That report is a condition precedent to the increase being granted. I can easily understand that in a case such as the present, when a new Minister desires to reorganize his department, he might find it well to stop this annual increase. As has been stated by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace)—and nobody can deny it—if ever there was a time in the history of the country when economy should be practised, and when if any changes are to take place, salaries should be decreased rather than increased, that time is the present. That rule applies to all professions and all departments just now. If the Minister has to reorganize his department, he must first discover what men are competent and efficient to do the work. If the head of a department who has to take the responsibility for his administration is not to be permitted to make a selection of that kind, it would be very extraordinary indeed. In any mercantile establishment he would have that discretion allowed him, and much more should he be allowed to have it while administering such an important department as the Interior. It seems to me that the House ought, without cavil, to accept the action of the Minister in reference to the increase of salaries, to particular men whom the Minister sees are the best fitted to discharge their duties. I quite agree with what was said this afternoon ; that if the whole of the officers of the department were not left without the passing of this Order in Council, which is a condition precedent to the increase, then there might be an invidious distinction which certainly would be objectionable in reference to a class of persons such as compose the civil service of Canada. No one could have greater respect for the members of the civil service as a whole than I have, judging from the intercourse I have had with them during the short time I have been a member of this House. The Government in this case have made no distinction. They state, apparently under the advice of the Minister of Justice, that they have the power, without making any invidious distinction, to say that this increase, this additional increase, provided for by the statute, shall not be given this year, and so without doing the officials any harm—except, of course, the harm of disappointed expectation—they do not give the increase. However, disappointment is quite in order these days for others than the civil servants, and they can hardly find fault, if the Government, in their desire to practice economy, should not ask this House to vote the increases. It is rather fortunate that the statute is so worded as to permit of a reduction all around, or rather to prevent an increase all around, at a time when the country can ill afford it. I hazard the opinion, after carefully reading the Act, that the Government have made a fair interpretation of it. I submit that now is a good time for the Government to avail itself of the provision of the statute, and to practice economy in the right direction.

Mr. HAGGART. No one on this side of the House disputes as to what the law is on the subject. It is not denied that the Government have an option in the matter. Even after the report recommending the increase is made by the deputy head, it has to be approved by the head of the department, and then it requires the sanction of an Order in Council. What we do object to is that the Ministry come here and ask for an increase in excess of the amount specially mentioned in the statute. The Minister and the deputy head of the department are perfectly justified in refusing any increases, as these were not intended to be made annually and perpetually. The increment is only to be granted when the party is deserving, when the deputy recommends it to the head of the department, and when the head of the department recommends it to Council ; the Council may refuse to grant the increment. I remember the debate which took place in the House upon the parties who were suspended. Mr. Pereira was one, Mr. Henry was another. In that debate, hon. gentlemen opposite took the ground that these men were not punished sufficiently by a month and a half's deprivation of salary, and that they ought to be dismissed from the service ; yet we now find them supporting a Minister who by his action justifies the course of the Government at that time.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the Minister whether there are any vacancies at the present time ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There are no vacancies.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I understood that the opinion of the Minister of Justice was to be laid on the Table before this item was declared carried.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I stated that the opinion of the Minister of Justice had been procured, and that I had sent it to a clerk to be copied. I will lay it on the Table of the House in a few minutes. That opinion refers to statutory increases in all the departments, and it can be discussed at one stage of the Estimates, as well as at another.

Office of the Comptroller of the N.W. Mounted Police..... $10,350

Mr. HUGHES. It is reported that the Mounted Police are to be reduced in number. I would like to know from the Minister of the Interior if that is true.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, it is true.

Mr. HUGHES. To what extent ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. So far as I am able to say at the present, the reduction will amount to about 250 in officers and men. The present force is 750, officers and men, speaking in round numbers, and the intention is to reduce it to about 500.

Mr. HUGHES. Has there been a detachment of police newly enrolled and sent north to the Yukon country recently ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, there has been.

Mr. DAVIN. This question of the reduction of the Mounted Police force will come up at another time. I intend to speak on it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I appreciate the hon. gentleman's intention.

Department of Indian Affairs $45,090

Mr. FOSTER. We would like to have the full explanations of this.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Would the hon. gentleman say what particular portion he wishes to have explained ?

Mr. FOSTER. All of it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That would involve simply the reading of the details, which I presume the hon. gentleman does not wish to have done. I will state the chief changes in the department. In the first place, it is proposed to unite the office of Deputy Superintendent General with the office of Deputy Minister of the Interior, which makes a reduction of $3,200. It is proposed to do away with the office of Solicitor, which secures a reduction so far as this department is concerned, but an increase of $400 in the Department of Justice. It is proposed to raise the salary of the gentleman who has been at the head of the Land and Timber branch, to $2,000, and to make him secretary and chief clerk. It is proposed to appoint a law clerk ; he is not appointed yet.

Mr. FOSTER. What is Mr. McLean's present salary ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. $1,800.

Mr. FOSTER. When was he appointed ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In 1873 or 1874, I am not able to say positively which. The law clerk to be appointed will receive a salary of $2,000. The accountant and chief clerk receives $1,950. There is a reduction in the number of first-class clerks. The first-class clerks were estimated last year at $15,125 ; this year at $9,700. Second class clerks, we estimated last year at $10,687.50, and this year at $9,600. Third class clerks last year at $17,337.50. and this year at $18,350. The changes in the clerkships arise from the fact that two have died, and it is not intended to fill their places, and it is proposed to superannuate two of the clerks at the end of this year.

Mr. FOSTER. Who are they ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Wm. McGirr. I was in error in saying there were two ; there is only one. I can give in detail an explanation of the decrease. There is a saving in the Department of Indian Affairs, by combining the office of Superintendent General of Indian Affairs and that of Deputy Minister of Interior, amounting to $3,200, and there is the abolition of the solicitorship, $400. Then there is the abolition of two first-class clerkships and a reduction in the salary of one first-class clerk. The reduction took place because the official unfortunately was so much addicted to the use of intoxicating liquors that I found it necessary to dismiss him, but subsequently, upon his very strong promise to reform, I took him back at a reduced salary, upon probation for six months. There is the abolition of a second-class clerkship, and the salaries of messengers transferred from this department to that of civil government contingencies, $600, and statutory increases not granted, $102.50.

Mr. FOSTER. Why was Mr. McGirr superannuated ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Because I came to the conclusion that his services were not necessary in the department, that is to say, his services could not be satisfactorily made use of to the advantage of the department. I might add that Mr. McGirr was brought down from the outside service some time ago, I think in 1892 or 1893, and the work which he had been doing in the office here did not seem to me work which called for the employment of a clerk. I considered him unnecessary and recommended his superannuation.

Mr. HUGHES. Who is now doing the work he did ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is done in the secretary's branch. His duties

consisted chiefly in checking the reports that came from the agents. They are checked in the usual way.

Mr. HUGHES. What are the duties of Mr. McLean, the new secretary ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. As secretary of the department he is practically responsible, under the deputy head, for the conduct of all the correspondence of the department. In addition to that, he is particularly the head of what is called the secretary's branch, which comprises the correspondence and registrar's branch—the branch where the largest amount of business has to be done.

Mr. HUGHES. Is Mr. Smart acting Deputy Minister of Indian Affairs ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Smart is acting in the place of Mr. Hayter Reed, who is absent on leave. He receives no additional salary. Mr. Hayter Reed is still Deputy Superintendent General but is not transacting any business in connection with the department.

Mr. FOSTER. What becomes of him when he returns to the department ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He will be superannuated.

Mr. FOSTER. So that the Minister proposes to get rid of all the old standbys who do know something about the department, and put new men in their places. How long was Mr. McGirr in the employment of the department ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not know.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not think the remark of the ex-Minister of Finance came with very good grace with regard to getting rid of old men who were in the department and knew all about it. He will remember that Mr. Vankoughnet, the man who knew most about it, was superannuated without his consent, by hon. gentlemen opposite, and Mr. Hayter Reed was put in there, not because he was considered a better man or more efficient, but because a place had to be found for him, and in order to find that place, Mr. Vankoughnet, an efficient and faithful servant, was superannuated against his will. Mr. Hayter Reed, on the contrary, has been a very short time in the department into which he was brought and of which he was made deputy head.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is very forward in coming to the rescue of the Minister, who has so ably violated the principle that my hon. friend always stood up for when on this side, and who has, in his first appearance before this House, brought down no less than eight violations of the Civil Service Act in his Estimates. This newfound convert, the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen), has the proverbial zeal of new converts. There is no parallel at all between the treatment of Mr. Hayter Reed and the superannuation of Mr. Vankoughnet. Mr. Vankoughnet was a long time in the service, and an old man.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). 57 years old.

Mr. FOSTER. I think he was a good deal older than that. My hon. friend, as usual, is speaking without the book. I happen to know about Mr. Vankoughnet's superannuation, and there is no parallel at all between the cases. The hon. member for Wellington says that Mr. Reed had to have a position made for him. He certainly was not a person floating around somewhere for whom an office had to be found. He was in the employ of the department in the Indian branch, and I make bold to say, and I do not think I will be contradicted, that there is not a man in Canada to-day who understands more about Indian affairs in Canada and who has more of the confidence of the Indians than Mr. Hayter Reed. He was made what he was simply because of the long experience he had had of this branch, one of the most intricate and responsible that the Government has to deal with. So, there is not a fair comparison. My hon. friend has not answered the question as to treatment of Mr. Reed by referring to the superannuation of Mr. Vankoughnet. The same remark applies partly, to Mr. McGirr. He may not have been so long in the service—or perhaps he may have been quite as long.

Mr. HUGHES. Since 1877.

Mr. FOSTER. So he was longer in the service. Mr. McGirr has special knowledge of the North-west and aptitude in the treatment of the Indians, and he was brought here because of these qualifications. Mr. Hayter Reed and Mr. McGirr are two young men, and both men of ability. I do not think there has been any fault found with their work while they have been in connection with the department. They are both able and experienced men, and they have a knowledge of the North-west and of the Indians, which has been especially availed of to do useful work. There is something in being acquainted with the whole of the antecedents, with the whole course and record of matters connected with the departmental administration. These gentlemen have been turned out. Mr. Burgess has been turned down and degraded. These are all men who might have expected far different treatment. They have been long identified with the department, and there is no fault found with their work. But just as soon as the new Minister comes in, a change takes place. These officers are not political supporters, they were not wanted for one reason or another, and, within three months of the advent of the new Minister, before he had even got his bearings in the department, out

they went. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Sifton) think that these two departments, with the multiplicity of work there is in them will not be overburdened with only one Deputy Minister ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Not under the organization we have.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, will my hon. friend tell us why he added $200 to Mr. McLean's salary ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will answer my hon. friend's question with pleasure. I have asked the committee of the House to add $200 to Mr. McLean's salary, because I think his capacity and his experience and ability in the department warranted it, and because I think that when a man shows capacity and ability in a most important department, as Mr. McLean does, the service will not suffer, but will rather profit by a recognition of it. The hon. gentleman will understand, of course, that the discussion of personal matters in which the reputation and character of men are involved is a delicate matter. He will understand also, of course, that in speaking as the responsible head of the department, I express myself upon subjects of this kind with a great deal of diffidence. I prefer to err upon the side of prudence in avoiding saying anything that would injure anybody's reputation. I may say, however, in this connection, that the somewhat perfunctory way in which the hon. ex-Minister of Finance has given the explanation why Mr. Reed and Mr. McGirr were brought down from Regina to take places in the Indian Department shows pretty conclusively that he is repeating the explanation that was prepared for public use at the time the change was made, an explanation which, I can tell the hon. gentleman, is only a subject of merriment in the North-west where these gentlemen are known. For reasons which never were made perfectly clear to the public, the late Minister of Interior saw fit to make certain changes. I do not propose to discuss the capacity of Mr. Vankoughnet as compared with the capacity of Mr. Reed. Suffice it to say that the opinion has hardly ever been contradicted—I do not think the hon. gentleman contradicted it himself this evening—that Mr. Vankoughnet was quite as competent to discharge the duties of deputy superintendent as was Mr. Reed ; and it was not hinted at the time the change was made, so far as I can remember, that there was any lack of capacity on the part of Mr. Vankoughnet. But the explanation which was generally conceived at the time, and which I apprehend was the true explanation, was that it was desired to give these gentlemen positions here, and this means was taken of making room. There is a marked difference between the proposition I make and the proposition the hon. gentleman and his friends endorsed as regards this office. They removed a man who was promoted by themselves. If he was not fit for the place, he should not have been promoted. He had received their official recognition as one well qualified to discharge these duties. But I have done nothing of that kind. I have not removed a man who had received my endorsement or the endorsement of my colleagues. There is this radical difference between the hon. gentleman's position and mine. I can quite understand that the hon. gentleman should say there is no parallel ; there is no parallel in one sense of the word. There is a parallel in the sense the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) indicated when he said that if there was anything open to criticism in this matter, the transaction carried out by the hon. gentlemen opposite when in office was much more open to criticism upon the same ground. Now, I do not know that there is anything further I can say in regard to the observations of the hon. gentleman except this :—That the Department of Indian Affairs is a complicated department, and that its efficiency is largely a question of organization. I wish the committee to understand, Mr. Chairman, that I fully realize the responsibility it involved in recommending changes of this kind. And, if the Department of Indian Affairs is not more efficiently conducted hereafter than it has been in the past, I shall be quite prepared to have the House condemn me, and through me the Government, for the changes made. But I would ask the House to remember that it has been somewhat notorious that the Department of the Interior and the Department of Indian Affairs have not been conducted in all cases in the past with the degree of efficiency that the people of Canada have a right to expect in view of the large amount of money that has been annually expended. All I ask is to be judged by the results of the changes I have made and not by the doleful prognostication made by my hon. friend while the Estimates are going through the House.

Mr. BENNETT. I think the hon. Minister of the Interior is unfair to Mr. Hayter Reed in remarks he has made.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I did not say anything very uncomplimentary of Mr. Reed.

Mr. BENNETT. If he is to be superannuated on the ground of unfitness, let it be so stated and understood. If, on the contrary, he is to be displaced by reason of his political affinities, let that be known, because the inference then can be drawn and from what has been said is that and that alone. I have a word to say in defence of Mr. Reed. I met him in the department during the last Parliament, and I have had a good deal to do in the Department of Indian Affairs. His conduct, as compared with that of his predecessor, was altogether in his favour. There was a

time when reflections might have been cast upon the late Government relative to the manner in which Mr. Vankoughnet performed his duty, and I think I remember correctly that when he was superannuated, no vote of censure was called for on the action of the Government on dispossessing him of the office he held. If anything needed to be said in justification of the superannuation of Mr. Vankoughnet under the administration of the department by Mr. Daly it could be found in a very strong letter which appeared in the Toronto "Globe" over the signature of Mr. H. H. Cook, entirely supporting the stand the Government had taken by Mr. Daly in recommending this superannuation.

I regret that the Minister of Interior differs from the hon. the Premier, because a little time ago the Premier made the announcement that of all matters to be kept in view, one certainly should be the advancement of art and literature in Canada. Now, I regret to see that Mr. Scott, who has acted as superior officer to Mr. McLean in that department, has not been advanced instead of Mr. McLean. In the absence of Mr. Reed, Mr. Scott usually discharged the duties of this office, and I venture to think, discharged them with the greatest possible satisfaction to all hon. gentlemen, and to the public generally, who may have come into contact with him.

Mr. DAVIN. I rather think my hon. friend the Minister of Interior made a too sweeping proposition in reference to the question under discussion. The question under discussion was the superannuation of Mr. Hayter Reed and Mr. McGirr, and in that connection the Minister said that it is notorious that the management of the department had not been what it was desirable it should be. Well, the meaning of that could only be that Mr. Hayter Reed and Mr. McGirr, but especially Mr. Hayter Reed, who occupied a controlling position in that department in the North-west Territories, had been inefficient. Now, I must say this in justice to Mr. Reed, that I have had a good many transactions with that department in connection with business in the North-west Territories, and so far as I was able to judge of Mr. Reed's actions as Indian Commissioner, he was a most efficient officer, and so far as I was able to judge of his conduct as Deputy Minister here, he was a most efficient officer. Not only that, but his subordinates who were in a position to criticise him, although some of them personally may have disliked him, I never heard from one of them an opinion regarding his management of the department that did not reflect credit upon him. The reputation Mr. Reed had in the Territories was one that we in this House should always be ready to acknowledge. The reputation he had as Commissioner—and I think his actions here as Deputy Minister bore that out—but certainly as Commissioner the reputation that he had was one of keeping down the expense of his department as low as possible, and of having a thorough knowledge also of his department in all its details. As my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) has pointed out, he had won the confidence of the Indians to an extent that no other man in that department had ever done. That is a great advantage in itself. I must say that the proposition made by the hon. Minister, made as it was in connection with the superannuation of Mr. Reed, seems to me to reflect unjustly on that officer, and in a way that facts would not bear out. And so with Mr. McGirr. Of course, I am not in a position to controvert what the Minister says respecting the duties that Mr. McGirr had to discharge, but I must say that the reputation that Mr. McGirr had in the North-west Territories was that of a man who has a thorough knowledge of Indian Affairs and was a most useful officer. I could quote the opinion of gentlemen in the North-west Territories who are connected with the department now, and who have the confidence of hon. gentlemen opposite, who share that opinion, or used to share that opinion that I have expressed in regard to Mr. McGirr. Now, there is this remark, I think, to be made. I think that none of us will deny that the Minister is perfectly entitled to say that he will have to be judged by the result of the experiment that he is making. Of course, that is the position of every Minister entering in the duties of a new department. But I express this hope, that we shall not find by-and-by that this place that is now made vacant, this position of deputy superintendent, will be filled up again. If this removal is a bona fide one, and if the two departments can be carried on by one man, why, if time endorses that view, we shall of course rejoice at the fact. But what I say now is that I fear that after some little time has passed away, the Minister will discover that in a department like that of Indian Affairs, so full of details as it is, and having so many complicated questions coming before it, he will have to appoint a deputy, and then we shall have a deputy Superintendent of Indian Affairs brought in from the outside, just as we have a Deputy Minister of Interior. That is what I fear is going to take place. I rose because I could not hear the remarks that have been made without saying that there cannot be the least doubt that a more conscientious or a more efficient officer is not in that department to-day than Mr. Reed or Mr. McGirr.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the Minister tell the House who he proposes to appoint as law clerk ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have not arrived at any conclusion as to the appointment. I may say, by way of ex-

planation of the item, that I find that the work of the Indian Department suffers by reason of the fact that we do not have the exclusive service of a solicitor. There is a very considerable amount of work that involves legal knowledge in connection with the construction of the Indian Act, the Indian Advancement Act, the legal advice to agents and the conduct of disputes, and preparation of questions with regard to disputes, that arise in reference to the various treaties : and it is, I find, almost impossible to have these matters satisfactorily disposed of unless I have some person who will perform the duties of a law clerk, and will be able to deal with these matters, and give them his constant attention. I in no way reflect upon the conduct of the work of Mr. Newcombe, the Deputy Minister of Justice, but the difficulty arises in the preparation of questions, and in watching legal matters which are referred when they are very important, to the Department of Justice, and when they are not very important, are decided by clerks of the department. I think the work would be much more effectively done if we had a law clerk, and I therefore ask for provision to be made for one. There is a considerable number of matters which specially require attention in that direction, which I expect to take up after the present session of Parliament is over, and there is no immediate necessity why a clerk should be appointed until some time after the 1st of July.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope my hon. friend does not propose, in carrying on his department where so many intricate questions arise, to make a law clerk the arbiter of legal questions.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, unless it is an important matter. There are many minor matters which could be conducted by an ordinary lawyer. Of course specially important matters will be referred to myself, and I will refer them to the Minister of Justice, as is the practice in other departments. There are, however, more minor legal matters in connection with this department than in connection with any department except perhaps the Department of the Interior. Of course this officer will not handle important cases, but he will act rather as a solicitor, the important matters being referred to the Minister of Justice in the regular course.

Mr. FOSTER. Then this officer will be an intelligent clerk who will deal with certain matters, and important questions will be referred to the Department of Justice. The hon. Minister has made another break. He is asking an appropriation to pay for two private secretaries.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the hon. gentleman has read the political history of this country for the last five, six or ten years ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The "Debates ?" I confess I have not read them all.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the hon. gentleman is at a disadvantage, and he does not know what kind of stone wall he is running against. Of course he has never come down and asked allowances for two private secretaries. He is not aware probably that by all the strong men in the Opposition this crime of having two private secretaries for one Minister was very strongly reprehended. It never ceased to be a ground of contention when the Estimates were up, and a ground of condemnation of the Minister for his extravagance and of the department for its extreme extravagance. I am sorry the Hon. David Mills, who now has a seat in another and higher sphere, is not present. I am sure the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) if not so verbose was just as eloquent in condemning a Minister for having two private secretaries ; but the hon. member for Bothwell at that time particularly attacked the Department of Indian Affairs for its tremendous extravagance, and one of his main points was that there was a second private secretary. So strong was the cannonade, so furious and fast were the bombs and shells that in his good nature the Minister of the Interior gave way, and wagged along for two or three years with one private secretary, and seemed to do very well. Now, we have a new Minister, and the first thing he does is to make this terrible demand on the conscientious convictions of his supporters by asking them for a second private secretary. Would it not be the best thing, in the interest of the hon. gentleman's own friends, to drop the item ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Will the hon. gentleman say he objects to it?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. On what grounds ?

Mr. FOSTER. Simply because I think you ought to do with one. And if not, for shame's sake, when a party has year after year inveighled strongly against the appointment of two private secretaries, the hon. gentleman ought not to ask for two. He even should not have a double one—he should have only one.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I fancy the hon. gentleman in his desire to exercise the talent which he possesses as a debater is losing sight of the fact that the purpose of asking for Estimates for the Department of Indian Affairs is to get the business of the department done in the most efficient way possible. I suppose the hon. gentleman will admit that, for it is a simple proposition. It is purely a question of how the service shall be organized, as to whether by

changing the service in a certain direction the work can be more efficiently performed. I may tell the hon. gentleman that one of the first things I encountered in connection with the department was a deluge of letters—not applying for offices——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Although there were quite a number—in which my attention was called to the fact that people had written letters, one, two, three, four and even five years ago and had not received any replies. This it appeared had been going on for many years. I take it to be the right of people who have business to transact with the department to receive answers to their letters, and I am inclined to think that any one who has had any business with the Department of Indian Affairs during the last five months will say they have received answers in the ordinary business course and have obtained the information asked for. If I do not have a secretary at liberty to collect the information asked for by these letters sent from all over Canada, it will be an absolute physical impossibility that the correspondents can get answers to their letters. It is one of the duties of a Minister to see that correspondents get answers to their letters, and I am endeavouring to do it, and for this purpose I have employed this gentleman to do this part of the work, and I do not think he is excessively paid. In view of the extra work and of the fact that he is liable to be called upon at any hour of the day or evening when Parliament is sitting, he should be allowed the additional remuneration asked in this vote. I may say that so far as regards the appeals made by the hon. member who sits behind me, I can appreciate the disappointment the hon. gentleman must feel at the lack of response.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the new secretary ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. A. J. McKellar.

Mr. FOSTER. Is he now in the service ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. He is a clerk belonging, to what class ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He is a second-class clerk, at $1,400 a year.

Mr. FOSTER. Here is a second-class clerk at $1,400 made a private secretary. I must now call upon the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who has most persistently declared that it was a parliamentary outrage to take a first-class or a second-class clerk for private secretary. Why did not the Minister select a young man on a comparatively small salary and add $600 to it, so as not to make a drain on the service and on the finances of the country. Instead of doing so, the hon. gentleman must have a high class clerk, one at $1,400, as private secretary. But how grateful will the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) feel that during the last five or six minutes the Minister of the Interior has had the satisfaction of telling him in so many words that while that hon. gentleman opposed the appointment of two private secretaries in previous years, he must refrain from doing so now, and in fact he complimented the Minister on his administration of the department.

Mr. McMULLEN. The late Minister of Finance seems to take considerable delight to-night in having a "drive" at me. On the question of private secretaries, I found fault with the appointment of a first or second-class clerk in his department as secretary.

Mr. FOSTER. He was a second-class clerk at $1,000 a year.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman increased his salary, and gave him the allowance of $600 as private secretary.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is quite wrong.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then the hon. gentleman proceeded to criticise very fiercely the estimate for two private secretaries. I can remember, not so many years ago, when the Minister of Finance had two private secretaries. He had one in his department, and in order to do the very large volume of work that devolved upon him, he found it necessary to keep another at his house.

Mr. BENNETT. But you condemned it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I did. I challenged the prudence of keeping two private secretaries, but the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) gave such a very plausible explanation that the House sanctioned the vote. I cannot but feel amused by the criticisms of my esteemed friend the ex-Minister of Finance, because its brings to my recollection so many little things that he was guilty of himself when he was in power. It is wonderful what a change a position makes in a man.

Mr. FOSTER. We want now to hear from the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright). Has he also experienced a change of heart. I am thinking he will be a little more prudent than the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen), and will say as little as possible about it ; but for fear that the Minister of Interior may have wrong information imparted to him by the hon gentleman (Mr. McMullen) I want to say, that although I had two private secretaries, $600 was the total amount that was paid, and I did not have two clerks drawing pay from the department either ; only one, so that there is quite a difference

between the two cases. But then we are all human and fallible and liable to failings.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You should have been in Opposition long ago; it has improved you vastly.

Mr. FOSTER. I was speaking particularly for the benefit of my hon. friend (Mr. Landerkin) who has just interrupted me.

Offices of the Auditor General..... $27,100

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). One messenger has been dispensed with and there are two partial statutory increases. These are the only alterations.

Mr. FOSTER. Very well.

Department of Finance..... $50,460

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This sum is almost identically the same as it was before.

Mr. FOSTER. I notice that.

Department of Inland Revenue..... $38,540

Mr. FOSTER. The Controller of Inland Revenue is not here, and the vote had better stand. There seems to be an additional clerk which requires explanation. There is another matter which I want to bring to the attention of the Controller (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) and I would like him to be here. I notice that a distinguished relative of Li Hung Chang is about to be fumigated, and I want to appeal to the sympathy of the Controller of Inland Revenue to prevent such an outrage.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We will let the vote stand; but I think my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) will find that it is the Minister of Agriculture who has charge of the quarantine.

Post Office..... $194,962 50

Mr. FOSTER. We want some explanation of this.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). There is a decrease. There is one first-class clerk less.

Mr. HUGHES. What became of him?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He died. Mr. Fortier is his name and he is still dead.

Mr. HUGHES. He might come back like Mrs. McManus's husband.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No. Unfortunately he is dead, and it is not necessary to fill the vacancy. There are two second-class clerks less and that involves a reduction of $2,200, I think. These vacancies were in existence when the last Estimates were voted and have not happened since I entered the department.

Mr. FOSTER. Are there any vacancies in the second-class clerkships now?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No. These two that are dropped are all the vacancies in existence. There are three third-class clerks less, arising from three resignations.

Mr. FOSTER. Forced?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No. Mr. Scribner was studying medicine and resigned. Miss Barber resigned to get married, and I have forgotten the reasons for Mr. Balderson's resignation, but they were all voluntary. One messenger died; and lastly, there is an error of 50 cents in the amount. That disposes of all the changes, resulting in a reduction of $3,550.

Mr. FOSTER. There seems to be one new chief clerk.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes. That is a new office. It is what we propose to call the Controller of Railway Mail Service. The railway mail service heretofore has been under the divided control of the various district inspectors, and this appointment involves the transfer of the railway mail service from the local inspectors to a central officer at Ottawa. Temporarily, I am trying in that position, Mr. B. W. Armstrong.

Mr. FOSTER. Who was what?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He was a first-class clerk in the Toronto post office and a man of very considerable experience. He is, I think, one of the best men in the service for the position. I did not select him on my own responsibility, but I entirely approved of his appointment. I acted on the advice of the chief inspector in the choice. Mr. Armstrong is there for the time being, and I have no doubt will be a success. He has had considerable experience in the service. He was practically in charge of the Toronto general post office, but has spent the best part of thirty years in the service, though comparatively a young man.

Mr. FOSTER. Just what are the duties you propose such a man to do?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He will, among the other things, have charge of the railway mail service. The mail service on the trains is every day becoming more important from the gradual process of transferring the mail service from stages to railways. Before I took office there were 404 railway mail clerks. The Controller will have the direction of these, arranging their time-tables, seeing that they are in charge of their trains in every part of the Dominion, and generally perfecting the organization. The province of Ontario, for instance, is divided into six inspectors' districts. Formerly the railway mail clerks were supposed to be attached to these districts. They were more or less local officers, their immediate superior being the inspector of the district to which they were attached. My view of the railway mail

service is that it is one continuous service, and that the local inspectors should not interfere with it. The new system will result in a very considerable saving in the number of mail clerks in due time.

Mr. FOSTER. How ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think the men will work with greater efficiency and with more economy to the service. Not being under local management, their time will be utilized to the full without regard to districts. I could, if it were worth while, illustrate in detail some of the inconveniences arising from the old system. Suffice to say that in the United States the system obtains, the whole mail service over that vast area being under one controlling mind, one central officer, with his officials scattered here and there, and all responding to his authority direct or through his local agents. Under the old system, the inspectors, having the railway mail clerks in their charge, have become rather local and stationary officers than what they were originally designed to be, as the term implies, inspectors, so that we have little staffs scattered throughout the country, doing local office work, instead of being engaged in what I think was the original design—inspecting local post offices and seeing that the stage work and the local mail service was being properly discharged. The new arrangement will, I think, result not only in a considerable reduction in the cost of the railway mail service, but in greater efficiency in what is commonly known as the land service. The inspectors will then be freer to attend to the work of their districts, and fewer men will be required for the working of those districts. I am satisfied that there will be generally increased efficiency with a reduction in cost.

Mr. BENNETT. In each of the six postal divisions in the province of Ontario, there were a certain number of railway mail clerks who were under the inspector of the division, and the inspector of each division had what was known as a chief railway mail clerk, to whom was assigned the duty of looking after the clerks on the trains. I understood the Minister to state that Mr. Armstrong, from the Toronto post office, who I believe is a most capable officer, has been appointed to the position of controller of the railway mail service. I wish to ask the Minister if it is the intention to have under Mr. Armstrong a chief railway mail clerk in each division, as heretofore. If these chief clerks are to be dispensed with, it must of necessity be the duty of Mr. Armstrong, in the event of a letter being lost or tampered with on a train, to go from one part of the province or of the Dominion to another to look after the matter.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It will not be necessary to have as many chief railway mail clerks in the Ontario division as there have been. The system went into force on the 1st of April. I am feeling my way into it, but up to the present time it has worked satisfactorily, and I think, when a year goes by, if I am then here, it will be my pleasure to report satisfactory results such as I have indicated.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the hon. Minister be good enough to state what changes have been made with regard to the chief clerks ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot give all the details. No new persons have been taken into the service, the men being transferred from the railway mail service or from the inspectors' offices. There has been one chief clerk appointed for Halifax, one for St. John, one for Montreal, one for Quebec, one for Ottawa, one for Toronto, one for London, one for Winnipeg, and one for Victoria and the mainland in British Columbia. The last-named officer is temporarily looking after the service on the mainland, and is also, in consequence of the rapid increase of population, doing some work that properly belongs to the inspector's office.

Mr. HUGHES. Will the hon. Minister say what has been done with the railway mail clerks at Kingston, Stratford and Barrie ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot tell what has become of them at present. I presume they will be discharging the ordinary duties of mail clerks. My desire is to make promotions in the mail service the reward of merit, and I instructed the chief inspector and controller in each case to select the most efficient men in the district as local superintendents. I cannot give the names of them all now. These appointments that have been made as local superintendents, as connecting links between the controller and the railway mail staff, are, for the time being, temporary, to see whether they are equal to the task. If, after reasonable trial, they are found equal, their appointments will be made permanent. I have given a free hand to those officers to recommend—and have, in each case, acted on their recommendation—the men they consider the fittest, without regard to any other consideration. The system is being put into effect. If it happens that there are any in the service who occupy the position the hon. member for Victoria inquired about and who have not been drafted into higher positions, I will endeavour to find proper positions for them in the service.

Mr. HUGHES. Do the six old divisions for ordinary inspection purposes stand as they formerly did in Ontario ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Up to the present I have arrived at no final conclusion, but I believe this system will result in a very considerable economy in those inspectors and will warrant a reduction in the number.

Mr. HUGHES. Are the railway mail clerks, under the new system, transfered from, say an Ottawa or Quebec division, up to an Ontario division ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Whilst I would feel bound to have regard to the convenience of those in the service, and perhaps would be bound to respect provincial lines, I think there is much inconvenience in the mail service through having to regard the division of provinces, such as Ontario, where the province is divided up into different railway mail service districts. I would desire the railway mail clerks to understand that there is but one service from ocean to ocean, and that they are not to consider themselves unfairly treated if their runs are changed in the public interest.

Mr. HUGHES. In making any such change, is the hon. gentleman careful to look after seniority. For instance, a clerk in Barrie or Toronto division should not lose his seniority because a mail clerk is brought in from another division to fill a vacancy. For instance, if a vacancy occurred in the first-class, it would not be fair that a second-class officer should lose his seniority by some one being brought from another position to fill the first-class vacancy.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I should not like to make a statement that would be binding upon me in any way. I do not know that mail clerks who are attached to a division have any special rights with regard to that division. They should rather be regarded, I think, as members of one common service. There are certain prizes under this arrangement for the service, which, I believe, will stimulate the members of the staff to efficiency. The railway mail service is regarded as one of the most severe in connection with the Post Office Department. It is a service very trying to the physical endurance of the staff, and after a man has served a number of years in it, it is reasonable that he should look forward to being able to retire into a less severe branch. For that reason, I think that whoever may be in this department should feel perfectly free to reward merit and promote men regardless of the accident of their having been appointed to another division.

Mr. HUGHES. Here is a division, say the Toronto division, with a certain number of second-class clerks, and among these a vacancy occurs. There is a third-class clerk ready and available, and who merits promotion, but a second-class clerk is brought from Ottawa to fill the vacancy in the Toronto division. Would the third-class clerk in Toronto then lose his seniority and chance of promotion, which a third-class clerk in Ottawa might gain ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It would be my duty to try and respect the rights of the clerks in these divisions, but my own inclination would be, if there were no restriction of the kind alluded to, to treat all the railway mail clerks as members of the common service, and in matters of promotion I would take the advice of those capable of giving it and make them without regard to districts.

Mr. McINERNEY. Has the hon. Postmaster General had any protest from the mail clerks of New Brunswick concerning a change in the run made there lately ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have had no protest, although some representations have been made to me. I do not think there is any real foundation for any grievance. The change the hon. gentleman refers to arises in respect of the run between Lévis and Moncton. It happened that at one time that was a dividing line, Campbellton being the dividing point, I think about 290 miles from Lévis to Campbellton, and a little less from Campbellton to Moncton. I think I am correct in saying that there were twelve railway mail clerks engaged in that service. By making it one through run, doing away with those divisions, and making the run direct from Lévis to Moncton, we are able to conduct that service with four less men, when they are properly educated to it. When they are properly accustomed to it, it would be more profitable to the clerks and better for the service. Every time there is a change in connection with the railway there is a loss of energy, a waste of time, a waste of labour. By the arrangement that we are experimenting with and that I believe will be successful in a month, we shall have four mail clerks starting from Quebec and four from Moncton, four New Brunswickers, and four Quebecers. I think that my hon. friend (Mr. McInerney), perhaps, is under the erroneous impression that inasmuch as in the organization there happened to be a little preponderance from Quebec that is a permanency. If that is his fear, I will assure my hon. friend that there is no foundation for it. We are only putting it in shape.

Mr. McINERNEY. I only wish to bring this matter to the Postmaster General's attention, because when I was down in New Brunswick at Easter I met several of the railway mail clerks and it was evident that they felt very sore indeed—I will not mention names—on account of the change then in operation. There were men who had been on the list for a long time, men appointed in 1873, in 1874, and they thought that the privileges they had enjoyed for so many years in the long run—which I understand is of advantage to a mail clerk because he is paid something for mileage—would be taken away from them by the system the Postmaster General was trying to bring into vogue. They made certain representations to me and said they intended to call the Potsmaster General's attention to the facts. I understood that the whole

run from Lévis to Moncton was being made by men sent from the province of Quebec. Naturally there would be a grievance in the minds of New Brunswick mail clerks if they found that the run they had over the best part of the Government road was being interfered with by men from any part of Quebec. I wish to protest on behalf of the New Brunswick mail clerks against any change that will interfere with the privileges that have been enjoyed for a long term of years by these men, some of whom were appointed by the Mackenzie Government, and who have no particular shade of politics, and who, from the number of years they have spent in the service, are entitled to consideration. I also wish to protest against any change which may be contemplated that would interfere with the privileges they have enjoyed during all these years. From what they told me I understood that they had a grievance. I only wish to ask the hon. Postmaster General if that grievance has been put in writing and presented to him, or if any protest has been made. For I have collected some information, and, at another time, I may see fit to bring it before the House.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No protest from any mail clerks have reached me. Whether it has been sent to any officer of the department or not, I do not know. If there has been any inequality in the representation, such as I indicated a moment ago, that will come to an end on the 15th of this month. We had to settle down in a certain way. We had to take clerks off other runs to teach those who are being put on the practical duties of the office, the sortation on the cars, &c. The Controller stated that it would take about six weeks, and that after the 15th of May he would have the representation I had mentioned—four from Lévis and four from Moncton, to run through each way. I think my hon. friend will agree with me that that is a fair arrangement. If not, I shall be glad to hear any representations on the subject.

Mr. McINERNEY. Did the four men from Lévis previously run through from Moncton? Were they on the road before?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The run was different—it was from Lévis to Campbellton, and then there was a run from Moncton to Campbellton.

Mr. GILLIES. I would ask the hon. Postmaster General if he contemplates or intends making any addition to the inspectoral division of Nova Scotia. The hon. gentleman knows that that is a very important division. It is territorially large and it is practically divided already into two divisions, Nova Scotia proper and the island of Cape Breton. I understand that for some time past it has been contemplated by the department to have the inspectoral division divided into two. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he intends making such change?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have no objection to discuss that point now, but perhaps my hon. friend (Mr. Gillies) would prefer to wait until the matter of inspectors comes up. Such a discussion would hardly be in order under this item of civil government. The discussion we have had has arisen over the establishment of the new office, that of Controller of Railway Mail Service. If my hon. friend acquiesces in that suggestion and will renew the inquiry when we come to the item which deals with the inspectorates, I will discuss the matter.

Mr. GILLIES. I am aware that the discussion is, perhaps, just a little irregular on this item, but I brought up the question because there is a possibility that I may not be present when the item the hon. gentleman has referred to is going through. If the hon. Minister (Mr. Mulock) would prefer to discuss the matter on the Main Estimates, I will get some gentleman to ask some questions for me if I am not here.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman wishes it, I will answer him now.

Mr. GILLIES. I would be pleased to have an answer from the Postmaster General.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not been able to find any argument in favour of an increase in the inspectorates of Nova Scotia. My opinion is that there are too many inspectors at the present time in Canada and that there has been too much extravagance. I believe that the new system, when it is in full swing will make any increase in the number of inspectors quite unnecessary.

Mr. GILLIES. Then the intention is not to increase?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I see no reason for making a recommendation for an increase or to propose any appropriation for that purpose to the House.

Mr. McINERNEY. I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General if there is any vote here for an increase in the number of first-class mail clerks in the province of New Brunswick, and I wish to say that I think that there was last year a proposition for the addition of one or two, that is, promoting them from second to first-class rank. Mr. Henry Wathen was one. I would like to know if it is the intention of the Postmaster General to propose a vote to enable him to put Mr. Wathen on the first-class list?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Bain). We are drifting away from the item.

Mr. McINERNEY. But I would like to ask now if the Postmaster General does not object to answer me.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Chairman is quite correct that we are drifting away from the item, but I will answer my hon. friend if I may be allowed. I do not think there is any item in the Main Estimates for the purpose my hon. friend refers to.

Mr. McINERNEY. Would I be in order in asking the Postmaster General if he intends to bring down an item to that effect. Mr. Wathen was appointed by the party to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) belongs, and has been in the service ever since his first appointment. He has passed his examination and every person who knows him will know that he is well qualified for a first-class clerkship. I have brought this case before the Postmaster General, believing that he will do him justice. I would ask him now if he intends to bring down the vote at any time this year to put him in a position to give Mr. Wathen what I think he is entitled to, a first-class clerkship

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will say to my hon. friend, that I am anxious to have an opportunity of going through the whole staff of the service. Speaking roughly, there are some 1,800 on the staff, and as soon as this session is over, I intend to make a study, to inform myself as to the merits of every member of the staff. As a matter of fact it has been simply impossible, to me at least, to do that work properly, since I have been in office, and for that reason and no other I have not felt able to make suggestions and recommendations to my colleagues, or now to the House, dealing with promotions of any kind. Therefore it has not been from a determination not to do it, but because I want to have an opportunity during recess of carefully studying the claims of each member of the staff so as, if possible, to do justice all round. It is for that purpose alone that I am unable, during this session, to deal with the question of promotions at all.

Mr. HUGHES. I think the proposition of the hon. Minister to make a seniority list, has a good deal of merit in it. Now, in making his seniority list, it would be well to consider localities from which appointments come. At the present time he will understand of course that appointments are made, for instance, in the New Brunswick division, from New Brunswick, in the Quebec division, from Qubece, and so on from the other provinces. Now, if a vacancy occurs in the seniority list, is the appointment to come from the district from which the vacancy occurs? I suggest to the hon. Minister that there might be difficulty in that respect in the new seniority arrangement. A locality might possibly lose its chance of having its members appointed on this staff.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. As I mentioned before, whilst I regard the mail service of Canada as one unbroken service, at the same time I think public opinion would not warrant me in disregarding provincial lines. It seems to me that that is about as far as efficiency will warrant one going, in having regard to territorial divisions of any kind.

Department of Customs..... $38,600

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). There is a decrease of $1,387.50 since last year.

Mr. FOSTER. Why are there three additional first-class clerks?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. In the first place, it is proposed to dispense with the services of a chief clerk whose salary is $1,800, and there are three gentlemen who will be promoted from the second-class to the first-class, and one Mr. Moran, from the third-class to the second-class. His present salary is $1,350, very near the maximum of the second.

Mr. FOSTER. That is another break.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. No, it is expected that he will have extra duties to perform in the re-arrangement of the staff, owing to the discontinuance of the services of a chief clerk.

Mr. FOSTER. And you are giving him an extra $50 besides?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, but I am saving $1,800 on other grounds.

Mr. HUGHES. Who is the chief clerk whose services are being dispensed with?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Mr. Webster; I am trying to re-organize the department and work it at somewhat less cost.

Mr. FOSTER. I think I will have to ask my hon. friend to let this stand over till to-morrow. The ex-Controller of Customs has something to ask him specially.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I have no objection, if the hon. gentleman will feel that I am not neglecting my duties. I am asked out on public business a good deal during the day.

Department of Marine and Fisheries..... $55,780

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). In this matter the hon. gentleman will see there is $200 of a decrease. There are one or two votes on which explanations will no doubt be asked. In the first place, I ask for an in-

crease of $100 for Mr. Stewart, Commander of the Surveying Service.

Mr. FOSTER. He is not in the regular service, is he?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, he is what is called a technical officer. The hon. gentleman will remember that Commander Boulton formerly filled the position which Mr. Stewart now fills, and received a salary of $4,000. Mr. Stewart is a graduate of the College at Kingston, and was trained under Commander Boulton, and receives a salary of $1,700, which I propose to increase to $1,800. I think all sides of the House will agree that that increase is desirable in the interests of the public service. He well deserves it, he is doing his duty remarkably well, and to the satisfaction of everybody.

Mr. HAGGART. Why do you put in "notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act?"

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not understand myself why that is put in. So far as Mr. Stewart is concerned, the Civil Service Act does not apply to him at all, and there was no occasion for that, but it was slipped in because it was an increase. The next gentleman in whose salary there is an increase is Mr. Stanton. Mr. Stanton occupies a position in the Civil Service, in the Marine and Fisheries, corresponding to that in other departments known as a chief clerkship. He is in charge of the fisheries correspondence, and he was reported to me by the deputy and all those who understand his business well, as a gentleman who ought to receive an increase. I examined the matter pretty thoroughly, and satisfied myself that Mr. Stanton's case was one that deserved an increase. He is getting $100, two statutory increases.

Mr. HUGHES. There were six officers last year, and there are six officers this year, and yet there is a considerable reduction in the salaries.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will come to that in a moment; I was confining myself to the increases. Now, with respect to Mr. Gilbert. He is revenue clerk in the Marine and Fisheries Department, and has charge of the revenue, without any assistance, and no less than $160,000 a year passes through his hands. He is recommended by his superiors as a good officer, and as one deserving an increase. After examining into the matter very closely, I came to the conclusion that $650 a year was altogether too low a salary for the work performed.

Mr. FOSTER. When did he come into the service?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He entered the service five or six years ago at least. He has to do a great deal of work day and night. There are no politics in any of these increases. Every officer in the department except one, I believe, is in sympathy with hon. gentlemen opposite. Mr. Gilbert, however, I believe has no politics. After consulting with the deputy and the chief accountant of the department, I came to the conclusion that his salary should be increased from $650 to $800 a year, which is a very moderate sum. These are the only increases I ask the committee to vote.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I notice the words are appended "notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act." Why is that necessary?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Because Mr. Gilbert is a third-class clerk, and the increase is $150.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). It seems to me that while hon. gentlemen opposite found much fault with these words being used when they were in Opposition, they are now used to an extent far beyond any application ever anticipated. It is a dangerous precedent, and is adopting a dangerous principle.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I thoroughly agree that hon. gentlemen opposite have a right to receive full information as to the reasons why I propose this increase. Mr. Gilbert is practically assistant accountant; he has charge of an expenditure of $160,000; he works day and night and has no regular hours. There is no question of politics in this advance. He is a young gentleman who has an enormous amount of work to do, and does it well. The officers in the department recommend this advance, as his present salary is altogether inadequate for the service he discharges. I looked into the matter myself and satisfied myself that the representations were correct; so I took upon myself the responsibility of advising that this increase be made. I repeat that there are no political influences at work in this matter; I do not think Mr. Gilbert has friends in this country, but he is a thoroughly good officer and efficiently performs his duties. It is an act of common justice to grant this increase. I recommend it cheerfully, after having made a close examination into the facts.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will make other explanations, as I suppose increases grow out of decreases.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is a decrease, which I propose to the House, and it is a very unpleasant duty to perform, but under the circumstances I feel bound to propose it. My hon. friend (Mr. Costigan), when he was Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in August, 1895, appointed Mr. O'Hanly as technical offi-

cer at a salary of $1,100 a year. Last year I asked for a similar amount, stating to the House at the time that I did not propose any change in the salaries of officers in the department because I did not feel qualified to pass judgment on the amounts paid to the different officers. When it became my duty to examine the matter very closely, I formed the opinion, from information obtained from the head of the branch and from examining Mr. O'Hanly's work, as far as I was capable of doing so, that Mr. O'Hanly was paid altogether disproportionately to the value of the work he performed. I do not think that in strict and severe justice I have sufficiently reduced the amount, but there were considerations which prompted me to act on the side of mercy, and allow the salary to be $800. I therefore propose a reduction of $300. I do it on the ground that this amount represents the worth of Mr. O'Hanly's services. I do not want to say more, and I ask the House to accept that as my statement, and as also as being the statement of the head of the branch to which he belongs. I think in July, 1896, the Minister confirmed Mr. O'Hanly in his appointment and salary of $1,100. I would be willing to do so if I thought his work justified it. I am compelled to say, however, that it does not, and I frankly state that I cannot recommend Parliament to pay a larger sum than the amount named.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think I should say something as to this appointment, as it was made on my recommendation. A vacancy occurred in the department. Several applications were sent in, amongst the applicants being Mr. O'Hanly. We made inquiries as to his qualifications in relation to the technical branch of the service. We found that he was as well qualified as any man in the technical service of the country; that he had been a practical engineer, had been employed in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway for many years, and had been employed temporarily in the Department of Interior, and was there at the time I proposed to transfer him and give him this permanent position. His appointment was under consideration for a couple of weeks before the transfer took place, because the chief officers of the branch of the Interior Department where Mr. O'Hanly was then working, were urging very strongly that, on account of his industry, his application to work, and the intelligence with which he discharged his duties, they ought not to lose the services of so valuable an officer as he was, and that he should be made permanent there. It was because that could not be carried out, that they reluctantly consented to the transfer to my department, on the very highest recommendation that any officer could leave one branch of the service to go to another with. Mr. O'Hanly was appointed at $1,100 on the understanding that it would be made $1,200, and I think the salary of $1,200 was voted for him. Whatever deficiencies may have been charged against Mr. O'Hanly—I cannot say as to what reports have been made—I know that he is an engineer, that he has given practical test of his ability in that profession, and I know that his superior officers in the branch that he left, and while I was there in the branch that he came to; never gave two opinions as to his industry and to his attention to the duties imposed upon him. He was then considered a most satisfactory officer in every way. I never learned until just now, that there was the slightest question about his ability in the discharge of his duties. The hon. Minister (Mr. Davies) has stated that politics had nothing to do with these changes. Well, politics had nothing to do with the appointment of Mr. O'Hanly, because if politics had anything to do with it, he would not have had the appointment. The politics of Mr. O'Hanly's father are pretty well known in this country, and if there is a prominent Liberal in his section, it is Mr. O'Hanly, senior. Therefore, the appointment was not made out of consideration of his politics, and I thought that perhaps Mr. O'Hanly might have received as generous treatment from the gentlemen now at the head of the department as he received from me.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am sorry my hon. friend (Mr. Costigan) should intimate any want of generosity on my part. I am aware that Mr. O'Hanly's father is a Liberal, and he himself is supposed to be a Liberal, and I was disposed to give him fair even-handed justice. His industry I do not call in question. He is a technical officer, however, and I am bound to accept the reports of his superiors in office. After examining his work and the time he takes to do his work, I have been able to form an honest and fair conclusion, and in fact, I think I have gone possibly a little further than I should have gone in recommending that a larger salary than $800 should be paid to him. I may say that I have been pressed from a great many quarters on this point, and there were many considerations which might prompt me to err on the side of what my hon. friend (Mr. Costigan) is pleased to term, generosity; but I cannot see that in the discharge of my duty as a public servant, I would be entitled to allow mere feelings of generosity to weigh with me. There must be justice done. While I regret it—nobody regrets it more than I do—at the same time, I cannot recede from the conclusion I have reached after a good deal of consideration, pressed as I have been from all sides, and knowing him to be a Liberal and all that.

Mr. McINERNEY. Is this the only reduction in the department?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes; that is the only reduction in the department.

Department of Public Works $48,600

Mr. FOSTER. Please explain.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). I am asking $3,940 less than last year, and the reason is that I have dispensed with the services of Mr. Lightfoot, a first-class clerk, drawing a salary of $1,800. I have also dispensed with the services of the following third-class clerks: Mr. Durocher, Mr. Marion, Mr. Belliveau and Mr. Champagne.

Mr. FOSTER. How is the Chief Architect $200 less?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Fuller, the Chief Architect, has been superannuated, and I only give $3,000 to Mr. Ewart, who is acting chief architect.

Mr. FOSTER. Is Mr. Ewart a first-class clerk?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He has been acting for years as assistant chief architect. I have promoted him, and he is now acting chief architect.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the assistant.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have none. I do not want any either, for the time being.

Mr. HAGGART. Have you appointed Mr. Ewart chief architect?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not appoint him chief architect. He is simply acting as such.

Mr. HAGGART. Is it your intention to recommend his appointment?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not made up my mind what I will do.

Mr. McINERNEY. Is there any special reason for dismissing Mr. Belliveau?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no special reason, but in looking through my department I found that I could dispense with the services of a certain number of employees, and I am very sorry that Mr. Belliveau was one of these. I would like very much to keep them, but I feel that I can go on without those whom I have dismissed, and I have made up my mind to practice economy as much as I can.

Mr. McINERNEY. I regret very much that the hon. gentleman found it necessary to dismiss Mr. Belliveau. I understand that there were only two French Acadians in the service at Ottawa, and one of these was Mr. Belliveau who has been dismissed. The French Acadians in the province of New Brunswick number over 60,000 souls. They are a people who ought to be looked on as having some rights in this country, and to have them represented by one man in the service here is not, I think, giving them a fair measure of justice. If the Minister of Public Works found it necessary to curtail the number of officers in his department, I think he might have done so without striking at one of the two men of a nationality, who I think, are entitled to some consideration in this country. Therefore, on that ground, if it were possible to do so, I would ask the hon. gentleman to reconsider the case of Mr. Belliveau and try to put him back in the service.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not see what the question of race has to do with such a question. I did not inquire whether Mr. Belliveau was a French Acadian or a French Canadian. I simply inquired whether this man was needed. I found I did not need him, and the question is whether because a man is of French origin or of English origin, we are bound to employ him when we do not want him. There is the whole question for me. I am very sorry indeed to have to dispense with the services of Mr. Belliveau; but I may add, as the hon. gentleman raises this question, that if Mr. Belliveau had been an abler man than he is, perhaps I would have kept him. I am quite prepared to show the letter which Mr. Belliveau has written to me, and in which there are as many mistakes as lines.

Mr. McINERNEY. I thought you had no special reason?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I had no special reason when he was dismissed: but he has written this letter to me since. It seems to me that in such a case I should not be accused of being an enemy of the French Acadian race. Still, if I can see my way to employ Mr. Belliveau in another place, I will do so gladly.

Mr. McINERNEY. Did the hon. gentleman take in his department a new third-class clerk in place of some he had dismissed?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not appoint one man.

Mr. McINERNEY. Did not Mr. DesBrisay go into the Public Works Department?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He has been transferred from the department of the Privy Council to my department in place of Mr. Thériault.

Mr. HUGHES. Is Mr. John B. Charleson employed in the Public Works Department?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. He is not employed in the class I am now asking money for.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I would like to know in what class he is employed, because we have something to say about him when the vote comes up?

Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. gentleman tell me whether any one but a first-class clerk can be appointed chief architect—whether he considers that it is open to him to make a selection from outside the service ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not give any attention to that question, but my intention is to keep Mr. Ewart. I have no desire to change him at all. So far I have found him to be a very faithful officer.

Mr. HAGGART. Surely the hon. gentleman will be able to answer this question, whether under the law the appointment of chief architect should be made from the first-class clerks.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not considered that question.

Mr. REID. I would like to ask the Minister if Mr. Belliveau was on the permanent list ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He was.

Mr. REID. Was he paying into the superannuation fund ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No : he had not been ten years in the service. He had only been in two years, if I remember rightly.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Will the hon. gentleman say why he dismissed Mr. Thériault, Mr. Durocher, and Mr. Champagne in preference to others in the department ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Champagne was a messenger. I found two messengers, Mr. DesRivières and Mr. Lepage, who were paid $500 a year, employed as copyists instead of as messengers. I brought them down to the work for which they are paid. Mr. Champagne was then no longer necessary and I dispensed with his services. As to Belliveau, Thériault and Durocher, I found that I could do without their services. As a matter of fact, I dispensed with the services of some others, not from any political reasons, but because I did not need them.

Mr. HAGGART. But the hon. gentleman asks us to appoint another, Mr. DesBrisay, whom he takes from another department.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He has been appointed in the place of another man, Mr. Verreault, whom I was obliged to dismiss because he was not a useful employee. Mr. DesBrisay is a very able man, and so far he has proved very useful.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman got rid of two whom he had not a word to say against and whom he does not pretend to say were not perfectly efficient. Why not have retained them instead of bringing Mr. DesBrisay over from the Privy Council ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not retain them because they were certainly not of the class Mr. DesBrisay is. He is an exceptionally able man.

Mr. FOSTER. Has my hon. friend no compunctions of conscience in depriving the Privy Council and his leader of the services of so able a man ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). If my hon. friend wants to part with him and I have a vacancy, I would be very glad to have him in my department. Politically he is a very bad man, but otherwise he is a very good officer.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He is not so bad as my hon. friend thinks.

Mr. CASGRAIN. When will we be able to discuss Mr. Charleson's appointment ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As soon as my estimates come, I will be glad to give my hon. friend the opportunity he wants.

Resolutions to be reported.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 5th May, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 94) to commemorate the reign of Her Majesty Queen Victoria by making her birthday a perpetual holiday (from the Senate).—Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière.)

Bill (No. 96) to amend the law respecting Controverted Elections.—(Mr. Bell, Pictou.)

CRIMINAL LIBEL.

Mr. DAVIN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 95) to amend the law of Libel.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Explain.

Mr. DAVIN. The object of this Bill is to prevent a person accused of libel and pleading justification from—after he has set out the facts in the plea of justification, and

that plea has been set aside or quashed—coming on again with a new set of facts, and if that is set aside or quashed, coming on again with another. I did not think such a thing was possible under our law, but it seems to be possible; and as evidence has come before me that it is possible, I wish to amend section 634 of the Criminal Code. I also think the Criminal Code should be so amended that if, in the plea of justification, the libeller makes a criminal charge against the libelled, and fails to prove it, he should at once be liable to be put on his trial for that. If this change is not made, then, as a learned judge has said, a man may libel you worse in the pleadings of a court than he can in a publication, and go scot free. In Quebec, as appears from the case of the "Mail" and Laflamme, in a civil suit, the person bringing an action for libel cannot only recover for the damage done by the libel, but also for the libel in the pleadings. I am not sure that that can be done outside of Quebec, but what I propose has nothing to do with civil matters. It is to prevent possibly great hardship and put the law in a position in which I think every lawyer will agree it should be placed. In fact, I have not spoken to any lawyer on the subject who does not feel astonished that what I want to prevent could possibly occur, but the impossible has taken place.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUEEN'S OWN RIFLES.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON asked:

1. Has the report of the commission of officers appointed to investigate the affairs of the "Queen's Own Rifles," Toronto, been received by the Government?
2. If so, does the report recommend the reinstatement of Col. Hamilton?
3. Has any action been taken by the Government on the report?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). On the first two questions the General Officer Commanding reports as follows:—1. Yes. 2. The court had no power to make any such recommendation. All they were empowered to do was to inquire into, and report fully all the facts of the case. This they did. 3. No.

IONA STATION RESTAURANT.

Mr. BETHUNE asked:

Does the Government propose building a restaurant at Iona station, on the Intercolonial Railway? If so, when?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). No, the Government has not decided upon building a restaurant at Iona station, on the Intercolonial Railway, but the matter is under consideration.

Mr. DAVIN.

WHARF AT IONA.

Mr. BETHUNE asked:

Has the Government decided to build a new wharf at Iona, Victoria county, Nova Scotia, this season, or repair the old one

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). The matter is under consideration.

WHARF AT NORTH RIVER.

Mr. BETHUNE asked:

Was there a petition received from North River, St. Anns, Victoria county, Nova Scotia, praying that a public wharf be built at said North River? If so, will the prayer of the petition be granted?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). A petition has been received from North River, St. Anns, Victoria county, N.S., praying that a public wharf be built at that place. That petition is under the consideration of the Government.

GOLD DREDGING IN STEWART RIVER, YUKON.

Mr. McINNES asked:

1. In what newspapers and within what dates in each of such newspapers, did the Government advertise for tenders for a lease for the exclusive right to dredge for gold in a part of the bed of Stewart River, a tributary of the Yukon?
2. What are the conditions of the proposed lease referred to in the said advertisement?
3. Have any tenders been received? If so, from whom and for what amounts?
4. What is the nationality of the tenderers?
5. Is it the intention of the Government to accept any of the tenders? If so, which?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say: 1. The following newspapers were authorized to insert an advertisement inviting tenders for a lease for the exclusive right to dredge for gold in a part of the bed of Stewart River:—The "Times," Victoria, B.C., the Vancouver "Daily World," Vancouver, B.C., the "Tribune," Calgary, N.W.T., the "Tribune," Winnipeg, Man., the "Free Press," Ottawa, the "Journal," Ottawa, the "Globe" Toronto, the Toronto "Star," the "Telegram," Toronto, the "Herald," Montreal, "La Patrie," Montreal, the "Witness," Montreal, the "Freeholder," Cornwall, the "Canadian Freeman," Kingston, the Advertising Printing Company, London, Ont. All the above named newspapers, with the exception of the last three mentioned, were authorized to insert the advertisement three times a week during the month of April. The last three mentioned papers were authorized to insert it three times. 2. The conditions of the proposed lease are annexed hereto. 3. Three tenders have been received, but have not yet been opened. Until the tenders are open-

ed, no reply can be given to questions 4 and 5.

Conditions under which a lease may be issued for the exclusive right to dredge for gold in a part of the bed of Stewart River, a tributary of the Yukon River, North-west Territories.

1. It will be necessary for the successful tenderer to furnish evidence within three months from the date upon which his tender is accepted, establishing to the satisfaction of the Minister of the Interior his financial ability to carry on the proposed undertaking.

2. The returns of the survey of the one hundred consecutive miles of the river selected shall be filed in the Department of the Interior within two years from the date of the acceptance of the tender.

3. The term of the lease shall be twenty years, and the royalty 25 cents per ounce of gold on the gross production, shall be payable monthly during the season when the dredges are working.

4. A return under affidavit shall be made once in each year from the date of the lease, showing the progress made by the lessees in their undertaking.

5. If it is found that the lessees are not progressing with their work to the satisfaction of the Minister of the Interior, he may cancel the lease.

6. The lease shall be subject to the rights of all persons who have received, or may receive, entries for location under the mining regulations; provided that no one shall obstruct the river so as to stop the dredge from working or from passing up or down the river, or build wing-dams above or below any dredge within a distance of 1,000 feet; but the persons who have obtained entries in the manner described, shall not be prevented from depositing tailings in the river.

7. The privilege to be granted shall not be allowed to interfere in any way with the general right of the public to use the Stewart River for navigation and other purposes; the free navigation of the river shall not be impeded by the deposit of "tailings" in such manner as to form bars or banks in the channel thereof; the current or stream shall not be obstructed in any material degree by the accumulation of such deposits; and upon being satisfied that these conditions, or any of them, are not being complied with by the lessees, the Minister of the Interior may cancel the lease.

8. The lease to be issued shall reserve all roads, ways, bridges, drains and all other public works and improvements now existing, or which may hereafter be made in, upon or under any part of the river, and the power to enter and construct the same. It shall also provide that the lessees shall not damage or obstruct any public ways, drains, bridges, works and improvements now, or hereafter to be made, upon, in, over, through or under the river, and that they will substantially bridge or cover and protect all the cuts, flumes, ditches, and sluices, and all pits and dangerous places, at all points where they may be crossed by a public highway or frequented path or trail, to the satisfaction of the Minister of the Interior.

9. The lessees will also be granted the privilege of locating in sections of five miles or less in length and ten chains in breadth, ground in the bed of the river within the hundred miles selected that is not submerged at high water, but which is low and formed by the changing of the bed; but, before any dredging is done on any of these locations, entry therefor shall be obtained from the agent of Dominion Lands or other officer acting under authority of the Minister of the Interior in that behalf in the district in which the claim is situated; and entry shall not be given for any portion of a location for which entry has been granted as a placer claim under the mining regulations, or for any portion which will interfere with the operations of any person holding an entry for a placer claim; and it shall be optional with the Minister of the Interior whether one or more locations may be entered for by the lessees at the same time. The royalty to be paid on the gross production from claims of this class shall be 25 cents per ounce of gold.

10. An area of land, not exceeding 160 acres, will be granted to the lessees free of charge for the construction thereon of works necessary for the prosecution of their operations, the grant to consist of such parcels, and to be situated at such points, as may be determined upon by the agent of Dominion Lands for the district or the officer acting under authority of the Minister of the Interior in that behalf; and such grant may be made upon application at any time after the agent or other officer has certified to the Minister of the Interior that not less than three dredges belonging to the lessees, properly equipped for mining operations, have arrived at Stewart River.

11. A permit will be issued to the lessees to cut whatever timber is required for the operation and maintenance of their works, upon payment of the dues prescribed by the timber regulations.

CASCUMPEC BUOY SERVICE.

Mr. MARTIN asked:

1. Have tenders been called for the Cascumpec buoy service in Prince Edward Island?

2. If so, did the notice calling for tenders contain the usual condition that the lowest or any tender need not be accepted?

3. If these words were omitted, what was the reason?

4. Has the contract been let, and at what figure?

5. Has the contract been awarded to the lowest tenderer? If not, why not? What is the name of the contractor?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). 1. Yes, tenders were invited up to the 21st April last. 2. The notice did not contain this condition; it was in the customary form. 3. Notices inviting tenders for buoy contracts have not in any instances contained this condition. 4. The tenders have not yet been determined upon by me. I only saw them an hour ago. Complaints have been made that sufficient time was not given to enable tenders to be made after the notices were posted up, which will be considered before a conclusion is reached.

CUSTOMS SUB-COLLECTOR, ORWELL, P.E.I.

Mr. MARTIN asked:

1. Who is acting as sub-collector or sub-inspector of customs at Orwell, in Prince Edward Island?

2. Is a permanent official to be appointed?

3. When did the services of the late sub-inspector or sub-collector terminate?

4. Was his salary paid up to the date of the termination of his services?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). 1. No person. 2. No. 3. 1st December, 1896, when the outport was abolished by Order in Council. 4. Yes.

CAPTAIN WILLIAM McKENZIE, DREDGE "CANADA."

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked:

1. Have the services of Captain William McKenzie, master of the Government dredge "Canada," been dispensed with?
2. If so, at what date and for what reason?
3. Was an investigation had prior to his dismissal?
4. If so, when did it take place?
5. If Captain McKenzie was dismissed after the late local elections on 20th April, why was action taken then and not prior to that date?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. Yes. 2, 3 and 4. The engagements of dredge men are only for one season, and Captain McKenzie was not re-engaged for the present season. 5. The action in this case has not been taken before date mentioned, because the dredge on which Captain McKenzie was engaged last season was not then in commission.

VALLEYFIELD MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. BERGERON asked:

Is the Honourable the Postmaster General aware that the mail carrier between the Canada Atlantic Railway station at Valleyfield and the Valleyfield post office detains the afternoon mail over an hour and a half? Will the Postmaster General give instructions to the effect that the service be done in a more regular way?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The department is not aware of there being any such delay as that referred to, but inquiries have been set on foot, and, if such a delay exists, steps will be taken to prevent it in future.

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL.—DISMISSALS.

Mr. BERGERON asked:

1. Is it true that Joseph Cardinal, Napoléon Mathieu, Alphonse Julien, Amable Rufionge, lockmasters, and Homer Monette, lockman, all on the Beauharnois Canal, have been dismissed from their employment?
2. If so, why?
3. On whose recommendation have they been dismissed?
4. Was an investigation held?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). It is true that the persons referred to have been dismissed from the Beauharnois Canal. They were dismissed because they took an extreme and offensive part during the elections in June last. Dismissal took place on the representation of the Hon. J. Israel Tarte. No investigation was considered necessary, the Minister speaking from personal knowledge.

HARRISON LAKE REGION.—GOLD DISCOVERIES.

Mr. MORRISON asked:

Is the Government aware of any gold discoveries in the Harrison Lake region, British Columbia?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The Government has no information in regard to gold discoveries in the Harrison region, except such information as is contained in the last annual report of the Minister of Mines in the province of British Columbia. That report, of course, is public property, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Morrison) can consult it for himself, if he so desires. If there be any gold discoveries there, they will be, according to the best of our knowledge, upon provincial lands, and will fall under the administration of the provincial government.

HARRISON RIVER RAPIDS.

Mr. MORRISON asked:

Is it the Intention of the Government this year to make an appropriation for the improvement of the Harrison River Rapids?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). It is not the intention of the Government to make an appropriation this year for the improvement of the Harrison River rapids, but it is the intention to have an examination of the said rapids made. In the meantime the Snag boat "Samson" has been detailed to remove snags in that river, thereby improving the navigation of that river, as much as possible.

THE BREMNER FURS SEIZURE.

Mr. DAVIS moved for:

Copies of all letters, reports and other papers in possession of the Government in any way relating to the claim of one Bremner, of Bresaylor, N.W.T., for compensation for furs alleged to have been taken possession of by General Middleton, during the trouble in the North-west Territories.

He said: In making this motion in connection with the claim of Mr. Bremner, of Battleford, I am quite aware that I am bringing up a question that was discussed some years ago in this House; and although this question was discussed and a great deal of evidence was taken before a committee, up to the present time Mr. Bremner has never been paid for the furs taken from him. Now, previous to the rebellion of 1885, Mr. Bremner was a fur trader near Battleford, in the district of Saskatchewan. He had traders acting as agents for him further west, and he was a wealthy man. In the spring of the year previous to the breaking out of the rebellion, these agents had brought in their furs to be stored. The rebellion then broke out, and Mr. Bremner sent his furs for safe-keeping to Battleford, where they

were put in charge of the North-west Mounted Police. I believe that General Middleton was in command of the Government troops in that country at the time, and that he and another gentleman in the Indian Department, Mr. Hayter Reed, took possession of those furs—I think evidence was brought before this House to that effect. However, I happen to have a letter here that I received the other day from Mr. Warden, who is in the Indian Department. But before I read this letter I must say that it was very strange that Mr. Warden at that time, although he was a Liberal and not in sympathy with the party in power, received a Government position. I do not know why he received this Government position, because it was the first case in which a Liberal in the North-west Territories was appointed to a position by the Conservative Government. The position, however, was only a small one, worth $600 a year. We also know that a gentleman named Mr. Clink, another Liberal, was appointed as Indian agent at a salary of $1,200 a year. Well, it was obvious to us that these gentlemen must have been possessed of certain information which they did not wish to give at the time of the investigation, and for that reason we assume they must have been given these positions. Now, however, things have changed, and Mr. Warden has written me a letter in connection with the Bremner seizure, which I will read to the House :

Battleford, 26th April, 1897.

T. O. Davis, Esq., M.P., Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—In reply to your letter of the 13th instant, re Bremner furs, I beg to make the following statement :—

In the summer of 1885, just after the rebellion, Mr. Hayter Reed and the late Mr. Bedson came to my room, at the Q. M. store, Battleford, about four o'clock in the morning, saying they wanted to get some of the furs lying in the store, as the General had confiscated them. They wanted a parcel put up for the General, and one each for themselves. I told them that as soon as the storeman, Constable Dorion, came in, he would attend to their wants. Dorion came in about 5 a.m., and I told him to give these gentlemen what furs they required, and that he could pack them in some of the empty saddle-boxes. Dorion, Reed and Benson then went to the storehouse and packed the furs. Some time in the forenoon, a team came from the steamboat landing, and took the three cases away to the steamboat.

Now, Sir, I think that goes to show that Mr. Hayter Reed and Mr. Bedson, two Government employees, took those furs. I do not know what you call it here, but the people in the North-west Territories would call that stealing. I claim that it is the duty of this Government to see that this man is remunerated. Those furs were taken by an agent of the Government, and I think the Government is legally and morally bound to pay that claim. I read a great deal of the discussion that took place on this subject some time ago, I think six or seven years ago ; I read the speech that was made by the Hon. Mr. Blake, in which he went all over the facts, but I claim that his speech was not to the point. If Mr. Bremner had been a rebel, it might have been all right ; but he was not a rebel. Bremner was a loyal citizen, and as such he should have had the protection of General Middleton for his life and his property. But in place of that we find General Middleton, and others with him, took this man's property. Now, I claim that as he was a loyal citizen, he had a right to the protection of the Government troops ; his property should have been protected, but it was not protected, and was taken from him. Therefore, I think the Government are justly bound to pay this man's claim. There are precedents for this. The Government has paid some millions of dollars of claims of people in the North-west Territories, whose goods were taken ; we do not know who took them, and still the Government has recognized those claims as legal. We know that at Batoche they paid the claim of Xavier Batoche, amounting to $20,000 ; they paid a certain gentleman by the name of Solomon Venne $15,000 ; and they paid a gentleman by the name of Baptiste Boyer. We find that all those gentlemen were belonging to the faithful, while other men who did not belong to the faithful have not to this day got one cent for the property taken from them. Now, I claim that if it is right and just for the Government to pay a million dollars for those claims in the North-west Territories, then it is right and just that this man, not being a rebel but a loyal citizen, should be paid the same as any other citizen.

Mr. LISTER. Some years ago the claim of Mr. Bremner was brought to my attention and I deemed it my duty as a member of this House to call the attention of the then Government and Parliament to the claims of this man, who, in my opinion, has been most unjustly dealt with. Prior to the rebellion of 1886, Mr. Bremner had been for years a successful fur trader in the North-west Territories. At the time of the breaking out of the rebellion he was a man in very comfortable circumstances as a result of his own labour and industry for years before. When the rebellion broke out Mr. Bremner had in his possession the whole catch of furs from the previous winter, amounting, according to my information, to some $7,000 or $8,000, furs of a very valuable character indeed, as the House will understand when I say they amounted to that sum of money.

The rebellion broke out. Bremner was at one of the points, with his stock of furs, preparing to send them to market, and without any notice whatever officers in command of the Canadian forces seized his furs and arrested him as a rebel. He was taken to Regina and imprisoned for months. When

the rebels were tried there, the Crown did not find sufficient testimony to justify even placing this man on his trial, and he was released without a trial. When he returned home, he found his furs had disappeared; somebody had taken away all he had in the world, the catch of furs of the previous winter. Information which I obtained induced me to make a charge, and it was referred to a special committee of this House, at the instance of the Government. It is not necessary that I should not go into all the testimony that was taken, suffice it to say that the evidence proved conclusively that this man had been wrongfully deprived of his furs, and it was proved with equal clearness that General Middleton and others, officers the officials of this country, had taken those furs away. It was proved that a portion of those furs was brought down to Ontario, that a part of them was brought, I believe, to the city of Ottawa. The evidence was sufficiently strong to make it convenient for General Middleton to resign his position; but that did not pay the unfortunate man who lost the earnings of a lifetime. Bremner was released. His property, as my hon. friend has stated to-day was, in plain Saxon, stolen—stolen by the officials and officers of this Government.

An hon. MEMBER. Of this Government?

Mr. LISTER. Of the old Government. Governments, however, never die. Honest men may come in and dishonest men may go out, but the Queen's Government continues all the same. Sir, General Middleton resigned, he left the country; but poor Bremner, the half-breed of the North-west, never could get hon. gentlemen opposite to extend to him one atom of simple justice. The man since then has been afflicted, paralyzed; he is ruined, he is a pauper to-day, and what my hon. friend asks is that a measure of common justice should be meted out to this man. Hundreds of claimants in that country were paid under the report of the commission issued by the Government to investigate claims for damages alleged to have been sustained during that rebellion; but for some reasons, which I never could fathom, Bremner's claim was ignored by the Government. At last they said that in law Bremner is not entitled to recover anything because his property was taken by the military forces of Canada. That is good law, I believe; but in a case of this kind I doubt the wisdom of any Government setting up such a defence. This man was not a rebel. He was never brought to trial, he left the court-room in Regina a free man as regards any charge of rebellion against the country; and if it can be shown that officials or officers deprived him of his property, surely it is the duty of the Government to make him some compensation. The letter which my hon. friend has just read I have never seen before; but the statements made in it seem to prove that Canadian officials took those furs without lawful authority and they were divided between military men and Canadian officials. It was impossible at that late date to get all the evidence that might have been obtained, if we had been in a position to bring the people here and get their evidence before the committee. The evidence set out in this letter was not before the committee, but the evidence submitted was sufficiently strong and convincing to satisfy every man who listened to it, every member of the committee, and, I believe, every member of the Government, that the property of this poor half-breed had been wrongfully taken, and that he had been deprived of his furs; and if the Government is satisfied from the evidence taken by the committee that such is the fact, then, by every rule of justice, honour and honesty, the Government is bound to make compensation to that man.

Motion agreed to.

MAIL FROM NEWBURGH TO KINGSTON.

Mr. WILSON moved for:

Copies of correspondence and papers cancelling the contract with Mr. Finkle for carrying the mail from Newburgh to Kingston by the way of Camden East, Wilton, Odessa, &c. Also copies of tenders for carrying the mail from Newburgh to Kingston by the way of Camden East, Wilton, Odessa, &c.; together with all correspondence, reports and papers in connection with this contract.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that Mr. Finkle had his contract renewed for four years by the old Government, without any tenders having been asked for the work. The new Postmaster General, as has been his custom, cancelled the contract and called for tenders, and tenders were recived by his department. I understand that one Edward Martin was the lowest tenderer, and that the contract was awarded to him, and he was notified by the post office inspector at Kingston, Mr. Merrick, on 23rd February, that his contract had been accepted and that he should commence work on April 1st. Martin did what any man would do, he made all preparations necessary to fulfil his contract. On the 19th March he was told by the same post office inspector, not to make any preparation, because it was under consideration by the department that they were likely to change the route. Matters continued in that way until the latter part of March, when he was notified not to commence to fulfil his contract on the 1st of April. I think this is very unfair to Mr. Martin. He was the lowest tenderer, and he had been notified that his tender had been accepted, and he made preparations to carry out the contract. I do not think that the present Postmaster General or any other hon. gentleman in this House would ignore a contract of that kind, and allow a man to suffer loss in consequence. I understand that the tenders of two other persons be-

side Mr. Martin, were lower than that of Mr. Finkle for this service, and if there was any change contemplated in the route, or with reference to the contract, the Government might have asked for new tenders, or more proper still, Mr. Martin should have had a fair show to do the work as he had made the arrangements to do so. I hope that when the papers come down they will show that things are not so bad as I anticipate they are. In any event, the Postmaster General should see that Mr. Martin, who is in ordinary circumstances, should not suffer loss by reason of the action of the department. He should not be put to the inconvenience and expense of selling traps which he had for other purposes, buying a team of horses, and making arrangements to carry out his contract with the Government. I trust that the Postmaster General will at least indemnify him for that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). There is no objection whatever to the order of the House being carried for the production of the papers in question. I cannot speak with any knowledge of the facts, as I know nothing whatever in regard to the matter, but I am perfectly certain that my hon. friend (Mr. Wilson) will be satisfied when the papers are produced, that everything was conducted strictly in the public interest. It sometimes does happen that after tenders have been invited, the community awakened to the fact that perhaps a more convenient service would be better, and in such cases these representations have to be considered. It may be that this is one of the cases in point. If, however, the notice given to the successful tenderer was such as to have justified him in going to the expense to carry out his contract, and if the public interest afterwards called for the change of service, it would be very reasonable indeed that this official should receive some compensation for the expense he might be put to.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will investigate the matter thoroughly, and I am sure I will do what my hon. friend (Mr. Wilson) would under similar circumstances do himself.

Mr. WILSON. Hear, hear.

Motion agreed to.

BEAMSVILLE POST OFFICE—MR. FAIRBROTHER.

Mr. McCLEARY moved for:

Copies of all letters and correspondence between the Government, or any members thereof, referring in any way to the dismissal of Mr. W. D. Fairbrother as postmaster at Beamsville, with a copy of the charges and by whom such were made.

He said: Mr. Speaker, on the motion to adjourn the House a few days ago I endeavoured to say something in connection with this matter, but you very properly called my attention to the fact, that I had this resolution on the Order paper, and so I was obliged to postpone my remarks until this hour. It will be hardly necessary for me to go over the ground I did a few days ago, in connection with this Beamsville postmaster who has been dismissed from his position. Suffice it to say, that I read to the House the charges that were made against Mr. Fairbrother, and which were given by the Postmaster General as the reasons why that gentleman has been dismissed from the office. I quite agree with the statement, that if any of those charges were true, Mr. Fairbrother was not entitled to continue in his position as postmaster at Beamsville. My greatest objection to the whole procedure is, that the hon. Postmaster General refused to give Mr. Fairbrother an investigation into the truth or falsity of these charges. The House will remember, Sir, these charges were of such a character that they would deprive Mr. Fairbrother of his honour, and his status as an honourable business man in the community. He was, therefore, entitled to receive at the hands of the Postmaster General, far more generous consideration than he did. The first intimation that Mr. Fairbrother had in reference to this matter, was a letter that he received from the post office inspector in the following words:—

I beg to inform you that I have this day received from Ottawa intimation of your dismissal from the postmastership at Beamsville. You will be notified later on as to the date on which the transfer will take place.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) R. N. BARKER.

Mr. Fairbrother immediately wrote to Mr. Barker asking him for an explanation, and Mr. Barker in reply, said:

I am in receipt of your letter of the 21st instant, but I am unable to give you the information that you ask for. Your successor in office is Mr. Alexander Allan.

Not having received the information from the post office inspector, Mr. Fairbrother immediately wrote to the Postmaster General and asked him for an explanation as to why he had been dismissed. The answer that he got from the department is as follows:—

I am directed to acknowledge your letter of the 23rd instant, protesting against your dismissal from the postmastership at Beamsville.

Your obedient servant,

THE SECRETARY.

That is the reply that Mr. Fairbrother got from the department when he pleaded for an investigation or at least for a statement of the reasons why he was dismissed. Now, the hon. the Premier declared before this

Parliament last session, that an entirely different line of procedure would be taken in reference to the dismissal of officials. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) declared, that no official would be dismissed without an investigation, unless of course, the Minister in charge of the department directly knew that the officer was guilty of offensive partisanship. Let me read his own words:

No Minister would pretend to dismiss any official unless he had an opportunity to defend himself; but when the case is within the personal knowledge of the Minister himself, under such circumstances there is no cause for inquiry. When the Minister is not cognizant of the facts himself, whenever a case is brought to him by extraneous evidence, these statements must be substantiated, and every man must be given an opportunity to defend himself.

I ask the Prime Minister, the Premier of this country, the leader of this House, what attitude he is taking to-day in this connection? Is he prepared to defend the conduct of the Postmaster General in dismissing a man whom he the Prime Minister pledged himself before this Parliament to protect? He gave his word as a man of honour, as the leader of the Government, as the Premier of this country, that no official would be dismissed without having an opportunity to defend himself, but, Sir, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) has not shown himself equal to the occasion. He has permitted somebody, whoever it may be, to belittle him in the eyes of the community and to belittle him in the eyes of this House as well, when he allows himself to be dragged down from his high position as leader of this Government to listen to what petty charges may be brought in by individual members of the party, and when he descends to gratify the spleen or the vicious desire of the heelers of the party to get positions for their friends. This dismissal of Mr. Fairbrother is more than an ordinary one, because he was an exceptionally good man. He was the postmaster of the village in which the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) resides. He has not only the good-will of the citizens generally, but, without any allegiance to party whatever, he has the sympathy and cordial support of both Reformers and Conservatives alike in that municipality. I want to read, for the information of the House, an editorial that was published in the Beamsville "Express" of April 7th:

In the Toronto "Globe" of yesterday we noticed an item regarding this subject, originating in a reply to a question proposed by Mr. McCleary, and answered by the Minister of the Interior. In the answer given by the Minister, Mr. Fairbrother, the recent incumbent of the office, is accused of being guilty of many offences, some of them very serious ones, any of which, if proven, might be sufficient to procure his dismissal. But the question is, have the offences, or any of them, been proven? Have the accuser and accused been brought face to face, so that an opportunity was afforded for disproving the charges made? If this has not been done—and we believe it has not—there has been a serious failure of justice. We have no personal object to answer in the matter, but we do love British fair-play, and so far as we are able to ascertain the views of a large portion of the community, irrespective of political leanings, they judge that Mr. Fairbrother has not had a fair opportunity of vindicating himself. His character has been seriously maligned by some one, and all he asks is that a thorough investigation takes place. To this we think he has a right.

Will any one question the right of Mr. Fairbrother to have an investigation in this matter? The publisher of this paper is not a political friend of Mr. Fairbrother. The Liberals in that neighbourhood were strongly opposed to his dismissal. Let me read to you a letter written by a Liberal, whom my hon. friend from Lincoln will recognize as a warm supporter of his own—a letter which was published in the Beamsville "Express" of April 14th:

To the Editor of the "Express":

Dear Sir,—The charges made in the Commons against Mr. W. D. Fairbrother, the Beamsville postmaster, as published in the daily "Globe" of Tuesday, are to us residents here simply astounding. The catalogue of offences, any one of which, if proven, would be enough to remove him, stretch out over one-third of a column of the paper. Burglary and arson are pretty much all that is not down in the list. The exceedingly off-hand style of throwing out in the House and through the press over the country charges affecting the character and conduct of one occupying a public and responsible position is not edifying. I suppose the privileges of Parliament may protect those who can claim its protection, but there surely must be somewhere a weighty responsibility attaching to those who have originated and given currency to these damaging allegations.

As regards the merits, nine out of ten of the persons doing business at the Beamsville post office, and knowing in what manner the office is conducted, will readily testify, if opportunity be given, that the office has never been administered so satisfactorily and upon such straight business lines, as it has sine Mr. Fairbrother came into the office. He is really an exceptionally good postmaster—young, active, courteous, very regular and attentive to duty. I do not know how any one can speak too highly of him as a public servant in an office requiring uncommon patience and kindliness of disposition, with great quickness, accuracy and activity of mind and habit. Not myself giving very much time to politics, I yet have a warm interest in clean, good government, and am a Reformer. I am in a reasonable degree certain that Mr. Fairbrother has not discriminated as is alleged, in favour of Tory against Reform literature as to post office delivery or circulation, that he was not a Tory canvasser outside, nor a Tory scrutineer inside, any polling place last June, and that he has not been an active partisan anywhere at any time. Negatives cannot be proved, but certainly, if any of the charges of political partisanship are true, they are susceptible of proof—in an open, face to face investigation. As he was too young to be put upon the last Dominion lists, his sins must be within somebody's recollection besides the person furnishing the information to the Government.

There is in our village a standing Reform committee, or political organization to look after Re-

form interests. We have a president, a secretary, and a lot of good Reform members. I have not of late attended the meetings. I do not understand that there has ever been any complaint made against the postmaster in the party caucus on account of any unfairness or for any other reason, or that any proceedings whatever have been taken to effect his dismissal. I think the rumoured dismissal first, and the undreamed of list of charges since, came upon my brethren of the local Reform committee, as it certainly did upon me—a thunderbolt out of a blue sky.

In singular consistency, while summarily dismissing, a young, capable and popular official, the Government appear to have appointed as his successor a most estimable gentleman certainly, but one who has reached the ripe age of eighty. With the honour and the wisdom that come with many years, there has come also to my old friend, Alexander Allan, some of the counterbalancing weaknesses and infirmities that attend old age. He is partially blind ; he has had for some years a disabling nervous affection of the hand or fingers, so that he writes with great difficulty and very slowly and tremulously. It would not be very much aside from the truth to say that he cannot write at all.

Now, keeping in mind that the village post office is not being run for the sake of the postmaster, but for the convenience of the public ; that it is maintained for the public by the money of the public, and that the administration that we have to deal with has lately come from the people ; that it is a Reform Government, and so in a measure pledged to govern according to the wishes of the people—having this in mind, there is reason to believe that this case will not be closed without due and full inquiry, and, if need be, a reversal of the decision that has been announced as having been reached upon ex parte statements.

The continuation of the letter does not pertain to the matter in question. This letter was written by Mr. Van Norman, of Beamsville, who is and has always been an active Liberal. He states that this Government is pledged to Liberal principles and to deal out even-handed justice to the people of this country ; and he hopes this case will not be closed without justice being done to Mr. Fairbrother. Mr. Fairbrother has been thrown out of his former employment, and the elderly gentleman to whom Mr. Van Norman refers, Mr. Allan, has superseded him in the position.

Mr. TAYLOR. How old is he ?

Mr. McCLEARY. Eighty years of age : that is what Mr. Van Norman says.

Mr. HUGHES. The new postmaster is eighty ?

Mr. McCLEARY. Yes, eighty years of age.

An hon. MEMBER. That is the old postmaster.

Mr. McCLEARY. I do not think Mr. Allan intends to be postmaster very long. He may hold the position nominally, but he has two assistants now, if I am rightly informed, and he is more of a figure-head than anything else, just to tide over the little skirmish for the position. Coming back to those charges, which were given by the hon. Postmaster General as the reason why Mr. Fairbrother was dismissed, I wish to give to this House, and through it, to the people, the reply of Mr. Fairbrother to those charges. Mr. Fairbrother says :

In answer to the charges made against me as postmaster of Beamsville, I submit the following, which I declare to be true :—

Charge 1.—I sold both Reform and Conservative papers. I did not try to force the sale of Conservative papers more than I did Reform, or Reform more than I did Conservative. I sold more "Globes" than any other paper I handled. From April 1, 1895, to April 1, 1896, my account with the "Globe" Printing Company was $110.60 ; from April 1, 1896, to April 1, 1897, it was $113.48. From April, 1895, to April, 1896, my account with the "Mail-Empire" Printing Company was $74.32 and from April, 1896, to April, 1897, it was $56.01. I did not give away any papers to try and influence any one in voting ; in fact, I do not remember giving any away. I never held back any Reform literature or literature of any kind.

Charge 2.—I never attended any political caucuses in the interests of either party, and was never on any committees or in any committee rooms. I went to a public meeting in the city of St. Catharines to hear Sir Charles Tupper speak. I did not take any part in the procession or meeting while there. I simply went to hear the speaking, and I came away before it was over. I also attended the meetings that Mr. Gibson and Mr. Rykert held in this village. It was late when I got to both of them. I took no part in either of them.

Charge 3.—I always tried to accommodate every one, and to make the office as convenient as possible. I opened my office never later than 7 a.m., and often at 6.30 a.m., and kept it open from then until 8 p.m., and very often till 9 or 10 p.m. I have always tried to be as prompt as possible in serving the public and to give them a good, efficient service, and always tried to live up to the rules prescribed.

Charge 4.—The assistant had been in the habit of putting all the mail for people of the same name into the one box, and had also been giving people boxes when they did not rent them. I spoke to these people about the matter, and the consequence was that a good number of them rented separate boxes, thereby making it more convenient for the public and for the postmaster as well. Those that did not care to rent a box asked me to put their mail in the general delivery. I have that arranged in alphabetical order. There are just as many general delivery boxes now as there ever was.

Charge 5.—I have never made a practice of reading postcards. Sometimes, when cards are illegibly addressed or have been dropped in without any addresses on at all, I have had to turn them over so as to find out who dropped them in, so as to find out where to distribute them, but I have never read any cards just for curiosity sake, and have never been spoken to by, or been cautioned by, my assistant for so doing.

Charge 6.—I emphatically declare that I was not scrutineer at the last election, nor was I even asked to be. I did not assist in bringing any voters up to vote. I was not in a rig at all that day. I did not take any active part in the election. I did not ask any one to vote for either candidate or even ask any one how he was going to vote. I was up in front of the election booth for a short time in the afternoon, when there was not much doing in the office, watching the

people come up to vote, but I did not try to influence any one in voting, or speak to any one about how he was going to vote. I do not think I was out of the office, except for my meals, for more than an hour all that day.

W. D. FAIRBROTHER.

This is the declaration of Mr. Fairbrother. He has not only given his word but he went before a justice of the peace and made the following affidavit :—

I, William D. Fairbrother, of the village of Beamsville, in the county of Lincoln, do solemnly declare that the statement made by me in reference to the management of the Beamsville Post Office, and hereunto attached, to be true in every particular, and I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of "The Canada Evidence Act, 1893."

Declared before me, at Beamsville, this twelfth day of April, A.D. 1897.

DAVID DAVIS, J.P.

Now, Mr. Fairbrother has given his affidavit that those charges, which were sent broadcast over the country by the hon. Postmaster General against him, with the purpose of destroying his character and standing in the business community, are untrue in every particular, and all he asked from the Postmaster General was the opportunity of establishing that they were untrue. That opportunity, however, was not granted to him, and, therefore, I have conceived it to be my duty, as the representative of the people in that neighbourhood—because I may say there is a sort of little reciprocity between my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) and myself in this regard ; my hon. friend looks after some of my constituents, and while Mr. Fairbrother is a constituent of his, I am only just extending to him a sort of reciprocity in that regard—therefore, I have conceived it to be my duty to bring this matter before the House. I have stated this question fairly and truthfully. The hon. Postmaster General, I hope, will reconsider the matter. I think that, in honour to himself, in justice to Mr. Fairbrother, for the good name of the Government, this matter should not be allowed to rest and Mr. Fairbrother sent adrift without the benefit of an inquiry. I ask the hon. First Minister, who pledged himself before Parliament, last summer, to give every public servant accused a chance to defend himself, to adhere to that pledge now. If he desires to receive the plaudits and approval of the right-thinking people of this country, he should stand by his declarations in Parliament. Mr. Fairbrother was ruthlessly and heartlessly dismissed without any reasonable ground whatever for his dismissal.

Mr. GIBSON. Before this motion is carried, I think it is due to myself to say a few words regarding it, but first of all, I desire to return my thanks to my hon. friend, who has just taken his seat, for the courtesy he has extended to me by not bringing up this matter in my absence. A great deal has been said through the public press about the age of this gentleman who has been appointed postmaster at Beamsville. Well, I wish to call the attention of the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition to the fact that this man is just exactly his own age, and I am bound to admit—and I think every hon. gentleman in this House will bear me out—that the hon. gentleman does not consider himself old, and I am sure the gentleman who has been appointed postmaster at Beamsville is just as active and vigorous as my hon. friend who leads the Opposition, and who, I hope, will be able to lead the Opposition for many years to come.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I cannot allow that to pass because, according to my hon. friend behind me, this young and new postmaster is eighty years of age.

Mr. GIBSON. The gentleman, if I am correctly informed, is between 75 and 76 years of age. However, like the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition, he is a man of experience, having had some experience as postmaster some years ago. Unfortunately for him, through no fault of his own, he lost all his money. However, to come back to the appointment at Beamsville, the hon. member for Welland did not enlighten the House as to how that appointment came about. I think, perhaps, the less that is said about that the better. But I want to say, in a word, that this young man was not summarily dismissed. The young man of course, after the election in June, heard all kinds of rumours that he was to be dismissed. One Saturday evening he came down to my house and asked me candidly if it was my intention to recommend his dismissal from the service. I said : Certainly not so long as you behave yourself. I think I am well enough known in the neighbourhood from which I come to be certain of unanimous endorsement when I say that I never have undertaken the dismissal of a man even from my own employ for voting against me or for holding opinions on political questions different from my own. I certainly would not have treated this young man differently in that respect from one of my own workmen. I can say here that I have never asked a man in my employ to vote for me. When this young man came to me, I gave him my assurance that so long as he behaved himself, I would not recommend his removal from office. Now, how did he get the office? His father-in-law got the office for him. Prior to that the father-in-law had held it for eighteen years and had farmed it out to Mr. Zimmerman. When the young man married Mr. Bennett's daughter, Mr. Bennett came and informed Mr. Zimmerman that he would have to make way for Mr. Fairbrother, but that, so far as Mr. Zimmerman was concerned, the emoluments he had

received would be the same as before. How did this young man act with his assistant postmaster? Did he act as his father-in-law had done? This boy, not yet of age, came into office, and his assistant taught him to telegraph, taught him the business of the office; and then, he, feeling that he had my assurance that nothing would happen to him, began to abuse his assistant. Tory-like, he wanted everything for himself. He cut his assistant's salary down to $20 or $25 a month. I understand that the receipts from the office, the post office, the telegraph and sale of newspapers was something like $900 or $1,000. This money was formerly divided equally between Mr. Bennett and Mr. Zimmerman, and this was Mr. Zimmerman's position until Mr. Fairbrother felt himself strong enough to say to this man who had shown him such kindness: I cannot discharge you, but I will cut your salary down and make your position as uncomfortable as possible. Mr. Zimmerman then came to me with the complaint that has since been recorded in "Hansard," and stated further that this young man, Fairbrother, left the windows open in the winter time, but protected himself with a glass screen so that the wind and frost should not affect him. On more than one occasion, Mr. Zimmerman came to my house and made complaints to me. I said: Well, Mr. Zimmerman, my time is not always at my own disposal, and I cannot listen to your complaints. Put them in writing, like a man, and I will send them to the Postmaster General, and let the Postmaster General deal with them as he sees fit. Now, the hon. member for Welland says that there is no truth in those charges. How does he know?

Mr. McCLEARY. The sworn statement of the gentleman.

Mr. GIBSON. The sworn statement of a gentleman who, in my presence, on election day, stood checking off the people who went in to vote, the man who, with his father-in-law took turns in checking off the voters in my presence. Is not my word in this House as good as the statement of a boy sent down to an hon. member? I leave that to the judgment of the House. Not satisfied with checking off those who were going in to vote, he jumped into a rig and brought up voters in my presence. And he dared to tell the hon. member that he never neglected his duty on election day. Mr. Zimmerman's statement is as true as the other, for he not only neglected his duty on election day, but on some others. I need give no better proof than to say that he admitted that he went down to hear Sir Charles Tupper in the afternoon in the city of St. Catharines—to hear that hon. gentleman plead for my opponent. But it is only fair that I should say that the hon. gentleman hardly mentioned my opponent's name but told the people: If you cannot vote for Mr. Rykert, vote for the National Policy. Now, my hon. friend from Welland is very much shocked. He talked about the Turkish atrocities. Well, I will give him a sample of the Turkish atrocities that were committed by some of his leaders some years ago. Let me read a letter that was read in this House last session:

Department of Railways and Canals.

Dear Sir,—Referring to your letters of 17th November and 9th and 17th February, relating to the dismissal of your son from the service of the Intercolonial Railway, I have to state that the reason for his dismissal was that he took an active part in opposition to the Government at the last election. This, as you will readily understand, no Government officer will be permitted to do, and your son's action was so conspicuous that it could not be passed over.

Yours faithfully,
CHARLES TUPPER.

Now, along the same line, we have another case, somewhat similar; and, if the House will pardon me for a moment, I will give this illustration. A gentleman writing to one of the hon. members of this House that he had been removed from office without cause, states as follows:—

In 1884 I was sent to Port Arthur from Winnipeg, in the customs service, to assist Collector Nicholson, who was the only officer at that port at the time. I was there until the close of 1887, when I was dismissed to make room for a secretary of the Conservative Association of Port Arthur and one of their most active workers. In all my time in the customs service I took no part in politics whatever, but somehow they found me out, and I had to go.

Now, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, who answered this gentleman's complaint, stated:

Department has a high appreciation of your services as an officer, but the Government could not overlook the claims of the Port Arthur Conservatives.

No fault to find with the officer, but they had to make room for "Port Arthur Conservatives." We had another case which was read to this House last session:

The position had been taken from me by Mr. Macdonnell, the late Conservative member, and the reason given by him, which the post office inspector informed me, was that I had gone Grit in the preceding election.

Mr. LISTER. Who signed that?

Mr. GIBSON. I cannot tell you now. I deny the statement that has been read to this House by my hon. friend from Welland, and I state on my honour and on my responsibility as a member of this House that every word I stated in regard to Mr. Fairbrother is true. And I am not only prepared to make that statement to this House, but I am prepared to make an affidavit in a court of justice. Now, my hon. friend spoke about the hunger of the Grit party.

Mr. TAYLOR. Hear, hear.

Mr. GIBSON. You are hungry now. In 1878 no Liberal who was not fastened down

under the Civil Service Act was allowed to remain in office for a month, they were turned out in all directions. Men were removed, not on account of their inability to do the work, but because they were Liberals. I knew a case in point, because I employed the same man afterwards myself, and know whereof I speak. The Government found that the men whom they had in their employ knew nothing about the drainage and masonry work around these Parliament Buildings, and after this man was discharged they brought him back again, and said that they had made a mistake. They appointed him as assistant to another man, and after the work was done, my friend had to leave Ottawa and come back to work for me in Beamsville. My hon. friend opposite can find lots of cases in his own riding without coming into mine. I will give him another name of one of his own pet friends in the village of Niagara Falls, young Simpson, a mail clerk, who not only poses as a Conservative, but he was president of the Liberal-Conservative Association. At the last election he, a Government employee, had the indecency to allow his name to be put upon posters in a town of my hon. friend's riding, calling meetings and grand rallies of the Conservative party. The hon. gentleman referred to a letter that was written by a friend of the Liberal party. Now, I want to ask here, How was this petition that he speaks of circulated in the village of Beamsville? He does not know the whole case, I see. A petition was circulated in the village of Beamsville among the Liberals under a misapprehension. They were told that it was in order to call a meeting of the executive of the Liberal Association of the village of Beamsville to consider Mr. Fairbrother's case. The Tories, of course, did not require to be coached, it was the Liberals whom they wanted to sign it, and they signed it under a misapprehension that the whole of this matter was to be re-opened, not by Parliament, but by the executive of the village where I live. Now, speaking about the respectability of the young man who was in charge, I have nothing to say against him. I do not want to say anything against him, but I say that he abused the position that was given to him, and he abused the confidence that I reposed in him. After I gave him my assurance, he went to work and abused the man who had not only taught him, but the man who had been more than kind to him during all those years, and kind to his father-in-law for eighteen years. I know that the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition will remember the gentleman whose letter I am about to read to the House, not only as a personal friend of his own, but as a very strong and warm admirer and political supporter of his. This is the letter:

Mr. GIBSON.

Toronto, March 25, 1897.

Mr. Alexander Allan, Beamsville, Ont.

Dear Sir,—It gave me great pleasure to have your letter this morning, stating that you had been appointed postmaster of Beamsville. I congratulate you on securing the appointment, and also I may say that your friends in power have only done what was right and fair by you, for the consistent support you and your friends have given to them for a great number of years.

I shall attend to any application made from the Guarantee Company immediately. Wishing you many years of pleasant occupation as postmaster of Beamsville, I am,

Yours very truly,

W. R. BROCK.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is, so far as I am concerned, the whole case of the postmaster of Beamsville.

Mr. CRAIG. I have no particular reason to interfere in this debate, except to say that I think it is a most unfortunate thing that, instead of politics being elevated, as we all hoped they might be when the party opposite came into power, it seems to me they have been rather degraded by a great many dismissals for political reasons all over the country. Now, what is the great complaint made by the member for Welland (Mr. McCleary) in this matter? It is that this postmaster who admittedly discharged his duties well, who was perfectly qualified to discharge them, who declares that he took no active part in politics—that this man was dismissed without an investigation. I think that is the great cause of complaint, and no complaint, I understand, has been made against him. But this dismissal is aggravated when we recall the words used by the Premier in this House last session, that no Minister would dismiss any civil servant, or any servant of the Government, without a complaint being made, and the matter being investigated, and without that man having an opportunity of replying. Now, we all admit that this is British justice. I see that the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) shakes his head.

Mr. McMULLEN. Because my hon. friend does not state the case correctly.

Mr. CRAIG. Will you state it correctly, then?

Mr. McMULLEN. After you are through, I will.

Mr. CRAIG. I find the Premier's words, uttered on the 1st of September, 1896, at page 506 of the "Hansard"—perhaps the hon. member for North Wellington will read this over before he speaks, so as to be quite correct. I will read it to the House now:

The PRIME MINISTER. No Minister would pretend to dismiss any officer, unless he had an opportunity to defend himself.

I think that bears out what I said. Now I will go on and read a little further:

But when the case is within the personal knowledge——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CRAIG. Well, I am interested to see that the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) calls himself a Minister. I am going to read a little further:

But when the case is within the personal knowledge of the Minister himself,——

Now, I do not think that the hon. member for Lincoln can put himself under that head. Perhaps he looks forward to the time when he will, but I think he is anticipating, he is rather too soon. The Premier does not say, within the knowledge of any member at all. But he says distinctly:

When the case is within the personal knowledge of the Minister himself, under such circumstances there is no case for inquiry.

Now, what can be plainer than that? If the hon. member for North Wellington can get around that, he can get around anything. When the Premier used that expression, I admired him for taking that position, and I regret very much that he has allowed pressure from members of this House—I have no doubt pressure was brought by the hon. member for Lincoln in this matter, I have no doubt that he is responsible for this dismissal—I am very sorry that the Premier has allowed himself to be influenced by the member for Lincoln, so as to forget what he pledged himself to in this House. Now, I hold that this was a pledge, not only to the House, not only to the country, but to the civil servants all over the country, and gave them the assurance that they would not be dismissed at the whim of any member of this House. I say whim, because I think it is a most unfortunate thing for civil servants, who are servants of both parties all over this country, to feel that they hold their positions at the whim of any member of any party. I think that is a most unfortunate state of things, and has a demoralizing effect upon the civil service. Now, I was a little surprised, although I was not very much surprised, at the remarks made by the hon. member for Lincoln, when he read a letter written by the present leader of the Opposition. The hon. gentleman remarked: It is all right, we are acting perfectly right, we are doing just what we ought to do in this case, because you did the same thing. That is a great argument, is it not? I am sure the hon. gentleman and many members of his party have gone up and down this country talking about the wicked Tories and what they have done, and that they should be driven from power, and thus they held us up to scorn and obloquy for doing these very things which the hon. gentleman now turns around and says the present Government are perfectly right in doing, because we Conservatives did the same when we were in power. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman should use such an argument. If it was wrong when we did it, the fact that we did it does not make it right to-day.

An hon. MEMBER. Was it wrong?

Mr. CRAIG. I say it was wrong. I say that if anything like that was done, it was a wrongful act.

Mr. LANDERKIN. But you formally sustained it.

Mr. CRAIG. When I spoke on the question of dismissing translators of the "Debates," the Premier asked me what I would do, and at the same time he said you would cut their heads off. I replied that I would do no such a thing. I do not pretend to be any better than other Conservatives; but I want to speak on this point, and at the same time show that I have a right to speak on it, because I have been consistent in my course throughout. When I had the power to appoint a postmaster at Bethany, I appointed an Equal Righter who had worked against me, and I did so because he was a poor man and I thought he would be a good man for the position; and for so doing I was blamed by many Conservatives.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What was his salary?

Mr. CRAIG. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will either rise and say what he wishes to say, or will keep quiet. My action on this question gives me the right to speak on it, for my action has been consistent. I have another case in mind; I do not want to show any egotism, but I wish to express my disapproval of carrying party to the extreme, as is seen in this country. I know that the Postmaster General and other members of the Government are often placed in an unfortunate position by members like the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), who wants certain things done from party motives and no other motives. They want to place certain men in positions and punish others, and they bring pressure to bear on the Postmaster General or some other Minister, as in this case, because they want to punish a man. I do not think members should have the power to punish men in this way. The Government should resist the pressure and stand between the civil service and members of the party, no matter which party is in power. I have another case, I say, to show my consistency. At one time the dredge was lying at Port Hope, and I was asked to nominate a caretaker. I appointed a poor man who had voted against me, because I wanted to give the man something to carry him over the winter. Some Conservatives disapproved of my action, but I acted irrespective of party.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Because he was an honest man.

Mr. CRAIG. I am sure the hon. gentleman would not have done so. He would have appointed a clear Grit, and I am glad

he is interrupting because it gives me the opportunity of saying this. I regret that this man Fairbrother was dismissed without an investigation being held. That is the gravamen of the charge made in this case. If an investigation had been held, this man would have had an opportunity of being heard, for he denies the charges in toto. Of course, I am bound to accept the statement of the hon. member for Lincoln. This man, however, believes he has been unjustly treated in having been denied an investigation, and moderate men throughout the country will say that if this man was guilty of these charges, an investigation should have been held and he should have had the opportunity of proving his innocence, or the member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) would have been able to show that he was guilty.

Mr. LISTER. During the last session of Parliament, and during this session, many hours have been taken up by complaints from the other side of the House of dismissals of public officers by the present Government. I can only say for myself, speaking with some knowledge of the facts, that the Government has acted in this matter with the greatest possible moderation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LISTER. I have no hesitation in making that statement. What are the facts? For eighteen years hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. At election after election, the office-holders were led to believe that they would be retained in office for ever. They were encouraged to act as committee men—they were the men who carried out the election campaigns throughout the country, and they were the active supporters of the Government. They were offensive to the Opposition in many instances—of course, there were exceptions; but in the majority of instances the office-holders were the most offensive partisans the Liberal party had to meet. They believed that hon. gentlemen opposite would retain office, and that they might continue to take the offensive part which they had assumed in the past. Those gentlemen must have known—if they did not know, they were obtuse, indeed—that if a change of Government took place, they would be removed; and the complaint we on this side of the House have to make is that the Government has not done its full duty in this regard. When hon. gentlemen went into office in 1878 the first work they entered upon was the dismissal of the public servants of the country. From the lowest officer to the highest, no man felt himself safe. Even the railway employees in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, the present leader of the Opposition did not scruple to dismiss, not because they were inefficient or did not perform their duty, but because they were Liberal supporters; and if we give hon. gentlemen opposite a dose of the same medicine they gave us in 1878, they must not complain. Do they want to goad this Government to make further dismissals, for there are many men who should be dismissed? In my own county there are a number of officials who, if political partisanship is to be good cause for dismissal, should be dismissed; and I may say that I have not asked for the dismissal of a single man in the county of Lambton. Although I feel they have acted improperly, and that I would feel justified in insisting on their dismissal, I feel, furthermore, that the stand taken by the Government and the Liberal party since their accession to power in teaching the office-holders that they must maintain a position of neutrality, will, in the future have a salutary effect, and office-holders will discharge their duties and leave politics alone. I only state what is known. Hon. gentlemen opposite know perfectly well that throughout the length and breadth of the country, office-holders have been their most active political supporters.

We are not introducing a new rule in Canada; we are not disregarding what has been the rule in England for years and years, because for the last seventy-five years the rule in the mother country ever has been; that the price of office is neutrality. It is the rule there, that if an office-holder takes an offensive part in politics, he does it at the risk of losing his office in case the party he supports is not successful at the polls. Sir, that is a salutary rule, and that is the rule that ought to have been enforced in Canada during the last eighteen years. Office-holders should have been given to understand in Canada, that the political party which they supported did not expect them to engage actively in its campaign, but instead of that, the late Government encouraged the civil servants to actively support them in elections. Such being the case, what complaint can now be made? The office-holder when he takes office knows that he takes it upon the implied understanding that he is to be neutral in politics. If he disregards that rule, he takes his official life in his hands, and if he loses it he has only himself to blame. Sir, take through the length and breadth of this country, and I say, that since the present Ministry have come into power their moderation is a matter of surprise. The Government have been urged to dismiss employees for the sufficient reason that they were active political partisans, but when you look at the number of dismissals actually made, you find that they are insignificantly small. Hon. gentlemen opposite want this country to believe, that we want to dismiss the whole civil service of Canada. We want nothing of the kind. We want to impress upon the civil servants of this country, that when they take the pay of all the people of Canada, they must give their undivided attention to the people of Canada as a whole, regardless of politics. Civil servants although they may have been

partisans before, must cease to be active politicians when in office. I admit, that as a general thing a Government will appoint its own followers to office, but the moment a party follower is appointed, he must cease to become an active supporter of any party. He must make up his mind that while he has the right to exercise the franchise as any other citizen, he must cease to be an active politician. I repeat, Sir, that in the interests of the service itself, and in the interests of the country, public officials must be taught the lesson that they are to serve Canada, and not any political party. I believe that the public servants of the country now understand this, and that in future elections there will not be found that active interference by them in political campaigns, which has been so prejudicial to the interests of the country, and so injurious to themselves.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It would be probably difficult to occupy the time of the House with a graver or more important question that is at present under consideration. Last session and this session, reference has been made to this question at considerable length. I believe that gentlemen on both side of the House will agree with me, that it is time there should be some clearly defined and well recognized line of conduct laid down and adhered to by the Government. Half a dozen different principles have been propounded from the Government benches in regard to this question of the position of civil servants, which to a great extent concerns the interest of this country. Last session, the Minister of Public Works read a letter written by me in reference to a dismissal in the county of Digby, and he stated that the Government would follow the principles laid down in that letter. Sir, that letter of mine gave the reason for the dismissal referred to, and declared that the official had been guilty of grossly offensive partisanship. The Minister of Finance then held, that civil servants were free men to exercise the franchise, but that they must do it within certain bounds, and they must not be guilty of offensive partisanship. He laid down the rule, that if an official took a grossly offensive attitude in reference either to a candidate supporting the Government of the day, or a candidate of the Opposition, he must not complain if he is removed from office. I at once said then, that both sides of the House would agree to that proposition as to the line of conduct to be pursued by the Government and that while civil servants were not forbidden to express their opinions in a fair and gentlemanly way, yet they should not be guilty of offensive partisanship. Before the House rose, last session, it will be remembered, that the hon. the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) after a long laborious effort, and after several weeks had passed, exhumed a letter written by myself which he read from his place in the House, and which found its way into the pages of "Hansard." That letter has been re-read to the House by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), who, like the Minister of Finance, considers, that the highest authority to justify any act charged against the Government, is to show that they have for it such an illustrious precedent as that set by myself. Well, Sir, I accept that, and I will abide by any action that I have taken as a public man in regard to this question of dismissals from office. I will exonerate the supporters of the Government, whenever and wherever, they are able to quote my actions as a precedent in support of what they have done. I may tell the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), that the man who was discharged by me when Minister of Railways and Canals, was not only guilty of offensive partisanship, and not only guilty of taking a conspicuous part in elections, but he actually used physical force at a public meeting, in support of his party and in opposition to us.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Did he have an investigation?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There was the fullest inquiry. He was guilty of this conduct at a crowded public meeting in the city of Moncton, hundreds of people were cognizant of it, it was a matter of public notoriety, and after a full investigation——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. A full investigation.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, a long period elapsed between this conduct and the date of dismissal. There is hardly a gentleman in the House who will say that if an official goes to the length of using physical force at a public meeting, you would not be perfectly justified in dismissing him.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Did he hurt many of your fellows?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not say that, because as my hon. friend knows, we are generally able to take care of ourselves, whether in a question of intellectual or of physical force. But, Sir, this is a grave matter, a matter which this House cannot treat with too great consideration, for this reason, that if the system that "to the victors belong the spoils" is to be introduced, and the wholesome practice of admitting the individual right of public officials to maintain their opinions in a temperate, fair and gentlemanly manner, is to be departed from, the country should know it; and every official under the present Government, and the Government also, should understand that what is now established as the law in relation to their opponents, will necessarily have to be carried into effect in regard to themselves and other officials supporting them when a change of Government takes place.

Mr. McGREGOR. It will be a long time.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It may be a long time, but if these dismissals are rolled up in the manner in which they have been during the short tenure of power of hon. gentlemen opposite, there will be a fearful account to be rendered when that day comes be it far or near, and it is just as well that it should be understood that these gentlemen on the Treasury benches are not laying down the law for their opponents; they are laying down the law for their friends. I want to ask the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, and who has argued this matter in a temperate and straightforward manner, stating that in his view the moment a man is appointed to office he is to understand that his political life has terminated and he is to do nothing but attend to his duty—I want to ask him if he holds, as I assume he does, from that statement, that the gentlemen appointed and holding office under this Government, are precluded from supporting the Government—from going to an election and giving their votes, or giving a free and independent, but fair and manly expression of the views they hold on public questions. My hon. friend behind me (Mr. McCleary) made an overwhelming case in regard to the matter now before the House—an unanswerable case, and consequently an unanswered case. I listened to the specious plea of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) in favour of what had been done; but he was unable to meet the ground taken by my hon. friend behind me, when my hon. friend showed that what had been done by the Government had been done in contravention of the declaration of the leader of this Government made on the floor of Parliament. My hon. friend behind me shows that that declaration has been dishonoured, and a course diametrically opposed to it has been adopted in driving from an important office this man, against whom there is no charge of his not having honestly and faithfully performed his duties. What does the hon. member for Lincoln say? Do I require better evidence of the impropriety of driving this man from office without any investigation than that hon. gentleman's statement? No, Sir. What does he say? He says that when this gentleman came to him and said, "Do you intend to dismiss me, or do you intend to sustain me in office?" he, knowing the character of the man, the position he had attained in life, and the mode in which he discharged his duties, gave him his word that he would not be disturbed, provided he acted in a proper manner. What does he say to-day? He says he disapproves of some business arrangement between that man and his assistant. What had he to do with that? What had this House to do with that? A gentleman entrusted with official duties has a right to make his own arrangements with persons who assist him. That is no ground whatever for the violation of the declaration of the First Minister, that no man should be deprived of his office, if any charge were brought against him, except after investigation, save in a case in which the transaction was within the knowledge of the Minister himself. We all admit that if a Minister is able to say that he is aware of his own personal knowledge of offensive partisanship or any other improper conduct on the part of an official, he would be justified in acting upon his own personal knowledge. But that is not the case in this instance. There the matter stands, that the hon. member for Lincoln had given this gentleman a high character and had given his word that he should remain in the position undisturbed; and yet, when a gentleman came to him with complaints, what did he say? "I have given my word to this gentleman that he should be retained in his office, and I cannot listen to your complaints, but I will send them to the Postmaster General, and get him to turn out of office the man I was pledged to protect."

Mr. GIBSON. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman should not put words in my mouth. What I said was that I had no time to listen to the complaint of the gentleman, and that if he would put his statement in writing, I would forward it to the Postmaster General for him to deal with. Not to discharge him; I did not say anything of the kind. I hope the hon. gentleman will accept my word.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I accept the hon. gentleman's statement without hesitation, but he makes the case stronger against himself, because, having refused to entertain the complaint himself, he sent it forward to be dealt with by other parties, after having given his pledge that this man would not be dismissed. But I was astonished to hear the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) say that this Government had proceeded with great caution and great moderation. I believe I shall put a motion on the paper asking this Government to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the number of persons who have been discharged from the various departments of the public service since they came into power; and I do not hesitate to say that I believe it will immensely outnumber all the dismissals which took place under previous Governments during the past eighteen years. What did an hon. gentleman say in reference to the mode in which I had administered the Department of Railways and Canals? Let me repeat that when I was appointed Minister of Public Works and of Railways and Canals in 1878, because the two departments were then consolidated, I found that the account of the Intercolonial Railway was between half a million dollars and three-quarters of a million dollars on the wrong side of the ledger of the previous year. I found also that the hon. gentleman who had been charged with the administration of the Railway Department had put

on record his declaration that it would cost the Government about $750,000 a year to operate the Intercolonial more than could be obtained from its operation. There is not an hon. member in this House who will not say that it was not my duty to grapple at once with such a state of affairs. No hon. gentleman will fail to approve of the course I adopted of at once entering into a most thorough investigation of the management of the Intercolonial, in order to see what reduction could be made in the burden which its management had hitherto entailed on the country. I called upon the ablest men in the department to report to me what could be done to effect a saving and more equally balance revenue and expenditure. When I got their reports, I went into the whole question in the most thorough and careful manner myself. I say more, I say that when these gentlemen showed to me that I could make a great saving by a great reduction in the number of employees on the railway, I called upon them—and I can prove my statement before a committee of this House, because these men are now living and can testify to the truth of what I say—to return to me a list, without favour or affection or partisan bias, of those that could be dispensed with. Practically a large number had been appointed, in fact almost all had been appointed by my predecessor, Mr. Mackenzie. I called upon the chief men in the department to not only give me a statement of how great a saving could be effected, but to give me the means of working the road with the fewest hands possible by selecting the ablest and best men in the public service, regardless of political considerations altogether, and the result was that while I did make a great reduction, I was attacked right and left by the Conservative party and by various Conservative members, and even Conservatives out of the House, for having dismissed Conservatives and retained a large body of strong political opponents on the railway. That is a matter susceptible of proof in the clearest possible manner; and when I tell the House that the result of my management was to save to the country over half a million dollars per annum, they will understand not only that I was able to perform a great service for this country, but that in discharge of that duty I had regard mainly to the qualifications of the men who were retained whether Liberals or Conservatives, and many of those occupying the highest and best paid positions in the service were selected from men who had been and were known to be my strong political opponents. So much for that, but I say more. I say that during the whole period of Liberal-Conservative administration, the course was adopted of maintaining the integrity and character and position of the civil service, and whether in the inside service engaged at the Capital, or the outside civil service all over the country, regard was had solely to efficiency and permanency of office. Unless there was some strong and sufficient ground brought against an official to warrant his dismissal from the service, none were disturbed. Again and again, as hon. gentlemen behind me know, appeals that were made to provide for partisans anxious to serve the Government were met by the statement that unless good ground could be given, it was impossible to make room for partisans or political friends. I say that during the long period the Liberal-Conservative party were in power, we adopted the course of maintaining the integrity and high character and independence of the service by refusing to listen to every request for the dismissal of a civil servant, except on the ground of his incapacity or of offensive partisanship. We stand on that ground to-day. I say, show that any official is incapable of performing his duties, or that he is guilty of offensive partisanship, show that he has offered open insult to gentlemen supporting the Government, and we have not a word to say in his defence. That is the position we take, but hon. gentlemen opposite have swept hundreds out of office without cause, without investigation, without any reason except that their places were wanted for hungry partisans who are hounding this Government on to its destruction. Under these circumstances, not only is deep injury done to the men who were thus deprived of positions in which they were honestly and honourably and faithfully discharging their duty to their country, but apart altogether from the injustice done to them, there is a deeper and greater wrong done to the best interests of Canada in establishing this doctrine which has been abandoned by the United States of America as fraught with utter ruin to the public service. This old doctrine, that to the victors belong the spoils, which was found to sap and undermine the public service of the nation until they were compelled to abandon it, is taken up and being put into execution from day to day by the members of this Government, and that in violation of the declaration made, not only by the First Minister himself, but by other Ministers in this House. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) said that the gentleman whose case is before the House took notes at the polling booth.

Mr. GIBSON. I said that he was scrutineer at the polling booths and checked off the men who went into vote.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not see anything offensive in that.

Mr. GIBSON. Of course not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am sure there was nothing offensive in it; we have the authority of the hon. gentleman for it. He said himself to this man: You shall not be disturbed by me; yet he was dismissed at once and without any charge. If it be

decided that a man shall be deprived of everything except the right to vote, let it be so announced. But do not let us have one declaration of principle from one Minister and another from another Minister, and then have all these declarations treated as idle wind and scores of dismissals made of honest, industrious, efficient public servants without cause assigned, without explanation of any kind. Why, Sir, I know several cases of dismissals in which the parties have asked the Government: Is there any charge against me? Have I done anything wrong? Have you any ground of complaint? And the answer was: No, there is no charge whatever against you. And when these parties have asked: As I am not allowed to serve the country and am not in employment, will you give me a recommendation, will you allow the officials under whom I have served to say whether I have performed my duty in an honourable and straightforward manner? And this has been refused. So, Sir, it would appear that the policy of this Government is not only to drive men out of office, to deprive men who are honestly and faithfully serving the country of the positions they hold, but to starve them, if possible, by preventing them from getting employment elsewhere. There has been an amount of cruelty, an amount of injustice, an amount of unfairness in dealing with the public officials of this country during the short regime of the present Government, that, when it is summed up before this House—as I hope it will be, for I shall move a resolution that a list of the employees discharged, either without cause assigned, shall be laid upon the Table—will startle this House and this country. Assuming the sincerity of the statements—and I am not questioning it—made by my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister), I think nobody will be more astonished than he when this long list of officers who have been ruthlessly driven from office without cause or reason, except simply that some person else wished to occupy their place, is submitted to this House. But this policy of dismissals on one side from office is a policy that cannot be maintained. It is utterly impossible that it can be maintained by one party and not by another. The first duty that will be forced upon whoever may succeed these hon. gentlemen is to remove from office—and I say it here in the face of the House and of the country—every man who has taken the position of a man improperly driven out of the public service. And I can only say, so far as the officials are concerned, the principle propounded and laid down by gentlemen opposite will have to be applied to the officials of this country in the same way that they have applied it. The course they pursue will be forced upon their successors, and a condition will be brought about that every man who wants to see the civil service of this country preserve the high and independent character that it has heretofore had, will deplore from the bottom of his heart. No person regrets it more deeply than I do. I feel there is no injury that this Government is inflicting upon this country greater or more serious than their endeavour to strike down all independence of character in the civil service and to terrorize the members of that service by giving them the impression that they must carry out the views of this Government or be driven out of office.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I would not have attempted to say a word but for the statement of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) who has just sat down, that the present Government have dismissed, within the short space of time that they have occupied the Treasury benches, more officers than were dismissed by the Conservative party in the eighteen years during which they were in power. I take exception to that statement. When the Conservatives came into power in 1878, they swept out of the service every officer they could possibly dismiss. I am only going to detain the House for a single moment to state one fact. The hon. leader of the Opposition, when he was in the Government in 1872, introduced a law in reference to weights and measures inspection. They were driven from power before they had time to put this law in operation. When the Government of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie came into power that Government had the opportunity of putting the law in operation and making the appointments in the weights and measures inspection service. When the Conservatives came back to power in 1878, the hon. gentleman who now leads the Opposition forgot all the good points of the measure he had introduced and thought it was not a good measure for the country, and he repealed it holus bolus. He could not see his way to dismiss the men individually, but he repealed the law and thus drove every man who had been in the Weights and Measures Inspection Department out of office at one sweep. The hon. gentleman himself was then the person to introduce a new Weights and Measures Act, and under that they appointed their own men in almost every instance all over the country, making up the weights and measures service much as it is to-day. But they did not stop even with this wholesale sweep. There was a gentleman occupying a high commercial position in Hamilton who had been appointed collector of customs at Niagara Falls. He occupied that position for a very short time. Nobody could find fault with him: a man competent in every way to discharge the duties of collector of customs. He was summarily dismissed from office; no complaint against him, but simply that he was a Reformer and always had been, and that was enough to bring down upon him the vengeance of the Government. The hon. leader of the Opposition would have us believe that he is the guardian of the civil ser-

vice of this country. These hon. gentlemen guard the interest of the civil servants so long as those civil servants do their bidding, but when they fail in that, they must make way for others. Several other dismissals took place at that time. It was many years ago, and I have forgotten the details; but had I thought that this matter would come up I would have refreshed my memory and could have given the hon. gentleman some samples of his own work that he seems to have forgotten. I hope he will carry out the promise he has almost made to this House that men in office, no matter what their political opinions, if they are competent and faithful will be secure in their positions when he comes back into power.

An hon. MEMBER. He does not expect to come back.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). We know that. I hope he will live long enough to come back into power, but I do not think he will. I only desire to recall to the hon. gentleman's memory these things of which he himself was guilty, to show him that he is hardly in a position to find fault with the Government. This Government has only dismissed men who have taken an active part in politics, and I hope that they will dismiss every man who takes that position in the future.

Mr. LOGAN. The hon. leader of the Opposition has spoken of the action of the Government as injustice and cruelty. With reference to this case in Moncton, of which I happen to have some personal knowledge, I beg to say one or two words. This young man was only seventeen years of age when the election took place in 1882, some time, I think, in the summer—and on the 17th of November this young man's father wrote to the then Minister of Railways asking him why his son had been dismissed. Where was the investigation? By whom was the charge investigated? Where was the tribunal? He waited long days, and long weeks, and did not even receive the courtesy of a reply to his letter of the 17th of November. On the 9th of February, in the depth of winter, he wrote again to the hon. gentleman, imploring him to tell him why that his son, seventeen years of age, had been dismissed from the railway. Then we find that the month of February passed, the month of March passed, and April had gone until its 7th day before the then Minister of Railways deigned even to reply to the request of this poor boy's father made on the 17th day of November of the previous year. This is a specimen of the cruelty and injustice of the hon. member when he was Minister of Railways, and he complains to-day—of what? He complains to-day because this Government appointed a commission to investigate this case; he complains also because of other dismissals made in this country. Now, Sir, having the honour to represent the county which that hon. gentleman so long represented, I can tell him that in that county—and he knows it as well as I—there are five or six hundred employees of this Government, and out of this whole number there have not been only two or three dismissals, notwithstanding the fact that some of them are most violent political partisans, and a good many of them are relatives of the hon. gentleman himself.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman says that many of them were relatives of mine; I would ask him to name them?

Mr. LOGAN. I have not here a directory of the county of Cumberland; but at some future time when I have more time at my disposal, and when this House has more time at its disposal, I may take occasion to remind the hon. gentleman of a few of his relatives who occupy Government positions in the county of Cumberland. I can think of three or four of his relatives at the present time. The collector of customs at Tidnish, for instance, is an esteemed nephew. The late inspector of bridges on the Intercolonial Railway is a relative, and there are others in the county of Cumberland whom I can bring to the attention of this House when time permits. Now, Sir, let me say it is my opinion that the Government has dealt too leniently with partisan officials. In the county of Cumberland, out of five or six hundred employees, there have been only two or three dismissals. And yet the hon. gentleman talks about injustice and cruelty. The hon. gentleman himself did not even give an answer to this boy's father, who wrote on the 17th of November, until the 7th day of the ensuing April; and then what did he do? Did he say there was to be an investigation? Did he even claim that there had been the farce of an investigation? No, Sir, he only says:

> The reason for his dismissal was that he took a very active part in opposition to the Government at the last election. This, as you will readily understand, no Government officer can be permitted to do, and your son's action was so conspicuous that it could not be passed over.

Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that the hour of six o'clock has arrived, because I would like to call the hon. gentleman's attention to many other dismissals that took place in the county, under the late Government.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all correspondence between the Department of Railways and Canals, or any officer or officers thereof, and Wm. McArthur, of Fenelon Falls, in regard to the dispensing with his services.—(Mr. Hughes.)

Copies of all correspondence between the Department of Railways and Canals, or any officer or officers thereof, regarding the dispensing with the services of Wm. Hungerford, late engineer of the dredge "Otonabee"; of Mr. Kennedy, late

foreman of the Rosedale Works, and of George Laidlaw, late timber inspector on the Balsam Lake section of the Trent Canal.—(Mr. Hughes.)

Copies of all letters, petitions and orders between the Government and any person or persons referring in any way to the installing of David Halliday, who was appointed by the late Government to the position of collector of customs at the port of Morrisburg; or letters, petitions and orders referring in any way to appointing any other person or persons to that position.—(Mr. Broder.)

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

After Recess.

MINING DEVELOPMENT AND ADVISORY CORPORATION.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (for Mr. Maxwell) moved second reading of Bill (No. 82) to incorporate the Mining Development and Advisory Corporation of British America (Limited).

Mr. FOSTER. I think we ought to know what the nature of the Bill is.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The hon. member who has charge of the Bill is not here. Of course if the hon. leader presses the matter, it will have to stand.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it had better stand, then, unless some one else is able to give explanations.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think there is no one else here who can do so.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 28) respecting the Ontario Pacific Railway Company, and to change the name of the company to the Ottawa and New York Railway Company.—(Mr. Landerkin, for Mr. Snetsinger.)

Bill (No. 12) further to amend the law respecting Building Societies and Loan and Savings Companies carrying on business in the province of Ontario.—(Mr. Landerkin, for Mr. Wood, Hamilton.)

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT—BICYCLES AS BAGGAGE.

Mr. CASEY moved second reading of Bill (No. 16) to amend the Railway Act. He said: In moving the second reading of this Bill I am not inflicting a discussion on the House from any whim of my own. As I was asked to undertake the introduction of this Bill by a most influential body, the Canadian Wheelmen's Association, I looked into and considered the matter before acceding to their request, and being confident that what they asked was only consonant with justice and fair-play, I intend to do my best to induce the House to pass this measure. I am very much obliged to those gentlemen for paying me the compliment of asking me to take charge of their Bill, and I only fear some want of address on my part may lessen its chance of success; however, I will do my best. The Bill itself is an exceedingly simple one. It consists of one clause with a subsection. It provides that section 250 of the existing Railway Act should be repealed, and the following substituted:—

Checks shall be affixed by an agent or servant to any parcel of baggage having a handle, loop or fixture of any kind thereupon, or to any part of which a check can be affixed, delivered to such agent or servant for transport, and a duplicate of such check shall be given to the passenger delivering such parcel.

That section only varies the original wording of the section by adding the words "or to any part of which a check can be affixed." Then comes a new part, subsection 2, as follows:—

2. Bicycles are hereby declared to be baggage within the meaning of this section, and a passenger shall not be required to protect in any way any bicycle delivered by him for transport. Provided that the company shall not be required to transport, under the provisions of this section, more than one bicycle for any passenger.

It is quite clear, then, what the meaning of the Bill is, that it is simply a declaratory Act that bicycles are to be considered as baggage, and as such shall have all the rights and be subject to all the conditions which are accorded to and imposed upon any other class of baggage.

In requesting the House to pass this Bill, I feel I am speaking for one of the most important sections of the community; I feel I am speaking not only for those who are using bicycles now but those who will be using them next year and the year after. I am speaking for the youth and progress of this country—not exclusively for the youth either, because there are some grave and serious members of this House even, not to speak of any higher grade in the world, who are using the wheel. I believe some members of the Cabinet have lately began to practice; I might instance the Postmaster General, who I am told, and in fact I have the evidence of my own eyes for asserting, is becoming an expert on the wheel.

Mr. FOSTER. He is becoming a "fly on the wheel."

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman has called attention to a personal matter, to which I did not intend to refer. I have heard that joke made in regard to a certain hon. gentleman as he appeared on a wheel, but I did not mean to refer to it. I see the hon. gentleman takes my joke, and I do not intend to push it further. As a general rule, though, I may say it is safer for a gentleman wishing to ride a bicycle not habitually to wear a long-tail coat.

I speak for the youth and progress of the country in asking the House to pass this Bill. Over one hundred thousand young men and women, I believe, use the bicycle to-day in Canada; we have the best grounds for believing they do so. The sale of wheels is increasing very rapidly. As the price goes down, the sale will grow with increasing rapidity. The bicycle no longer can be said to be the luxury of the few or of the rich or even of those comfortably well-to-do; it has become an article of habitual use by all classes of the community. We all know how largely it is used in cities, not only by the rich and their children, but by the workingmen, and by the workingwomen; by railway employees, by factory people, and by all classes. I am able to state from my personal knowledge, that in the country districts the case is quite similar. In the part of Ontario in which I live —and I think it is not peculiar in that respect—nearly every farmer's son now aspires to have a bicycle, almost as eagerly as he aspires to have a horse and buggy to take his best girl out for a drive. He has the horse and buggy still, but he wants to have the bicycle also.

An hon. MEMBER. And the girl.

Mr. CASEY. Yes, and the girl wants to have her bicycle too to accompany him, so that the farmers' sons and daughters are equally interested in this. Then, if all classes of society in cities, and towns, and in the country are interested in this measure, I am not ashamed to insist upon the House giving it the utmost attention.

One of the arguments used against this Bill is a sort of pooh-pooh argument: Oh, this is just a thing gotten up by a few rattle-pated young fellows who have bicycles, and who want to run out a few miles from the town, and come back on the train! I have disposed of that argument by pointing out the influential character of the persons who use the wheel. They are influential in many ways. There is, I suppose, hardly a member in this House who has not been assisted in his successful campaign by the bicyclists amongst his supporters. They have drummed up meetings, they have carried special messages to committees, they have brought in reports of the state of the polls, and they have gone in procession on the triumphal evening when the hon. gentleman in question was elected. In all ways, the wheelmen have taken an important part in the last general election held in this Dominion.

It is worth the while of hon. gentlemen to consider, whether the wheelmen may not take an important part in the next campaign. I do not wish to be accused of bribery and corruption, by calling attention to a matter of this kind, but I do think it is worth the attention of every member of this House, from the members of the Government down to the junior members on the back benches – if there be such a thing as a back bench in this House where we are all free and equal —I say that from the youngest to the oldest member here, it is worth his while to remember that these young men who use bicycles are important fellows at election times. This is by no means a party measure; these young gentlemen are by no means all of the same party feeling, but there is no doubt that they will feel much more kindly towards those who assist them to obtain what they believe are their rights, than towards those who try to debar them from obtaining these rights.

This matter has been before individual members for some time past. There has been a good deal of discussion in the lobbies, and I want to pay attention to a few of the arguments I have heard against the Bill, and to those objections to it which have been formulated in print. In the first place, I am told, that it is a matter of class legislation, and that it would be an innovation. I claim that the boot is on the other foot. Until about a year ago, every railway in Canada carried bicycles on the same terms as they carried other baggage. Therefore, it is the railways who have introduced class legislation, or rather class discrimination against a certain large section of the people. They it is who have made the innovation by declaring that something is not baggage which had been formerly considered baggage, and they have made this class discrimination against those who use wheels, as compared with the rest of the public. Not only did all railways class bicycles as baggage until within a year, but up to the present day, the Government railways continue so to class them. On the Intercolonial Railway and Prince Edward Island Railway and all others in the maritime provinces, bicycles are still carried as baggage, and for that reason some of our maritime province friends hardly realize the grievance which the people of Ontario and Quebec labour under. They have been accustomed to see bicycles carried on railways as they should be carried, viz.: As the personal necessities of the passengers. In the United States, nearly one-half of the railway companies have always carried, and still carry bicycles as articles of baggage. In eleven states of the union they are compelled by law to do so; but apart from that compulsion, such large railway systems as the Pennyslvania railroad system with its ramifications extending through many states, and the Boston and Albany, which is somewhat similarly situated, and many other railways carry bicycles as baggage. The Boston and Albany road has gone so far as to provide a complete outfit in the baggage cars to make it convenient to carry bicycles, and they make no extra charge to the passenger. The eleven states which by legislation class bicycles as baggage are as follows:—New York, New Jersey, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Arkansas, Arizona, Ohio, Colorado, California, North Dakota, and Michigan. In France, by order of the

government, bicycles are carried as baggage. These illustrations are sufficient to prove that in many large and civilized communities, what we ask from this House is considered to be justice to those who use the wheel.

Let me give another instance. It is said by some that the bicycle is too serious a rival of the railways to be treated in the manner we ask. The bicycle is certainly much more of a rival of the street railway than it is of the steam railway; but what is the case in the city of Toronto? The Street Railway Company there, which undoubtedly suffers by bicycle competition, which claims that it loses five or six per cent on its total capital by the competition from bicycles, now fits up its cars with attachments for hanging up bicycles, and carries the machine free when the owner pays his five-cent fare. This enlightened company, a company jealous of guarding its rights, has seen it to its advantage to carry the bicyclist home, and his wheel along with him, when he is tired, or when his tire is punctured, or when for any other reason he does not find it convenient to use the wheel. I have thus disposed of the argument that this is class legislation, and that it is unfair to railways to ask them to comply with this request.

The Bill is merely a definition of what should be considered baggage. Now, some dispute our right to define what is to be called baggage, but we may as well go to first principles. It is an undoubted fact that this House has the right of dictating anything it likes to a railway company, so that we need not question our power in this matter. What is open to question is: Whether we are doing what is fair in this particular respect. We already dictate to railways what they shall charge for passenger traffic, and we have fixed the maximum rate at 3 cents a mile. The freight rates of all our railways except the Canadian Pacific, I think, are subject to approval by Order in Council; the alignment of every railway is subject to dictation either by this House or by the Governor in Council. If we have the right to regulate the railways in these respects, the right to call them before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, and decide there all sorts of disputes, between one railway and another, or between the railways and the public, surely we have the right to declare what is baggage and what is not.

I contend that the definition which we wish to put on the statute-book now will not interfere with the convenience or the profit of the railways in any noticeable degree. Even if it did so interfere, I contend that the rights of the public should be considered before the convenience of the railway companies. Why, Sir, the public are the largest shareholders in Canada in many of our leading railways. So far as Canadian capital is in these railways at all, the greater part of it has come from the public chest of Canada. What has gone into them from other sources has been invested in bonds and mortgages by people outside of Canada after their construction has been provided for. The public interest, then, is the interest of the largest shareholders in cash paid down, and we have therefore the right to say that the convenience of the public shall be consulted as well as the convenience of the railways. But I say that the rights of the railways do not clash with the convenience of the public in the present instance, because we do not want to make any unfair or brutal use of the powers we possess.

In framing this Bill, we have tried to follow the language of definitions already laid down by the highest judicial authority in Great Britain. I refer to Lord Chief Justise Cockburn, whose decision as to what is baggage under British law is accepted, I believe, by the railway companies as well as by ourselves. The courts of England, of Canada and of the United States have all pretty unanimously held, with him, that "whatever a passenger takes with him for his personal use or convenience, according to the habits or wants of the particular class to which he belongs, either with reference to his immediate necessities or to the ultimate purpose or his journey, must be considered as personal baggage." Following this indisputable principle, the courts have held that guns and ammunition are the baggage of the hunter, that fishing tackle is the baggage of the angler, that tools are the baggage of the mechanic, that the easel and sketching materials are the baggage of the artist, and the bicycle is the baggage of the wheelman. We take our stand on the ground that the bicycle is as much the baggage of the wheelman as any of these things I have mentioned are the baggage of these respective classes.

I may be allowed to enlarge very briefly on that point. The bicycle is a purely personal belonging. It is a thing which can only be operated either by the owner or by some individual who rides upon it. It is not in the same category as a horse and cart, a plough or a harrow, which may be used by animal power, by steam power, or in any other way, apart from its individual conjunction with a human being. It is as much personal to the man as a pair of boots, a pair of skates, a pair of stilts, or any other means of getting about.

We are met on all hands by what I may call the horse-and-buggy argument. It was brought up in the House when I introduced this Bill, and it is brought up seriously in print by some persons. We are told that if you allow the bicycle to be carried free, you might as well allow a horse and buggy to be carried free, because both are vehicles. The comparison is so absurd that I hardly know how to go about disproving it. I said, when introducing the Bill, that

if its opponents could show a horse and buggy as small, or as well-behaved in a baggage car, as a bicycle, there might be some fairness in the comparison. To say that because you allow a bicycle to be carried free, the next step is to allow a horse and buggy to be carried free, is about the same thing as saying that because you allow a cat or a canary to be carried on a train, you will have to allow an elephant or a camel to be so carried. Whoever got up this comparison between a bicycle and a horse and buggy is about as muddled as was the porter of whom I read in "Punch" over a tortoise—or turtle, as we would call it—which was to be carried on the train. He turned to a fellow employee and said: "Now, Bill, look here; what do you make of this? Cats is dogs, and canaries is dogs, and parrots is dogs; but what in thunder is a tortoise?" The classification which makes cats canaries and parrots pass as dogs is no more absurd than the classification which would put the horse and carriage and the bicycle under the same head.

In going into this question a little more particulary, I am obliged to follow the line of argument published and put before the House by the Grand Trunk Railway people. They have adopted as their own a memorandum made by the general baggage agents of railways in the state of Illinois in opposition to a Bill called the Sharrock Bill, then before the legislature of that state. I may say in general terms that the statements in this memorandum are many of them incorrect. The Bill which this memorandum was intended to oppose was materially different from the Bill now before this House, and the reasoning based on the incorrect statements in the memorandum is of such a nature that I cannot characterize it without going through it at some length. First, I have said that the two Bills are different. The Bill in opposition to which this memorandum was issued proposes, according to the statements of these baggage agents:

> That the transportation of bicycles and similar vehicles be compulsory on the part of railways, and that such articles be carried free in baggage cars.

The Bill before this House does not provide that "similar vehicles" should be carried as well as bicycles. I do not know what that might include. It might perhaps include a horse and buggy. This Bill does not provide that bicycles shall be carried free. It merely provides that they shall be put on the same footing as any other baggage; and if the railways have the right to charge on baggage generally, they will also have the right to charge on bicycles. So that the Bills are quite different. Then this baggage smashers' manifesto says that it should be understood that the railway companies are willing to carry bicycles when they are packed in trunks the same as ordinary baggage, and further on they say that they do not carry guns, easels, mechanics' tools or other articles, which have been declared to be baggage, unless they are packed in trunks. This last statement, Mr. Speaker, is absolutely false. The railway companies do carry these things without their being packed in trunks, and the baggage smashers of Illinois are simply telling a lie, unless the practice in Illinois is very different from what it is here.

In another paragraph they quote again Lord Chief Justice Cockburn's decision as to what is baggage under the existing law. The Lord Chief Justice says:

> On the other hand, the term "ordinary baggage" being confined to that which is personal to the passenger and carried for his use or convenience, it follows that what is carried for the purpose of business, such as merchandise or the like, would not pass as baggage.

Now, here are these railway people asking us to accept Lord Chief Justice Cockburn's dictum as to what is baggage. He decides that merchandise carried for the purposes of business is not baggage, and yet these very railway people carry for commercial travellers, who travel at a reduced rate, to the extent of 300 pounds weight of merchandise, carried for business purposes, and they not only do not object to it, but do all in their power to get this class of travel. If they diverge so far from the lines laid down by Lord Chief Justice Cockburn with regard to the carrying of merchandise as baggage, how can they ask us to accept a twisting of his decision in some other part of it, in order to exclude bicycles?

They proceed to say that the most liberal construction possible would not authorize the transportation as baggage of beds and bedding, brooms, pots, pans and other kitchen utensils, in the case of a man moving his domicile from one place to another. Well, that is just what the Canadian Pacific Railway is very glad to do in the case of settlers moving to the North-west.

Later on this memo. goes into some most remarkable calculations as to the convenience of stowing away bicycles. It says in one place that a bicycle occupies as much room as three trunks, and in another place that two bicycles occupy as much room on a truck to be wheeled across the platform as twenty-five trunks, and so on. The absurd and wilful untruth of those statements must be evidence to any one who has seen a bicycle and a trunk. They pretend that ordinary baggage is always delivered to them in compact parcels of 8 cubic feet. Did anybody ever see a commercial traveller's baggage done up in the compact form of a cube containing 2 feet each way? I do not think so, nor will you find any ordinary baggage so packed. As a matter of fact, the present law does not make any distinction as to the shape in which baggage is done up, and the railways in Canada make no such distinction. As long as there is a handle to it, they have to check

it and are very glad to get it. I know of a Saratoga trunk belonging to a couple in the province of Ontario into which they can both get and shut the lid on top of them, and they measure combined considerably more than 8 cubic feet. That trunk is carried everywhere without charge for excess baggage.

It would be impossible to take up all the arguments of this memo. at present. Yet I must take up two or three of them :

> We are aware, they say, that various devices have been invented for the hanging or securing of bicycles in the baggage cars, and quite alluring pictures have been made showing how the bicycle can be carried under such circumstances. It will be observed, however, that, in these pictures, little or no baggage is shown, and while these devices may be very excellent to secure bicycles when transported in an otherwise empty car, their use is practically impossible upon any road the passenger traffic of which assumes any degree of magnitude. On the trunk lines of the country, east and west, and north and south, baggage cars are usually so well filled that the handling of all bicycles within them is frequently difficult, and sometimes impossible.

Taking that to be true, I would ask the baggage smashers' association of Illinois, and those in Canada who adopt their arguments, what they are going to do, under the circumstances, if somebody offers a bicycle and ready to pay the fee demanded ? Will there be any more room if the bicycle is paid for than if it is offered as an article of baggage ? There certainly will not. If it is hard to find room for the bicycles as baggage in their cars, it will be equally difficult to find room for them when paid for. That whole argument is put entirely out of court by the fact that the companies make no objection to receive any amount of bicycles provided they are paid for. We may accept it as a fact proved that the railways can stow bicyles in their baggage cars if they want to.

Then they go on to raise a bugbear. They say that the passing of this law will affect a certain class of passengers. They say that : " A statutory provision, such as is asked for by some bicyclists, specially defining bicycles as baggage and requiring their carriage on the same train with the passenger, works an unjust discrimination against other passengers and their baggage. Such a statutory provision would give them a preferential character, and wherever it became necessary, as is sometimes the case, to leave some baggage to be carried on a later train, with the existence of such a provision, the bicycles would have to be carried and the other baggage would have to be left."

The only answer to these statements is that they are absolutely untrue. This statutory provision which we ask you to put on the Statute-book does not give preference to bicycles over other baggage, but only provides that other baggage shall not be given any preference over bicycles. If the companies have too much baggage, composed partly of bicycles, and partly of trunks, they would have to leave some of the baggage behind. It would be for them to decide whether they would leave the bicycles or the trunks or some of each behind, and there is nothing in this Bill to force them to give any preference to the wheels. Then they proceed to give a statement of the fares charged on the roads in the United States and in England. They give a list of the rates on American roads for various distances. I would ask what American roads carry at this rate ? I am informed, on good authority, that the roads in the United States charge more than is stated n this memorandum. On the other hand the tariff of rates charged on British railways is given at rates which are quite too high. I need not read the figures, but I can give the tariff of rates charged on British roads, if occasion calls for it, showing that the figures given for British roads are about twice as high as those actually charged.

In other words, this falsified memorandum underestimates the charge, of American roads and overestimates the charges of English roads and draws a misleading comparison. Besides, these underestimated figures for United States roads are below the rates charged in Canada. For instance, in the States, according to this memorandum, they carry bicycles one hundred miles for 25 cents. At the rate demanded in Canada you could not get a bicycle carried for one hundred miles for 25 cents. I have not the time to figure it out exactly, but it is a good deal more than that. So, this memorandum, prepared to combat a Bill not before this House, is incorrect in its facts, weak in its argument, and misleading in its conclusion.

I must refer to one other point. They say they are glad to accept—and we know that Canadian railways are glad to accept—bicycles put up in what are called bicycle trunks and carry them as baggage. Did you ever see a bicycle trunk, Mr. Speaker ? It is about as convenient a thing to put into a baggage car as a two-humped camel would be. It has no particular shape, and can not very well stand up or be allowed to lie down. It is about as bulky and inconvenient a thing as you can imagine. But the railway companies practically say : If you take one of these bicycle trunks empty on your shoulders when you go out from Ottawa for a spin to Britannia or Aylmer, and will pack your bicycle in it, we will carry it back for nothing. But if not we will charge you 25 cents —for the charge for the shortest distance is that amount.

Now, I want to make a point or two of my own. First I lay down the proposition, which cannot be controverted, that the use of the bicycle procures passengers for the railways who would not be procured if people were not in the habit of riding a wheel. The use of trains by bicyclists is almost entirely confined to cases where the wheelman

has run out into the country, and, for some reason, has found it more convenient to come home by train. Thus the use of the bicycle is advantageous to the railways in getting them a fare that they would not otherwise have got, and they should not fine a man who gives them that fare by charging a tremendous rate for his bicycle. It costs at commuted rates five cents to go by train from Ottawa to Britannia. For this rate they are bound to carry your baggage also. But if the owner of a commutation ticket makes the trip by train and takes his bicycle, they charge 25 cents for his bicycle, and 5 cents for himself—five times as much for the wheel as for the man. If a man has not a commutation ticket, he will have to pay 15 cents for himself and 25 cents for his wheel. I contend that free carriage of bicycles would induce wheelmen to take longer spins in the country, and come back by train, paying their fare and thereby affording a great deal of traffic for the railway companies which they do not now get. Instead of riding ten miles out and ten miles back, making a twenty mile spin, the wheelmen would go out 20 miles and come back by train, paying a very handsome fare to the railway company.

But I find that I have talked a great deal longer than I intended to and I shall close. I merely want to mention the fact of the number of petitions presented in favor of this Bill already—and they are still coming in. I find that petitions have been presented up to this afternoon from different cities from Canada as follows: Toronto, seven petitions containing 7,070 names; Montreal, 2 petitions containing 1,105 names; Hamilton, 1 petition, 870 names; Kingston, 1 petition, 350 names; Chatham, 1 petition, 389 names; Brantford, 1 petition, 257 names; Fredericton, 1 petition, 46 names. One other city has been omitted by some oversight of the compiler. There was a petition from St. Thomas, which is also a city. Petitions have been received from many towns and villages. In all petitions have been put in bearing the signatures of 14,618 people asking that this Bill may pass. These came from 45 different electoral divisions, of which also I have a list before me. There is a petition of about a thousand names from the city of Ottawa which is in the hands of one of the hon. members for the city who is now away from home and has not been able to present it. I have two or three more petitions which arrived this afternoon and could not be presented. We have petitions already received, in addition to those presented, to make the number of signatures of those praying for the passage of this Bill, over sixteen thousand, and these from all parts of the Dominion, from Nova Scotia to the extreme West. These represent a vastly larger number who have not had the opportunity of signing any petition, and altogether represent an amount of influence which this House cannot disregard.

Now, I have a word to say to the Government. I hope they will see it possible to take up this Bill and use their undoubtedly great influence in this House to secure its adoption. If they cannot quite see their way to do that, I hope they will give it the benefit of their moral support. If they feel perfectly indifferent about the matter, I hope they will, at least, not oppose it. In other words, if they do not help us, I hope they will not "help the b'ar," but will let the Bill have fair play, and I am satisfied from the expressions of opinion I have heard from hon. members of the House that it will triumphantly pass all stages and become the law of the country.

Mr. PENNY. In seconding the Bill proposed by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), I desire to say that I do so because I represent a constituency in which there are many wheelmen. Under ordinary circumstances, I do not believe in asking legislation for matters of this kind, but, as I understand that this Bill asks for nothing but what the railway can give to the wheelmen of the country without materially interfering with their accommodations for baggage, I think it is perfectly reasonable. I do not intend to go into a long argument, because I think the proposer of the Bill has placed the case of the cyclists of Canada very ably, and has explained the case clearly. It would only be worrying the House to go over the ground again. But I would like to say that in asking for this legislation we are doing a great good to the whole community. We are not here to legislate only for corporations; we are here to legislate for all classes of the people; we are here to legislate, if possible, so as to turn out our young men and young girls who are growing up as good citizens. It is a well known fact that athletic sports tend to make good citizens of our young people, and therefore I consider that any legislation which will encourage our young people to go in more for athletic sports than they have hitherto done, will be a great benefit to the whole Dominion. It is a well known fact that bicyclists are per force compelled to be moral citizens; therefore, I think it is the duty of this House, as far as possible, to aid them in their humble pastime of bicycling. Now, another consideration which I wish to bring before the notice of the House is that the greater portion of those who enjoy the pastime of bicycling, belong to the middle classes, they are persons who find that 25 cents added to the cost of their day's pleasure, will be a considerable inconvenience to them; therefore, I think that if we can in any way cheapen their pleasure, it is the duty of this House to do so. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have supplemented with these few remarks the arguments of the hon. gen-

tleman who proposed this measure, and I will say no more than to ask the Government to give it their favourable consideration.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. I will not occupy much time of the House in expressing my opinion in regard to the Bill now before the House. In connection with this proposal in regard to bicyclists, I think that the general convenience of the people who use bicycles should be considered by the railways. It looks very much as if the railways, in objecting to carry a bicycle as the baggage of the wheelman, are actuated more by a desire to add to their receipts than by any hardship they experience in handling these machines. Railway managers take advantage of the doubtful interpretation of a word which they define to suit themselves. The word baggage must necessarily change in meaning as inventions increase which add to the comfort and convenience of travellers. The personal effects of to-day are not what they were thirty years ago, nor will they in the future be identical with what are accepted as personal effects to-day. It is therefore unfair to define the word baggage by any hard and fast interpretation which railroad managers may give it for all time to come. In the past the word baggage has been elastic enough to cover a multitude of things, from a shot gun to a Saratoga trunk; and it is only now when railway managers find the bicycles a source of revenue, that they conclude that the word has been stretched to its limit, without even selvage enough to include bicycles. Consistency is not a jewel that sparkles in the shirt bosom of railway managers. They claim it is a hardship to carry a thirty-pound bike unless it is paid for, but it is no hardship to carry a 150-pound Saratoga trunk free. Railways, I think, should not be permitted to take advantage of every change in the usages of the people to add to their receipts. The bicycle is in universal use, it is an article of personal convenience, it has come to stay, and to my mind it ought to be considered as baggage in the popular sense of the term. It has been recognized as such in the United States, and by railways that have much less privileges under their charters than railways in Canada. The railways in the United States, and in Europe, have solved this alleged difficulty, of the carriage of bicycles, without much loss of space, by suspending them from the ceiling of the baggage car. To me it seems that it is the duty of railways as common carriers to meet the requirements of the public consistently with the rights of the public. The railway companies in this country are only too ready, yea, too keen to insist upon the strict letter of their privileges, and surely it ought to be the function of this Parliament to see that they do not deviate from the strict line of their duty.

Mr. PENNY.

Mr. LISTER. I do not rise for the purpose of opposing the Bill now before the House; my sympathies are entirely in favour of the measure which has been introduced by my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Casey). The Bill is a short one in itself, and it was difficult for me to understand how my hon. friend could make such a lengthy speech upon the two provisions in this Bill. The Bill, Mr. Speaker, whether it passes this House or not, will go down to posterity as Casey's Bicycle Bill. Men in the United States have attained—shall I say notoriety? No, prominence, by the introduction of just such Bills as this. There is no reason to my mind why a wheelman should not have the right to have his bicycle carried, the same as a passenger has to have his baggage carried. There is just this difficulty about the Bill under consideration, and one almost doubts whether it has received that care and attention which a Bill of such importance should receive at the hand of the promoter. My hon. friend, under the sections of the Bill, provides that railway companies shall carry a bicycle upon the same terms as railway companies are obliged to carry the baggage of a passenger. Of course my hon. friend knows that railway companies are not obliged at all to carry the baggage of a passenger free of charge. What is the result? We pass a law saying to the railway companies: You must carry the bicycle upon the same terms as you carry the baggage of the passenger. Ten thousand, twenty thousand, thirty thousand wheelmen will say: We want our wheels carried free. But to pass this Bill as it stands at present, would put it in the hands of the railway company to say: We are not bound by any law to carry any baggage free; therefore, we will charge the baggage of every passenger who travels upon the railway. The result would be that the wheelmen would be compelled to pay a charge upon their bicycles, and the passengers on the railway train would be compelled to pay for the baggage which is now carried free. I do not pretend to say that this is an insurmountable objection to the Bill. I am inclined to think that the difficulty can be surmounted, but one would think that it would have been much better on the part of my hon. friend to make it compulsory on the part of the railway company, not only to carry the bicycle, but to carry other baggage free to the extent of 150 pounds which they carry now. This Bill, however, does not do that, and the result of passing this Bill might be to force the railway companies into charging what they do not charge for now. Sir, this Bill has been promoted, and this Bill is being supported, by many thousands of the younger men in this country. They undoubtedly have rights, and it is undoubtedly in the power of this Parliament to compel the railway companies to carry the bicycles of travellers who have no other baggage, in all

probability, than the bicycle upon which they ride. We have heard my hon. friend from Elgin lengthily and eloquently advocate the passing of this Bill. There is no argument, I venture to say, that he has not advanced why this Bill should become law; every argument that ingenuity could devise has been advanced by my hon. friend. He has recourse even to anecdotes apropos to the question under consideration. Now, this measure, like everything else in this world, has two sides. There is no doubt that the railway companies have some objection to this Bill, otherwise they would accept the principle without an Act of Parliament to compel them to do so. My judgment is that the wheelmen have the stronger side: my judgment at present is that it would be profitable to the railway companies, and it would not be an inconvenience to the public generally, if this or some other Act similar to it should become law, and therefore I feel as if I should heartily support the measure now before the House. But I think that this Bill, being one relating to railways, should be referred to the Railway Committee, where it could be fully and exhaustively argued pro and con. If that committee is satisfied that this is a proper measure to become law, it will so act, as it always does in the public interest, and will recommend that this Bill become law; on the other hand, if it is not satisfied, it will recommend that this Bill do not become law. Under any circumstances, I think this Bill should be referred to the Railway Committee, where it could be more thoroughly and fully discussed by those in favour of it as well as by those opposed to it. After that has taken place, this House will be in a better position to determine whether it should become law or not. I do not think this Bill as drawn should become law, because I do not think we should leave it to the railway companies to decide in regard to carrying baggage which is now carried free. It now rests with the companies to say that any person who travels with any baggage shall pay to the uttermost farthing. If the railways occupy that position, then it will be competent for them to say that they will or will not carry one wheel for every passenger free. I believe the House will agree with me that this Bill should be referred to the Railway Committee.

Mr. SPROULE. It is somewhat difficult to understand the object which the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) has in view when he endeavoured to throw light on the Bill, because the argument he has advanced is entirely premature. It is not now a question whether the Bill should be referred to the Railway Committee or to a special committee, but the House at the present time is considering the principle of the Bill. The hon. gentleman started out by stating that the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) would probably immortalize his name if he carried this Bill through the House, and that it would be known as "the Casey Bill." If so, I think we might with equal propriety, say that the hon. member for Lambton will immortalize his name by the efforts he is making to kill the Bill, in what he would no doubt call a respectable way, by referring it to the Railway Committee.

Mr. LISTER. That is not a very great compliment to the Railway Committee.

Mr. SPROULE. The whole point of the hon. gentleman's argument was that the Bill should not pass—if a fair interpretation is placed on what the hon. gentleman said. The hon. gentleman expressed sympathy with the Bill, and thought the mover had the weight of argument in his favour, and yet the hon. member for Lambton was quite willing to assist in killing the Bill by sending it to the Railway Committee.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman has no right to make such a broad statement. I asked that it be referred to the Railway Committee for the purpose of hearing all sides, those in favour as well as those opposed to the Bill. Surely that was fair. The hon. gentleman, I do not think, intends to be unfair in his criticism.

Mr. SPROULE. If so, the hon. gentleman should advise the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. LISTER. Certainly.

Mr. SPROULE. Why did the hon. gentleman suggest a reference to the committee? It is plain to any hon. member who has had any experience that the hon. gentleman's aim was to get the Bill before the Railway Committee, because it is easier to kill a Bill there than it is here, and there is not the same record taken of what is said on one side or the other. I take exception to those who hold that a fair interpretation of the law does not include a bicycle as personal baggage. The railway companies admit it is personal baggage because they say that if you put it in a box we will carry it. If it is personal baggage in the one form, it must be so in the other. It is only for convenience of carriage that the railway companies require a bicycle to be carried in one form rather than in another. So long as they admit—and they do admit the principle, because if a bicycle is boxed they are perfectly willing to carry it—that a bicycle is personal baggage, then it becomes a question as to whether the companies should, because it is not convenient in one shape, refuse to carry it at all. The courts of England, of Canada and of the United States hold that "whatever a passenger takes with him for his personal use or convenience according to the habits or wants of the particular class to which he

belongs, either with reference to his immediate necessities or to the ultimate purpose of his journey, must be considered as personal baggage." If this definition be correct, it is "for his use and convenience," and "according to his class." A bicycle must be regarded as personal baggage according to that interpretation. Although there might be a dispute as to that, railway companies practically admit it by agreeing to carry a bicycle if it is boxed up. It is not, therefore, imposing any hardship on the railway companies to compel them to carry a bicycle free, even though it is not boxed, any more than if it is boxed, the only difference being that in the latter case it may be stored away a little more conveniently. That, however, is only a more liberal interpretation of the law than the railway companies themselves are disposed to put upon it. I was amazed at the argument, made by implication rather than by direct statement, that this House should not pass the Bill on the ground that railway companies are not now obliged to carry personal baggage free, and, therefore, if you compel them to regard this as personal baggage, they will refuse to carry any kind of baggage free. We had that species of argument used before; we heard it with respect to second-class return passenger tickets. This is, however, only an apparent danger, and in reality there is no danger whatever in that direction.

Mr. LISTER. Let the Act declare in express terms that the bicycle shall be carried free.

Mr. SPROULE. It may be necessary to go that far. The Toronto street railway carries bicycles free. That is a city having 200,000 people, and it must be a greater concession on the part of that electric railway than it would be on the part of any ordinary railway company. The cars are small and the room is therefore very limited, and yet bicycles are carried as free personal baggage. Surely if an electric street railway company, with limited accommodation in the cars, can carry bicycles free, a similar concession can be granted by the ordinary railway service. Already seven states in the Union have passed laws to carry bicycles free as personal baggage. What has been done there is regarded as right, and the railway companies have carried out the law, after having tested its legality in some instances. One or two of the largest railway companies on the continent have accepted this view and are prepared to carry bicycles as passengers' baggage. The railway companies in those states having accepted the situation, and the electric railway of Toronto having agreed to carry bicycles free, the time seems to have arrived when Parliament should impose a similar duty on the part of our railway companies, provided they will not otherwise do it. Taking all these things into consideration, we would do no injustice to the railway companies by asking them to give a more liberal interpretation of the law. Although perhaps in some cases, this would be inconvenient to the railway companies and would require more space in their cars, there is no doubt in my mind that they would ultimately make money by it. The time is rapidly coming when the force of public opinion will be so strong that neither the Parliament of Canada, nor the railway companies will be able to refuse to carry bicycles as personal baggage.

Mr. CRAIG. I feel that this in an important measure, and one which requires very careful consideration. I was requested by a number of wheelmen in the town in which I reside to support this Bill, and I answered them, that I would give it my best consideration, and if after hearing both sides of the question I could see my way to support it, I would do so. That is the position I take now. I have a natural repugnance to vote for a measure which compels public institutions to do more than they have hitherto been obliged to do, unless it is distinctly shown that what they are asked to do is in the public interest, and will not impose upon them any unfair obligations. I believe that to be a pretty safe position to take on these questions. I was struck by one remark made by the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey), when he said, that this Parliament has the right to dictate anything to railway corporations. It is true in one sense. We have the right, that is we have the power to do it, and I feel that having that power, it imposes upon us the obligation of being very careful as to how we use it. We have the power, but we should never use that power in an unfair way. As was pointed out by the mover (Mr. Casey), we are asked to define baggage. The hon. gentleman told us, that baggage had been defined by a high authority, and he gave us the definition. It occurred to me to ask: why we should be asked to give any specific definition, and to go further than that general definition which has been laid down. If we specify bicycles as baggage, do we say that tricycles are baggage? I see, that as an amendment to the first clause, the sentence is added:

> That checks shall be affixed to any part of baggage having a handle, or to any part to which a check can be affixed.

The question occurs to me now, whether a wheelbarrow would come under this definition of baggage. That may seem an absurd sort of question, but it is a fact that many men who go to work have wheelbarrows, and the question arises, whether that would come under this definition. I do not suppose it would, nor do I suppose that tricycles would come under the definition; so that a man travelling with a tricycle could not have it checked, while another

man could have his bicycle checked. I mention this merely to show that it is rather a dangerous thing for this Parliament, to constitute itself a dictionary to define a word like "baggage" which has a general signification.

Now, why do the railways object to this Bill, and, have they any reasonable ground for objection? I have not read these circulars which have been distributed, but it occurs to me, that one objection is that bicycles are awkward to handle. We know that trunks are jumbled in and out of the baggage car, and we know also that bicycles could not be handled in that way. Trunks are piled indiscriminately in the car, whereas a bicycle would have to be hung up or placed in a rack, and consequently occupy a great deal more space. There is also the risk of breakage. I presume that if the railway companies were compelled to carry bicycles as baggage, they would be held responsible for their safe keeping, and this would be a serious consideration as the bicycle is a very delicate machine, and might be very easily broken. All this shows that the question is not so easy to settle as it would appear at first sight. The hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Penny) mentioned, that bicycles often run out a short distance from the city, and that they want to come back by train. That seems to me to be one very strong objection to the Bill. Suppose thirty, or even fifty bicyclists, go to some station ten miles from Toronto, and buy their tickets which cost them about thirty cents, and when the train comes along they want to return; these young men who go out for amusement could compel the companies to carry their bicycle, although the railway company might not have expected that they would be called upon to provide such accommodation on a train which merely pulled up at the depot. This would undoubtedly cause delay and inconvenience.

It is quite natural that bicyclists should want this privilege, and I sympathize with them in their desire that this Bill should pass. They no doubt think they have a perfect right to it, and I am strongly in favour of it, if it can be accomplished without doing anything unfair to the railway corporations. I heartily approve of giving the Bill a second reading and referring it to the Railway Committee, which is the proper place for such a Bill to go. In the committee, the whole question will be argued by those in favour of granting the privilege, and by those opposed to it, and the members of the committee who like myself are anxious to do what is fair to both parties, will have an opportunity of hearing both sides and deciding on the evidence. The hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) mentioned, that the Toronto Street Railway carries bicycles free. I do not know whether that is so or not; but I believe I saw a paragraph in one of the newspapers to-day or yesterday, which stated, that the Toronto Street Railway had absolutely forbidden its employees to take bicycles on at all. I mention that to show that there are a great many points which ought to be discussed in considering this measure, and the only place where that discussion can properly take place is before the Railway Committee.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to resent the imputation made by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), that the proposal to send this Bill to the Railway Committee is for the purpose of killing it. My experience of that committee is, that it gives careful and full consideration to every Bill that comes before it, and I am quite sure that this Bill will receive fair and reasonable consideration from that committee. I am in favour of its being sent there. The hon. member (Mr. Craig) has raised some very important points, and it is quite proper that the representatives of the railway companies should be heard with regard to their objections to this Bill, and that also those who are interested in its becoming law should have an opportunity of stating their case. When both sides are heard, the Railway Committee will fairly and impartially deal with the whole question, and report to the House pro or con upon it. There is another point to which allusion has already been made. We certainly have not reached such a condition of railway development in this country that we can afford to legislate imprudently with regard to railway corporations. We know that for years they have not been earning the money they anticipated when the original investments were made in them, and I think we should be exceedingly careful about forcing upon them by legislation anything that would damage their credit or interfere with investments in railways in the future. I hope that the railway people, when they come to hear the arguments presented by the advocates of this Bill, will be able to give very sound and good reasons why it should not become law. If they cannot do that, I have no doubt the committee will adopt the Bill and report it to the House. I think it was possibly in an unguarded moment that my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) spoke of the Railway Committee choking or killing the Bill if it went there. I have never known a Bill that went before the Railway Committee that did not receive careful consideration on its merits; and I have never known any Bill to be rejected by that commitee which gave evidence of being a Bill that should be passed. Therefore, I hope that if this Bill passes its second reading, it will go to the Railway Committee, where I am sure all parties will have a full opportunity of presenting their arguments for or against it. Another point worthy of consideration is that raised by my hon. friend

from Lambton (Mr. Lister). I have heard railway managers say that if this Bill passed, and you added to the amount of work they would have to do for nothing, they would be forced to charge for other baggage, in order to earn money in some other way. My hon. friend from East Grey asks why the railways should require bicycles to be boxed up in order to go as baggage. If my hon. friend were going on a journey, and he carried loosely in his hands a number of coats and other things needed for the journey, would he not think it unreasonable to ask the railways to check them in that condition? I think they would insist on their being boxed up in some way, so that they could be handled carefully. The railways may say the same with reference to bicycles. We know that a bicycle is a tender structure, easily damaged, which must be carefully handled; and in being transferred from train to train and coming into collision with trunks, the bicycles might suffer serious damage; and if a baggage car got into a collision, I am afraid they would fare worse then the trunks. The question is whether the railway companies should be responsible, under these circumstances, for bicycles in the same way as they are for ordinary baggage. In England I understand bicycles are not carried free, but for a moderate charge; I do not know whether that is general or not. In the United States some railways carry them free, while others do not. In Canada I should have hoped that the railway companies had decided to carry bicycles as baggage. I think it would have been in their interest if they had done so. But we should avoid legislation of this kind, if we can do it by getting the railway companies and the bicyclists to come together and adopt some reasonable way of getting over the difficulty. I would rather see that done than see this Bill forced through the House in bitter opposition to the railways.

Mr. CASEY. There is no bitter opposition.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the Bill is sent to the committee, and both parties state their case there, the committee will be able to come to an intelligent conclusion on the subject.

Mr. LOUNT. The objections made to the passage of this Bill do not seem to me to be serious, as every member who has spoken so far has endorsed the principle that railways should be compelled to carry bicycles free. I think they express the sentiments of the country generally; and if one is to be guided at all by petitions to this House coming from all parts of the country, it can be very easily seen that there is a unanimous feeling in favour of the passage of the Bill. I have not yet heard any strong reason why it should not become law. It is quite true, as the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) has observed, that there is no law at present that can compel a railway company to carry baggage free. That is, there is no written law; but there is a very well understood law of practice, which existed for many years past, in fact, almost from the very inception of railway enterprises, that they shall not only carry the passenger for his ticket, but also necessarily his baggage to a limited extent free, and properly so. Had it been necessary to pass legislation for the purpose of compelling railway companies to carry baggage free, no doubt long before this there would have been such an Act upon the Statute-book; but as the railway companies have recognized their duty in that respect, there has been no necessity for any such legislation. Therefore, I may safely say that there is an unwritten law practically compelling railway companies to carry baggage free. Then the question arises, whether or not bicyles should be regarded as of that character. One has to have regard to the class of persons who are asking for this legislation. The bicycle traveller carries nothing with him but his wheel, and he would be entitled, when travelling by railway, by the unwritten law I have mentioned, to carry 200 pounds of baggage. The railway company would make no objection whatever to carrying this amount. It is, therefore, not at all unreasonable that being unable to carry anything but his bicycle he should ask that the railway companies be compelled to deal with him as fairly and liberally as they do with ordinary travellers. What objection can there be to this? It cannot matter much whether the baggage be in the shape of a bicycle or a box so long as it does not amount, either in size or weight, to more than the other baggage a traveller would have the right to carry. It surely cannot be urged that a bicycle is more troublesome to carry than the ordinary Saratoga. Probably the best evidence we can obtain as to the reasonableness of this measure is the fact that in eleven states of the union bicycles are now being carried by railways free; and as the railway companies in these states have been able to make arrangements to carry bicylces with the greatest convenience, the objection urged from that point of view does not appear very serious. You will notice, Sir, also that in the United States this law is not confined to any one section but prevails all over from New York to California. Of the intervening states, eleven have legislated in this direction. We are told that we should not press this because the railway companies may possibly put a charge upon baggage. I apprehend no difficulty on that score. My hon. friend from West Lambton has drawn attention to this Bill and pointed out that it is framed in such a way as not to be a benefit to the bicycle owners, if it passes. Well, eliminate a few words, and you make it operative without any difficulty. Strike out in the

second section the words "Within the meaning of this section" and let it read "Bicycles are hereby declared to be baggage, and a passenger shall not be required to protect in any way any bicycle delivered by him for transport," and add these words "and shall be carried free of charge." In this way you make the bicycle baggage, and compel the railway companies to carry it free of charge, and I can see no reason why this Bill should go to the Railway Committee. The first section might be struck out altogether. I would simply take the second section and make it provide that bicycles shall be baggage and shall be carried by railway companies free of charge. That is what the wheelmen are asking for and that can be passed at once if the House approves of it, without any reference to the Railway Committee. But the objection is raised that this ought to be referred to the Railway Committee in order that both sides may be heard. Why, Mr. Speaker, we have heard both sides. The amount of literature which has been sent to every member of this House by railway companies on this matter sets forth every possible objection they can make, and we cannot possibly require any more evidence. The members of this House are quite capable of coming to a conclusion upon the simple question whether bicycles should be baggage or not, without further information from or reference to the Railway Committee. I therefore would urge that this Bill should not be referred to the Railway Committee but be dealt with by the Committee of the Whole House and amended in the way I have pointed out.

Mr. DAVIN. I rise merely to suggest that in such an important measure we ought to hear from the Minister of Railways and Canals. It is clear that if this Bill is to be seriously dealt with and passed into law, that cannot be done without the consent of the Government, and if the Government wish that it should become law, it is perfectly clear that nothing is easier than to pass it. We ought to hear from the Minister of Railways and Canals on this important matter.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I have no objection at all to state the view which has presented itself to my mind and which is entertained by the Government with respect to one question, at all events, which has been spoken of in the present discussion. I gather that the sense of the House on both sides is in favour of allowing this Bill to pass through its second reading. I have no objection to offer to that course. On the contrary, without expressing any personal view as to whether the Bill should ultimately pass into law or not, I am decidedly in favour of the course which seems to be approved by the general sense of the House, of having the second reading taken. I am, however, on the other hand, decidedly of opinion that it is a proper Bill to be referred to the Committee on Railways and Canals. I think that there are features of it and questions involved in it which can be much better dealt with and more satisfactorily disposed of there than in the Committee of the Whole House. That is the view the Government entertain. We feel that as this proposes an amendment to the general Railway Act, it should receive the fullest possible consideration. There are interests which are entitled to be heard and considered. Even those who may most strongly favour the ultimate passage of the Bill will agree that it should be threshed out fully, and that cannot be so efficiently done as by the Railway Committee. If this Bill receives the second reading, I will move that it be referred to that committee, and I will do so without the slightest disposition to prevent it being dealt with by that committee as speedily as circumstances will permit. So far as I am concerned, I am personally prepared to afford every facility for the early consideration of this Bill by that committee, and I regret that the hon. member for East Grey thought it right to assume that a proposal of that kind implied, in any way, a disposition on the part of the mover of the proposal to strangle the measure at its birth. Such an idea is most unfair to the Railway Committee. As far as my observation has extended, that committee has, at all events, evinced a disposition to give every measure before it the fullest and fairest consideration. If the Bill passes its second reading, I shall move that it be referred to that committee, and shall do so, feeling that I am not thereby evincing the slightest hostility to this measure.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair) moved:

That the Bill be referred to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Mr. CASEY. As the promoter of the Bill I wish to say that I am sorry my hon. friend has thought it necessary to refer this Bill to the Railway Committee. It is a Bill of only one clause, containing no intricacies and hardly any points disputed or requiring evidence. I think personally that a Committee of the Whole House could have dealt as well or better with this Bill as the Railway Committee. I hardly like the practice of referring public Bills to a private Bills committee. I do not think it is regular, and I do not think it is in the interest of public legislation. That committee was intended for private Bills, and they take up its time. However, on the excellent assurance we have received from the Minister that he will facilitate the consideration of this Bill in the Railway Committee, and that he has no hostility to the

Bill, and will do nothing to kill it off in that committee, I am satisfied that the Bill will receive fair play before the Railway Committee, will be called in good time, and will have a fair chance of being passed if the majority of members think it a right thing to pass it. Under all these circumstances, I have no objection to the motion of the hon. the Minister of Railways. I have only mentioned my general objections for the purpose of putting them on record for any cases that may arise in the future.

Motion agreed to.

EXPORT BONUS ON BUTTER.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Reid in favour of the payment to farmers of a bonus on a specified quantity of finest fresh creamery butter to be exported to Great Britain.

Mr. DAVIN. It seems to me that the motion is one which ought to commend itself to the House. The hon. the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) when my hon. friend (Mr. Reid) made that motion, contended that the principle of bonusing butter was a bad principle. But we have the tariff before us now, and in that tariff we have the principle of a bonus. We have the iron bonus. If it is a good thing to help the manufacturer of iron by means of a bonus, why should it be a bad thing to help the manufacturer of butter in the same way? The hon. the Minister of Agriculture argued against the bonusing of butter because he said butter had been bonused in Victoria, and butter-making had made great progress there. On the face of it, it seemed to me to be a non-sequitur that the hon. gentleman should refer to the fact that butter had been bonused in Victoria, that it had made great progress there, and that therefore a bonus was not a good thing. It seems to me that the experience of Victoria, where the manufacturer of butter has risen from one million to thirteen millions is an instance in favour of the policy suggested by my hon. friend. Then the hon. Minister of Agriculture pointed to the fact that in Quebec there has been a bonus on butter and he said that, instead of the bonus going into the pocket of the farmer, it had gone into the pocket of the middleman. What did that show? It showed that the legislation was defective, and all we have to do in embodying in an Act the suggestion of my hon. friend, is to avoid the mistake which was made in Quebec. I find, on turning to the Statistical Year-Book of 1895, that the butter imported into Great Britain was 158,238 tons, or 316,476,000 pounds. Of that quantity we exported to Great Britain only 4,970,047 or about one seventy-eighth part of the butter that is imported into Great Britain. The position of the hon. the Minister of Agriculture on this matter seems a strange one. The hon. gentleman takes a great interest in his department. I am glad to say that; I am more forward to say it in his absence than I would be if he were here. I think he takes as great an interest in his department as any Minister could; and those of us on this side who have had any transactions with him have received the impression of an interest in his department, and an efficiency to which we are glad to testify. The hon. gentleman lays it down, in the course of his speech, that Canada is quite capable of producing the very finest kind of butter. In every part of Canada, but especially in that part from which a few of us come, there cannot be the least doubt, we can produce butter the best that can be produced in the world. Well, why should not this House do for the farmer of Canada what it would do for the iron-maker in Canada, and why should we not seek to get part of this immense market that imports every year nearly 160,000 tons of butter? I humbly think that if we adopt the policy of my hon. friend (Mr. Reid) the result will be that we shall stimulate the export of butter to such an extent that we shall make progress somewhat like that made in Victoria, and, instead of sending four million pounds of butter we shall send twenty-four million pounds in a few years. With the cold storage policy that hon. gentlemen have adopted from their predecessors and which the hon. Minister is carrying out with such energy—in fact one of the reasons why I admire him is that one of the subjects that I was pressing on my own friends for two or three years, he took up with exemplary energy which gave me the greatest possible satisfaction—there is no reason why this country should not compete with Denmark in the exportation of butter to the English market. I think that the proposal that something should be done to help our farmers, and to stimulate the manufacture and exportation of this great staple of industry finds favour with those newspapers that have directed their attention to this subject. At one time we were very low in the manufacture of cheese. But, in consequence of the fostering influence of the Government of Canada this has become a staple of export to be reckoned in the very largest figures. Although we can produce good butter just as well as we can produce good cheese, we are still sending to that vast English market, only a sixtieth part of the amount that she imports. Therefore, I would urge on the Government, notwithstanding what has fallen from my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture, to consider this motion favourably, and certainly if it comes to a division, I shall give my vote in its favour.

Mr. McMILLAN. Before this resolution passes I would like to say a word or two. There is no doubt that it is in the interests of Canada at the present time to foster

legitimately, as far as possible, the dairy industry generally, and the butter industry particularly. But let me say that the Government has already a very large sum of money in the Estimates for the benefit of creameries all over the country. Every creamery in the country has the privilege of putting up cold storage, and if they put it up according to instructions, they get $100 for each creamery. The Government have also appropriated a large sum of money for the outlying districts, so that the farmers who are not able to hold their butter until it is marketed, will get the benefit of this large amount of money, which will be used to pay for their milk as it goes into the creamery, and they will refund it when the butter is sold. But apart from that, there are $140,000 in the Estimates this season for the benefit of the creameries. As a farmer I say that that is a large sum of money to be given for our benefit. Let me also add that according to the evidence of the Minister of Agriculture, the system of bonusing creameries in the province of Quebec has not been successful. We have the evidence of people there, at one of their meetings, that except in one instance there had not been a pound of butter manufactured in that province as a result of the bonus. It appears that the persons who manufactured butter from cream and milk sent from Ontario, got a good portion of the bonus, and by this means had built up a little business at the expense of the Quebec legislature. Then there was a committee appointed to draft a resolution strongly advising the discontinuance of the system of granting bonuses to creameries, and also advising the application of whatever money had been voted for the purpose, to increasing and improving the refrigeration accommodation, both by sea and land. Here is the resolution that was passed by that committee that was appointed:

> That this association, having heard that the province of Quebec proposes the discontinuing the bonus to creameries, heartily concurs in the same, and recommends that any further grants be given towards the increasing of refrigeration accommodation.

I believe it is the duty of the Government to do everything that they possibly can to get our goods carried to the British market in the very best possible condition. They have done that, and as a farmer, while I have an interest as shareholder in a creamery to-day, I believe that we are getting all that the farmers in reality ought to get in that direction; and if this comes to a vote, I shall certainly vote as a farmer against giving any bonuses in that direction. We also have evidence from the Australian colonies, where butter has been bonused for a certain length of time, that the butter industry was not benefited by the bonus, showing that their experience has been similar to ours in this country. I hold that the Government is doing all that they ought to do by giving us cold storage, and even assisting to build creameries in outlying districts where it is a necessity that the dairy interest should be encouraged in its inception. I do not know, from the evidence that we have before us, that it would benefit the butter industry to give a bonus for butter; therefore as a farmer I hold that it is not the duty of this Government to give a bonus.

Mr. BRODER. I dissent from the view of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. McMillan. He has quoted from a speech delivered by the Minister of Agriculture on the 7th of April, giving the verdict of the trade in Montreal in reference to the butter bonus in the province of Qubece. Now, Sir, it is quite reasonable to suppose that the men engaged in the produce trade in Montreal would not, in their own interest, favour a bonus. Their object is to wait for the accumulation of stock in the country, to buy it at reduced prices, and hold it in anticipation of a rise in the market; and they would naturally be opposed to the continuous shipment of our butter from the factories week by week. Now, the object of the bonus should be to induce farmers and producers of this article to ship it continuously week after week, while it is fresh, rather than hold it until it becomes stale and unmarketable. It is therefore, quite reasonable to expect that the trade would not want the butter to be shipped from the factory through the city of Montreal without passing through their hands. I am somewhat surprised to hear the hon. gentleman from Huron (Mr. McMillan), who is a farmer himself, take the view that he has taken. Now, the Minister of Agriculture held that the bonus did not increase the product of butter in the province of Quebec. Well, his statement is at variance with the statements of the Department of Agriculture in that province. I hold in my hand a statement issued by the Department of Agriculture of Quebec as to the increase of the number of factories in that province during certain years, a part of those years being covered by the two years that the bonus was granted. For the sake of comparison I will take the liberty of giving the House the figures of the number of creameries and cheese factories. In the year 1890, in the province of Quebec, there were 617 cheese factories; that number had increased to 1,467 in 1894. In 1890 the number of butter factories was 111, and in 1894 there were 307; and last year there were, in round numbers, 400. Now, Sir, that proves without doubt that the bonusing system in the province of Quebec, although giving only a small amount, 1 cent per pound, largely increased the butter product in that province. Now, notwithstanding the fact that the cheese industry stands on such good footing, and holds its own against all competitors in the English

market, I question whether it would not be wise for the people of Canada, and particularly for the farming interest, to keep these two industries more evenly balanced than they are. When we look at the condition of things in the United States with reference to dairying we find—I am now quoting from memory from a report of the Secretary of Agriculture for the United States—that in 1894, which is the last report I have been able to secure, they had 16 million milch cows in the United States, and they had 36 million of other cattle, steers and those that were non-milkers. Now, if they saw fit, they could easily have 30 million milch cows in three or four years, by ceasing to keep steers and fat cattle, and by turning their attention instead to keeping dairy-cows. Therefore, we ought to be on the alert, for I noticed in the "Gazette" of Montreal, of the 7th of April, a statement there that the Department of Agriculture in the United States are already proposing to send commissioners over to England to inquire into the condition of the market there, and to endeavour to secure the English market for American butter. For this purpose they are going to move on the very line adopted by the old Government in Canada, and continued by the present Government. What I wish to call the attention of the House to is this fact, that if there is anything the Canadian people can do to place their butter on the English market, we should do it. The only system by which this can be done is by placing the butter on the market every week while it is fresh; but you cannot induce the farmer to do this while butter commands only low prices, for he considers the question of prices as much as does the speculator. He wants to hold his product for higher prices, just as does the speculator, and he will not ship it unless he is specially induced to do so while it is fresh. We cannot secure the English market for our butter unless the product we send over is fresh. I am surprised at the position taken by the Minister of Agriculture, because he seems to lose sight of the fact that the logical conclusion of the cold storage system is to keep the product fresh and in good condition, and thus enable it to find its proper place in the market. In regard to Australia and Victoria being benefited by the bonus system, we must remember that these colonies have given a larger bonus than that brought to the attention of the House. They have given 4 cents per pound. Hon. members can well understand how such a bonus has built up the trade. Instead of lopping it off at once, it would have been very much better to have taken off one cent of the bonus, say each year. I have here a statement showing the increase of the product of butter in the colony of Victoria during the six years in which the bonus was granted, as follows:—

	Pounds.	Value.
1888	1,202,649	£ 54,369
1889	1,019,230	37,447
1890	1,626,605	60,327
1891	4,652,344	236,336
1892	7,093,344	355,700
1893	13,975,633	573,107

If hon. gentlemen will look at the money received for this number of pounds of butter and take the trouble to notice the prices, they will find that the prices received by this colony in the English market were very good prices; and when they are compared with the prices of Canadian butter, it will be found that the Australian colonies realized a larger difference than that between bonus and no bonus, and that they realized more than 4 cents per pound above the ordinary price. This shows that not only did the people of Victoria get back the 4 cents per pound owing to their butter being fresh and in good condition, but that notwithstanding the Government had paid 4 cents per pound bonus, they received 4 cents additional, or 8 cents in all. This is a matter that should be dealt with on business principles. The farmers cannot understand why $2,000,000 can be expended on militia and $10,000 only in promoting the butter interest. There is no use fighting when there is no bread in the House. We should expend $1,000,000 of the $2,000,000 voted for militia on the farmers. They are loyal in their affection for the country. It is about time to take up and seriously consider the interests of our farmers. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about what they are doing for the farmers. Their proposals are calculated to benefit the well-to-do farmer who has money, but the poor farmer who is struggling with an unimproved farm and who has a few cows, will be assisted very little by the propositions of hon. gentlemen opposite.

The main reason why Canadian butter does not occupy a better place in the English market is that it is shipped when it is too stale. The Commissioner of Agriculture of the province of Quebec took the trouble to send commissioners to England. He asked certain questions in regard to the trade, and to those questions he received replies from men largely interested in the butter trade in the old country, and five out of seven of those firms answered Question 4—Why does not our butter realize a better price?—with the statement that it reached the market too stale. In some instances, it is too salt; but in almost every case the reason it does not realize a better price is because it is too stale. We know that France ships fresh butter to that market, and although that butter is very inferior to our Canadian butter, it realizes a better price, because it is fresh and very slightly salt. The people of England can inhale all the salt they require from their atmosphere, and do not need to take it in their butter; but our farmers think they must put it

in large quantities in their butter for keeping purposes. If they take out of that butter all foreign matter, it will practically keep itself. The difficulty arises from not being able to keep out foreign matter, and thus butter becomes strong and rancid; but if the butter were carefully made and subsequently kept under the cold storage system, there is no reason why it should not reach the English market in a fresh condition and be able to meet all competitors. I venture to say that the Canadian people as a whole are prepared to support the proposition contained in the motion of my hon. friend from South Grenville (Mr. Reid).

I wish to answer the statement made that under a bonus system not one dollar goes into the pocket of the farmer. That appears to be the conclusion reached by the Minister of Agriculture, who said there was no benefit resulting from such a system and that it did not increase the price of butter received by farmers. If the money did not reach the farmers, of course it could not do any good to them. If, however, the butter trade in Montreal received the money, then why were they opposed to the bonus system? I have had some experience in the trade, and I am aware that speculators are satisfied to make half a cent a pound profit. If the men in the trade could get one cent per pound Government bonus, they would be well paid on their transactions. They would be the last men in the world to advocate a discontinuance of the bonus if the money went into their pockets. I venture to say that all the trade are not opposed to the bonus system. Now, Sir, I have here a statement made by a very prominent dealer in Montreal, and he spoke rather favourably of the bonus in the province of Quebec. In the report of the Minister of Agriculture of the province of Quebec for 1895, he gives a statement made by Mr. A. A. Ayer, one of the largest produce dealers not only in Montreal but in Canada. I am quite aware that Mr. Ayer afterwards advocated the discontinuance of the bonus, but he did so for the simple reason that he declared the bonus had already done its work. He said:

> The bounty has had the effect of stimulating the exportation of butter. This trade promises to turn out much more satisfactorily than in the past. We are surprised at the number of demands we receive. Our stock of butter at the present moment is very low, and we expect high prices for the month of October and for next winter. Our exports, up to last Saturday, amounted to 38,500 boxes or tubs, against 20,786 at the same date last year, and we think that about 6,000 tubs will be shipped this week, which will still further increase the difference over last year.

In that statement, he is referring to the exports of his own firm only, and not to the trade generally. That is the position that Mr. Ayer took in 1895 in reference to the effect of bonusing in the province of Quebec. I wish to say in connection with the question, that if there was a failure in the province of Quebec, and if the money did not reach the people for whom it was voted, and if the effect was not that which was desired, nevertheless it ought to be within the competence of hon. gentlemen opposite to so devise a scheme, that the money will reach the proper parties, and that the effect will be what it is intended to be. The certificates under which this butter was shipped from the province of Quebec were such, that if the scheme had been carried out properly, it would have resulted in the commendable object they had in view. I venture to say, that this Government should give a higher bonus than one cent a pound. I would advocate 3 cents a pound bonus and I would advocate that after a few years, one cent a year should be taken off; thus bringing the trade back to its normal condition, without a bonus. In that way, the effect would not be disastrous on our trade. The Government must induce our people to ship the butter over to the English market, when it is fresh, or we will never secure that market. The trade in England is handled entirely different from what it is in Canada. If you get a customer for Canadian butter he wants to get his supply constantly, and in good condition. He does not want to go to the market one week and get Canadian butter, and the next week being unable to get Canadian butter to be compelled to take Danish or Australian butter. When a dealer gets customers for a good article of butter, he wants to continue giving them that article. The difficulty has been, that when a dealer goes into the large markets, such as Liverpool and London, he may get a fair article of Canadian butter one week, he puts that on his counter and gets a class of customers who like it; but when he goes back to the markets of London or Liverpool next week, he cannot get Canadian butter up to the former standard, and so he has to take something else. He cannot get a constant supply of good Canadian butter, and consequently his customers will demand something better. If our Canadian butter were put on the English market in good shape it would find customers, and if it were furnished of uniform quality and continuously, these customers would continue to use it, and so create a demand. I hope, Sir, that if we have any other member in this House who will represent the farming interest with the earnestness of the hon. gentleman from Huron (Mr. McMillan), he will take a different line of argument, and one more in harmony with the interests of the farming community.

Mr. ROGERS. I wish to say one word in connection with this matter. I did not expect that it would have been brought up to-night, and so I am not prepared to deal with the question at length. I, for one, would be very sorry to say a word in any

way which would throw the least damper on any policy calculated to encourage the farming industries of this country. This has been a live question for me for many years back, and I have always felt that in the past we have not received that consideration from the Government which we should have received. One of my strong complaints against the late Government was, that they did not attend to the interests of the farming community as the importance of that community demanded. I claim that the Government of Canada has been doing for the farmers during the last three or four years, only what they should have done for us years ago. We all know the high stand which our Canadian cheese has taken in the English market, and we know also, that it has worked its way up slowly and gradually to that high place, with but very little encouragement from the Government. We have had very little assistance in any way, in the shape of schools or instructors throughout the country, both of which have been the growth of later years. Many years ago the cheese market was entirely in the hands of the Americans. Their Government advanced the interests of the American farmers, while our Government was in the background in that respect. The Canadian farmers, much to their credit, took this matter into their own hands, and brought up Canadian cheese to its present standard in the English market. We have felt for a number of years, that Canadian butter has not taken the place it should take in the old country markets. It was not shipped in a proper state, and it was kept too long and became stale. Another reason which told against it was, that it was all dairy butter, made indiscriminately of all grades and shapes, and even if it had been shipped directly, under these circumstances it could not have competed with the butter from other dairying countries. Of late years, however, butteries and creameries have been established not only in the summer but in the winter as well, and this has given a great impetus to our trade in that article. If I thought for a moment that Government bonusing of butter would be of lasting benefit to the farmers of Canada, I would be sorry to say anything against it; but I do feel that the stand which the Government has now taken will for the present at all events fill the Bill. We farmers on the whole, have always contended in the past, that the bonusing of exports in any branch of trade was against our interests. We have advocated that strongly, and we propose to continue advocating it, and not to ask for any bonuses. Give us a fair show in a legitimate way, and I believe we can hold our own with any country in the world. It is quite evident to me, that the small bonus which has been mentioned here, of one cent a pound, would not in any way increase the export of our butter. Our main object is to get lower freight rates and better accommodation in the shape of cold storage. I am very glad to see the stand which the present Government have taken this year, by appropriating such a large amount of money to encourage cold storage. If the farmers were so encouraged that they could secure a uniform market which they could rely upon, a market that would not be glutted and the prices brought down to a starvation basis, then they would have a better chance of selling their butter in the English market, and of increasing its reputation there. I would not advocate that the Government should commence any other system, until they had given their present system of supplying cold storage, a fair opportunity of proving whether it will be successful or not. If our butter trade in the English market does not increase in consequence of this policy, then we shall have to look out for something else. At the present time, we do not believe in the principle of bonuses, and we do not ask for it this year. I believe that when the present policy of the Government in regard to this matter has had a fair trial it will be so successful that we will not have to ask for a bonus, and so it will give us stronger ground on which to take our stand against the bonusing of any other industry.

Mr. REID. I must say that I am surprised at the course taken by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan), and the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) in regard to this resolution. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) has been in this House for a number of years, and has been regularly speaking in the interest of the farmers, claiming that they were in a very bad state, and that the Government should do something to assist them. He mentions that there is now a vote of $140,000 in the Estimates in the interest of the farmers. I take it for granted that he means item No. 83:

> To promote dairying interests by advances for milk and cream, and for making butter and cheese, to be recouped out of the proceeds of sales of such butter and cheese to be placed to the credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

As I understand this item, any money to be advanced to the farmers has to be recouped out of the proceeds of sales. In that case the farmers are not getting any benefit whatever except the use of the money. Would not any business man go into any business in this country if the Government would put up the money in the same way? The resolution I propose would give a direct benefit to the farmers. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers), if I remember rightly, took a strong stand during the last campaign against giving bounties. I do not know whether or not he will be in favour of the bounties on iron; but I take it for granted that he will be. If that is the case, we shall find him favouring the bounty on iron and opposing

the bounty I asked to be given to the farmers. Now, in figuring up the amount that I would like placed in the Estimates for the farmers this year, say $10,000, I find that it would amount to about one-fifth of a cent a head of the population of the Dominion to-day. I believe people who are living in the cities and towns and villages, and who are dependent on the farmers, would gladly pay their share towards this bonus. I was strongly pressed by both Liberal and Conservative farmers in my constituency to urge this matter on the Government. It is not a party matter at all; it is a matter I believe in the interest of the farmers, and in the interest of the public as a whole. I believe that the large amount of money that would be brought into this country by the increased quantity of butter that would be sold in the English market would be of great benefit to this country; and I am especially surprised to find the two gentlemen who I thought would be the most willing to support this resolution, taking the stand they do this evening. In view of that, I ask that the fact be placed on record.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). In the absence of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), I would suggest that my hon. friend have this matter again adjourned. The arguments which have been brought forward, for my part, I do not feel competent to answer; but when the Minister of Agriculture is in his seat again, he will no doubt be prepared to give his views on the subject. I would therefore move that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. WALLACE. Will the hon. the leader of the Government give the House to understand that he will see that the matter is brought before the House again? Otherwise I think it should be disposed of to-night.

The PRIME MINISTER. I will undertake to have it brought up again.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 6th May, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE TUG "LILY."

Mr. McMULLEN asked:

(a.) What was the date on which the tug "Lily" was first engaged by the Dominion Government?

(b.) The name or names of the owner or owners?

(c.) The estimated value of the tug?

(d.) The number of days employed each year from her first engagement and the gross number of days?

(e.) The hire paid per day and the gross amount of hire paid to date?

(f.) Was hire paid on Sundays as well as other days?

(g.) Where do the owners reside, and where has the tug been used?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). The following are the answers to the hon. gentleman's questions:—(a.) On 1st June, 1884. (b.) W. B. & S. Anglin—from 1st June, 1884, to 31st August, 1891. S. Anglin & Co.—from 1st September, 1891, to date. (c.) From $1,000 to $1,500.

(d and e.)

Fiscal Year ended 30th June.	No. of days.	Rate per day.	Amount.	Less, received by owners during spare hours.	Amount paid.
		$	$	$	$
1884	25	4	100	.....	100
1885	107	4	428	.....	428
1886	85	4	340	.....	340
1887	104	4	416	.....	416
1888	106	4	424	.....	424
1889	152	4	608	80	528
1890	114½	4	458	.....	458
1891	129	4	516	37	479
1892	141	4	564	12	552
1893	158	4	632	.....	632
1894	75½	4	302	1	301
1895	107	4	423	10	418
1896	84	4	336	.....	336
Totals	1,388	....	5,652	140	5,412

(f.) Hire for tug not paid for Sundays. (g.) In Kingston, Ontario; tug used in Kingston harbour.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Firman McClure, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Colchester, introduced by the Prime Minister (Mr. Laurier) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding).

HUDSON'S BAY EXPEDITION.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to interrogate the Government with reference to the Hudson's Bay expedition, which is a matter of very deep concern to the people of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and the time for the departure of which is close at hand. We hear rumours in the lobbies, and I have seen statements in the newspapers, that the vessel which the Government propose to send out to investigate the navigability of the straits is not at all suited for the purpose. In fact, it is stated that this vessel is entirely too small and too light and en-

tirely unfitted for ice navigation. I may also say that I had a conversation with Mr. Hugh Sutherland, the president of the Winnipeg and Hudson's Bay Railway, and he leads me to understand that he has looked very carefully into the arrangements made, and, in his opinion, the boat is not at all a satisfactory one for the purpose. I have also learned from certain conversations I have had that the impression exists that the men who are to be sent out in charge of the expedition have not the necessary experience to conduct an expedition of that kind. I should like to have a statement from the hon. Minister of Marine regarding this expedition. I should like him to tell us exactly the kind of boat that has been chartered, and, if possible, submit to us some evidence as to the character and fitness of that boat for the purpose. The hon. gentleman might also inform the House as to the ability of the man who has been selected to take charge of the expedition. This is a matter in which this House and the country are very deeply interested, especially Manitoba and the North-west Territories. For the last ten or fifteen years——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must not go into a discussion of the question.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have but two or three words to say in conclusion, but I shall resume my seat, Sir, if you think I have gone far enough.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman has gone far enough.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The subject to which the hon. gentleman has brought the attention of the House is a very important one. Some questions were asked in the Senate to-day concerning it, and I had some information prepared this morning in order to answer the questions in the Senate and that information I shall be very happy to give to the hon. gentleman now. When the House last year voted some $35,000 for this expedition, I felt it was desirable to have the very best boat that could be obtained for the purpose. After thinking the matter over and consulting with my colleagues, I came to the conclusion that it was absolutely essential that the gentleman placed in command of the expedition should be one who would have the confidence of the Canadian public. I am happy to say that I think I have been able to select a gentleman who will command that universal confidence. Commander Wakeham has been for many years in command of "La Canadienne" in the Gulf fisheries. His record in the Marine Department stands very high. I think my hon. friend opposite (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), who was in charge of the department before me, will endorse what I say, that there are very few men better qualified to command an expedition of that kind, both from his experience and education, and it was with the greatest satisfaction that I found myself enabled to procure his services to command this expedition.

The next point that occupied our attention was the class of vessel to be sent over. There were many conflicting opinions, and I did not attempt to rely upon my own judgment in the matter at all. I had many consultations with Commander Wakeham and the other nautical advisers of my department, Captain McElhinney and others, and we determined that the best boat for the purpose would be one of the ships employed in the sea fisheries for the Newfoundland sealers. I sent a special agent to Newfoundland to examine the ships, and one that was recommended the highest was the steamer "Hope," which had been engaged by Commander Peary, the United States Arctic navigator, for two years previously. She was a vessel of 452 tons gross and 307 net, with a horse-power of seventy, and a speed of eight knots, but she was already engaged, and her owners would not charter her for the expedition. There was a sister ship called the "Diana," which we were fortunate enough to secure. Some misconception exists about this vessel. She was built twenty-two years ago, and there were rumours to the effect that she was not suitable, but the important fact was ignored that the "Diana" is a Dundee sealer screw-boat, was rebuilt entirely in 1892. She has a tonnage of 473 gross and 275 net, almost the same as the "Hope," with a horse-power of seventy and a speed of nine knots. Mr. Whitely, the officer of the fishery department in Newfoundland, after examining all the ships there, recommended this one as the most suitable, and I am happy to be able to say that we were able to charter her and she will probably leave Halifax the 20th of this month. The gentleman to whom my hon. friend refers, Mr. Hugh Sutherland, entered into correspondence with the department, and intimated that a vessel of the build, size and tonnage of the "Diana" would not be suitable for this expedition. He desired that we should engage a very large steamer of 2,000 or 3,000 tons, made of steel, as being more suitable; but on referring the matter to the nautical advisers in the department, they one and all advised against such a vessel being taken. They thought a steel vessel not suited, that she would be too unwieldy, and being of steel would not be at all suitable for the arduous work she will be engaged in as a vessel specially built to resist the action of the ice. I had placed in my hands as far back as last December, a letter from Admiral Markham, who has had a good deal of experience in the navigation of ice waters, and who intended at one time, or hoped to be able, to accompany this expedition. When I heard of his desire, I at once forwarded an invitation to him on behalf of the Can-

adian Government to accompany the expedition and give us the benefit of his valuable services. I regret to say that Admiral Markham finds himself unable to accept the invitation, and he has recommended in his place Captain Burke of the Royal Navy. The moment I had an intimation from him that Captain Burke would be a suitable man, I at once asked him to take Admiral Markham's place on the expedition. As this is a subject of great importance, I will read, if the House will permit me, the letter which Admiral Markham wrote, on the 14th December last, on the subject of this expedition and the proper kind of vessels to employ. The letter was written to Col. Harris, and was forwarded to me by Col. Harris' attorney. He said:

I find that here are two Dundee whalers that would be available for Hudson Strait next summer, viz.: the "Terra Nova," of about 600 tons, and the "Esquimaux," of about 450 tons. Both would be admirably adapted for the purpose we should require, namely, to report on the state of the ice in the strait during the summer months. As they will be employed in the Newfoundland sealing in March, either of them could be delivered over at St. John, Nfld., on the 1st of May. The price of the "Terra Nova" would be $500 per month for five months certain, and $350 per month after that period. To be insured for $11,000. The "Esquimaux" would be $400 per month for five months, and $300 afterwards. To be insured for $6,000.

This, of course, simply means ship and machinery, and does not include crew, coal, stores or provisions. If chartered, they would like their present captains to accompany the ship, not necessarily in any official capacity, although they might be usefully employed as ice-masters, for they are both experienced ice navigators. If the Canadian Government have voted $35,000 for the survey of Hudson Strait, I do not see why they should not charter one or other of these ships. They possess a speed of about 8 knots, and are especially constructed for ice navigation. Please command me, if I can do anything further in the matter; of course, their owners would like to know as soon as possible, for if not chartered, they will be employed whaling in the summer.

Mr. FOSTER. Does he mention what the horse-power was?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No; it was a speed of eight knots. I at once instituted inquiries, and found what the horse-power was, and I found the horse-power of the "Esquimaux" recommended by him, was seventy. I instructed Mr. Whitely, a fishery officer in our employ, to examine each of these ships. I have already said that I was unable to obtain the "Hope." He reported in favour of the "Diana," and he says that the speed, size, and strength of the "Diana" are just about the size, speed, and strength recommended by Admiral Markham. The "Diana" is the faster by one knot than the one he suggested. I was in hopes that we would be able to obtain the services of Captain Bartlett, a very experienced ice navigator, and I tendered him an offer. I may say that I did not chaffer with him about the pay, but unfortunately, after considering the matter for some time, he had in view another appointment of a more permanent character which he accepted, and which prevented him from accepting the position of sailing master. We then looked about in all directions to obtain a first-class man, and we settled upon Captain Whitely, who has been for several years in the employment of Messrs. Job Brothers, and who lately has been in command of some sealing vessels in British Columbia. Finding he was qualified for that position, I telegraphed him and he accepted the appointment, and is now in command of the "Diana." So that the House will see that we have chartered a ship about the size, about the speed, and about the horse-power recommended by Admiral Markham. Now, with respect to the "Port Pirie" steamer which was recommended by Mr. Hugh Sutherland, I referred the matter of her selection to Commander Wakeham, and he reported to me that she would not be at all suitable. He said that the owners did not seem to have a great deal of faith in her ability to carry out the work, themselves, and they proposed that we should insure the ship to her full value and take all risks. Commander Wakeham did not feel disposed to accept that risk, and he reported that:

Handiness is of as much consequence in ice as power. Many ice-masters would say, more. Bartlett speaks of the "Hope" being a good vessel, because she is handy, can turn and manœuvre quickly.

Admiral Markham says, in his paper "On the Hudson Bay Navigation," a ship with quick manœuvering powers will have an enormous advantage over one whose turning powers are indifferent, while threading her way through lanes of water in a loose pack.

"Diana" is such a ship with quick manœuvering power. There is no intimation that the "Port Pirie" was orginally built for ice work. Her owners are the Anglo-Australasian Steam Navigation Company; this does not sound like ice. She must be unhandy, owing to her great length. Her coal consumption must be altogether too large to permit of her remaining north through a long season. It would never do to load her deeply with coal and put her in ice. She would not work under sail, and can have no provision for lifting her screw clear of ice, or replacing a broken blade.

The "Port Pirie" is the ship suggested by Mr. Sutherland.

As regards sending ordinary steel or iron vessels into ice, I would call the Minister's attention to the case of the "Miranda." Four or five seasons ago, some American scientists chartered this steamer in New York for a season's trip to Northern Labrador. They were warned that she was not safe, but decided that for a summer trip it would be all right. They had only got a short way north of Belle Isle when they struck what seemd to be a small piece of ice; the vessel was stove in and sunk in a short time. The passengers and crew were saved and brought back in a fishing schooner. The "Miranda" had been running between New York and St. John's, Nfld., for some years, and was considered a strong boat. The case of the "Miranda" is a fair specimen

of what we might expect when in light ice with an ordinary iron or steel ship.

Acting upon these recommendations, I determined not to charter a steel ship, but to charter the best sailing seal ship in the Newfoundland seal service. We were fortunate enough to secure the "Diana," a vessel reported well of in every respect. I regret very much that there seems to be a doubt existing in the minds of the uninformed, as to the capacity and strength of this ship. Now that she is rebuilt, she is confounded with the old "Diana" before she was rebuilt, but this is an entirely different vessel. She is now strengthened and rebuilt in every way, and fit to cope with the difficulties which she must necessarily encounter in the Hudson's Bay.

Mr. FOSTER. Has Captain Burke accepted the invitation?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not heard that he has accepted the tender that has been made to him through his agent here. We have, therefore, Commander Wakeham in charge of the expedition, the officer who will be directly responsible to the department, and who will make the report. We have Captain Whitely as sailing master, and we have succeeded in getting a man from Nova Scotia, Captain McCormick, I think, who has been some twenty-five years visiting Hudson's Bay, and who speaks Eskimo, and can act as translator. We have a crew of Newfoundland sailors engaged, men selected by Whitely as sailing master, and we have some specialists who go forward to take meteorological, geological and other observations during the summer months that she will be in the Bay.

Mr. FOSTER. You said you had not heard from Captain Burke, but were corresponding through his agent here. Is Captain Burke a man of business?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, I say that Captain Burke was the gentleman nominated by Admiral Markham, and Captain Burke is one of the promoters of the Hudson Bay and Pacific Railway Company. The attorney for the Company in Ottawa, presented his name to me, and after consultation I decided to accept him, and notified the attorney in Ottawa to that effect. He has cabled the offer to Captain Burke, and I am in hopes that Captain Burke will accompany the expedition. Therefore, we think the "Diana" is in every way well equipped and prepared for the expedition. Commander Wakeham is now making the necessary preparations to equip the vessel in every proper way. No pains have been spared to make everything complete, in order that the experiment may be a thoroughly reliable one. Instructions have been given to the commander that he is to proceed to the entrance of Hudson Straits at the earliest possible moment when experience has shown that any vessel could possibly enter there; that he is to remain cruising in and out of the straits for so long as there is any difficulty in the way whatever. When he has finished and settled the spring navigation of the straits, he will then proceed to Hudson's Bay proper, and test the fishing capacity of those waters. The steamer will carry with her a detachment of men from the Geological Survey. One detachment will be landed on the north shore of the straits and another detachment on the south side to make geological explorations, and they will be brought back by the steamer in the autumn. It has been reported to me that some American whalers have for a series of years visited Cumberland Sound, north of Hudson's Bay Straits, and have acted as if they owned the country; and my instructions to Commander Wakeham were to proceed up the Sound, to take as formal possession of the country as possible, to plant the flag there as notice that the country is ours, and take all necessary precautions to inform natives and foreigners that the laws must be observed, and particularly the customs laws of Canada. After consultation with Dr. Dawson of the Geological Survey, I adopted that course in regard to a matter, which he considers of very great importance. That gentleman seemed to think that if encroachments were allowed to be made and to continue, they might result in diplomatic questions arising within a few years, and we determined to anticipate any possible difficulty by asserting our sovereign rights in the most marked and distinct manner possible. If I have not answered the question put by my hon. friend, I shall endeavour to do so, and I am prepared to give any further information to hon. members of the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries did not answer the question that I intended to ask, if I did not ask it, namely, who will be the representative of the Manitoba Government; will the North-west Territories be represented; also, if they have applied for representation, and the reasons why the application was refused, if it was refused?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I may say, in answer to my hon. friend, that the Government considered the question of having on board the vessel a representative specially and particularly from Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and they determined that it was right and proper that such a concession should be made. After communicating with the authorities there, we determined to appoint a gentleman. Mr. Fisher was nominated as a gentleman who would be suitable for that position; his nomination was accepted by me, and I notified the Manitoba Government that he could go. He

has had notice sent him, of course if he accepts—and I have reason to believe he will—he will go as the representative specially of Manitoba and the North-west Territories.

Mr. HUGHES. Is he a member of the Manitoba legislature ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not know. I am aware that he comes from that part of the world ; his name is James Fisher.

Mr. DAVIN. I am very glad the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) has brought this matter up ; and as it is desirable that a full understanding should be arrived at in regard to this expedition, and as the hon. member for Lisgar did not take the step that would enable hon. members who are interested in it to ask questions, make suggestions and discuss it, I will take the course which will enable that to be done.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will move the adjournment of the House ?

Mr. DAVIN. Yes. From the last words which fell from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the reply he gave to my question as to whether the North-west Territories were to be represented on this expedition, it appeared that our desire is not to be realized.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I must have misunderstood the hon. gentleman. We are sending on the expedition a gentleman who is specially to represent the North-west and Manitoba.

Mr. DAVIN. The question I asked was : Whether the North-west Territories would have a representative.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not understand that the hon. gentleman wanted to have a representative distinct and apart from Manitoba ; in other words, that he wished to have two representatives sent on this expedition.

Mr. DAVIN. We do not regard ourselves as identical with Manitoba. We knew there was to be a representative from Manitoba, and the question I asked was, whether the North-west Territories would be represented, and the hon. gentleman told me it would. We do not consider when a man is taken from Manitoba that the North-west is represented. That statement seems to amuse the Prime Minister and to give a sense of humor to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries ; nevertheless if the hon. Premier when he made a visit to the North-west had made his stay a little longer, he would have become more westernized, and he would now understand that we do not regard ourselves as subsidiary to Manitoba or identical with that province.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I could not see the boundary line.

Mr. DAVIN. There is a good deal the hon. gentleman could not see when he was there. His sunny ways not only dazzled the people but his sense of fact was hypnotized. I do not think the information given to the House by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries can be considered satisfactory, especially by the North-west. It is not interested in the questions which alone can be settled by this expedition, according to the explanation given by the hon. Minister—whether a sealer can make its way through Hudson's Bay and Straits and live there, and what fishing facilities may prevail, and how long Hudson's Bay may be navigable for such a vessel. These are the three questions which the Minister thinks will be settled by this expedition. But in not one of these questions is the North-west directly interested. What the North-west is interested in is this, whether a vessel that can carry North-west products to the English market can live in those seas and can be navigated, and for how long a time each year. It is not the navigability of Hudson's Bay by a sealer that is to be solved, but it is the navigability of Hudson's Bay by a commercial vessel ; and not by a vessel of 275 tons net, which would be unable to do any business for the North-west or Manitoba, but by a vessel of 3,000 net and possessing many hundreds of horse-power. Therefore, the answer given by the Minister will certainly not be satisfactory to the North-west. Suppose Commander Wakeham, who I may say I have heard is not a man who has ice knowledge and who I am told has had no experience to fit him for the command of this expedition, although I am told he is a good commander in the work in which he is engaged—should come back from the command of the refurbished "Diana" and report that he was able to live for a certain number of months in those seas, and that he found them navigable, is there not the same uncertainty as to whether a commercial vessel would find them navigable ? If the offer made by Milburn &, Company had been accepted—an offer that placed at the disposal of the Minister a ship of adequate capacity, and at a risk that was not large—better results might have been anticipitated. A difficulty appears to have arisen in regard to insurance of the vessel. The Government could have insured the vessel for a certain number of dollars. If she had been lost, Lloyd's would have paid her value. This was, therefore, a mere trifling matter. And yet, that is held by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to be a bugbear that cannot be got over. I should like if the Minister had explained—and there will be nothing to prevent him speaking again—to what question, and by whom was the question put, to which Admiral Markham sent that letter in reply. If the real problem had been placed before Admiral Markham, the

chances are that he might have sent a very different letter from that. What we want to know is, not how a little sealer can get along in the Hudson's Bay, but how a vessel that would carry cattle, and grain, and the produce of the North-west Territories would get on. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) left me in doubt, as to whether he had had any communication direct with Captain Burke. He seems to have communicated with both Admiral Markham and Captain Burke indirectly.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend (Mr. Davin) is mistaken. I communicated with both of them through their agent, who communicated with me. They first opened communication with me through their agent, and I directed my answers to the agent whom each of them had respectively chosen.

Mr. DAVIN. I should like to see what was the character of the communication that was made to Admiral Markham, and what question was placed before him, because it might turn out that the letter sent to him would actually suggest such an answer as he has given, and limit him in his answer. If the real problem was placed before him by saying: We want to test this outlet for the great North-west Territories and Manitoba; we want to see whether that grand bay is capable of being used, as most Canadians believe it can be used, for sending our grain and cattle at a short transit across the Atlantic, and we want to know it as soon as possible. If Admiral Markham received a communication of that kind, I am inclined to think that he would not have suggested a petty little vessel of 275 tons. That vessel can come back, and the commander can make his report, and say: I have been successful, and I found the fishing good; but, Sir, there would be still the uncertainty as to whether or not this could be made a great commercial highway. Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I know my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) would not like to have a false impression created in the country. When he refers to this as a little vessel of 275 tons, that is not the proper way to express it. The "Diana" is a vessel of 475 tons, but when you deduct, as they do deduct, to arrive at the net tonnage——

Mr. DAVIN. I said 275 tons net.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Two hundred and seventy-five tons net is the tonnage of the vessel, when all deductions are made for space utilized on board. The vessel is actually 475 tons, and she is not a small vessel, but a large one.

Mr. DAVIN.

Mr. McGREGOR. I live on the Detroit River and we have a ferry crossing that river every five or ten minutes during the winter months. We have tried all kinds of iron boats, steel boats and wooden boats, and we have found that the best for the service is a vessel much similar to the "Diana." A 475-ton vessel is quite a large vessel. The gentlemen in charge of the expedition will undoubtedly take instruments with them to ascertain the depth of the water, and they can find out on a small vessel whether it is deep enough for navigation by larger vessels. For more than one hundred years the Hudson's Bay Company has been navigating those waters, and as they have preserved the records of the different trips, there is no doubt of the navigability of Hudson's Bay. The question to be solved by this expedition is in reference to the currents, and also in reference to ascertaining how long each year they can navigate through the Hudson Straits. There is no doubt in the world that Hudson's Bay is open a very large portion of the year, but the difficulty is as to the straits. I can tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin), speaking from my experience of forty years in a district where ice is very heavy, that a wooden boat, or a boat similar to the one engaged by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, is the very boat required for that kind of work.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) Although this is a question that more particularly refers to the North-west Territories and Manitoba, still it is one of general interest to the Dominion as a whole. That being the case, I wish to make a few remarks, and I shall say, at the outset that, in my opinion, the practicability of the navigation of Hudson's Bay is sure to be established in the near future. The hon. Minister (Mr. Davies) tells us, that on information he has received, he has recommended a wooden boat for the expedition, and it must be remembered that this wooden boat is twenty-seven years old.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND it. I stated that the "Diana" was thoroughly rebuilt in 1892.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) I do not wish to put the hon. gentleman in any wrong position, and I intended to refer to that. Now, as regards the rebuilding, everything depends upon what that ship is. If she is a colonial vessel, built of the ordinary woods of the country, it makes no odds how much she has been rebuilt, she is still an old ship. If she is a good English-built vessel, built of live oak, then, even though she is twenty-five years old, and has been renewed, she may be a good ship. Although a wooden vessel has been recommended to the Minister, his own experience of the good ship "Stanley" ought to tell him the immense advantage possessed by a steel ship for such

work. While the "Stanley" may not have the very excessive currents to contend with that prevail in Hudson's Bay, yet she meets very strong currents and very heavy ice. Judging from the success that attended the "Stanley" in prosecuting the winter service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, I myself am of the opinion that not only can Hudson Straits be successfully navigated by proper ships, but also the River St. Lawrence, where the ice does not freeze across, can be navigated during the winter. For one hundred years the Hudson's Bay Company have navigated these waters with wooden vessels. It has been stated that the "Diana" is only nine knots, and in my opinion that is not sufficient to enable her to get out of the way of the ice floes in places where there are such strong currents as prevail in Hudson's Bay, and where the ice flows so rapidly. In my opinion, a vessel of much greater power and much greater speed is requisite for a fair trial of proving the practicability of navigating the Hudson Straits during a long season. I have no doubt at all that the gentleman whom the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has put in charge of that expedition, Commander Wakeham, is, in all probability, the right man in the right place. As has been referred to by my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), he may not have large experience as an ice navigator, but he is a man of great intelligence, and a man who will discharge his duty properly and in a capable manner. I am of opinion that the vessel is rather small to give the matter a fair trial. A small vessel of that kind would naturally have a small draft of water, and in that case the screw—as she is no doubt a screw vessel—would be brought so near the surface that the ice would injure it much more than a vessel of greater capacity and greater draft. The "Stanley," which plies between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, is capable of taking in water ballast, and being lowered so much that the screw is below the point where it would likely be injured by ice. A ship of that kind would be desirable, both on that account and because her movements would be so rapid that there would be very much less danger of her being injured in passing through a narrow place where the ice might catch her or jam her. I trust, however, that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries will meet with every success in this expedition, because I think it is of very great importance to this country as a whole, and of exceedingly great importance to the people of the North-west.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the motion is put, I would like to say a word or two with reference to this matter. It is an important question in more ways than one, but there are two points in which it is especially important. In the first place, we have no money to spend for a purpose that will be idle; we have no money to throw away; and this expedition, as it is now being planned, will cost at least $35,000. It would not be good economy if, for the sake of spending no more than $35,000, an inferior ship were to be secured for what the whole country is looking for—a real test of the navigability of these straits; not by whaling vessels, short vessels, or slow vessels, but by vessels such as must to-day be employed in order to do a commercial buiness. The question of the navigability of these straits to be tested to-day is not whether whaling vessels can get in, not whether a vessel of peculiar build can get in during certain months or certain days of the year, but whether it is possible to carry on successfully through these straits a commercial business for the great North-west, and of course to carry it on with vessels sufficiently large to make freighters, and sailing with sufficient frequency during the open season to render the venture a commercial success. The expedition sent up there in 1885 and 1886 was, I think, for a somewhat different purpose. It was preliminary. What it was intended to do, and what I think it did do, was to make observations, chiefly to find out at what period of the year the ice opened and the quantity of ice to be encountered during the whole season; and consequently observers were kept there for two seasons, and they were to take a constant note and keep a faithful record of everything in connection with these matters. That period is past, and if my hon. friend is going to send up a vessel simply to do that work over again, even if he should do it somewhat more thoroughly, which I hardly think he can do in one season, the expenditure will be money wasted. If the railway is to be built to Hudson's Bay, it can only be built on the ground that it will form a connecting link between the sources of supply and the old country by a line of regular steam navigation; and what the country wants to know to-day is whether it is possible to navigate the straits by commercial vessels for a sufficient length of time each season to render the project a success. The only question with me is whether my hon. friend's vessel is going to elucidate that question in any way at all. I am afraid it is not. He is sending up a vessel which he says has the merit of being a short one and being able to make quick turns; but you are not going to carry hundreds of thousands of bushels of wheat across the Atlantic in vessels which are short, and which can make sharp turns. The hon. gentleman is getting a vessel which has nine knots of speed and seventy horse-power; but a vessel of that kind would never be adopted as a commercial venture to carry freight through those straits. I am not a navigator, but I can see just where, in the navigation of those straits, perilous at the best, a strong reserve power, along with quickness, would be the salvation of a vessel in a place where

currents and the jamming of the ice are the two incidents chiefly to be met with. These requirements are not going to be attained by my hon. friend's ship. The old "Diana," though she has been overhauled, cannot be called a new vessel; and the very facts which my hon. friend has stated show that she is not a vessel which can be classed as a commercial vessel. What I think ought to be done is this. Whether the expedition goes this year or waits for another year is a matter of very little importance compared with the importance of making a thorough test of the navigability of the straits; and if my hon. friend has not been able to find a vessel which comes up to the mark for that test, he had better not spend his $35,000 this year, but wait for another year; and Manitoba and the North-west and the rest of the country will thank him for waiting if by waiting he can secure a strong and capable commercial vessel to make the test properly. I want the hon. gentleman to give that point the consideration it deserves; for he will be judged in the country in proportion as he meets the requirements of a commercial test. My hon. friend is not sure that he is going to have an experienced ice navigator with this vessel. I do not raise any question with regard to Commander Wakeham. He has had a great deal of experience with ice in the gulf and is in every way a competent and reliable man; no better could be obtained. At the same time, I think it is important that we should have with the vessel some man like Admiral Markham, or one of equal or nearly equal ability and experience, in order that there may be the greater confidence in the results of the test. My hon. friend has not stated whether Captain Burke will go or not. But is there not another point which my hon. friend ought to guard? I understand, from what the hon. gentleman said here, Lieutenant Burke is interested in a company which proposes to do business in that section of the country.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He is one of the promoters of what is called the Pacific Railway Company to run from Churchill to the Pacific coast. Admiral Markham is the chief promoter and Captain Burke the second.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend would probably admit that if he takes Captain Burke, who represents that company, he should also take a representative of the older company, and the one which, in this House and the local legislature of Manitoba, has for eight or ten years been considered as the Hudson's Bay Railway Company. It might be a cause for well-founded discontent if you took the representative of one of these companies and no representative of the other. One man's place on board a ship does not amount to very much when fitting out an expedition. I throw that out as a hint which it might be well for the hon. gentleman to act on. Is my hon. friend sure that he is making this a commercial test, for if not, he will not accomplish anything?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have just a few observations to make, and I would not make them were it not for the remark of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) that I failed to put myself in order so as to enable me to make them. I am not quite as adept in debate as the hon. gentleman, and therefore forgot for the moment that I could have put myself in order by moving the adjournment of the House. I was about to say, when called to order, that one of the reasons why the west particularly would like to see this question settled, and settled for all time, is the fact that for the last fifteen years the Hudson's Bay Railway has been used as a stalking horse in every election. It has been almost impossible for the people of the west to hold an election without having the question of the construction of the Hudson's Bay Railway Company introduced. Now, the position I have taken and that taken by a great many others in the west, is that if the Hudson's Bay Railway is a feasible enterprise, it would be an excellent thing for the North-west. So far as I am concerned, I have never been able to satisfy myself that it is a feasible enterprise from a commercial standpoint. But I have always taken this position. I have always said, let the Government satisfy itself upon that point, let it have a thorough investigation made into the navigability of these straits, and I would hold up both hands for the expenditure of any reasonable amount of money to attain that end. It was in that view that I introduced the subject here. All the members of the west are anxious, I am sure, that this test should be, as the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) has said, a thorough and satisfactory test, one that will satisfy the people of the west and the people of all Canada as to the navigability of those straits. I am not sufficient of an expert to say whether the ship to be sent out there should be a steel steamer or a sealer or a whaler, but I have heard various representations on the question, and I am inclined to the opinion that it would be a dangerous experiment to send a large steel steamer into those straits to encounter the ice. I have also come to the conclusion that a vessel of the character of the one chartered by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would probably be the proper vessel for that work. It seems to me that the character of the vessel is not the most important matter. Suppose large ice floes are encountered, surely it is not the intention to back up and make full charge at them in order to smash them. It seems to me what is infinitely of more importance is to have in charge of that expedition a man of experience in ice navigation, who would be able to size up the situation and could

form an opinion whether the floes found in those straits would be an impassable obstruction or whether a vessel could navigate through them. Entertaining that view, I do not see that it would be so very important to have a vessel of large tonnage or that it would be necessary to have a steel vessel. I may say, in conclusion, that there is another consideration, although not so important, which may have some weight. There is a gentleman in the North-west who all who have met him will agree is a man of very considerable ability, and who has devoted the last ten or twelve years of his life to this project, and it would certainly be a good thing to have this matter finally settled and thus enable that gentleman to realize his project or drop the question of the Hudson's Bay navigability entirely, and devote his time and abilities to some calling that would bring tangible results.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). As the arrangements, I understand, have already been completed by the Government and a steamer chartered, any criticism we may now make is not likely to have any material effect and seems to me rather late in the day. If we are to believe what has been said by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Richardson), and who, I am glad to say, expresses himself as in a position to speak for the North-west and Manitoba, this question, which, for the last fifteen years, has engaged so much the attention of this House of Parliament and Government, is about apparently to receive some measure of settlement. Regarding the question from the standpoint of the desirability of a final settlement, it seems to me unfortunate that a steamer has not been selected which would be more likely to furnish us such complete information as would settle the question, than the one which had been chosen. From what little knowledge one acquires from shipping in our maritime home, we must come to the conclusion that while the steamer selected will, to a large degree, ensure the safety of the members of the expedition, it will not be so efficient in furnishing us with evidence to settle this question, which has been under the consideration of the Government for the last fifteen years, as a steamer combining much greater power and speed. Such a steamer would enable the parties sent out to investigate to see a very great deal more of Hudson's Bay in the course of the short season over which the navigation there extends than can be possible with the very slow steamer the Government has selected. In these days of rapid transit at sea, a steamer with a speed of eight or nine miles an hour is one which cannot possibly accomplish a great deal of work in that short season. It would take her a long time to deliver the two exploring parties at the north and south ends of the bay. The time taken to deliver them and then to return and bring them home in the early autumn would leave very little spare time for any other work. As has already been pointed out, the navigability of the Hudson's Bay is not in question at all, because that was settled years ago. It is well known that the vessels of the Hudson's Bay Company make regular trips to the bay, so that the question of navigating the straits and the bay is already settled. What I imagine is of more importance is to ascertain whether or not they can be navigated by such a class of steamers as are used nowadays to convey large cargoes. Every one will agree that the great object is to ascertain whether the great wheat crops of the North-west can be sent by that route to Europe, and I do not see how that can be ascertained by sending out there a slow steamer, a sealer, whose ordinary business it is to poke about in a slow and leisurely manner among the ice floes until it has discovered where the seals are to be found and then to work into that floe and lay there. What is required is such a steamer as the Government already own, because this question of navigating water filled with ice, in which there are strong currents, has already been settled by the Government in the navigation carried on between Prince Edward Island and the northern ports of Nova Scotia. This is done with the steamer "Stanley," which has proved herself capable of navigating these waters in the most inclement season—throughout the winter and not in the summer only as would be the case in Hudson's Bay—and maintaining a high rate of speed, say from 18 to 20 miles an hour. In a steamer like the "Stanley," you would have a vessel well fitted to meet the conditions and able to push aside obstacles if they were encountered. Furthermore, you would have a steamer which would enable the trained men who represent the Geological Survey and other scientific departments to study the currents and temperature, &c., and thus collect the data which it is most important and most necessary to the people of Canada to ascertain. Accepting the Minister's statement as being authoritative and not subject to question, I am sorry, for my part, that I cannot but fear that the result of this expedition, which will cost thousands of dollars to the people of Canada, will be almost nil, and, in the end, will leave us in the position which the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) has deplored, with a question, which, for fifteen years has occupied the attention of the country still unsettled, and, practically, no progress made toward its settlement. I am sorry the Government has not acted differently. However, it is not well for us to predict what will happen. I hope for the best results. Still, from my knowledge of ice navigation and of the circumstances of the case, I do not anticipate very favourable results of the expenditure about to be incurred by the Government.

Mr. KAULBACH. I am very anxious indeed, that the proposed expedition to Hudson's Bay may be a success, and I am sorry that I could not have had an interview, or an opportunity earlier to suggest one or two things to our respected friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries bearing on this subject. I quite agree with some of my friends who referred to the speed of the vessel, which vessel, I understand him to say, he has engaged. A boat of eight or nine knots appears to me entirely insufficient for the work contemplated. Had I known what was proposed, I could have recommended to the hon. gentleman a boat of a speed sufficient to meet the requirements and of a tonnage of some 400 or 500. The speed would be about from 12 to 15 knots. The boat I refer to is built of pitch pine and comparatively new. I know that the currents in these waters are very strong, from the fact that the fleet of vessels belonging to the port in the county I represent have to frequent the waters of the Labrador shore, and proceed north very often, as far as the mouth of Davis's and Hudson's Straits. A boat for this service would naturally be required of extra power to navigate these waters and push through the immense floes of ice. The object of this expedition, as I understand it, is to ascertain whether the waters of Hudson's Bay are navigable for a sufficiently long time in the year for the purpose of the export of grain from the North-west. I fear, from what I have read and learned, that the season in that country is too short for mercantile enterprises, that the bay cannot be entered earlier than the middle of July, and that any vessel found their eight weeks after that would have to arrange to get out at once or be bound there for the remainder of the winter. As to Hudson's Bay itself, I understand that it is open the whole year round. Of course vessels would have to remove from the shore or the mouths of rivers, otherwise they would be sealed for the winter. I would suggest, if the proposed contract is not closed, that it be delayed until the hon. Minister can secure a boat for the purpose of a power sufficient to navigate these waters with success, and that the whole of the bay, from one end to the other, on the north shore as well as the south shore, be visited by the expedition and a report made as to the capabilities of that country. I would suggest that, in addition to the main object, that of ascertaining the possibility for the export of grain from the North-west, this other object should be kept in view and the expedition made thereby in every way a grand success.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I would like to say a word or two, not that I am an expert in ice navigation or know much about Hudson's Bay; but, from what has fallen from the lips of several of the members of the House, it would seem that the ship chosen to go on this expedition is not quite suitable for the purpose, and when it comes back another will probably have to be sent. The navigability of Hudson's Bay is a problem which will probably be solved very soon. If the solution of that problem results in the traffic from the North-west going to Europe from some port on Hudson's Bay, and if that is for the general advantage of Canada, of course, we have nothing to say. But I must say that we should regret to see our ports sacrificed, as they would be to a certain extent, in this matter. I would like to call the attention of the Government, and especially of the members of the Government who more particularly represent the district of Quebec, to a few facts. Hudson's Bay is very far away from Quebec. We have been trying for a great many years to ascertain if the River St. Lawrence is not navigable, if not all the winter, at least for a great part of the winter. As hon. gentlemen know, navigation in the St. Lawrence from Quebec now ceases about the end of November and is not resumed until the last days of April or the first days of May. However, for some years past, experiments have been made with relation to this matter, and the Board of Trade of Quebec has called the attention of the Government to the fact that it would be in the interest of the country that an expedition of some kind should be sent into the St. Lawrence to ascertain if it is navigable during the winter months. This last year we have seen the experiment carried out to a certain extent. Mr. Menier's ship, the "Savoy," which is rather a large ship, has been navigating to and fro between the Island of Anticosti and Quebec, after the 1st of December, and also prior to the 15th of April, and she is demonstrating that, during that time, at all events, the winter navigation of the St. Lawrence River, to a great extent, would be practicable. Some years ago, also, a boat crossed the St. Lawrence River from Murray Bay to River du Loup, and to St. Denis, opposite, for the greater part, if not for the whole part, of the winter. As I said before, the Board of Trade of Quebec called the attention of the Government to this important subject some years ago. Now, it seems to me if this large sum is to be voted, or has been voted, to test the navigability of the Hudson's Bay, that the gentlemen who represent the district of Quebec in the Cabinet should bring their great influence to bear on their colleagues to have such an expedition sent out into the St. Lawrence River to find out whether that river is navigable at least for a longer space of time during the winter months than it is now supposed to be. The hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) I know has at heart the best interests of Quebec, and he has done a great deal to give us the fast line of steamships between Quebec and Liverpool, and I believe he is converted to the idea of a fast line now. He has also done a great deal, I believe, towards build-

ing a bridge between Quebec and the south shore, and if he will bring this very important question before his colleagues, and bring his great influence to bear upon them to try and get an expedition sent out in a short time to test the navigability of the St. Lawrence River during the winter months, and if he did succeed in giving us a longer navigation, I have no doubt he would feel himself that he was giving Quebec a great boon.

Mr. McNEILL. I would like to ask one or two questions of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries before he closes the debate. Listening to the discussion as carefully as I have been able to do, it seems to me that if the vessel my hon. friend has selected, is not of sufficient power to enable her to contend effectually with the currents of the straits, that is a fatal objection to the choice he has made; also, if she is too slow a vessel to cover the distance which she ought to cover during the time she is out, that is also a fatal objection. But, having listened to the discussion, I cannot see, for my own part, that a good case has been made against the vessel from any other point of view. I cannot see why, if there be intelligent officers on board of that vessel, those officers should not be able to decide whether an ordinary mercantile vessel would be able to perform the work. It seems to me it does not matter whether the vessel is a long vessel or a short one, whether she is a whaler or a sailer, or what she may be, as long as she is commanded by intelligent men who understand their business, and who are able to make an intelligent report. It seems to me that if these men are capable men, and are fit to discharge their duties, whether the vessel be long or short, the officers in command of her ought to be able to give a thoroughly trustworthy opinion as to whether this is a navigation which ordinary mercantile vessels would be able to undertake. But I should like very much, for my own information, at all events, if my hon. friend would deal with these other two questions which have been brought up, that is, as to whether she will be powerful enough to contend with the currents effectually in such a way as she ought to do, and also, as to whether she will be fast enough to cover the amount of space that she ought to cover, in order that a proper report may be made.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. While I regret the tone of the observations of some hon. gentlemen, I may say, Mr. Speaker, that some remarks have fallen from hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House that are deserving of consideration. I do not think that I made myself as plain as I would liked to have done when I first gave my statement. There seems to be an impression abroad that the "Diana," which has been chartered, is a small vessel. I repeat again what I said before, that she is a vessel of 475 tons, rebuilt in Dundee in 1892, and one of the strongest vessels in the fleet that sails from Newfoundland. She was recommended by Commander Wakeham as the best vessel that could be obtained; and she was recommended by Mr. Whitely, fishery officer in Newfoundland, as the best vessel that could be obtained in Newfoundland. She is of the horse-power that was specially recommended by Admiral Markham. She was recommended by Captain Bartlett, the most experienced navigator that sails from Newfoundland, as the best vessel that could be obtained. She possesses, in point of fact, all the qualifications which these experienced men seem to think a vessel should have. It struck me, as the hon. member from Prince Edward Island thought it should strike me, that possibly the "Stanley," a vessel specially constructed by the Government some years ago to cross the Northumberland Straits, might be chosen. I submitted the question to Captain Wakeham, whether it was possible to utilize the "Stanley" for the purpose of this test, and he denounced it as an impossibility, he would not trust his life in her. I was not satisfied with that report, and I sent down a special letter to Captain Finlayson, of the "Stanley," who has been twenty years on board that vessel navigating the straits, and to Mr. McMillan, the chief engineer of that ship, who has also been twenty years in the service, and I asked them if they thought it was possible to utilize the "Stanley" for this purpose. They told me it was a mad scheme, that neither of them would risk his life in her, and nobody who understood the perils of ice navigation would think of trusting the "Stanley" in that work. What was I to do next? I had the offer of the "Port Pirie," a vessel of 3,000 tons, a steel vessel. I was told by those experienced men that she also was unsuitable, and the owners of that vessel would not charter her for the voyage unless we insured her for the amount of $140,000 in case she was lost. What was the gain of putting her on? This vessel was recommended, she is of the same horse-power, and the same size that Admiral Markham says are suitable for the purpose, and she is of the class of vessels which all experienced arctic navigators choose when they go upon expeditions of that kind. Did ever anybody in the world hear of a steamship of 3,000 tons being sent up on Arctic navigation? Can anybody imagine for a moment that a man who values his life, an experienced man, would trust it on board a ship of that kind in the spring and fall months when she is specially to be engaged in fighting ice? It would be all very well to send such a vessel there in the midsummer months, but what we must have is a vessel that can go there and fight with the ice in early spring, to see how early a vessel can go in there, and late in the fall, to see how late a vessel can go in and out at that

season of the year also. My hon. friend knows that when he says that she has to go there for the purpose, not of testing whether a vessel of that size would be suitable for navigation, but whether there is navigation at all in those months. That is the point, and we have got the class of vessels which are always used in Arctic navigation and have got the most experienced men. I hesitate not to say that I conceive myself to have been exceedingly fortunate in getting Commander Wakeham's services to take charge of this expedition. He is a gentleman of very great experience, and a man of very level head; and I appeal to my hon. friends who have presided over the Department of Marine and Fisheries for years back, if they can recall to mind a single officer in the service of that department who would be as suitable for the purpose for which he has been chosen as Commander Wakeham. The sailing master, Captain Whitely, has been for three or four years in charge of the Job Brothers' sealers in the Hudson Bay navigation. He therefore has great experience in that line, he possesses all the necessary qualifications, and he has been in charge of a Behring Sea sealer besides. With these two gentlemen in charge, one experienced in navigating vessels through the ice, and the other a man of very large and varied experience in navigating ships, and thoroughly well educated, and, in my opinion, capable of making a most careful, prudent, and reliable report, I think we are exceedingly fortunate in those who command the vessel. I could get no experienced men to advise me to select or to risk a steel vessel for a purpose of that kind, at a probable cost to the Government of $140,000; and when I was backed with the opinion of Commander Wakeham that the "Diana" was in size and in speed and in horse-power, just the vessel for the purpose, I thought I was doing something that would meet with general approval. I believe that everything has been done that prudence and care could do to insure success, if success is possible at all. I do not think there is any other point that I need comment upon.

Mr. HUGHES. What about representatives of the company?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Some gentlemen have expressed a desire that another person should be nominated to specially represent one of the rival companies. I may say with respect to the matter, that I shall be very happy to consult my colleagues on the point. I did not consider it necessary that two special representatives should be sent of the companies which proposed to construct railways. I was informed by the solicitors of this company that they wished to send a representative as they intended to go on immediately with the work at Port Churchill.

Mr. DAVIN. Who were the solicitors?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. An Ottawa firm. I have their letter, which I shall be very happy to show to my hon. friend. I thought when we selected a gentleman who has the same interest as the representative of the other railway company would have, and we sent him on the expedition, he would obtain all the facts. But I shall be very glad to consider the suggestion made.

Mr. KAULBACH. I desire to ask the amount of the charter paid per month and the insurance on the ship?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We do not insure the ship.

Mr. KAULBACH. How much is to be paid per month for the charter?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot for the moment recollect the amount; it is very reasonable, however. I will give the hon. gentleman the information.

Mr. KAULBACH. I have a very high opinion of Commander Wakeham. I have known him for a number of years, and I think he is just the man for that expedition.

Mr. CASEY. Not having heard the whole of the debate, I do not intend to go into any details in connection with the subject. I may say, however, that the question of the navigability of Hudson's Bay is one of the utmost importance I believe to the future prosperity of Canada, and I will add that I am satisfied from conversations with the Minister in charge that he is fully impressed with the importance of making the fullest investigation possible. No doubt he will see that a full powered vessel, properly manned, will make the exploration. But the point to which I wish particularly to refer at the present moment is that which was touched upon by the hon. Minister in his last remarks, in regard to the representatives of different railway companies going with the expedition. The gentleman who was announced as going with the expedition to represent the Hudson's Bay and Pacific Railway Company is not known to me. I will not speak as to his qualifications: he is a director of that company and is one of the original promoters. The original promoters of the Hudson's Bay Company are asking for a representative as well as their rivals. I think the request is a fair one. I do not see any reason why a representative of the one company should not be sent and not of the other. At the same time, I understand the promoters of the Hudson's Bay Railway Company are willing to drop their request to have a representative, if a representative of the North-west Territories be sent in whose opinion they would have confidence. I hope the Minister will be able to arrange with the Government of the Territories and the Hudson's Bay Company in regard to this matter,

so that no one will be able to complain that rights and interests were not looked after, because the cost of sending a couple of men would be very trifling compared with the satisfaction of knowing that every one's interest has been attended to.

Mr. DAVIN. I was very sorry the Minister resumed his seat without giving the House the assurance that the North-west Territories would be represented on the expedition, because, as I emphatically said, we do not consider the North-west is merged in Manitoba. We never admitted it, and if there should be any greater desire now than at any past time to merge the North-west in Manitoba, that would lead, I hope, to its protesting with still greater strength against that proposition. We are apart from Manitoba, and we wish at all times to be dealt with as we are, a separate entity. I wish to say one word with respect to what fell from the hon. member for Lisgar. He talked of this question having been used as a stalking horse in elections for fifteen years. What kept this question for fifteen years before the elections, and what prevented the successive Conservative Governments from building the Hudson's Bay Railway? The opposition offered by hon. gentlemen who then sat on this side of the House, and no member offered greater opposition to it than the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The hon. member for Lisgar cannot console himself with the thought that this exploratory survey—because it is nothing more—will settle the question. If it would settle it, we on this side of the House would be satisfied; but the complaint made by the hon. member for York and by myself is that it will not settle the question. This will be simply an exploratory survey. The hon. member for Bruce did not seem to think that we have made out a case against the vessel that is to be used. Let me read what Admiral Markham said in regard to a vessel of about the same horse-power. He wrote:

> We, in the "Alert," were frequently detained for many consecutive hours at a time for want of power to propel the ship through loose streams of ice which an ordinary steamer would have had no difficulty in penetrating.

In that report Admiral Markham lays particular stress on those two important factors, power and speed required to take advantage of lanes of open water which always prevail in loose ice. What I fear is this, that if Commander Wakeham comes back, as come back he will, I am satisfied, and reports that he ascertained that the Bay is navigable, still we shall not be any nearer than we are now to the construction of the railway to Hudson's Bay. While speaking of the building of a railway, I would emphasise the suggestion made on this side of the House by an hon. friend behind me—perhaps the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will give me his attention——

Mr. CAMPBELL. Go on.

Mr. DAVIN. I shall take my own course, with all due deference to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell). I ask my hon. friend the Minister, that in view of the suggestions from this side of the House, and also from the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) who supports him, he should deal fairly with the two companies and let the old company as well as the new be represented on this expedition. This new company I understand is an interloper in this question. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the House and the country will be glad, that my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) raised the question, and that we have thus far been able to ventilate it. All I regret is, that when, according to what the Minister stated, we are about to pay $7,000 a month——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not say $7,000 a month. I said I could not recollect the amount, but it is very much below that.

Mr. DAVIN. $7,000 is what the hon. gentleman said, and I do not know what he would call below that; whether it would be $100 or $200 a month.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman will excuse me; I said $7,000, but I at once corrected myself, and said that I could not recollect the sum.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is not that or anything like it.

Mr. DAVIN. We are going to pay several thousand dollars a month to do what has been already done by the "Alert." The "Alert" proved the navigability of the bay for the purpose of fishing and coasting, but what it did not establish was that it was navigable from a commercial standpoint, and that is the standpoint that interests us in the North-west Territories.

Mr. HUGHES. A word or two more will not do any harm in connection with this debate, although probably it may not do any good. Already a number of railroads in Ontario have charters to the James Bay, and I would suggest to the Minister that he should add a representative of the province of Ontario to the expedition.

Mr. PRIOR. And British Columbia.

Mr. HUGHES. British Columbia has the Pacific Ocean for a sea front, and there is no necessity that that province should be represented. The rights of the provinces that do touch on Hudson's Bay might be considered, and either a representative from

each of these provinces, or a joint representative should be sent to the expedition. I would ask the Minister, is it the intention to have the press represented on the expedition ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If all those whose claims are being pressed were represented on this expedition, we would have a larger number than are going to England on the Jubilee contingent.

Motion to adjourn, negatived.

JOSEPH MERCIER, OF STE. FAMILLE.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked :

1. Is one Joseph Mercier, of Ste. Famille, Island of Orleans, employed in any capacity by the Government?
2. If so, in what capacity?
3. What is his salary?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). We have no record of such a man being employed under this department. It is quite possible that he may be employed as one of the crew of a lightship, but of that there would be no record here as the captain employs his own crew.

DISMISSAL OF MR. McCALLUM.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called. I wish to ask the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) whether he has any knowledge of the dismissal of Mr. McCallum, foreman and lock superintendent on the River Du Lièvre works, and by whom has Mr. McCallum been succeeded ? If the hon. gentleman has not the information now, I beg to give him notice that I will bring the question up to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). Very well.

THE BANK NOTE CONTRACT.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved :

That the papers laid on the Table of the House on the 3rd instant, relating to the printing of Government notes, stamps, &c., be printed forthwith, and that Rule 94 be suspended in relation thereto.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). There is no objection.

Mr. FOSTER. I would be glad if the Minister of Finance would add to that, a copy of the late contract which was current up to the 23rd of April.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is the last contract.

Motion agreed to.

BEAMSVILLE POSTMASTER—MR. FAIRBROTHER.

The House proceeded to further consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. McCleary for an Order of the House for :

Copies of all letters and correspondence between the Government or any members thereof referring in any way to the dismissal of Mr. W. D. Fairbrother as postmaster at Beamsville, with a copy of the charges and by whom such were made.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. Speaker, at 6 o'clock last evening I was discussing this matter when the House took recess. I believe that the case made by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. McCleary) in reference to Mr. Fairbrother, is an exceedingly poor one. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson) who represents the county in which Beamsville is situated, has given his personal word of honour as a member of Parliament that this man Fairbrother has been an active political partisan. Now, I am perhaps a little conservative in reference to this question of partisan officials. Before a member of Parliament asks that the bread and butter should be taken out of the mouths of his neighbour's children, he should be very careful that he is not doing a serious injustice, and he should see that there is sufficient cause. I think when a member of Parliament goes to the Government which he supports, and to which he is bound to be loyal, and asks for dismissals, he should be very careful that the circumstances of the case warrant him in doing so. When he gives his word of honour as a member of Parliament, that such and such an official has taken an active part in politics, and should be removed, he should approach the matter with very great seriousness and remember all the consequences attached thereto. For my part I do not propose to ask for the dismissal of any official, unless I am thoroughly convinced that I can defend my course, not only before this House but before the great bar of public opinion in my own county. If I err, and if I commit an injustice, then I have to answer to my own constituents when the proper time arrives. As far as I am concerned, I believe we should approach this matter with every seriousness. But, Sir, when a member of Parliament does take this stand and does state to the Government that he knows of his own personal knowledge that an official of the Government has taken an active part in the election, then the Government to whom he is loyal should be loyal enough to him to say : We take your word upon this matter, and we dismiss this man upon your recommendation. Sir, this has been the practice during the past eighteen years under the Conservative Administration.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. LOGAN. This, Sir, to my own actual knowledge, has been the course pursued by

the Conservative Government for eighteen years.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No; yes.

Mr. LOGAN. I do not wish to justify myself by anything which the late Government has done.

I look on this matter as a matter of principle. If a Minister of the Crown has an active political partisan in his service, that man, when the proper time arrives, and when he thinks he can do it with the best success, will stab that Minister in the back. Therefore, the Minister, for his own sake, and for the sake of the department over which he rules, should see that he has men in his department who are true to him as well as true to the country at large; and when a member of Parliament approaches a Minister of the Crown and gives his personal word that an official has taken an active part in politics, to his own knowledge, then that official should be removed. I think I heard a mild dissent from the other side of the House to the statement I made that this was the practice under the late Government. It may not have been the practice in some counties; but I am sure that it was in the county of Cumberland, in season and out of season.

I have already brought before this House the case of certain gentlemen who occupied positions under the late Government. I remember calling attention to the case of a certain doctor who lived at Northport, and who was the physician to the sailors who came there. He was the only doctor in the vicinity; but just before the last election his services were dispensed with, simply because he was a Liberal, and the position was given to Dr. Clay, who lived twelve miles from Northport. So that when a sailor became ill and was carried ashore, however sick he might be, he was driven past the door of the doctor who was a Liberal and carried twelve miles to Dr. Clay, who happened to be a Conservative. This is an example. I referred also to the case of Mr. Thomas Allen, of Cape Tormentine, who was dismissed after fifty-four years of service, and without superannuation. In the town of Joggins, in my county, we had a postmaster, an excellent man, named Burke, who one fine morning was informed that his services would not be required any longer. He was summarily dismissed without the slightest sign of investigation. A gentleman named Morris, a postmaster at Advocate, in my county, was also summarily dismssed, and a strong Conservative put in his place. In my constituency dozens of section men on the Intercolonial Railway came to me and gave me their word that after various elections, particularly that of 1887, when the present leader of the Opposition was elected the member for that county, they received summary notice that their services would be no longer required. One man named Tower, a very excellent man stated to me that he had received notice on the 13th of the month that on the 14th his services would be no longer required. I have many other cases of the same kind. One man, a station agent on the Intercolonial Railway named Livingstone, was squeezed out of the service by having his salary cut down to $13 a month. And when it was not thought expedient that men should be dismissed summarily, they were quietly superannuated. I would like to know where the investigation was held in reference to Mr. Brydges, the chief engineer of Government railways in 1878. Every one in the maritime provinces, whether Liberal or Conservative, if he is honest, will say that the Liberal-Conservative party, when it came into power in 1878, cut a clean swath in the maritime provinces, and wherever a man was a Liberal, he was summarily dismissed, and a first-rate Conservative was put in his place.

Last evening the hon. leader of the Opposition questioned a statement I made with reference to certain relatives of his being appointed to office. I have not time to go through the whole list; but I will call his attention to a few cases near my own home. I may say that some of the most important positions in the neighbourhood where I happen to reside are those of collector of customs at Amherst, chief auditor of the Intercolonial Railway, the railway's solicitor, station agent at the city of Moncton, collector of customs at Tidnish, chief inspector of buildings on the Intercolonial Railway, collector of customs at Truro, agent of the savings bank at Parrsboro', port physician at Parrsboro', and agency of the savings bank at Amherst; and let me tell you who have occupied these positions. The position of collector of customs at Amherst was held for a great many years by a very estimable gentleman named Dr. Nathan Tupper, who, I regret to say, has passed from this earthly sphere; he was a brother of the hon. leader of the Opposition. The chief auditor of the Intercolonial Railway is Mr. Clarence A. Lowe, a nephew of the hon. leader of the Opposition. The former railway solicitor, who also a year or two ago passed away, was Mr. W. M. Fullerton, a brother-in-law of the hon. leader of the Opposition. The station agent at Moncton, one of the most important stations on the Intercolonial Railway, was Mr. Alonzo Hillson, another nephew of the hon. leader of the Opposition. The collector of customs at Tidnish, seventeen miles from my town, is at the present time Mr. Thomas Lowe, another nephew of the hon. leader of the Opposition. The chief inspector of buildings on the Intercolonial Railway, has been Mr. Charles Tupper Hillson, another nephew and a namesake of the hon. leader of the Opposition. The collector of customs at Truro, a very important place, is Mr. George P. Nelson, who happily has married a niece of

the hon. gentleman. The keeper of the savings bank at Parrsboro' is Dr. A. Stewart Townshend, a relative of the hon. gentleman's family. The port physician at Parrsboro' is the same Dr. Townshend; and the keeper of the savings bank at Amherst is Mr. Charles H. Bent, who happily also married a niece of the hon. leader of the Opposition. And Mr. Speaker, there are others; their names are legion. I have referred to Mr. Charles Hillson Tupper as being the inspector of buildings on the Intercolonial Railway; but this was not the only position he held. He was the mail carrier at Amherst between the post office and the station. When the Intercolonial Railway was opened this position was given to his father, the brother-in-law of the present leader of the Opposition, without tender, and it was held by him until his death, when it was given to the very estimable sister of the hon. leader of the Opposition, Mrs. Hillson, and she kept until her death, when it was given to Mr. Charles Tupper Hillson, the chief inspector of buildings, without tender, and against protests of his own friends. Year after year, for probably fifteen years, this same contract was given to this gentleman without tender, and when the late Government was turned out of power in June last, I asked the hon. Postmaster General to cancel this contract, and he did so. And what was the result? Last year the same Mr. Hillson was paid nearly $600 for carrying this mail, and farmed it out for $200. I asked the hon. Postmaster General to put it up to tender, and he did so, with the result that it was let to an excellent firm for $193. Mr. Hillson had received nearly $600 for the last ten or fifteen years and had farmed it out every year, never paying more than $200, and never touched a mail bag in his life.

An hon. MEMBER. That is so.

Mr. LOGAN. The hon. gentleman has taken care of some of his friends in the maritime provinces. This case is one in which the Postmaster General has done perfectly right, and I am sure that when the hon. gentleman's supporters make statements such as those which my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) made yesterday, they make them, knowing the seriousness of the situation and knowing that the partisan officers whom the Government were asked to remove, were men who would not be true to their leader, but would be traitors in their department.

Mr. McNEILL. I have listened with some degree of surprise to the remarks which have been made by the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat. I had fancied that we were discussing the dismissal of a postmaster, but instead we have been treated to a dissertation about the friends and relatives of the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) having been appointed to positions under the Government.

Mr. LOGAN. I was asked to give these names last evening just before six o'clock.

An hon. MEMBER. By whom?

Mr. LOGAN. By your leader.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has just proved the statement he made yesterday to be entirely erroneous; and if it were worth while, I would show that the additional statement he has made to-day, is absolutely as erroneous as the first.

Mr. LOGAN. I would be very glad to hear the hon. gentleman. The statements I have made are not erroneous, and if the hon. gentleman wants more names, I can supply them to him in any quantity.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The names the hon. gentleman has given are not those of relatives of the leader of the Opposition, and if the hon. gentleman knows his county at all, he ought to know that.

Mr. McNEILL. If the hon. gentleman was merely replying to a request that had been made by the hon. leader of the Opposition, of course I would be very sorry to make any reflection on what he said; but I was not aware of that. However, I think he travelled a little outside the record when he talked about the mail contract, because I do not think he was requested to enter upon a question of that sort, at all events I wish just to say that I think nothing could be more unfortunate than that we should lay down a rule in this House that any member of the civil service who is accused of active partisanship by a member of this House should be dismissed because of that accusation from his position. We have, in the first place, had that position repudiated by the hon. First Minister himself. We have had the pledge given by him to Parliament, in the most solemn manner, that no civil servant would be so dismissed, and I am very much surprised to hear an hon. member from that side of the House, who is a supporter of the leader of his party, taking exception practically to the pledge given by his leader, and suggesting that another rule should be laid down. I do not think that anything more grave to the interests of this country could well be imagined than that a solemn pledge of that kind, given by a gentleman occupying the position of Prime Minister, should be held lightly by any member of this House. I presume that before this debate closes, we shall hear from the Prime Minister himself on this subject. For my own part, it seems to me that if pledges of this kind are to be given lightly to Parliament, if such pledges are not to be held

as something sacred which cannot be broken or in any way violated, public life in this country is becoming very much degraded indeed. I think that the public opinion of this country will hold the Government bound by the pledge given to Parliament by its leader. I shall be very much disappointed if public opinion does not go so far. So far as this matter is concerned, what we have heard has thrown a good deal of light upon actions of this kind and given us an opportunity of judging as to how complaints made by members of the House and acted upon promptly, without investigation, may result. Certain charges were laid against this gentleman. These charges were read to the House by the hon. member who brought this matter to our notice. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) got up and defended his course in this matter. Did he say that this unfortunate man who has been dismissed was so dismissed because he was guilty of the charges preferred against him. Not at all. What he said was that he had done something which had not been mentioned in these charges at all, that he had treated his assistants unkindly and improperly. That was the gravamen of the charge made by the hon. member for Lincoln, and because of that statement, without any charge, in reference to it being preferred against him, and without any opportunity to reply, this gentleman was dismissed. This is, to my mind, one of the most serious matters with which this House can be confronted. I am quite satisfied that if we were to have the Yankee spoils system introduced in Canada, we shall have in Canada just the same results as that system has given in the United States. What has been the result in the United States. Will the House allow me to read one sentence from the work of Mr. Lecky on "Liberty and Democracy," which has been published quite recently and which has attained wide popularity. Speaking of this system, Mr. Lecky said——

An hon. MEMBER. Who is Lecky ?

Mr. McNEILL. I am sorry the hon. gentleman does not know. Mr. Lecky says :

> The modern system of making all posts under the government, however unconnected with politics, rewards for party service, was organized in 1829 by Andrew Jackson. This President may be said to have completed the work of making the American Republic the pure democracy which Jefferson had begun.
>
> His statue stands in front of the White House at Washington as one of the greatest men of America, and he assuredly deserves to be remembered as the founder of the most stupendous of political corruption in modern history.

Then he goes on to refer to the spoils system and says :

> This was the beginning of a system which has spread like a leprosy over all political life and for which there is, I believe, no adequate parallel in history.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the system which is now introduced in Canada. I have heard the hon. member (Mr. Logan) who last addressed the House, say that in the county which he represents improper dismissals of public officials have taken place. I cannot judge of that, as I know nothing of the cases to which the hon. gentleman referred. No doubt he thinks that the dismissals were improper. Perhaps if an explanation were given it might turn out that these dismissals were not so improper as they appear. If any man were dismissed in any county simply because he differed from the Government of the day, I think that was a most improper action, whoever was responsible for it. But I know that in many counties, at all events in Ontario, that system was not adopted by the Conservative party. I know that it was not adopted in my own county ; I know that since I had the honour of representing the constituency I do represent, not one single man has been dismissed who was appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite for any cause whatever during that time, and I believe that not one single man has been dismissed there since Mr. Mackenzie's time in 1878. I have made inquiry and have heard of none, and it has been stated publicly in the newspapers that none have been dismissed. Readers were asked to send in the names of any who have been dismissed, and not one has been able to point to a solitary case. I do not believe that in the county of Bruce any such dismissals have taken place. I know this—that Sir John Macdonald set his face like flint against a system of this kind. I know that positively. And if there has been an individual case here and there throughout the country where this has been done, it only shows that there has been a very improper exercise of power, which should be denounced. And certainly, hon. gentlemen who have come into office and who desire, I hope, to conduct the affairs of this country in an honourable manner should not say that they will in this wholesale manner——

Mr. SOMERVILLE. They do not say so.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman has just said that any member of the civil service who had been an active partisan should be dismissed.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Hear, hear.

Mr. McNEILL. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen opposite to make a rule of that kind, if they choose, and to act upon that rule with the greatest stringency, if they think right. But it is not right to make a rule of that kind now for the first time and make it retroactive. I think it is very unjust, and, for my part, I protest with all the force I can command against a system which will degrade the civil service of this country and will reduce this Canada of ours to just such a condition in this regard as obtained in the United States for years past, but which, I

am glad to say, they are now endeavouring to set to rights. At the very time that the people to the south of the line are doing their best to get themselves out of the slough into which this spoils system had led them, we are threatened here in Canada with the plunging of this country into just such a condition of things as that which they are escaping. I will appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite; I will appeal to the best instincts they have—and there are men on that side of the House who are imbued with as high ideals and as pure instincts, and as honourable motives as any man on this side——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McNEILL. I think there are some. I suppose that those who jeer me are not among the number. I would appeal to the best men on the other side, at all events, to strengthen the hands of the members of the Government who are opposed to the spoils system. I believe there are such men who are utterly opposed to introducing the spoils system into Canada. I do not wish to take up more of the time of the House, but I could not avoid saying a word——

Mr. LANDERKIN. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? He stated that in Bruce there had been no dismissals during the last eighteen years. Would the hon. gentleman state if there have been any since the change of Government?

Mr. McNEILL. Yes, there have.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he has moved for the papers showing the reasons for these dismissals?

Mr. McNEILL. I have not moved for papers, but I have asked questions. I expect to move for papers before the session is over. The hon. gentleman may possess his soul in peace for he may rely upon it that it is my intention to bring the matter to the attention of the House before prorogation.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I thought I would remind you in case you should forget.

Mr. McNEILL. No fear of my forgetting. I am in correspondence in relation to the matter now. When I was interrupted by the hon. gentleman, I was just about to conclude what I had to say, but now that the hon. First Minister (Mr. Laurier) is in his place, I would like again to call his attention to the remarks I made when I first got upon my feet to address the House on this subject. I would like to call the hon. Premier's attention to the pledge he gave to this House last session to the effect that no member of the civil service should be dismissed without having had a trial, without having had an opportunity to reply to the charges made against him. I hope the hon. gentleman will give us some explanation in reference to this matter before this debate closes.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think we have heard about enough of this Beamsville post office. From all I have been able to gather from the statement that has been made by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), I think that the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) was perfectly justified in taking the course he did with regard to this dismissal and the appointment of another. In the first place, it was clearly proven by the statement of an hon. member of this House who, I am sure, has the respect and esteem of almost all members from both sides, that the man who was dismissed had taken an open, active partisan part in the elections. I do not think there is any person who will challenge the accuracy of that statement. That fact was reported to the Postmaster General. The hon. member for Lincoln did not demand the dismissal of this officer, but left the matter entirely in the hands of the Postmaster General. The Postmaster General, in the discharge of his duty, and following up the course intimated at the last session of Parliament, that where any man openly offered opposition to any candidate and took an active partisan part in an election, which this man did, no man will deny that——

Mr. McCLEARY. We do deny it.

Mr. McMULLEN. You cannot deny it. He checked off the voters at the polls.

Mr. McCLEARY. No.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) said so. I would like to know if that is not taking an active partisan part in an election. Now, it was distinctly stated at the last session of this Parliament that where any man took such action in an election, he risked his official life. The hon. leader of the Government was quoted as having stated that when it came under the eye of any Minister that a man had taken an active part, an investigation was unnecessary; and the leader of the Government also stated that in a case where a Minister from his own personal knowledge had dismissed a person in his own riding, or where a Minister had seen personally any one taking an active part—in that case he was justified in dismissing that man. Is not any member of this House, in his own place, within his own sphere, in his own riding, as much to be relied upon as any Minister of the Crown? Then I hold that under these circumstances the leader of the Government never intended to say, and his words do not convey the meaning, that the knowledge should be simply and solely confined to the Minister. The fact is that where any man has taken an open and active part in an election under the eye of any member of Parliament, or any Minister, that simple fact, certified to by the member, is a sufficient ground upon

which to dismiss that man. That was the principle laid down last session, and acting upon that principle, the Postmaster General did what I believe he had a perfect right to do, and I believe he would have been recreant to his duty if he had not made the removal in this case, and appointed the man who had acted in that capacity before. Now, I must say this, in view of all my business relations and political transactions with the Postmaster General since he came to discharge the duties of that office, I am prepared to say that he is one of the most painstaking and careful members of the present Cabinet, so far as I have seen, I think he is honestly anxious to discharge his duty faithfully, and I think he is trying to serve his country in its best interests. I am quite sure it was with that view, with an earnest desire to that end, that he dismissed the postmaster at Beamsville and put in his place the man who now occupies it. I think if the Opposition have no better case upon which to found a charge against the Government of acting from political motives and in the interest of their supporters, they have made a very great mistake and have cut a poor figure before the public. My hon. friend has drawn attention to the American system. Why, Sir, the American system has never been transported to this country. I am sorry to say that the political action that comes nearest to adopting the American system, was the action of the Conservative Government in 1878. When hon. gentlemen opposite came into power did they take off the heads of officials one by one? No, Sir, but they positively decapitated officially a whole lot of men, but they did it quietly and cautiously by repealing a statute, and in a short time the law was re-enacted and a number of supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite were appointed. We know that the statutes of this country confirm that fact. But the present Government have not taken that course, they have not encouraged that course in any shape or form. It is only when men have openly been offensive partisans, and taken an active and hostile position in elections against a member, that they have been dismissed from their offices, and justly so. I believe that the lesson that has been given to the civil servants by these dismissals was much needed, and will be of great benefit in future elections. It will teach the civil servants to be prudent, and keep within the sphere of their official duty, and to avoid being led into political hostility against one side or the other. They will learn that while they are officials of this country, they should observe neutrality, and not risk their official heads in their anxiety to help other political friends. I hope that the lesson that has been given them will bear fruit in the future, and that the civil servants will keep within proper and prudent lines, and not expose themselves to the inevitable result that will follow their taking an active and hostile course when elections are held.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not think the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) wishes to misrepresent the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), but if I understood him aright, he has done so. He has laid down the doctrine that a Minister has the right, if, within his own knowledge, a civil servant has taken an offensive part in politics, to dismiss that man; and he says that the Government have the right to make dismissals on the recommendation of a member.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman misunderstood what I said. I said that where a member of this House is perfectly cognizant of an official in his riding taking an open, active, and hostile course in opposition to him, on his so stating to the department under the knowledge he has, that is sufficient to warrant the head of that department in dismissing that man.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is as I understood the hon. gentleman; and the hon. member for Lincoln took the same view when he recommended the Government to dismiss Mr. Fairbrother for taking an open and active part in the election. Now, we had a statement made yesterday by the hon. member for Lincoln, that after the elections were all over he told Mr. Fairbrother: I will not advise the Government to dismiss you. Attend to your own affairs as you have done in the past, and you will not be interfered with. Now, which statement are we to believe? The hon. member for Lincoln who gave his word to Mr. Fairbrother——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Before the election.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, since the election. After the election was over, after these rumours were abroad that he was to be dismissed, Mr. Fairbrother went to the hon. member for Lincoln and asked him if it was true that he was going to recommend his dismissal, and he said: No, I will not recommend your dismissal. Attend to your business in the future as you have done in the past, and your position is all right. Therefore the member for Lincoln can not have recommended to the Government that Mr. Fairbrother should be dismissed; otherwise the statement must fall to the ground that he did not make the recommendation. Now, he must take either one horn or the other of the dilemma. He promised Mr. Fairbrother that he would not do it, and the member for North Wellington says the Government has dismissed him on the recommendation of the member for Lincoln. Now, what we want is the papers, so that we may see if the member for Lincoln did recommend this dismissal, and broke his

word that he gave to Mr. Fairbrother that he would not recommend it. The only statement he made here yesterday was, not that Mr. Fairbrother took an offensive part in the elections, but that he had not treated his assistant fairly—that was the only reason that he gave to this House—that he forwarded the papers to the Postmaster General, and let the Postmaster General act on his own decision, not on his recommendation. But we have his statement that he made, and his promise that he gave to Mr. Fairbrother that he would not recommend his dismissal, therefore the Postmaster General must have acted on the recommendation of some other person than the hon. member for Lincoln, judging by his own statement made in his place in Parliament yesterday.

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

After Recess.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). There is no objection whatever to an order of the House being passed for the production of the papers asked for, and if the discussion had been restricted until the papers were produced, it would have been confined within narrow limits. The discussion has wandered far beyond the mere issue involved in the removal of the officer in question, and it has taken a wider range as to the principle which should determine dealing with officers generally. On this occasion, as on many others, there appears to be, either by design or accident, an attempt to invoke an incorrect principle, or rather to apply to the acts of the Administration a principle that is not applicable. It is suggested that whenever a public officer is dismissed by the present Administration it is an application of the principle "to the victors belong the spoils." I entirely repudiate the idea that there is any foundation for asserting that such a principle has been applied in this case, or in any other case that has come to my knowledge in connection with dismissals by the present Administration. There is a wide distinction between dismissal for cause and dismissal without cause. Where there is dismissal without cause, then it may be argued that the principle referred to has been applied; but where the dismissal is for cause, then the only question is, was there sufficient cause or was there not. In all the cases that the present Administration have dealt with the dismissals have been made for good and sufficient cause. The doctrine "to the victors belong the spoils" implies that the men are dismissed from office without cause and without reason, simply because their party has gone down in the political battle and with the party the office-holders. That is not the condition of affairs in connection with any dismissal I am aware of, that has taken place by order of the present Administration. I listened last night to the leader of the Opposition, I will not say with surprise, because I am accustomed to the exaggerations of that hon. gentleman. If I had not had a great many years' experience listening to him I might perhaps have attached some weight to his exaggerated language; but remembering his indulgence in hyperbole and his strong expressions, and that in his habit of drawing upon his imagination to supply the place for facts, he is challenging the supremacy of Baron Munchausen in the realm of fiction. I have learnt to attach little or no importance to remarks made by the hon. gentleman. The less foundation there is for argument the more vehement he becomes and the more largely he indulges in invective. Thus yesterday he almost exhausted his extensive vocabulary of invective to find sufficient attributes with which to characterize the wrong-doings of this Administration. The hon. gentleman has long since abandoned the use of attributes that are not superlative in degree. Can any one imagine an hon. gentleman, filling the responsible position of leader of the Opposition, addressing this House with a "Hansard" reporter taking down his words, and making the statement he did in regard to his own practice and in regard to a particular act, and being cognizant of what he was talking about. Dealing with the case of Ryan, I think it was, the hon. gentleman stated that he had given that man a full investigation, that the charge against him had the fullest investigation. I am sorry the hon. gentleman is not in his place. He who became so virtuously indignant at the dismissal of officers by this Administration, because, as he said, there had been no investigation and it was an entire departure from anything he had ever been a party to, that even in the case of John Ryan his conduct had been subjected to the fullest investigation—is on record as having stated on a previous occasion in this House that there had been no investigation. Not only so, but the "Hansard" itself contains the evidence that there was no investigation. I challenge the hon. gentleman or any one to produce any evidence whatever in support of the correctness of the hon. gentleman's statement that there had been an investigation of the case of John Ryan. I have before me a copy of the letter read in the House last session in the presence of the hon. gentleman, its reading being interrupted by interjections from the hon. gentleman, and this letter is signed Charles Tupper and was written to the father of John Ryan, who had been dismissed.

Mr. HAGGART. Is the hon. gentleman certain that the leader of the Opposition said there was an "investigation"?

Mr. McDOUGALL. I do not think the hon. gentleman wishes to be unfair. If he

will look at "Hansard" he will not find the word "investigation."

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I heard the words "subject to the fullest investigation."

Mr. McDOUGALL. No; "fullest inquiry and consideration."

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am giving my version of what he said, and I think I am giving a correct version.

Mr. GILLIES. I am sure the hon. gentleman will pardon me for interrupting him, but there is a difference as to a statement of fact. The hon. Minister purports to quote the words of the leader of the Opposition, as to his having stated that there was a full inquiry. The words are as follows:—

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Did he have an investigation?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There was the fullest inquiry. He was guilty of this conduct at a crowded public meeting in the city of Moncton, hundreds of people were cognizant of it, it was a matter of public notoriety, and after a full investigation——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. A full investigation.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, a long period elapsed between this conduct and the date of dismissal. There is hardly a gentleman in the House who will say that if an official goes to the length of using physical force at a public meeting, you would not be perfectly justified in dismissing him.

The statement was not "full investigation," but "full inquiry."

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I leave my hon. friend where he has put himself. I had not looked at "Hansard."

Mr. GILLIES. The Postmaster General misapprehends the point. The hon. Minister interjected the word "investigation," after the leader of the Opposition had said "fullest inquiry." The leader of the Opposition followed this up by saying there was the "fullest inquiry."

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I find the word "investigation"—I need not repeat the statement. The leader of the Opposition stated that there had been the "fullest inquiry"—I do not care what term hon. members choose to say was used, because both the words "inquiry" and "investigation" were used. What is the fullest inquiry? Is it an inquiry made by a Minister alone, without giving any opportunity for the officer to be heard? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Gillies) is a lawyer, and does he say that an investigation or inquiry is of the fullest kind if it is so held? The leader of the Opposition was drawing on his imagination, and he was entirely in error when he said there had been an investigation. However, since he has apologized for the language, I am willing to allow the hon. gentleman to withdraw it, because he frequently says what he does not mean. This is but one proof of the correctness of what I have said of him. The leader of the Opposition in this letter laid down the principle upon which dismissals should take place. He wrote it on the 7th April, 1883, and addressed it to the father of the dismissed official. He says:

In reply to your letters of the 17th November and the 9th February, on the subject of the dismissal of your son from the service of the Intercolonial Railway, I have to state, that the reason for his dismissal was, that he openly took a very active part in opposition to the Government at the last election. This, as you will readily understand, no Government officer can be permitted to do, and your son's action was so conspicuous that it cannot be passed over.

It is there stated that this particular officer was dismissed for taking an open part against the Government, and I presume that the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) at that time took a course which he deemed proper in the public interest. How comes it that that rule is a good one for him to follow, and that he repudiates it when some other Government chooses to apply it. Talk about the fullest inquiry; why, the dismissal took place months and months before the leader of the Opposition made known the reasons for it. On the 17th November a letter was written to the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) asking for the reason of the dismissal. He did not reply then that there had been an inquiry, and he did not say until eighteen years afterwards that there had been an inquiry. How can the hon. gentleman say, eighteen years aferwards that there was an inquiry, full or otherwise, in connection with the transaction. The second letter was sent to him on the 9th February, and the hon. gentleman did not offer any excuse or explanation then. It was not until the 7th April, six months afterwards, that he ventured to explain why this officer had been removed from the service, and then he did not pretend to say that it was necessary to have an investigation, nor does he dare to say so now.

My hon. friends opposite seem desirous of discussing post office matters at considerable length, and I have no fault to find with them for that because they are quite within their right, and the subject-matter of discussion is worthy of public attention. I do say, Sir, that there is no branch of the service which more calls for neutrality on the part of officials than does the postal service. I have had occasion to look into complaints against the conduct of some postmasters during the recent election, and previously. Many hon. gentlemen opposite have spoken to me in apologetic language on behalf of many officials, friends of theirs, and whenever I could do so I have not disturbed these officials. I have not disturbed a

single officer on the permanent force, for cause or otherwise, with the exception of two cases, one of whom was reported as being guilty of corrupt practices by the trial judges. Even in that case, there are circumstances that appeal to my pity, and these circumstances I am considering with a view to see if it is possible to give that officer any relief. There is one officer in the department at Ottawa at this moment, and there are others in the outside service, who I know have committed offences, and against whom complaints have been made to me from undoubted sources, for having committed political offences quite as great as those complained of by the leader of the Opposition, and for which he dismissed Mr. James Ryan.

Well, Sir, I have not, in a single case, except, as already mentioned, dismissed one such officer, and whenever I have to recommend the dismissal of an officer I do it with regret, and would wish that I had not to perform so painful a duty. At the same time I am here to discharge my duty, and I propose to discharge that duty, and neither intimidation, nor criticisms, nor abuse, nor attack, nor any other influence will cause me to swerve from discharging my duty. I propose to show why, in this particular branch of the service, the officials, and postmasters especially, should observe a proper and dignified neutrality. Let me give an illustration or two in regard to matters which have been brought to my knowledge. In one case, in a small community in a rural district, the postmaster, with a salary of $200 or $300 a year, was one of a political committee and became deeply interested in party work. There were meetings in his post office, probably after hours, and as the election proceeded this man became so deeply interested in the contest, that he yielded to temptation and failed to discharge his duties as postmaster. He neglected to deliver letters, he prevented notices of meetings reaching their destination in proper time, and hindered campaign literature passing through the mails in the regular way. In another case, the postmaster so far forgot himself as to retain a letter for ten days, and then to alter the post date on it in his own handwriting, and so brought himself within the reach of the criminal law. In another case, the postmaster withheld a letter which was directed to a well-known political agent, although the latter called for it several times. In that way, and in many other ways, the rights of Her Majesty's subjects, regardless of politics, to have equal use of the mails, were interfered with. That state of affairs will increase in intensity so long as postmasters are permitted to become involved in party strife, and thus be tempted for the time being to place their political zeal before their official duty. Believing as I do, that the postal service exists for all the people of Canada regardless of party politics, I shall require the strictest neutrality from all the public officials engaged in that service.

Complaint is made that the appointment of Mr. Allan was not proper because of his being so advanced in years. Well, I have precedent for that. In 1892 a postmaster was appointed for the important city of Sherbrooke, in the province of Quebec, and the late Government appointed to that office a gentleman who, in the civil list, is described as of uncertain age, born about 1820, showing that he was seventy-two years of age when appointed.

Mr. CLANCY. Did you approve of the appointment ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not passed any opinion upon the appointment ; but there is this to be said about it, that it is much less defensible in the public interest, so far as age is concerned, because that particular officer would be entitled to superannuation, whereas if the Beamsville postmaster were to become unfit to discharge his duties, his office not being a staff office, his name would be simply taken off the list, and he would cease to be a charge upon the public revenue.

The leader of the Opposition proceeded in other ways to refer to the Administration, and I would refer to him a little. No public servant ever did more to demoralize the civil service of Canada than that hon. gentleman. He was appointed to a high position under the Government, a position demanding the strictest neutrality. He was our High Commissioner in London ; and yet, while retaining his office and receiving a large salary, he came out here in 1891, came down from his high position, took the stump, and became a political partisan of the worst kind. He well knew that he was doing an improper act, and the example he then set, unrebuked by his leaders, was imitated by other civil servants ; and so, the whole army of civil servants of this country—not all, but the great majority of them—came to believe that they were there to serve their party on the platform and promote their election. That vicious example set by the leader of the Opposition has borne fruit ; and now he would seek to escape from the responsibility of the demoralization of the civil service produced by that example, under cover of violent denunciation, because the result of his example brings disaster to those who unfortunately followed his lead.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The Government advanced $2,000 to pay his expenses in the meantime.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That may be ; I know nothing of that. But I would say, in conclusion, that when a member of this House in the position of my hon. friend from Lincoln gives me a statement in writing, upon his responsibility as a member of ths House——

Mr. GILLIES. But he did not give it to you, he says.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman is misinformed. When the hon. member for Lincoln gave me his assurance, whether in writing or verbally it would make no difference, that a postmaster in the village of Beamsville had to his own knowledge committed the offences in question, further inquiry would in my opinion be unnecessary. It would prolong action, and would result in considerable expense, but would accomplish no other purpose. No Government will question the absolute accuracy of the statement of my hon. friend. When a member in the position of my hon. friend from Lincoln makes a statement of the kind, there is the best guarantee that his statement is absolutely within the facts. He is bound to make good that statement before his electors and before the country. As a public man, he cannot afford to make a statement to me of something within his own knowledge if that statement is not literally true ; and, with evidence of that kind, a Minister would be derelict in his duty if he did not accept it as a full statement of the facts. At all events, in the future as in the past, I accept the words of my colleagues on matters within their own knowledge, and I consider that those statements are incapable of disproof, and that further inquiry under the circumstances would be an idle sham. For these reasons, I am satisfied that the man who was dismissed cannot truthfully contradict the statement upon which he was dismissed. When my hon friend from Lincoln said he saw him with his own eyes do these things——

Mr. HAGGART. What things ? I have not heard them yet.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not got the exact answer before me.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. He will find them in the " Hansard " of yesterday.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I suppose they are the same things that are on record in the department—if I remember rightly, that he was an active worker in the campaign, that he canvassed, that he was engaged as an outside scrutineer on election day, and so on. He was agent for my hon. friend's opponent. These were the offences for which he was dismissed, and I ask if there is one man on that side of the House who will contradict or question the accuracy of the statement of my hon. friend from Lincoln. If not, no one will say that further inquiry was necessary. I did not quite catch the remarks of the hon. gentleman who made this motion. I understood that he had some affidavits, but I did not hear any affidavit of the ex-postmaster controverting the statements that were made on the floor of Parliament in answer to the inquiry of the hon. member for Welland (Mr. McCleary) as to why Mr. Fairbrother had been dismissed. I do not understand that up to this moment he has dared to contradict the statements, and they stand confessed by his silence to be true. Then, what nonsense it is—it is a tempest in a tea-pot—to make a noise about an inquiry that would be productive of nothing. The whole issue is whether the statements made by the hon. member for Lincoln are or are not correct ; and until the accused person can by evidence make out a case that the charges are untrue, then, I say, he is out of court. And I will further give this challenge : If the dismissed postmaster can satisfy me that the statements made against him and for which he was dismissed were untrue, I will have great pleasure in doing my duty and reinstating him in office. Until that is done, he will remain outside.

Mr. BENNETT. The question under discussion is whether or not the postmaster of the village of Beamsville was given what the hon. First Minister said last year would be given to every person against whom a charge was preferred—the right to meet his accusers face to face and disprove or have proved against him the charges made. That point has been raised, but a very large field has been gone over from one province to another, and perhaps no person is to be more congratulated than the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) on the quantity of extraneous matter which he introduced into the debate this afternoon. I remember well, when quite a lad, I first heard Sir Charles Tupper address some thousands of people in the town of Barrie, on the occasion of a very large demonstration, and how I was struck with the greatness and ability of the man. In the last Parliament I had the pleasure of knowing the then member for Cumberland, the Hon. Mr. Dickey, then Minister of Justice ; and comparing the present member with these two men, who formerly represented that constituency, it would seem that the people of Cumberland have at last found a representative beside whom Sir Charles Tupper and the Hon. Mr. Dickey pale into utter insignificance. The hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) has made speeches all over the country and in this House on questions of vital moment to the country, but what were these compared with the utterances of the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) this afternoon ? That hon. gentleman must for years back have been pursuing the task of hunting the pedigree of the Tupper family and that, too, at the imminent danger to his life or at least to his health. I can imagine him standing in the draughts of blacksmiths' shops, listening to the people, who were in their prime, years ago, retailing to his absorbing ears who were the ancestors of the Tuppers. I can fancy his hanging

around corner grocery stores listening to town gossip——

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The hon. gentleman's fancy is stronger than his argument.

Mr. BENNETT. I can fancy the hon. gentleman at all times pursuing what should be the bent of a future statesman, endeavouring to find out something of great import to the country as a whole, and to-night he has moved down from the back benches to one of the Minister's seats, no doubt imagining that in one bound he has achieved promotion and become a Cabinet Minister. The hon. gentleman's remarks remind me of the fact that a man named Hamilton once made a brilliant speech in the House of Commons and after that subsided into unbroken silence, and his name was handed down to posterity as "Single-speech Hamilton." I trust that the hon. gentleman will never be handed down to posterity as having achieved a high reputation on the speech he made this afternoon. Be that as it will, the hon. gentleman is no doubt satisfied with his effort of this afternoon, he has no doubt placed on his own abilities the highest value, and I do not think any one will take occasion to quarrel with him in that respect.

I think this question should have been dealt with on its merits alone. I concede the perfect right of a Minister to accept the word of one of his supporters, I can understand the Minister accepting the word of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) as to the truth of the charges made against this postmaster, but I say that if those charges were true, that was the stronger reason why an investigation should have been held, and if they were not true, then an injustice has been done this man. If they were true, the accused should have had the opportunity of meeting his accusers face to face. Why, the hon. member for Lincoln stands forth as the embodiment of a great institution in this country, which preaches brotherly love and throws over every man the mantle of charity, and I think the hon. gentleman should have extended to this accused postmaster a little of that compassion which he and many others have always preached, on every possible occasion. And if the ardour of youth had impelled this young man to be rather restive in the political field, the hon. gentleman should rather have condoned the first offence, particularly when, as has been stated in the debate, he himself told this young man that nothing had been done by him of which the hon. gentleman had reason to complain.

Mr. GIBSON. I do not wish the hon. gentleman to misrepresent me or put words into my mouth which I did not say. What I said was that the young man, having heard certain rumours which were very rife and prevalent in the village in the month of June, came to my house and asked me if it was my intention to recommend his discharge, and I frankly told him no, so long as he behaved himself; and it was because he misbehaved himself that I added my testimony to the evidence given by Mr. Zimmerman.

Mr. BENNETT. That is exactly what I understood the hon. gentleman to say the other day. All these matters of which complaint were made occurred in and about the election, and not at all subsequent to it. Surely he could not accuse the postmaster of having been extra jubilant after the election. I suppose that his emotions were rather suppressed then, and that it was the hon. gentleman who was in a jubilant mood. So that when the hon. gentleman promised the postmaster that no complaint would be made of what he had done, he afterwards, on his own statement, broke faith with this young man. That must certainly follow the statement he has made.

I am pleased to hear the hon. Postmaster General make the statement that the department is to be conducted on the basis of non-partisanship; and if he proposes to carry out that promise, I can refer him to my own riding, where he will find some most glaring cases to deal with. He will find there two postmasters who were very active on the stump against me in the last campaign, and if that will not suffice, I can bring to his notice two cases of postmasters openly tampering with letters, and if that will not suffice, I can show the hon. gentleman postmasters who have been the most active partisans in the last five years. What I stated in the House last year when this question of the dismissal of public servants was up, I repeat to-day, and that is that during the time I had control of patronage, in the last five years, I always thought life was too short to heckle and harrass and worry men who were opposed to me politically. And if politics consist in venting your spleen and indignation on men against whom you have feeling, as the hon. member for Lincoln evidently has done, on his own admission, then all I can say is that politics must be reduced to the level of the men in power, because they are evidently above the level of the men who to-day have control of the patronage. I trust the Postmaster General will deal alike with Conservatives and Liberals. If he is prepared to give the same treatment all around I shall have much pleasure in submitting the names of two postmasters in East Simcoe who certainly distinguished themselves very much in the past campaign on behalf of the Liberal candidate in that riding. There is no doubt that in this case the postmaster at Beamsville was not fairly and honourably treated by the hon. member for Lincoln, because after that hon. gentleman had pledged his word that the man would not

be interfered with, he went behind his back and broke that pledge. It is opposed to all spirit of fair-play, it is opposed to British justice, to have acted in this way, and not have permitted the postmaster to confront those who accused him and make them prove the truth or falsity of their charges.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am astonished to hear our neighbours on the other side make such wry faces over the discharge of one postmaster at Beamsville. I live in a city opposite the city of Detroit, into which three trunk railways run, and which requires a good many custom-house officers. In that neighbourhood we have twenty custom-house officers. Out of the twenty, seventeen were Conservatives and three Liberals. Our friends opposite who are making such a fuss about the discharge of this postmaster of nineteen years of age at Beamsville, came to our city and discharged the only three Liberals in the county of Essex who were custom-house officers. Now, I can give the names. One of them was Mr. Samuel Chevalier, a man not more than 60 years old, in good health, and a competent officer. Another was Mr. John Watson, a man who had been twenty or twenty-five years in the service, an able, honest, industrious and prudent officer. And next was Mr. John Brown, who was at least fifteen or twenty years younger than the leader of the Opposition. Now, these men were discharged—for what? For being Liberals.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman permit me? I am informed that these men to whom he refers were superannuated, and not discharged.

Mr. McGREGOR. It was just the same. These men were doing their duty and doing it well. I would ask the hon. gentleman who has asked the question, why the late Government did not discharge some of the older Conservative members of the service who were alongside of these men and who were not nearly as efficient?

Some hon. MEMBERS. And much older.

Mr. COCHRANE. You don't know anything about it.

Mr. McGREGOR. Yes, I do, my dear Christian friend. Was there a trial or an inquiry into the cases of these men?

Mr. HUGHES. This is ancient history; tell us about Miss Kelly.

Mr. McGREGOR. My friend wants to know about Miss Kelly. I will tell him. In the town of Windsor we have a large post office with a full staff of clerks. In fact, they were falling over each other the number was so great. There was a political contest in the constituency of West Huron, and it was a pretty wicked fight between the Hon. J. C. Patterson and Mr. M. C. Cameron. As soon as the contest was over Miss Kelly was sent over from Huron to Windsor as an addition to the employees in the post office. Now, we never required Miss Kelly in Windsor for any purpose. We did not only have to dismiss Miss Kelly from the post office; we have dismissed three or four others, and nobody has been appointed in their places. When the Conservatives dismissed Mr. Chevalier, Mr. Watson and Mr. Brown, they appointed older men than any of them in their places. They appointed William Stokes and P. C. Ponting, both Tory heelers who had been Tory heelers for years. During the last contest we had a young Conservative in the county of Kent who went from place to place against my friend Mr. Campbell, a young man named Killackey. Having served his time on the stump within four or five days after the election, he took a place in the custom-house under the old Administration at a salary of $1,000 a year. And he did more than that—though he went in on the 26th of June he drew full pay for the month of June. Four or five days was quite sufficient for him on which to draw a month's pay. Gentlemen opposite talk about discharging men without trial. Why, Sir, they could not have acted more shamefully than they did in the county of Essex. There is another case. Last year, the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) said that I could not prove what I had said in reference to Mr. Hackett, who had charge of the lighthouse at Amherstburg. He said that I would not dare to move for the papers. But I moved for the papers. Mr. Hackett was appointed in 1876. During 1891 the Conservative Government discharged him, and the reason given on the return was "on the recommendation of the Liberal-Conservative Association of Amherstburg." The Order in Council was passed on the 1st of June, 1891. What are they hollering about a little postmastership in Beamsville for? Let them come to Essex and we will show where they have dismissed man after man because those men were Liberals and for no other reason. Did they put in the customs department more able men, more honest men or younger men? Had they done so, the case would have been different. I hope the time has come when we can close this little bickering because we have a good many cases we can give if necessary. We thought it well enough to let this thing go on for a short time, but where there has been one dismissal by this side, we can prove many dozens on the other. As against this Government we can say that they have not dismissed enough, considering the acts of which many officers have been guilty. They have been in office so long, these customs officers, and officers in the Inland Revenue and Post Office Departments, that they thought they were there for life and could do as they saw fit, so long as they did some damage to a Liberal.

Mr. CLANCY. I am sure if any evidence were needed as to the manner in which hon. gentlemen opposite are conducting the affairs of the country with regard to the officials, hon. members and the country can no longer be in the dark after having heard an hon. gentleman read a lesson to his own friends, meting out the strongest condemnation to the Ministers in this House behind him whom he sits. The hon. gentleman said that officials had been dismissed in the county of Essex, and when he was asked whether they were not superannuated he was forced to admit that they were.

Mr. McGREGOR. I stated so.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman admitted it when he was asked; but he took care not to tell the House that they had been superannuated as his friends are superannuating many officers.

Mr. McGREGOR. They put Tories in their places.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend (Mr. McGregor) is very much distressed because they did not put Liberals in their places. Let me ask my hon. friend if he is putting Conservatives in places that are being made vacant now? The hon. gentleman has one rule for Conservatives and another for Liberals. I want to say to my hon. friend that his statement with regard to an official in the customs at Windsor is entirely an unfair one. The hon. gentleman cannot be possessed of the facts or he would not, on responsibility of a member of this House, go so far as to state what he did with regard to the drawing of his salary for a month by an official who had been in office only a few days. I wish to say to my hon. friend in order that he may not repeat it again—because I do not think he would repeat it if he knew the facts—that official drew his salary on the recommendation of the chief officer saying that he must go upon the pay-sheet during that month, and it would be corrected in the next month. Now, if my hon. friend had made the slightest inquiry he would not have given utterance to a statement so damaging and so unfair.

Mr. McGREGOR. May I ask the hon. gentleman, was it returned the next month? Does he know it was returned?

Mr. CLANCY. I ask my hon. friend who is behind the curtain, who has the confidence of his friends, who has the run of the offices, if he is able to say now that it has not been returned?

Mr. McGREGOR. It has been returned, but not until after I brought the matter up in this House.

Mr. CLANCY. Now, my hon. friend knows perfectly well that this officer did not disgorge when he was caught. He knows he was giving utterance to a statement that was most damaging, and I have no hesitation in saying that it was entirely unworthy of the hon. gentleman. The fact is that this officer drew the salary upon the recommendation of his chief officer, with the understanding that it was to be returned on the other work. Now, the officers he speaks of as having been dismissed, were superannuated, just as his own friends are doing every day now. I think that puts an end to what the hon. gentleman thought to be an offence against his friends. I do not know if he was prompted through the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), who is sitting beside him, in the course he has taken. I am sorry the Postmaster General is not in his place, because I wish to call his attention for a moment to the position of the member for Lincoln. I wish to call attention to the statement that was made in the House yesterday, and was repeated a few moments ago by the hon. gentleman himself, that after the election this young man came to him and said to him: There are all sorts of rumours that I am to be dismissed; what are you going to do? Well, Sir, from those good impulses that sometimes impel us upon the moment, with our notions of fair-play, the hon. gentleman committed himself irrevocably to this statement: Well, so long as you behave yourself, I will have nothing to do with your dismissal, nor will I recommend it.

Mr. GIBSON. In the statement I made yesterday, I gave the reasons why he did not behave himself. Now, I wish to ask the hon. gentleman this question: Does he, as a member of this House, believe the statement I made of the way this young man behaved himself? Does the hon. gentleman believe that the postmaster of Beamsville conducted himself properly towards his assistant by throwing open the doors and abusing him, and then reducing his salary to $20 a month?

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend asks me if I believe that the official now in question had done any wrong to warrant his dismissal. I shall take the hon. gentleman's word, and the House should take his word, that the hon. gentleman gave his pledge to this man. I believe the hon. gentleman's pledge is worth something. I am not yet willing to believe that the hon. gentleman would pledge his word that the official would not be interfered with, and then go back upon it. What did it mean? It meant that he was cognizant, that he saw this young man marking off votes, and that he saw him hauling in voters, and after all that was over, when the offences were all committed, he said: I will not recommend your dismissal at all. Now, upon what ground did he recommend his dismissal? Was it for partisanship? Was it on the ground upon which hon. gentlemen are seeking to dismiss other officials in this country? Had

it anything to do with his public duties? Was it on account of anything pertaining in the slightest to his office that the hon. gentleman changed his mind, withdrew his pledge, went back upon the whole thing, and came down here and made a statement, as he said, to the Postmaster General? Why, it was upon the little thing that they did not divide the salaries properly. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if that is any part of his business? Is he going to inquire into the business of every official to see whether they are getting a just proportion of the salary, whether they are to keep the doors open, whether somebody has been sitting in the draft? Mr. Speaker, this reason is unworthy of an hon. member of this House. It is unworthy of any hon. gentleman to bring such a reason forth and offer it as an excuse for the dismissal of an official. Now, I wish to call the attention of the Postmaster General to this fact. I think the word of a member of this House should have some weight, and it is all well enough for an hon. member to come to this House and say: Certain officials have been aggressive in my election, they have taken a too active part. No doubt these gentlemen speak with some heat, they feel very keenly as we all feel after elections. Then we have more. There is the pressure of those behind who are constantly asking positions from the Government. I care not whether it be a Liberal or a Conservative Government, there is always a constant pressure for positions. Now, what should follow that? Why, the fact is that cases arise every day of the most frivolous and worthless kind, just such as that the hon. member for Lincoln has shown the House. I say conclusively that to proceed upon the ground alone of a statement of a member—I care not how truthful he may be, I care not how often he gives his word of honour and takes it back again—I say it is a most dangerous thing to make dismissals upon statements such as those made in this House by hon. members. I quite admit that it is not a proper thing for officials to make themselves offensive in elections, and it would be infinitely better if a new rule could be laid down by which they would all abstain from that. But I wish to point out that when an official does take an active part, if he is worthy of dismissal, his case is worthy of an investigation. I would like to ask my hon. friend who is a good lawyer, who would urge a case with great vigour and with great ability, if he were defending a client, would he allow his client to lose a dollar even in a division court without calling in witnesses? Should any person be condemned upon mere hearsay? Such a procedure with regard to an official is unjust, because it involves his living, it involves his reputation, and his livelihood for coming years. I think it is an unfair thing. Whatever might be the policy of the Government as to dismissing officials for taking part in elections we have seen nothing yet which would justify any such dismissal in the mind of any person who has any notion of justice, any notion of right, any notion of a procedure that would put it beyond the possibility of a doubt that the accused had committed an offence. I say there is no case too small if hon. gentlemen proceeded upon that line. Where are you going to draw the line between offensive officials and those who are not? Now, I make no apology for their taking part in elections. There has probably been too much of it in the past. I believe it would have been very much better had that not been done. But let me point out to the hon. gentleman that they laid down a rule before they came in office themselves, and I call the attention of the Postmaster General to the condition of affairs in Ontario. The hon. gentleman knows that the officials of the Ontario Government are most offensive partisans. They are in a position to coerce people. Their position is different from that of the Dominon officials, for not only do they use ther influence as individuals but they use their official influence, which is infinitely greater. If the hon. gentleman wanted to be fair and treat officials just as he would like his own friends to be treated in case of a change of Government, he would not endeavour to lay the foundation of a state of things under which all officials in Ontario could to-morrow be turned out on the ground that they had been active partisans in the past. Without discussing the propriety of dismissing public officials and laying down a rule contrary to that which hon. gentlemen opposite had advocated in Opposition, there is no reason why an official should be dismissed without trial. Of the hundreds of cases that have occurred we find very few in which the officials have had a trial. We have had the statement of the Postmaster General that if this young man who has been dismissed can show that he was not guilty of the offence with which he was charged and on which he was dismissed, the Minister would be willing to reinstate him. A stronger case could not be made than that embodied in the admission of the hon. gentleman himself, for he now admits that possibly after all that official was dismissed without cause. This only shows the difficulty of the present system.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Did your party ever make an investigation before dismissing an officer?

Mr. CLANCY. I congratulate hon. gentlemen opposite in finding one case in eighteen years, one letter in eighteen years' administration of public affairs on which they hang their case of an official having been dismissed by a Conservative Government. What was that case? As was stated by the leader of the Opposition, that official was notoriously offensive, and even used physical

force in the presence of hundreds of people. Those statements do not seem to be contradicted. I remember the Minister of Marine and Fisheries stating last session that he knew of a case of an official who was at a public meeting at which he was present and used offensive language—I do not know if he used physical force—and the Minister dismissed him. I think the hon. gentleman was quite right in his acton. But now hon. gentlemen opposite are able to find a single case, hinging on a single letter and they put that against hundreds of cases of dismissals that have occurred during the last nine or ten months, and they ask the country to take that as an answer. I have only to state this, that hon. gentlemen are more hopeful than is usual under circumstances of that kind. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) gave a very wholesome warning in the course of his speech. He said: Do not goad us on to dismissing officials; you had better keep quiet; I have not asked for any dismissals in my county, but if you are very noisy you may have to go; we have laid down a new rule, and in England they are pursuing a similar course. The hon. gentleman, however, on more than one occasion has had local officials side by side with him on the public platform and going through the riding with him, fighting the battles of the Liberal party. It is astonishing how hon. gentlemen have so quickly reconciled themselves to changed conditions. Hon. gentlemen opposite are now in office and they are making use of the patronage. It is unfair and illogical for hon. gentlemen now to say that they are not following the doctrine "that to the victors belong the spoils." Hon. gentlemen may make that declaration, but the fact is they are doing so every day. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not seem to assent to that proposition, but the Ministers are constantly dismissing officials. Let me tell them more. There are cases where officials have asked to be allowed to appear by counsel, where investigations are held, and the instructions of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries are not to permit counsel to appear. Is it unfair not to permit a man, who is unable to speak English, or speak it very imperfectly, to employ some one to conduct his case for him? Yet the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has given instructions not to permit this to be done. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) has been after the heads of the officials in his county. He came down and told the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that certain officials had been fighting against him, that their heads must come off, and they have come off. The hon. gentleman has had one or two cases of that kind. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman is actuated by the statement made by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), who said he was astonished at his own moderation, and has not had more heads removed. I know of cases of dismissals in which the officials asked for an investigation but were unable to get it. I point to the dismissal of Mr. Pelletier as Inspector of Fisheries.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Has he been dismissed?

Mr. CLANCY. He has received notice of dismissal; whether he has been retained or reinstated I do not know. I saw the letter of dismissal, but whether he is still acting I am not aware. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to that particular case. The gentleman holding the investigation sent a letter to the person charged with the offence stating that he would hold an investigation in Chatham on a certain day; but the person charged, being a farmer living two miles from the post office and not going there for his mail every day, did not receive the notice until the day after the investigation was held. The other party being nearer at hand—I will not say having any warning—appeared, and the investigation proceeded.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Who was the commissioner?

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Sheppard.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The inspector for Ontario.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Pelletier protested against this course, and asked for a re-hearing. I do not know what the report or recommendation of Mr. Sheppard was; but a commissioner can make a strong report when he hears the evidence of only one side. I am informed that Mr. Pelletier applied to Mr. Sheppard, and possibly to the department, for the case to be reopened in order that he might be able to put in his reply; but the request was not granted. I hope the hon. Minister will not lay down that rule as one to be applied to other officials. This official should have had an opportunity given him of disproving the charges. I have no more to say beyond this on that point: We have an affidavit solemnly sworn to by Mr. Fairbrother, denying in the most positive and categorical way every charge made against him. We have it on the statement of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) that he did not think the conduct of the postmaster merited dismissal. The hon. member thought, that although Mr. Fairbrother took part in the election, his action was not sufficiently offensive to dismiss the young man and he gave him his assurance to that effect. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson) now tells us, that he discovered afterwards that this young man had not been dealing quite fairly with some of the officials in the office—a matter with which neither he nor the Government had anything to do—and so he took back his word, and went to the Postmaster General and had this young man dismissed without the slightest investigation. The Government may disclaim as much as they

like, and they may deny as much as they like, but conduct of that kind proves beyond question that they have inaugurated the spoils system in this country. The friends of the Government have been pressing them for the last nine months, but I do hope that Ministers will have stamina enough now, to say, that no officials will be dismissed unless it has been made perfectly clear that they have been active partisans, and until they have had a chance of answering every charge made against them. In not one case out of ten where officials have been dismissed, have they been allowed even a sham trial. The Government have dismissed officials on the statement of a member of Parliament, who possibly does not know the facts, but who comes to a Minister and says: I want so and so dismissed, as I believe he has taken an active part in the election. Probably that action of the member is instigated by men who are candidates for the position, and who will get it when it is made vacant. We all know that human nature is weak, and no one more than the members of the Cabinet who are lawyers have the best means of knowing, the danger of accepting any such evidence as that. The country will judge the Government by their acts, and unless they retrace their steps the consequence of their conduct will come home to them in no uncertain way.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The hon. member for Welland (Mr. McCleary) and the gentlemen on the other side of the House who have backed him up in this debate, have not added much to their reputation, nor have they done any service to those of their friends whom they are seeking to benefit. It is making a mountain out of a mole hill, and it is altogether unworthy taking up so much of the time of Parliament with this little two-penny-half-penny affair. To the personal knowledge of an hon. member of the House, this discharged postmaster acted as scrutineer on the day of election, checking off the voters as they came in to vote, and brought voters to the polls in cabs to vote for the Conservative candidate. A man who would do that should have been dismissed at once, and the Postmaster General did perfectly right in accepting the statement of the hon. member for Lincoln, and giving that official the grand bounce. If he wants to be a politician he will have to cease to be a postmaster. It is amusing to hear some members of the Opposition lecture the Government, and dictate to them the standard of morality which they should adopt. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) has referred to the Ontario officials, and said that every one of them is an active partisan. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) is indeed ungrateful to the Ontario officials in the county which he represented in the local legislature for many years, and part of which I represent in this House now. Why, Sir, nearly every one of these officials of the Ontario Government were strong supporters of his. The sheriff of the county, the jailor——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Two bailiffs in the county of Kent, were his strongest supporters, and at every election where he was a candidate these men did their best to elect him to the local House.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well, that the jailor and the bailiff to whom he refers, were appointed, not by the Liberal party but by the Conservative party.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What difference does that make, they were Ontario officials.

Mr. CLANCY. Wait a moment till I explain.

Mr. LANDERKIN. We think Mr. Campbell can explain it better than you can.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) has no right to say that they were active in my support. They dare not open their mouths. But let me ask the hon. gentleman, what about Mr. Mills and what about Mr. Rankin who are Ontario officials, and who were presidents and secretaries of the Reform Association?

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is true that these officials were appointed by the Conservatives, but all the same they are officials of the Ontario Government.

Mr. CLANCY. And they dare not say a word.

Mr. CAMPBELL. They have always been consistent Conservatives, and they have always supported the hon. gentleman, and it is ungrateful on his part to throw slurs on those men who helped him so well. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) must remember that Mr. Rankin holds a position to which there is no salary attached. He is one of the license commissioners, and when the license commissioners were appointed in the county of Kent, the president of the Conservative Association was also appointed.

Mr. CLANCY. No.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, but because there was no salary attached to it he would not hold the office.

Mr. FRASER. That is it; after the money.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The Tories do not care for any offices unless there is a good round salary attached to it, and that was the reason why Mr. D. R. VanAllan, the president of the Conservative Association of the county of Kent refused the office he was appointed to. It is most unfair for the hon.

gentleman (Mr. Clancy) to contend, that gentlemen holding a purely honorary position should be debarred from taking part in elections. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) has referred to Killackey, but I do not think that he knows the facts or else he would not have made the statement he made to-night. There never was in Canada a more disgraceful course pursued by any public officer than that pursued by Mr. Killackey. On the 12th of May the Order in Council was passed appointing him preventive officer in the town of Windsor. He was advised by his own friends to retire from politics and attend to the duties of his office. They told him that possibly the Government might be defeated and that if he continued in the campaign it might be unpleasant for him. His reply was that he did not care, that the Government would not be defeated, but that even if they were he would hold his position.

Mr. BENNETT. Did not the hon. gentleman admire him for that?

Mr. CAMPBELL. The Order in Council appointing him to that position was passed on the 12th of May, and he continued actively from day to day stumping the county, and appearing every night at political meetings and taking part in the Conservative interest.

Mr. CLANCY. No.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but he knows it is true. He knows that Mr. Killackey continued until a few days of the election to take an active part in the contest. There never was a man in that county or any other who abused the Liberal party and the hon. leader of the Liberal party as did that gentleman. He denounced the leader of the Liberal party and the present Premier of this Dominion as a traitor to his race and creed, and pointed to him as a man who should not receive the confidence of the electors. Night after night he appeared on the platform, until two or three days before the election.

Mr. CLANCY. I wish to tell the hon. gentleman that he is making a statement that is utterly apart from the truth.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman should withdraw that expression.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I bow to your decision with pleasure. I accept it in the truest parliamentary sense. I desire to say to the hon. gentleman who has taken his seat that I know personally that Mr. Killackey never went on the stump after he received the notice of his appointment.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is begging the question altogether. The Order in Council appointing Mr. Killackey was passed on the 12th of May; the election took place on the 23rd of June. Mr. Killackey knew immediately after the Order in Council was passed that he was appointed. The Chatham "Planet," the Tory organ in the county of Kent, announced it in its editorial column; the Windsor "Record," the Chatham "Banner," and every other paper in the two counties announced it. He was congratulated on the appointment by his friends, and he was advised by his best friends to cease taking any part in the contest.

Mr. HUGHES. The papers have also announced that Mr. McGregor, the representative of North Essex, has been appointed collector of customs at Windsor.

Mr. McGREGOR. Is it the "Warder"?

Mr. FRASER. Then it would not be believed.

Mr. HUGHES. No, the "Globe."

Mr. CAMPBELL. This gentleman, as I have stated, continued addressing public meetings in the county of Kent up to within three or four days of the election. I know it because I met him on the platform myself, and there is no use for the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) shaking his head, because I met him and had to defend myself against his attacks. But what more did this gentleman do? As my hon. friend from North Essex (Mr. McGregor) has stated, the next day after the election he went down to Windsor and took possession of his office on the 26th of June. He served four days as preventive officer at Windsor. One of the first duties he had to perform was to make out the pay-sheet, and what do you think he did? Mr. W. P. Killackey put down his name for a whole month's salary and received it. He turned it off on the poor old collector, who was sick in bed, saying that the collector had advised him to do it, and that he could refund it next month; but the next month he again put down his name for his full salary; and when August came around, he again put down his name and drew the salary for the full month of August; and when September came around, he put down his name again and drew his full salary for the month of September; but on the 11th of September, when the matter came up in the House of Commons, and when the papers in Windsor and in other places called attention to what they called Killackey's "gall," he found that it was getting too hot for him, and then, on the last day of September, the poor fellow thought he had better refund the money that he had stolen in the month of June last. He knew, when he drew a month's salary in June, that he had only put in four days.

Mr. CLANCY. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not intend to do that official an injustice. If the hon. gentleman will look at the report of the Minister of Cus-

toms, he will see that he made a note in his statement——

Mr. McGREGOR. No, he did not.

Mr. CLANCY—that he had no idea of taking a salary to which he knew he was not entitled.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What an innocent fellow this man was. He put in four days in the month of June, and the poor, innocent man did not know that he was stealing a month's salary, less four days, when he drew it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Shame.

Mr. CAMPBELL. He says that, on the advice of the poor, old collector of custsoms, who was sick in bed, and not able to attend to the duties of his office, he drew his salary that month, saying that it could be returned the next month; but he did not return it until public notoriety called his attention to it, and it got too hot for him; and he returned it on the last day of September. This is the man whom the hon. member for Bothwell is defending; this is the man who is still in the office at Windsor, whom this Government has not yet turned out. I say he ought to have been dismissed in five minutes after the Government came into power; and when these gentlemen get up and make a hue and cry about a two-penny half-penny little post office at Beamsville, as they have, they are simply bringing home to the Government the fact that they are geting no thanks for their forbearance and leniency. The hon. member for Bothwell also refers to the case of Mr. Pelletier, inspector of fisheries in the county of Kent. I am glad he has brought that matter to the attention of the House, because if ever the late Government deserved the severe censure of the House, it was for the way they dismissed the predecessor of Mr. Pelletier, Mr. Timothy McQueen, who had been inspector of fisheries there for sixteen or eighteen years. There was no charge brought against him.

Mr. CLANCY. Yes, there was, and it was investigated too.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is true that there was an investigation, but Mr. McQueen was not invited to attend; it was held without the chief witness being present. Mr. Pelletier's friends held an investigation, but Mr. McQueen was given no opportunity of being present and defending himself. I say that there never was a more disgraceful affair than the dismissal of Mr. McQueen in the county of Kent, solely because he would not support the Conservative candidate in that county. Now, what has Mr. Pelletier done? It was notorious, everybody knew it, that during the last contest he canvassed actively and openly for Mr. William Ball, the Conservative candidate. The hon. gentleman says he had no notice. All I know is that the inspector of fisheries in the province of Ontario, Mr. W. B. Sheppard, of Toronto, who, everybody knows, is a strong Conservative.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Why, you are not acquainted with the gentleman. Charges were made against Mr. Pelletier. The inspector sent him notice of these charges and of the investigation, a week before he held the investigation in the town of Chatham. The same day that the notices were mailed to him they were mailed to other parties there, but Mr. Pelletier never came before the investigation at all. He knew that he could not defend his conduct, he knew that he had been guilty of the grossest partisanship, and that he could not answer the charges, and so he kept away purposely. Evidence was produced, and I do not know what the report was because I have not had the pleasure of seeing it, but Mr. Pelletier is still there performing the duties of his position. But I do say this, that if ever there was a man whose head ought to come off it is that of Mr. Pelletier in the county of Kent, and if there should be a vacancy, the old inspector, who for many long years filled the position to the satisfaction of everybody, against whom no charges were levelled at all, ought to be reinstated in the position from which he was unjustly and without investigation dismissed a few years ago. I do not know that I have anything more to say at present. I think the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) has been exceedingly unfortunate in the cases he has brought before the House. In the case of Killackey, that gentleman is still holding his position. Mr. Pelletier is still performing the duties of his position, and if the Government do not cut off the heads of those two officials, they will not be doing their duty to the people. I have a good deal of sympathy for the officials because a great many of them, who took part in the elections, were ordered to do so by the late Government. Why, a Government mail clerk in the county of Kent, who received leave of absence, spent about two or three weeks canvassing against me, and of that the hon. member for Bothwell no doubt is aware. That man has not been dismissed because I believe he was innocent of any evil intent. He was actually ordered to do what he did. These gentlemen were so long in power that they began to think they owned this country and would stay in office for ever, and they instructed their officials that if they did not turn out on election day and do all they could for the party, they would be dismissed. Those who took an active part in the elections, those who were strong party men, received their promotion or had their salary advanced, and in many cases these poor men were ordered to do, and actually did

work which they had no heart to do. I think the Government have been exceedingly fair in their dealings with these officials, and if there is any censure to bring it, must be because the Government have not been more prompt in dismissing more officials. I can assure my hon. friends opposite that if they continue this course of pitching into the Government and refusing them credit for their leniency, they will do more to goad the Government on and make things worse for their own friends. The hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Bothwell threatened to-night that they would pay us back, when they got into power, in our own coin. Well, they have been doing that for the last eighteen years. During that time, there was hardly a single Liberal in the whole Dominion appointed to a position, and the few Liberals who were in office when they came into power, they took steps to get rid of as soon as they could. By repealing the Weights and Measures Act, they destroyed every official in the province of Ontario, and that solely for the purpose of installing their own friends in office. There has been too much said about this question, and I would advise our friends to drop their talk about dismissing officials from this moment out.

Mr. DYMENT. To my politically untutored mind, some of the questions that have been brought before this House by the Opposition are most senseless and childish, and this is one of them. It is a perfect farce. We are sent here to look after the affairs of the country to the best of our ability, and we have now wasted two days of the time of this House, and for what? Because the Opposition are trying to defend an official, who plainly and openly worked for them in the elections against the hon. member for Lincoln. I venture to say that if the tables had been turned, if this official had worked for a Liberal, and the Conservative Government were returned to power, his head would have dropped into the basket inside of two weeks. If hon. gentlemen opposite think that by such means as this they can win their way back to power at the next elections, they will be sadly mistaken—more sadly mistaken even than they were in Quebec on the 23rd of June last. The people are sick and tired of this. I do not rise to exonerate the Government at all because they have done nothing that requires exoneration. If it were not presumption on my part, I would criticise them for not having dismissed more than they have. They have not dismissed one-tenth of those they should. My district is actually overrun with partisan officials, men who got out and worked against me in the last election, and but few of whom have been dismissed. Let me mention a few of them who have so worked and still retain their office. The Indian doctor at Gore Bay in the Manitoulin Islands is the president of the Conservative association there, and distributed literature and canvassed against me in the last election. Another Indian doctor who, by the way, drew over $1,600 a year from the country, was one of the biggest Conservative politicians in the whole of Algoma. In fact if it had not been for him, my friend, Mr. McDonald, would not have got the nomination at Sudbury when he did. It was this Indian doctor who turned the tables for Mr. McDonald. This is a notorious fact, yet this man had been allowed to remain on until now, I am sorry to say, he has passed over to the majority. I refused to ask for his dismissal, as I refused in many other cases, and I must say that of those whose dismissals I did ask for the Ministers refused absolutely to consider the cases at all, unless the fullest proof was given to them of some wrong-doing. The postmaster at Gore Bay at a political meeting just the next night after I had spoken, got on the platform and addressed the meeting, and yet he still retains his position. There is Mr. McGovern, the immigration agent at Port Arthur. It is notorious that he had full charge of the voters' lists for the Conservatives at the last revision. He enjoys, in the capacity of immigration agent, a pass over the Canadian Pacific Railway and was sent up and down the line arranging the voters' lists and he is still in his office. Mr. Robinson the postmaster at Manitouwaning atttended meetings against me and, even at my own meeting at Manitouwaning interrupted me. Mr. Davis, the postmaster at Norman, I am told on what I believe to be the very best authority —indeed I think I have an affidavit to that effect—canvassed against me. I am informed that he went to one of the men working on the road at Rat Portage, a common labourer, and told him that if he did not vote for Mr. McDonald in the last election he would have him dismissed from that paltry job. He was a councillor in Rat Portage. There is Mr. N. W. Ross, and my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) well knows that he is one of the strongest partisan officials. There has not been an election since he went there that he has not been the biggest toad in the puddle. He is still in office. There is another, whose name, were I to mention it, would not need explanation as to what he had done, for hon. members know something of his record. The House may remember a couple of letters that I read last session. In one of them the writer said that he had been dismissed from the public service without investigation and without any complaints made against him. In fact the department felt that there was no charge against him, that he had done his work faithfully and well. But he had to go. The House may also remember, Mr. Speaker, that some hon. members doubted the correctness of the statements in that letter. Now, I have something here I purpose reading to the

House, not that I think it will convince the members of the Opposition, for they do not want to be convinced; but this is a formal affidavit. After the usual heading it goes on:

1st. That, for more than ten years previous to A.D. 1894, I held the office of forest bailiff under the Indian Department at Ottawa for part of Manitoulin Island.

2nd. That, during my tenure of office, I heard of no complaints as to my efficiency or my neglect of any duty appertaining to the said office of forest bailiff.

3rd. That, in the summer of 1894, after the provincial election, the office was summarily taken from me, without any notice of any complaint or of any neglect of duty on my part.

Yet no one, we are told, was dismissed by the late Government without full inquiry being made.

4th. That I have cause to believe, and do believe, that the said office was taken from me because I voted for the Liberal candidate at the said provincial election.

5th. That in my room and stead three forest bailiffs have been appointed, all Conservatives, all of whom still hold the office.

There is an affidavit, solemnly taken by one H. May.

Mr. HAGGART. I listened with a good deal of attention to the remarks of the Postmaster General laying down the rule adopted by the present Government in reference to officials who interfere in politics. I was not present when the debate commenced this afternoon, but I have taken the opportuinty of reading the speech of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson). The postmaster at Beamsville seems to have committed a great offence in the eyes of hon. members opposite and in the eyes of the Postmaster General. I did not hear from the Postmaster General what were the charges against this postmaster. He referred me to the communication he had received from the hon. member from Lincoln (Mr. Gibson). The only way by which I could find out the charge was by reading the report of the hon. gentleman's speech. Now, what was the offence that this postmaster committed? The utmost of his offence, according to the hon. gentleman, was that he was an outside scrutineer at the polls. No, he afterwards committed a crime greater than that. He went to St. Catharines and listened to the speech of Sir Charles Tupper. Now, I can tell the Postmaster General that the postmasters have always been regarded as being in an entirely different category from the officers of any other department. They have always been treated so both by Conservatives and by Reform Governments. Never before in the history of the department has a postmaster been dismissed for taking part in politics. When I was Postmaster General I had hundreds of complaints such as that which the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) sent to the Postmaster General. I refused to act in any case, because it is a well known rule in the Post Office Department, where there are over ten thousand postmasters receiving salaries from $7 to $1,000 in villages, that they had a right to be political partisans if they liked, to attend political meetings and take an active and even partisan part in the elections. It was a well established rule in the department that no postmaster should be deprived of his situation on such grounds.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Is that a written rule?

Mr. HAGGART. It is a well known rule. The hon. gentleman cannot point to a case where even his Liberal predecessors have acted as he has done.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I can find cases in which——

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman cannot find a case when I was Postmaster General, nor can he find a case under my Conservative predecessors or successors in that office in which action was taken on the principles he has laid down. And the reason is plain. Is a man to be deprived of political privileges, because, for the benefit of the commuinty he lives in, he accepts the paltry situation of postmaster for which he receives, perhaps, $15 or $20 a year? Are postmasters throughout the Dominion to be told: Unless you support the Government in power you will be removed from office? This is a terrible doctrine of the hon. gentleman.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) say that I laid down the doctrine that postmasters were to support the Administration? I laid down no such rule. The rule I desire to lay down is that the postmaster shall observe neutrality between the political parties.

Mr. HAGGART. The law the hon. gentleman lays down is that no postmaster shall take an active part in a campaign and the evidence he receives on which to remove a postmaster from his position is the statement of one of his supporters in this House. That is a position that no Government has ever taken in this country before. In my own riding dozens of postmasters are among my most active political opponents. There are cases of postmasters in the villages in receipt of $800 or $900, and the committees of my opponents have met in their offices. Yet I never thought of removing them. The hon. gentleman is perfectly right when he states that if the postmaster is so much a political partisan that he refuses to deliver letters, delays the spread of political documents and so on, he ought to be dismissed. If a postmaster is so much a partisan that

he infringes upon the criminal law, he ought not only to be dismissed but punished criminally. I would not care who he is. When I was Postmaster General I would have dismissed such a man at once. To lay down the rule that a postmaster in a country town or anywhere, because he takes an active part in politics, upon the mere diction, perhaps, of my opponent in the riding, he must be removed from his position. This is the most monstrous doctrine that was ever advocated by a Postmaster General in this House.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. How is it then, that in 1879, about fifteen days after the Conservatives came into power, the postmaster of Montmagny was dismissed without any notice, just because he was a Liberal and worked for the Liberal candidate ?

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman says that, and perhaps it is correct. Would the hon. gentleman state whether it was in my incumbency of the office ?

Mr. CHOQUETTE. It was under Tory rule.

Mr. HAGGART. I venture to say that the principle I have laid down has guided all my predecessors and successors in office, not only in Conservative but in Liberal Governments, and under it no such dismissal was ever made on any such grounds. It never occurred when I was in office. I have had dozens of complaints that meetings of opponents of the Conservative Government were being held in post offices in different parts of the country ; I have had dozens of complaints of postmasters taking most active action during political campaigns ; but I never heard when I was in office that a dismissal was made on that ground. It was a well-known rule of the department that outside of cities and towns, where the statute declares they were ineligible for voting, in country places, on account of the difficulty of getting postmasters, they were to indulge their political opinions to the extent of partisanship, if you like. But this is the first time that I ever heard the doctrine laid down by a Postmaster General that because a postmaster takes an active part in a political campaign, he renders himself liable to dismissal.

Mr. FROST. It strikes me very forcibly that our friends in Opposition are making a great deal of noise over a very small matter. It reminds me very much of a story that I heard once of a man who was a dealer in frogs in the city of New York—and I call the attention of the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) to this story. This dealer came up to a certain country town to purchase frogs, and there he met a man who was in the habit of fishing for them, and who told the frog dealer that he could get him all he wanted. Well, says the frog dealer, that is all right, I will buy all my stock from you, and go no further. A short time afterwards the man came along with a small pailful of frogs. Why, says the dealer, I supposed you were going to give me all I required, but this is a very small amount. Well, says the other, I will tell you. If you had heard the noise that I heard in the pond, you would have thought that there were several car-loads there. Now we have heard a great deal of noise, we have heard a great deal of croaking, a great deal of mock indignation and of mock heroics, about the dismissal in a little village. We have heard the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals telling us in thundering tones how virtuous he was during the whole time of his incumbency of the office of Postmaster General. Well, we have heard this kind of stage thunder before. He says that the present Postmaster General has laid down the most monstrous doctrine that the postmasters in country villages and in country districts should be neutral as between neighbours holding different political views. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals calls that a monstrous doctrine. Now I contend, Mr. Speaker, that if a postmaster is not to be neutral in any part of this country, no matter whether in a city, town, village, or township, then I say you may bid good bye to all confidence in that postmaster on the part of the surrounding community. The people of the opposite political complexion from that postmaster will inevitably lose confidence in him, and there will be a more or less constant agitation for his removal. For my part, I am opposed, and have always been opposed to dismissals of any kind. I am satisfied that our Conservative friends and the country generally, if you could get right down to the bottom of their hearts, must be amazed at the leniency and the benevolent disposition of this Government towards Conservative officials. There has never been a Government in Canada that has treated officials so leniently, and so kindly, and so tenderly as the present Government. We know that the Conservatives have been in power twenty-five years out of the thirty years since confederation, and they have filled every office with their own friends. Wherever a few Liberals were in during the administration of the late Mr. Mackenzie, the Conservatives have mostly superannuated them and dropped them out, until to-day when this Government came into power, we find from one end of the Dominion to the other a continuous line of Conservative officials. Now it is only natural that these officials should have worked consistently and persistently on behalf of the Government candidates, and as one speaker has already said, many of them were at work because they were goaded to it by their superior officers, by the candidates in the local districts, and by the Government themselves. So far as that goes, they certainly have our pity. But there is no doubt

that throughout the length and breadth of the land the Conservative office-holders did work persistently and insistently, in season and out of season for the Conservative candidates. And to-day what is the result? In my own constituency where there is scarcely a Liberal office-holder, not one single man has been discharged. I know that on the Rideau Canal, where there were over twenty-two officials suspended last fall when the Minister himself gave me a list, and I could put any official in that I liked—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FROST. Certainly I could, I had that privilege; but what did I do? I told the Minister to put back every man, not one single man in the whole riding was dismissed. In my own constituency some of the postmasters were deputy returning officers in the election against me, but those postmasters are in their places and are not dismissed. Charges have been made against them time and again, but I have not troubled the Postmaster General with those charges, I have not troubled a Minister of this Government with these scores of charges that I have had from my constituency against different individuals.

Mr. CLANCY. That is a rebuke to your friends.

Mr. FROST. That is a far better record than can be furnished by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy). For my part, I think there has been altogether too much made out of this question of the dismissal of officials. One would imagine, to hear the constant thunder of our friends in Opposition, that the spoils system was practically introduced into this country. Now, there is no truth in that, there cannot be any truth in it, because my own constituency is an example. I know our friends on this side have been as careful as it was possible to be in all their constituencies in regard to the scores and hundreds of officials who worked openly and most flagrantly against them. I hope the time of the House will be taken up with subjects of more importance to the country than the mere fact of a few officials having been dismissed. Only yesterday we heard, when the Minister of the Interior propounded a system by which he would effect a saving of $27,000 or $30,000 in the Department of the Interior, hon. gentlemen opposite object to it simply because he proposed to make certain changes in the officials. If a new Government coming into power is not at liberty to make changes which they believe to be in the interest of the country, in what way is the business of the country to be carried on? Do we follow such a course in regard to our own private business? If I place a foreman in charge of my establishment, and he makes certain changes in my interest, do I find fault with him? Certainly not. The people have placed hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches at the head of affairs, and if in the course of their investigations in the departments they find dead timber, men who should be set aside, and men who are receiving too high salaries, surely reductions should be made in the interest of the people and to meet their wishes. I say the people will be satisfied with such action, and hon. gentlemen opposite are making the mistake of their lives in opposing these changes made in the interest of economy and in the public service of the Dominion. We should therefore consider that the Government are doing their best, and it must be remembered that they are all the time refusing demands made on them, because members are only human, and in some constituencies no doubt they are justified in calling for dismissals of public officials. So far as regards this postmaster, I hope it will not be held that such an officer should not be independent because he receives only a small salary. He should be neutral in order to ensure the confidence of every member of the community, and if he is not able to take that position, he should not take a postmastership. Wherever there is a civil servant, no matter whether in the inside or outside service, who has been doing his duty faithfully, he has not been interfered with, and no Liberal has any intention of complaining against such a man. In my own riding there are a good many officials who fought against me as persistently as they could; almost every Tory official in North Leeds and Grenville worked against me day and night, but up to this moment I have never complained of any one of them, and do not intend to do so, as I intend to leave them alone. This is a very small matter to be brought up by the Opposition, considering the very lenient and tender treatment which the officials throughout the Dominion are receiving from this Government.

Mr. McCLEARY. When I placed on the Order paper the resolution now under consideration I had no conception it would create a debate of such a wide range as that which occurred yesterday and this afternoon in regard to it. If the hon. member for Lincoln, who seems to be sponsor for the Postmaster General, had confined himself solely and entirely to the attitude he has taken in securing the dismissal of Mr. Fairbrother as postmaster of Beamsville, the discussion would have been confined to the subject covered by the resolution. But the hon. gentleman saw fit to ignore practically those grave charges which were submitted to the Postmaster General in the case of Mr. Fairbrother, and resurrected an old letter which did service last session, and which had done service two or three times previously, written by the leader of the Opposition in respect to the dismissal of a civil servant some time ago. When I in-

troduced the subject I made use of some pretty strong language in criticising the attitude of the Government in this matter. I said it was a flagrant outrage on the civil rights of a Canadian citizen. If I had any doubt as to the righteousness of Mr. Fairbrother's case when I made those observations, the doubt has been entirely swept away by the lame defence attempted to be put up by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) and the Postmaster General for dismissing this young man from his position. What is the attitude of the Postmaster General? Had he yesterday stood up in his place and made the statement he did to-night, namely, that if the truthfulness of those charges could be denied successfully, he would give Mr. Fairbrother an investigation, we could have settled the matter at once. He stated that if those charges were untrue he would re-open the case and grant an investigation or reinstate the officer. I am not asking for his reinstatement, if he is not worthy of it—all I ask is British fair-play. The hon. Minister said that Mr. Fairbrother had given a general denial, but not a specific denial to the charges. Mr. Fairbrother denied specifically every charge, and made an affidavit to the effect. Here is another affidavit he has made:

I, William Fairbrother, of the village of Beamsville, in the county of Lincoln, do solemnly declare, that the charges as given by the Minister of the Interior, for the Postmaster General, against me, as postmaster of Beamsville, in answer to questions made by Mr. McCleary, M. P. for Welland, and hereunto attached, are false in every particular.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of "The Canada Evidence Act, 1893."

Declared before me, this 12th day of April, A.D. 1897, at Beamsville.

(Sgd.) DAVID DAVIS, J.P.

There is Mr. Fairbrother's affidavit, to which he has attached the charges as taken from "Hansard," where they are specifically stated, and he declares they are untrue. Will the Postmaster General grant an investigation? I do not ask his reinstatement if guilty, and if he is guilty of one-tenth of what he is charged with, he is not worthy to hold the position. The Postmaster General found fault with the leader of the Opposition because he had not answered a letter from an official whom he dismissed some years ago, and he said that months elapsed before it was answered. What was the position of the Postmaster General in regard to Mr. Fairbrother? When the post office inspector told Mr. Fairbrother that his position would be vacant, he wrote to the Postmaster General asking for the reasons and praying for an investigation. The answer was brief; it merely acknowledged the receipt of his letter, and so Mr. Fairbrother never knew why he was dismissed until the question was answered by a Minister in this House. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) has strengthened my argument, and strengthened Mr. Fairbrother's position in demanding an inquiry. Fair-minded man as he (Mr. Gibson) is, I hope, even though it be against some of his political pushers that are urging him on to this; I hope he will yet insist that even-handed justice shall be meted out to Mr. Fairbrother. I believe that the hon. member (Mr. Gibson) did not intend to dismiss that gentleman. He told us, that this young man had come to his house after elections, telling him that there were rumors that he was going to be dismissed, and in the hon. member's own words this is what he said to Mr. Fairbrother:

One Saturday evening he came down to my house and askd me candidly if it was my intention to recommend his dismissal from the service. I said: Certainly not, so long as you behave yourself. I think I am well enough known in the neighbourhood from which I come to be certain of unanimous endorsement when I say that I have never undertaken the dismissal of a man even from my own employ for voting against me or for holding opinion on political questions different from my own. I certainly would not have treated this young man differently in that respect from one of my own workmen. I can say here that I have never asked a man in my employ to vote for me. When this young man came to me, I gave him my assurance that so long as he behaved himself, I would not recommend his removal from office.

From what I know of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson) I believe that he sincerely meant to carry that promise out. The hon. gentleman does not say, that Mr. Fairbrother was a scrutineer on election day, but he says he saw him checking off the names. And if this postmaster did act as a political partisan, why should the hon. member (Mr. Gibson) give him the assurance, subsequent to the election, mind you, Mr. Speaker, that he should not be interfered with so long as he behaved himself. The hon. gentleman now says, that the young man did not behave and he gives as an instance of his improper conduct, that he did not divide up the salary with his assistant in the same proportion as did his predecessor. Well, the hon. gentleman knows that Mr. Bennett who preceded Mr. Fairbrother, had Mr. Zimmerman as his assistant, and as Mr. Bennett had another and more remunerative business to attend to, he could afford to give a large proportion of his salary to Mr. Zimmerman who really had full charge of the office. Mr. Fairbrother married the daughter of the ex-postmaster, and he had to support his family, and could not afford to give the bulk of his small salary to an assistant. Surely, the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) cannot press that as a charge against the postmaster. But the hon. gentleman further says, that Mr. Fairbrother left the windows or the doors or something else open and caused some fresh air to get into the

establishment. Well, the Postmaster General did not enumerate that offence amongst the charges which he stated to the House. All this was thought of afterwards, and Mr. Zimmerman, the post office assistant, has gone to the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) with all this information. If the Postmaster General will dismiss a postmaster for leaving the windows open to ventilate the office, and deprive him of his livelihood and likewise take away his character and his honour, then things have come to a pretty pass in the public affairs of this country. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) stated, that I said nothing at all about how Mr. Fairbrother had got the position, and he insinuated that there was something that I dare not tell. I certainly do not know of anything that should not be told. I know that Mr. Fairbrother was an intelligent, active, industrious, honest and capable young man, and that is certified to in the letter of Mr. Van Norman of Beamsville, who is a political friend of the hon. member for Lincoln. I know that Mr. Fairbrother was recommended for the position by Reformers and Conservatives alike, and I hold in my hand a copy of the petition that was sent to the then Postmaster General asking for his appointment. The hon. member (Mr. Gibson) will know some of the names, and let him tell the House whether they are Conservatives or Liberals. The first is William Tollman, I know him, and I know him to be a good Liberal. The next is Mr. A. F. Campbell, who was a merchant in Beamsville at that time, another good Liberal. The next signature, James Allan & Company, merchants; the next is James Allan, and this Mr. Allan is, I think, the son of the postmaster who has been appointed. Were not all these good Liberals? I know they were, and I appeal to the hon. member (Mr. Gibson) to deny it if he can. The next is James Fowler, boot and shoe man, also a Liberal. The next is Milton Zimmerman. I do not think that is the assistant in the post office, but at all events he is a Liberal. The next is W. A. Comfort, M.D. Now, Dr. Comfort is a well known Liberal, and so I might go through the rest of the names.

Mr. GIBSON. Go on through them all.

Mr. McCLEARY. That is unnecessary. I want to show the character of the petition that induced the Postmaster General of that time to appoint Mr. Fairbrother, and I would not have referred to it had it not been that the member for Lincoln seemed to insinuate that there was something in the appointment that could not been told. I would ask the hon. member for Lincoln to contrast the conduct of the Conservative party in the neighbourhood where he and I live with the conduct that has been pursued since this Government came into power. Take the county which he has the honour to represent in this Parliament. There are in his own county twenty-two or twenty-five post offices, in which fifteen of the postmasters are Liberals, and strong Liberals, and seven are Conservatives—two Liberals to one Conservative. Not one of them was ever interfered with in any way; but, on the contrary I know of the appointment of Liberal postmasters in the county by the Conservative Government. These appointments were not made on party recommendations, but because we believed the parties were suited for the positions, on account of the conveniences they had for taking the offices.

I said a while ago that I did not believe the hon. member for Lincoln had any idea of carrying out this dismissal, or interfering much with the officials in that neighbourhood; but I will give you the reason why I think he changed his mind. It will be in the recollection of this House that when the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), I think for the first time, made some observations in this House, coming to it as a stranger from the maritime provinces, he declared that he was going to take the ipse dixit of any member of Parliament or any defeated candidate who was his friend, as to the dismissal of officials. That declaration created an uproar throughout the country. Every municipality, nearly every polling subdivision, throughout my neighbourhood at any rate, began to organize what were known as "bouncing" committees, and the officials were looked after. However, the Toronto "Globe" took a different position, and in an article in which it found fault with that attitude, it referred to the matter in this way:

> Now, it is true that the Liberals promised tariff reform, promised the destruction of abuses that have grown up in connection with the tariff, and promised to endeavour to put an end to the fraud and corruption that grew up under the late Government, but they certainly neither promised nor suggested that tariff reform or any other reform included in the Liberal platform was to be accomplished by a wholesale dismissal of officials.

The leading Liberal organ in the county of Lincoln, the St. Catharines "Journal," took this up, and declared that that was not the principle that ought to govern the Liberal party. This is an extract from its editorial:

> We have never advocated wholesale dismissals, but we do say, and say it deliberately, that a wholesome application of the "spoils system," where it is deserved, would, at the present time, be a positive benefit to the country, and notwithstanding the tone of the "Globe" on this subject, we know we voice the sentiments of the great bulk of the electors all over Canada when we assert that they are anxiously looking for such an application of the brush, and we mistake the temper of the Liberal party if they do not demand from their representatives the fulfilment of their promises, and prompt attention to the present desires of their Liberal friends. The high moral tone affected by the "Globe" will not satisfy the party, and to be continually prat-

ing about the guilty men who ought to go, but do not, is rather poor politics and poorer consolation. The "high moral plane" got a fair trial from '73 to '78, and Liberals have been eighteen years trying to explain why the pure Mackenzie Government was not appreciated by the people. The same mistake is about to be made, and we must protest, while there is yet time, against the present namby-pamby policy of the Administration. We have long cherished the idea that the Government should discharge first, and let the partisan explain his conduct afterwards. This would save trouble and expense. We fail to see where the present deputy heads of departments and other officials could be any more loyal to their chiefs than our Liberal friends, if they were given an opportunity, and the impression remains that if the Ministers neglect to judiciously "clean" up their bureaux, the "hard workers of the party" will see to it that they get plenty of time to attend to their own affairs in the near future. This is plain talk, but opportune.

I do not know whether the hon. member for Lincoln ever read that editorial or not.

Mr. GIBSON. I never read it.

Mr. McCLEARY. I thought possibly he did. Somebody must have read it and told him about it; and I think it is because of such an attitude taken by the hungry heelers around the city of St. Catharines, by the crowd who will rush the hon. member to his political destruction if he listens to them, that he has taken this course. Otherwise, I am satisfied that he would have adhered to the noble, manly and honourable position he took when he told Mr. Fairbrother that he would stand by him and see that he was not dismissed from his position. The hon. member further said yesterday that there was some misunderstanding in reference to the petition that was got up in Mr. Fairbrother's behalf; and he said in effect that Liberal names were got on it by misrepresentation—that the Liberals were told that it was only for the purpose of calling the local executive together to re-open this matter. Now, I never heard of anything of that kind.

Mr. GIBSON. You do not live in Beamsville, do you?

Mr. McCLEARY. No, but I will tell you of another petition, which I have in my hand. This is a petition from the ratepayers who get their mail at the Beamsville post office. This is not gotten up for an investigation by the local Liberal committee, but it represents:

That the said William Fairbrother has always fairly discharged his duty as postmaster and to the satisfaction of the general public.

That the said William Fairbrother has never taken any part in any election contest, either by voting or otherwise. He has always strictly adhered to the duties of his office.

Your petitioners would respectfully request that an inquiry be made into the manner in which the said William Fairbrother has discharged the duties of his office, and if the same results satisfactorily, that you will be pleased to return him to his position in the post office.

And your petitioners will ever pray.

There is a petition that was gotten up in the village of Beamsville and the surrounding neighbourhood. Is that signed by all Tories? No, Sir. I need not read the names, the first two are those of two clergymen whom the hon. member for Lincoln knows well and which are both Liberals, the Rev. Mr. Cotton and the Rev. Mr. Marshall. The next name is that of Mr. Van Norman. There are nearly 400 names on this petition, and nearly half of them are the names of pronounced Liberals. The hon. gentleman from Algoma spoke of this as a childish matter, but I say it is not only Mr. Fairbrother's position which is at stake, but something which the people of that district hold dear, its character and good reputation and the principle of justice and fair dealing to all. The hon. member for Kent said I had not mended my reputation by bringing up this matter. I did not come here, Sir, to get a reputation from him or any other hon. gentleman. I am not here to vindicate my reputation, but I am here to vindicate the rights, the liberties and privileges of Canadians, which I know have been abused by this Government, and therefore have a perfect right to bring this matter to the attention of this House. I certainly think that a sufficiently strong case has been made out to warrant the Postmaster General in giving Mr. Fairbrother an opportunity to defend himself and obtain justice. He certainly ought to have such an opportunity, especially when we consider the declaration of the hon. the First Minister last session, that no official would be removed without an investigation. No man on that side has dared to qualify that pledge except the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), who told us that the First Minister meant something else, but we have to take what comes from the hon. member for North Wellington with a great deal of allowance. Is there anything this Government would propose or do which that hon. gentleman is not prepared to swallow? Why, he has swallowed the retaining of the duty on coal oil and the increase of duty on cottons——

Mr. GIBSON. You swallowed a lot in your time, too.

Mr. McCLEARY. We had good things to take, and we never had to swallow doses like that. Some hon. members have told us that this Government have been too lenient, that they have not carried sufficiently into effect the wishes of their party, and have not driven from office a sufficient number, and the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has stated that the Government have kept on the Rideau Canal every official. I am sorry we have not got the hon. member up our way to protect the officials on the Welland Canal. I could take up an hour almost going over the dismissals in my own town—the dismissals of men who are now without any prospects

of making a living for themselves and families, and dismissals, not by the dozen or score, but, as my hon. friend knows, by the hundreds, of men who were employed on the Welland Canal.

Mr. GIBSON. How many men are employed on the Welland Canal ?

Mr. McCLEARY. About 200 or 250. Right around the town where I live there have been dismissals of many employees on the canal. Men who were on that canal for the past seventeen years, men who have given their best years to the service of the Government, have been dismissed. They went on in their young years, and now they are turned adrift not able to do anything else. The result is that in my town you will find bills of sale placarded everywhere, because these men are compelled to sell their effects, and families have already moved to the city of Buffalo. Talk about the National Policy driving the people from the country, the hon. gentleman is driving away men who have been true loyal subjects of this country, who never took part in election matters, and yet who have been dismissed from office without other means of gaining employment. If such action on the part of the Government is to be characterized as lenient, I do not know by what term we would describe the conduct of the Turks towards the Armenians. I think I would have to apologize to the Turk. A case has been made out sufficiently strong for the Postmaster General to interfere, and I hope he will have an investigation made. The hon. member for Lincoln says he acted as scrutineer, and I am bound to accept the hon. gentleman's statement, but Mr. Fairbrother declares he did not.

Mr. GIBSON. I was present when this young man was scrutineer ; I was present when he was taking the people to the polls, and if any one wants more information, I am willing that the hon. gentleman should get the opportunity of having an investigation.

Mr. McCLEARY. I am bound to accept the hon. gentleman's statement. The hon. gentleman must have understood that, when he saw Mr. Fairbrother there he was only there by chance.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. McCLEARY. Why then, did the hon. gentleman say to Mr. Fairbrother that he would protect him in his office, if he was an active partisan drawing voters to the polls and working as outside scrutineer and otherwise working against the hon. gentleman ? Why did he say after the whole thing was over, that he would not disturb him in his office ? Simply because the hon. gentleman knew that Mr. Fairbrother only happened to be there. I know who was the scrutineer- it was Joe Ryckman at that polling subdivision and Mr. Fairbrother was not.

Mr. GIBSON. Will the hon. gentleman answer me this question—does he say of his own knowledge that Mr. Fairbrother was not there as a scrutineer ?

Mr. McCLEARY. That he was not scrutineer ?

Mr. GIBSON. That he was not there as scrutineer.

Mr. McCLEARY. Well, what I want to say is that the hon. gentleman from Lincoln says he was and I am bound to accept his statement. But the hon. gentleman did not say so yesterday, he said he was there marking the lists. But that is neither here nor there. When the hon. gentleman reconsiders this matter with the Postmaster General and allows the case to be opened up for consideration, he will have behind him the respectable, right-thinking men of his own party in the county which he has the honour to represent. They desire that Mr. Fairbrother should have British fair-play.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McCleary) asks me if I will give an investigation, I stated before that I accepted the statement of my hon. friend from Lincoln as proof of the charges upon which this officer was dismissed. The answer given as to the reasons for dismissal was given on the 5th of April, and appeared in unrevised "Hansard" at page 496 :

> That he took an active political part in the last general election, that during the whole of the election day he acted as outside scrutineer and took an active part in bringing voters to the polls instead of attending to the duties of his office ; that satisfactory evidence was furnished as to the postmaster having taken such political part, which rendered any further investigation unnecessary.

For these political reasons this officer was dismissed. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCleary) will file with the department an affidavit of Mr. Fairbrother denying these charges I will give him an investigation and give him a chance to prove his innocence publicly before the people.

Mr. HUGHES. Will you restore him to office ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will deal out justice. I might say that the affidavit the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCleary) read to the House is a general affidavit referring in vague terms to all the charges that were made. The hon. gentleman's question was what charges had been made and for what reasons was he dismissed. Accordingly it was necessary for me in answering these questions in full not only to give the reasons for which he was dismissed, but the other charges which I

deemed it not necessary to deal with. His affidavit has reference to them all. I call this to the attention of the hon. gentleman that he may in turn call it to Mr. Fairbrother's attention lest he may think that that declaration does not go as far as it really does. Before he places on file an affidavit he had better study its language and see that it does not go further than he contemplates. Those are vague, and I think more sweeping than he would substantiate. Therefore, I caution him.

Mr. McCLEARY. Let me ask a question, so that the Postmaster General and I may understand each other. If Mr. Fairbrother denies on affidavit the charges that the Postmaster has referred to——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The political charges; these are the only ones I took action upon.

Mr. McCLEARY. If Mr. Fairbrother declares in his affidavit that they are untrue will the hon. gentleman give him an investigation?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will.

Mr. McCLEARY. All right.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I heard the discussion which took place at very considerable length spoken of as a two-penny-half-penny affair. To a very large extent it has taken the character of a series of criminations and recriminations bandied across the floor. At the same time, I suppose, any discussion in this Parliament can hardly be unprofitable; and, if it results in some principle of action being laid down for the Government to follow, it may have very good results. The ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) has, I think, stated the practice heretofore existing very fairly—that postmasters should not be held accountable for their political conduct. It is impossible, in some cases, to get persons to act as postmasters, for the trifling remuneration that is offered. It is very evident that it is unreasonable to expect that citizens of the country should part with most important political privileges in exchange for such remuneration. In the course of his speech the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) announced the principle upon which he proposes to go. I understand him to say that he would insist upon an attitude of strict neutrality on the part of the postmasters. If that is the intention of the Postmaster General it must be that he will deal out the justice to postmasters whether Liberal or Conservative; and if he intends to enforce strict neutrality on all postmasters, there can be no great hardship in compelling them to abide by that rule. They accept the office on that condition. If that is the course to be pursued, I would suggest to the Postmaster General he will find a very good opportunity for the application of that rule in the cases cited by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), who has stated in his place in Parliament to-night that two of the postmasters in his county took the stump against him and were extremely active and strong partisans. If the hon. Postmaster General really intends to enforce the rule he has enunciated, he can prove his sincerity—or rather, as I do not doubt his sincerity, I should say he can prove his impartiality—by taking action in such cases. When the whole matter has been settled and a course marked out, it will be fair to both sides, and postmasters may know where they stand.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell) wish me to answer?

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Yes.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. To deal with the two cases referred to by the hon. member for East Simcoe and these alone would not be a reasonable application of the principle. But I will say this: If the House desires to apply that principle generally throughout the Dominion in respect of all postmasters, Liberals and Conservatives, who transgressed the rule during the last general election, I am prepared to put that rule in force throughout the Dominion. But I did not intend to say that I was going actively into house-cleaning in respect to the past. As to the future I intend, as far as I can do so, to enforce strict neutrality on the part of postmasters generally. That applies to all postmasters, Liberal and Conservatives.

Mr. WILSON. Does that apply to the man getting $10 or so a year?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have given my answer. While it would not be fair to pick out the two cases suggested, I am prepared, if the House says so, to take the eleven thousand postmasters in Canada and have this principle applied to the whole staff. I will say that in my own riding, as an illustration, I am free to admit that postmasters on both sides have not considered it an offence to take part in politics; and knowing that in my own riding Liberal postmasters have offended against the rule as well as Conservatives, I have not disturbed one and do not intend to. At the same time I have had occasion on the platfrom to rebuke one, at least, because of the extent to which he went in his partisanship; and I even had to tell him from the platform that if my party succeeded at the polls it would be worse for him. However, when I really got here, I repented of that, so I have disturbed nobody in my riding.

Mr. BELL. I would suggest to the hon. Postmaster General that finding himself now in the wrong, and dissuaded by the contemplation of the state of affairs that would exist if he were to apply his rule and insist

on strict neutrality in all the postmasters of Canada, it would be much better for the service, and for his own comfort, and for the reputation of the Government, if he would resort to the old rule that was laid down by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, that postmasters should be held to be a class by themselves, and should be allowed to exercise all the privileges as citizens and as voters of Canada.

Mr. DAVIN. I have heard the remarks of the Postmaster General with regret, because I have observed——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think the hon. gentleman spoke yesterday.

Mr. DAVIN. No, I did not.

Mr. McMULLEN. You have spoken every day on some question.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, I have had a sweet-voiced example in the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), and I am trying to follow in his steps, but at a great distance. Sir, I heard the remarks of my hon. friend the Postmaster General with regret. I have observed his course since the present party came into power, and have observed it with admiration, because on the whole it furnished a marked exception to the conduct of his brother Ministers. I have observed that in most cases I have taken cognizance of through the newspapers, my hon. friend did in every case give an investigation, and in no case, so far as I could judge from the newspapers, did he condemn a man without trying him first. He did not adopt the principle of hanging him first and trying him afterwards. But to-night we have him furnishing a sinister exception to his own good rule, and the influence of a supporter of his has been too strong for his virtue, and has warped him from the high stand he took. The stand he took last session, and the stand the Prime Minister took was, that no man would be dismissed without trial. But in the case of this person, the hon. Minister, a lawyer, says that if this accused man will make an affidavit that he is not guilty of any of the crimes charged against him, then he will give him an investigation. Why, Sir, so monstrous a proposal was never heard of—so monstrous a proposal from a lawyer of high standing, and from a man who has furnished a better example to himself. He proposes that a man accused, in order to have a chance of being heard, of having the charges against him investigated, shall make an affidavit in which he may possibly trip, and in regard to which he may therefore subject himself to a charge of perjury. Somebody behind me appealed to the sense of generosity of the Postmaster General. I appeal to his common sense, to ordinary decency, I won't talk of justice—to abandon the sinister and degrading position he has taken up in regard to this case, and follow the example he has set himself, and give that gentleman a chance of being heard. Why not hark back to that good course he entered upon, and which was in accordance with the pledge given in Parliament by the Prime Minister and by himself, that no man would be condemned without a fair trial? Why not hark back and say to his supporter from Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) you have forced me into a false position, you have forced me to walk aside from the high course that I have taken in other cases. I must not continue in this course. I must allow this man to be heard. That is a very proper course for him to take and I urge the Postmaster General to take that position. It is the only position consistent with the pledges that we have had from that bench. But, Sir, after ten months of experience with those pledges, what are we to think of them? Every pledge in regard to the most serious as well as to the most trifling thing, is broken. Every day is revealing to us this one cardinal truth about the Ministry, that their pledges are as false as dicers' oaths. We can place no confidence whatever in anything that they say. They tell us one thing that sounds fair, and a few months afterwards while the words are still ringing in this Parliament, we find that they have departed from them. I would appeal to the hon. gentleman; from Philip in a less judicial condition to Philip in a more judicial condition; I appeal from the hon. the Postmaster General, influenced to an unjust course by a powerful supporter, to his own good record in the cases that have come to my knowledge; and I ask him in regard to this special case, to say that he will not take a step that will mar a good record, and a good reputation, and be contrary to justice, and to the demands of common decency.

Mr. McHUGH. This subject has been pretty well threshed out in the House, and I did not intend to address the House in regard to it; but owing to some remarks made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), and also by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart), I desire to recall some things to their minds that perhaps they have forgotten. The member for Bothwell tried to defend the civil service of this Government by making attacks upon the servants of another Government. Well, I do not intend to follow that line of attack more than to say that the action of the civil servants complained of by the member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) was very different from any action I have ever heard of on the part of the servants of any local government in political contests. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals says that neither he nor his predecessors ever discharged a post office official on account of his political partisanship. I think that I can remember when they did so, and I will recall one case to the atten-

tion of the hon. gentleman. I will read him a letter that was written by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) to the ex-Postmaster General. This letter is dated at Lindsay, July 18th, 1892 :

Lindsay, 18th July, 1892.

Dear Sir Adolphe,—I have not heard a word from your department yet anent Minden and Coboconk post offices. I find that the feeling among our fellows here is still very strong. The Grits, finding a change probable at Minden, are getting a petition signed among their own crowd asking that this office be given to W. Curry, brother of the man who now holds it. At last account, only sixteen of Mowat's Ontario Government officers had signed it ; only one Conservative supports W. Curry, and he is J. H. Delemere, father-in-law to Curry. Delemere is financially indebted to Curry, and is forced to do things he does not care to do, but his brothers are in Ontario offices. However, this one is a good, loyal fellow, but inclined to blow off at half-cock.

I wish the office vacant as soon as possible, and shall then name you my man. Meantime, kindly bounce them.

That is signed by the hon. member for North Victoria.

Mr. McMULLEN. Who signed it ?

Mr. McHUGH. Sam Hughes. On the strength of that letter the postmaster at that office was dismissed. We are told by the hon. member who brings forward his charge that the Reform party were going to appoint a bouncing committee, but if we do so, we are only taking a letter from our predecessors. The present Government are perfectly capable of dealing with the civil service, and will have to account to the country for the way in which they deal with it, and I am perfectly satisfied they will deal with it in a manner which they and their friends will be able to defend when called upon to do so. It has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite that the only defence made by the Government was the production of one letter. Here, however, is one that is not nearly so old, and there are no doubt many like it.

Mr. HUGHES. I am delighted that the hon. gentleman has blundered into giving me an opportunity to state the facts of the case. What are they ? In the first place, in regard to the Minden post office, the postmaster robbed the Government, as the official sworn evidence taken at the public investigation—no back hole and corner business—shows. I demanded an inquiry from the ex-Minister of Railways, who was then Postmaster General. This was about the time when he became Minister of Railways and Canals. It was handed over to the late Postmaster General (Sir Adolphe Caron). The investigation was held publicy ; witnesses were examined and it was proved that the postmaster had defrauded the mails, and that he had brought himself within reach of a criminal prosecution. The evidence is in the Post Office Department, and can be produced. What was done ? When a newspaper office in a rural district is sending its mail bag out, it is taken for granted that the newspaper men are honest, and that they are not putting dry goods, parcels, political literature or other matter not postpaid in the mail bags, but that they contain newspapers sent directly from the office. What happened in this case? This hon. gentleman and his ring in Lindsay had been filling these bags with Reform literature, which was not addressed to anybody—thus leaving themselves open to be sent to the penitentiary, if the law was pushed to the extreme. But the postmaster in Lindsay was not specially culpable, probably because he took it for granted that the newspaper offices were honest. The mail clerk on the train possibly was not culpable, because he took it for granted that the mail bags contained nothing but newspapers which had been sent from the newspaper offices. But the postmaster at Minden did know it, for he received and opened the bags. What was the excuse given? He said : I received them ; I did not send them to the dead letter office ; I did not report the culprit ; I did not give them out through the post office. Let hon. gentlemen opposite turn up the evidence, and they will find these are the facts. Why did he not give the reform literature out at the wicket ? Because, as he said in his sworn evidence, he would have had to put half a cent stamp on each document. How, then, did he get them distributed to the people ? He swore that he took them out of the door of the office and gave them over the counter. So, with his right hand he refused to hand them over the wicket because they would cost half a cent each, while with his left hand he passed them over the counter, and he thought they were free. The department held that this man had robbed the Government. They did not send him to the penitentiary, but they simply dismissed him. Another case was that connected with the Coboconk post office, and I do not think the hon. gentleman will receive many thanks from the people there. I will not refer to it at length here. I notice that the Postmaster General got out directly these offices came up. Certain parties came down here and muzzled around to see what they could find. Six months ago, they did the same thing, and they struck a snag. What are the facts about the Coboconk office? On four separate occasions transactions occurred, the last of which merited, not dismissal, but committal to the penitentiary, and yet in three of those cases I interfered to save the officers. They were allowed to retain the office on the distinct pledge and guarantee—this all appears in the evidence in the Post Office Department, which hon. gentlemen can obtain if they are inclined to do so, and they will find that the facts I have now stated are fully borne out—that this young man on whom the offence was saddled could not be employed in the post office in any capacity. Yet the post office inspector was

not more than twenty miles away before that young man was back again. Then the postmaster was removed.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What did you do with the young man?

Mr. HUGHES. We let him go.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was he a Tory?

Mr. HUGHES. No, he was a Grit—they were both Grits. There was another officer dismissed by me, and he was a fishery officer. He had been collecting fines from people for illegal fishing, and making no returns to the department at Ottawa, but putting the money in his pocket. Those are the three individuals I have had the satisfaction of dismissing, and in every case a public investigation was held, a report sent to the department and the evidence filed in the department, and all hon. gentlemen opposite have to do is to go and get it. To-day, half the post offices in North Victoria are filled by Reformers: Gelert, Irondale, Furnace Falls, Blairhampton, Maple Lake, Dalrymple, Dartmoor, Sadowa, Bexley, Carden, Horncastle, Ragged Rapids, Glenarm, Islay and Powles Corners. Every one of those offices is held by a Reformer. Several of them are my most bitter opponents in committee work, in preparing voters' lists, in speaking on platforms and they take a prominent part both in general and by-elections, and I have never made any complaint so long as they conducted properly the business of the office—I never cared whether they voted for or against me, or spoke for or against me, so long as they conducted their offices properly. But I assure hon. gentlemen opposite that so soon as these officers rob the mails, and I have the patronage of the county, and can get other men to fill the positions, they will be dismissed. Since these gentlemen have come into power the Postmaster General has dismissed one postmaster, for what cause I do not know, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has allowed himself to be made a tool of by some one, and he has dismissed James O'Brien, Thomas Johnston, Douglas Sinclair, M. Wellwood, Thomas Batty, Thomas Leary, J. Mortimer, George Hewitt, A. Martin, all fishery guardians. Several in the Railways and Canals Departments have also been dismissed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The guardians are not appointed by me at all.

Mr. HUGHES. They are appointed by the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They are temporary, and are appointed by the overseer.

Mr. HUGHES. The Minister suggested to me the other day, that I had better take charge of his department. He has admitted since that I was right and that he gave a wrong answer then.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, I did not give a wrong answer.

Mr. HUGHES. The hon. gentleman said that Mr. Archibald Bradshaw was a Fishery overseer for North Victoria, and Mr. Bradshaw has no more to do with North Victoria than has the man in Timbuctoo.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Read your question and my answer.

Mr. HUGHES. My question had reference to the fishery guardians in North Victoria, and the Minister gave me the fishery overseer for South Victoria. On a subsequent occasion he was forced to give the names of the fishery guardians for North Victoria, and he gave them to me like a little man. I know that under the former regime the names of these men were reported to Ottawa, and they were recommended to the overseer from Ottawa, and not from any one in the riding. I never had the impudence to ask the overseer to accept my nomination. When I recommended a man it was to the Department here at Ottawa, and the fishery overseer was notified from the Department as to who was appointed. I do not know what the present rule is but I know what the former rule was.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I never changed it.

Mr. HUGHES. Then that is how they were appointed, and yet they have been all dismissed. Three officials of the Railways and Canals Department have been dismissed and a Customs officer has been dismissed, and altogether sixteen officials in North Victoria have been dismissed since these gentlemen came into power, besides some minor officials whom it is not necessary to refer to. I intended to bring this matter before the House on my own account, but the hon. member for South Victoria (Mr. McHugh) fell into a mistake and gave me an opportunity of placing this on record. If he goes to the Post Office Department and produces the papers it will be found that in reference to the offices at Minden and Coboconk, that every word I have said is borne out by sworn evidence in the department.

Mr. McHUGH. I have the report of Mr. Spry, post office inspector, who held the investigation, and I think I had better read it for the information of the House. Here is what it says:

> Regarding these cases, as the charges are nearly all of a political nature or have a political tendency, I consider it would not be proper for me to express my opinion upon the merits of the case, and I beg, therefore, respectfully to submit the evidence for your consideration.

That is the report of Mr. Spry, the inspector.

Mr. HUGHES. Now read the evidence.

Mr. McHUGH. That is the inspector's report based on the evidence.

Mr. DAVIN. That is merely a newspaper account you have read; it is not an official document.

Mr. HUGHES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McHugh) has produced a report which says nothing, but he dare not produce the evidence.

Mr. BERGERON. This discussion has taken such a wide range that I may perhaps be permitted to make a few observations. If I have any surprise at all, it is that our friends on this side of the House should be astonished at the course followed by the Government in this matter. I have a few similar cases in my county where officials have been dismissed, but I expected that from this Government and am not at all astonished. During the time that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) was parading in my county, and when I had to attend to my duties in Parliament, a Liberal postmaster in my county prevented the Conservative papers from reaching the people of the parish, and he was caught sending the papers away. There was complaint against him, and after an investigation was held, it was found he had violated the rules of the department and was dismissed. He was replaced by another man on my recommendation. It is hardly necessary to say, that immediately on the new Government coming into power the new postmaster that I recommended was dismissed without any investigation whatever, and the former postmaster reinstated. I do not complain of that, but I do say that we will settle it the next time the Conservatives come into power. In Beauharnois, an excellent postmaster, probably one of the best we ever had, a very respectable merchant, kept the post office, and upon the recommendation of the Minister of Public Works that gentleman (Mr. Doutre) was dismissed without investigation, and without any means being taken to see whether the accusations against him were true or not. I have since been told by the Postmaster General in this House, that he was dismissed on the recommendation of the Minister of Public Works, who was a candidate against me in the late election. I suppose there is no use complaining about this; I am rather surprised that more officials have not been dismissed in my county, and indeed I expect some every day. I can tell the Postmaster General that the postmaster in St. Stanislaus at the present time is working in the elections night and day. However, he is working on the Liberal side, and I suppose the Government see no harm in that. The postmaster who was dismissed by the late Government and reinstated by the present Government, is working night and day, not only electioneering, but his office is used as a Liberal committee room. If it is very bad for the Conservative postmasters to work during election time, I fail to see how it is a very good thing for a Liberal postmaster to do the same thing. Hon. gentlemen opposite have said some very hard things in reference to the manner in which the present leader of the Opposition dealt with employees when he was in power. Let me give an incident which will tend to show that the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) dealt very leniently with some of the public officials. Before I entered this House Mr. Beique was superintendent of the Beauharnois Canal, and that gentleman opposed me on the hustings. He was a stump speaker, spoke very well, and he did his utmost for the candidate of the Mackenzie Government. After I was elected the Conservatives wanted Mr. Beique to be kicked out, and the Liberals wanted to keep him in his position. After consulting with the Prime Minister at the time I adopted a middle course, and Mr. Beique was allowed an investigation. It was proven, as everybody knew, that Mr. Beique, when superintendent of the canal, had appeared on the hustings and worked hard for the Liberal party. He had called Sir John A. Macdonald names that were looked on down there as very bad—a fanatic, an old Orangeman, an old Freemason, everything that in the eyes of Mr. Beique was likely to change the minds of Conservatives. He called Sir Hector Langevin a thief. When an investigation took place, these things were proved. So far as his duties were concerned, some little things came out in the investigation, but probably nothing sufficient to procure his dismissal without further consideration. When the matter came here, Sir Charles Tupper was the Minister of Railways and Canals, and he examined the report of the investigation. I was a young member of the House then, and he said to me, "I have more experience than you, and I tell you that dismissals are very bad things unless they are justified by very strong evidence. So far as political reasons are concerned, they do not amount to anything at all. Sir John Macdonald does not want anybody dismissed for having said that he was a Freemason or an Orangeman or any such thing, and Sir Hector Langevin would not allow me to dismiss any man for saying that he was a thief. They do not want to take any revenge. So far as the work is concerned, if you insist on the dismissal of Mr. Beique, I will dismiss him, but I am an older man than you, and if I have any advice to give you, I will advise you not to do so. I followed his advice, and Mr. Beique was retained in his position, notwithstanding all that he had done. I mention this to show that the Conservative party were more generous than they have received credit for being in the last few days. Mr. Beique was kept on that canal until

1895, when he himself asked to be superannuated, and he was superannuated by my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart), after having been on the Beauharnois Canal eighteen years, after having spoken for his party on the hustings, and after having been, as it is called now, an offensive partisan.

As I am speaking about these matters, I might remark that there have been other dismissals on the Beauharnois Canal. Five lock-masters were dismissed the other day, and I am not surprised. I am only surprised that they are not all dismissed, because the reasons given against these five are not any stronger, I believe, than what could be brought against all of them. I believe that every lock-master on the Beauharnois Canal have been appointed since I have been a member of this House. They are nearly all Conservatives, but some Liberals were appointed, and they all voted for me in my elections. These five lock-masters did not do anything but vote. They are poor men, and they were dismissed summarily without any reason being given and without any investigation, on three days notice, and were replaced by the most violent Liberal politicians in the county. I do not complain of it, because it will be to my advantage. Those appointed are already running after me to ask me not to disturb them when we come into power again. One of these new lock-masters, on the day before nomination day for the local election, the day before yesterday, a man named Marchand, on lock 6, who replaced a very good man named Julien, was at Beauharnois. Everybody would suppose that a man who had only been appointed about a week before would have been at his work. He is a new man, and does not know any more about locking than one of these pages. But he was at Beauharnois, behind a bar, serving liquor, and he was the worse of liquor himself before the day was over. These things have a most demoralizing effect on the employees of the canal and the people of the county generally. Now, some gentlemen have been speaking very much about investigations being held; but I am not in favour of investigations if they are to be like one that took place the other day. All the lock-masters are threatened with dismissal; but they are not dismissed, because the local Liberal candidate said: "Don't dismiss them before the election, or you will take votes from me." Of course, they will be dismissed after the election.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Do you think you will get them now?

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, at this election and at the other one too. There was no investigation of any one of these cases or of the case of the Beauharnois postmaster; but there was an investigation the other day of the case of the Valleyfield postmaster—why? Not because it was necessary to do the same work that was done at Beauharnois, but simply because a young lawyer who had nothing to do and wanted money, asked to be appointed commissioner. He was appointed, and I had it from the Postmaster General the other day that he gets $13 a day. He is not working on the post office case, but he is working on the hustings in the county every day. That is the kind of investigation we are granted, and for that reason I say do not give us any investigation; kick them out without investigation.

I want to bring up another matter, but I will not do it to-night; I will move before going into Committee of Supply in regard to a matter of greater importance than all we have been talking about to-night. But I wanted to bring up these cases to show the liberality of Sir Charles Tupper when he was a Minister of the Crown, and to show that these men in my county are dismissed without ceremony. But I want to say one word in favour of the Ministers, which I am sure will surprise them. I believe they are not as guilty as they are supposed to be. I believe they would not, on their own motion, have made such dismissals as they have made. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), I am convinced, would not himself have dismissed these employees on the Beauharnois Canal. He knows nothing about them. He has dismissed men who have never been accused of anything wrong in the service, but who did their duties thoroughly. He may ask the superintending engineer in Montreal, or Mr. Collingwood Schreiber here, and I am sure that neither of them will say anything against the men who have been dismissed, so far as their duties are concerned. So far as politics are concerned, they voted for me, I believe. My hon. friend has dismissed them simply on the recommendation of the Minister of Public Works. How did that happen? My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works knows nothing at all about them, I am convinced; but during the election he unfortunately promised about 900 positions in the county, where only about 75 are to be given. Everybody may imagine the piles of letters he gets every day, and as you can come here from my county in three hours, there were deputations on deputations up here asking for positions, until at last a man gets bothered and says purely and simply to the Minister: You must get positions to satisfy those who are bothering the life out of me. Under the circumstances there is some excuse for the Minister, but I deplore their weakness in yielding to such demands.

Motion agreed to.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies) moved the adjournment of the House.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 7th May, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 98) to incorporate the Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Hughes.)

Bill (No. 99) respecting the Restigouche and Victoria Railway Company.—(Mr. Wood, Hamilton.)

Bill (No. 100) to incorporate the Victoria, Vancouver and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Maxwell.)

Bill (No. 101) respecting the Montreal and Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Brodeur.)

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION.

Mr. BAIN. With the consent of the House, I propose to move concurrence in the second report of the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization. I may in explanation say, that it is with the view to get before the public at the earliest possible moment, information with respect to the facilities that are being furnished by the Government for the shipping of perishable products by cold storage, and the efforts they are making to secure the favourable introduction of our perishable products into the English market. The committee felt that the earlier that evidence was distributed through the country, the more likely it was to prove beneficial. We have asked for the printing of forty thousand copies; perhaps four or five thousand will be necessary for the Department of Agriculture, and the balance will be distributed through members of the House. We are all anxious to get it to the Printing Bureau without any possible delay.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved:

That henceforth to the end of this session, Government orders have precedence immediately after questions to be put by members, on Wednesdays and Thursdays.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is it the intention of the Government to give Monday afternoon to Public Bills after six o'clock? There is a pretty large number of Public Bills on the list, and I would like to know how Monday is to be divided.

Mr. BERGERON.

The PRIME MINISTER. We had not thought of that, but if it be the desire of the House, there can be no objection to have the order of Monday substituted by the order of Wednesday, that is to say, notices of motion in the afternoon, and Public Bills in the evening.

Mr. CASEY. Certainly that would be an improvement. But is the hon. gentleman quite certain that he needs to take both those days from us at once?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, quite certain.

Mr. CASEY. Very well, then I think the arrangement suggested would be the only one that would be fair to Public Bills, because there are several such Bills that have been promised a further hearing.

Mr. SPEAKER. With the consent of the House, the motion will be amended by adding the words:

That the order of Monday, henceforth to the end of the session, be the order of Wednesday, under Rule 19.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—REPLY TO ADDRESS.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) presented a Message from His Excellency.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

ABERDEEN.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I beg to thank you for the Loyal Address which you have adopted in reply to the Speech with which I opened the session of Parliament.

I receive with satisfaction your assurances that the measures to be submitted to you will receive your careful consideration.

Government House,
14th April, 1897.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to ask whether copies that were ordered by the House of all petitions and other documents bearing on the changes made in the quarantine regulations between the United States, and Manitoba, the North-west Territories and British Columbia, and particularly changes made at each station in the personnel of the officers employed to carry out the quarantine regulations—whether they are ready? The order of the House was made early in April.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I do not expect that they can be brought down before next Wednesday.

Mr. DAVIN. I would also like to ask the Minister of Interior when we shall have copies of all correspondence between the

Department of Indian Affairs, at Ottawa, and the officials of the department at Regina and at Winnipeg, respecting the furnishing of supplies to the St. Paul Industrial School; and also, correspondence between the department at Ottawa and Hudson's Bay Company at Winnipeg. That order was made more than a week ago, and there are only a few papers.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I have not got the papers ready to-day, but I will try and have them for the hon. gentleman to-morrow.

QUEEN'S JUBILEE—MILITARY CONTINGENT.

Mr. HUGHES. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the acting Minister of Militia when he will be prepared to submit to the House a statement regarding the officers who are selected to accompanying the regiment to England?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I think at the next sitting of the House I will be able to give the list.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to renew my request for the return I asked for early in the session with respect to A. P. P. It is desirable that it should be brought down before we go far into the Estimates. I refer to the return respecting active political partisans.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). It will be brought down sometime next week.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. SPROULE. Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I desire to make a personal explanation. Last Tuesday when certain items were under discussion with respect to the salaries of certain employees in the civil service, reference was made by myself to the increase of salary given to Henry and Rothwell. At that time, in answer to a remark made across the floor, I said:

It is, at least, pleasing to know that the hon. gentleman does not agree with his friends when they were in power before, because, if my memory is correct, they were the parties who adopted the principle of the statutory increase, and it has been acted upon ever since.

That was when it was decided to increase the salaries of some of the civil servants but not to grant the increase in other cases.

But it is unfortunate that the hon. gentleman should have selected for promotion the two clerks he has selected, because, if my memory is not at fault, the two clerks among others were the subject of considerable controversy in the House a few years ago, and his friends behind him moved a motion which was equivalent to a vote of want of confidence in the Government because the same two clerks were not dismissed.

Afterwards the Minister of Marine and Fisheries asked:

Which two clerks?

I replied:

Mr. Henry and Mr. Rothwell. There was a very long and heated discussion over the matter in this House, and some very hard strictures were passed on the Government because they did not dismiss those two men on account of the irregularities which were carried on in the department with their knowledge and consent; and now these two same men are selected for promotion. It is, at least, a justification of the late Government for what they did not do.

Referring to having them dismissed. Further on I said:

Then, the hon. gentleman must have a very bad memory. If he takes the trouble to look up "Hansard," he will see that he is entirely astray. I do not say that these gentlemen are worthy of condemnation because we defended their conduct at that time. What I say is, that the very fact that they are selected for promotion and an advance of salary is a justification of the late Government in defending them.

What I wish to say is this, that my attention has since been called by one of those gentlemen, Mr. Rothwell, to the fact that there was nothing in his conduct that was blameable, that he was not among the number referred to in the House. At the time I was led to believe that he was one of those reported by the Privy Council and suspended for irregularities in conduct. In looking up the record I find that he was not one of those men. Those who were censured were K. J. Henry, H. H. Turner, F. Nelson, L. C. Pereira. I was in fault to that extent in my remarks—I thought he was one of those men. I wish to say this: I did not desire in any way to reflect on their conduct or to say a word against them, but it was merely to remind hon. gentlemen that while there was a good deal of controversy over the conduct of these officers a few years ago, it was a justification for what the then Government had done in defending them and refusing to dismiss them. That is the meaning I intended to convey in my remarks, and not reflect on either the integrity or the character of those officers.

Mr. HAGGART. While on this subject, I may say that I have received a note from the same gentleman in regard to a remark I am alleged to have made in the debate the other day. It is stated in "Hansard" that I said Mr. Rothwell was one of those who were suspended. I never said anything of the kind: I knew Mr. Rothwell was not suspended. I was aware that Mr. Rothwell was one of those who was up before the committee, and who was fined to the extent of one month and a half's salary.

SUPPLY—DISMISSAL OF A. McCALLUM.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the House goes into Committee of Supply, I wish to ask the Minister of Public Works if he can furnish any information with respect to the dismissal of McCallum, lockmaster and foreman of the works on the Lièvre ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). Mr. McCallum, as the hon. gentleman has stated, has been dismissed. He has been dismissed on the strength of a letter which I hold in my hand, and which I will read. The letter is as follows :—

Ottawa, 13 avril 1897.

A l'Honorable J. Israel Tarte,
Ministre des Travaux publics, Ottawa.

Monsieur le ministre,—Je vous demande la destitution de M. McCallum, éclusier, aux Petits Rapides, et de son assistant, Simon Raymond. McCallum a reçu instruction de votre département, en janvier dernier, d'avoir à consulter Angus McMillan pour le choix des travailleurs à l'écluse. McCallum n'a pas tenu compte de cet avis, et ce n'est que par hasard que McMillan a appris à la fin de mars que telles instructions avaient été envoyées à McCallum. Quant à Raymond, il a pris une part active et violente contre moi aux dernières élections.

Je vous suggère le nom de Hugh Gorman, de Buckingham, pour remplacer McCallum, et celui de James Brazeau, Poupore P.O., P.Q., pour remplacer Raymond.

Votre dévoué,
(Signé) HENRI BOURASSA.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will ask the hon. gentleman, who is so fortunate as to be equally familiar with both languages, to read the letter also in English.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In a few words, I may say that Mr. McCallum was lockmaster at Petits Rapides. He was not a permanent employee ; he has been employed for some time, but these men are engaged by the year. In February he was advised to consult Angus McMillan in regard to the selection of men to be employed. He did not take any notice of the instructions sent to him by the department, and instead of doing so, he continued to apply to our political opponents regarding the selection of the men. Mr. Bourassa learned these facts and went to the place, and investigated the matter. I know Mr. Bourassa very well—he is very well known to members of this House. He wrote the letter I have just read, which conveys the facts I have stated. On the strength of his letter, I have dismissed the man. I will now read the letter in English, as the hon. leader of the Opposition desires :

Ottawa, April 13th, 1897.

To the Honourable Mr. J. I. Tarte,
Minister of Public Works, Ottawa.

Sir,—I request you to dismiss Mr. McCallum, lockman at Petits Rapids, and Office Assistant Simon Raymond. Mr. McCallum received instructions from your department, in January last, to consult Angus McMillan about the selection of the workingmen to the lock. McCallum took no heed of the notice, and it is only by accident that McMillan learned at the end of March that such instructions had been sent to him. As far as Mr. Raymond is concerned, he took an active and violent part against me during the last electoral contest.

I beg to suggest to you the name of Mr. Hugh Gorman, of Buckingham, to replace Mr. McCallum, and the name of James Brazeau, Poupore P.O., P.Q., to replace Raymond.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) HENRI BOURASSA.

I dismissed the man because I found out, not only by this letter, but from other information, that McCallum had simply laughed at us. He was in the employ of my department, and I was very well disposed to keep him where he was ; but I think every member of this Parliament will agree with me, that when a Minister finds out that one of the employees does not carry out his orders faithfully, but rather tries to embarrass the Government of the day ; then that employee is no longer entitled to be retained. That is the principle by which I have stood in the past and which I intend to stand by in the future. The employees of my department who have shown any disposition to serve faithfully, have no reason to complain. I have treated them well to the best of my ability ; but when I find that one of the officials does not want to serve this Government faithfully, I will dismiss him without any mercy whatever.

Mr. FOSTER. The somewhat heated manner in which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) gives the mere explanation which I asked, would rather lead me to suppose that his case is not as strong as it might otherwise be. He is the Minister of the department and so ought to have full knowledge of the circumstances. I gleaned my information from other sources, and my information is necessarily fragmentary, but I am going to ask my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) to listen to the information that I have, and I am going to ask the members of the House to listen to it as well, to form a judgment ; if not upon the information now given by both the hon. gentleman and myself—at least to be in a position to receive further information.

My hon. friend has simply read a letter of a member of Parliament in which that member of Parliament, evidently wishing to have Mr. McCallum and Mr. Raymond both dismissed, indited an epistle to the Minister, and without giving any reasons other than mere assertions, makes a peremptory demand for the dismissal of both these men. On that information—no, not information—but on that peremptory demand from the member of Parliament representing the country, the Minister of Public Works thinks he is perfectly justified in

cutting off the official heads of two gentlemen who have been in the department for a good many years, and against whom, in their work, the Minister has not said a word. The reason that this Mr. McCallum has been dismissed (according to the Minister who relies upon the letter he has read) is, because Mr. McCallum received an order to consult a certain gentleman as to those who were to be employed, and, of whom material was to be bought, and that he paid no attention to it. Now, let us see what light some correspondence which I happen to have, throws on that matter. I find here a letter written by Mr. Coste on the 24th October, which reads as follows. It is a letter written to E. D. Lafleur who is resident engineer in Ottawa:

I have to authorize you to employ Mr. McCallum, lockmaster at the La Lièvre, as foreman of the works of repairs to be executed. He is to employ Mr. Duncan McMillan on the work, and to take his recommendation with regard to the employment of any men that may be required.

Yours obediently,

LOUIS COSTE,

Chief Engineer.

At that time, evidently Mr. McCallum enjoyed the confidence of the department, and he received a letter from Mr. Coste representing the department (transmitted through Mr. Lafleur) for his employment, and he was told to consult the party man in the neighbourhood who seemed at that time to be Mr. Duncan McMillan, and from whom he was to take his orders as to what men were to be employed, and I suppose, as to those from whom the material was to be bought. That was on the 24th October. On December 30th, I find a letter written to this gentleman, chiefly with reference to the details of the work, and plainly showing that he had still the confidence of the department. At the end of this letter the admonition is given to him:

Please complete the work as soon as possible. I am directed by the chief engineer to tell you not to make any changes in your usual staff until you are ordered to do so. You will, therefore, continue to employ Mr. Simon Raymond.

Evidently, somebody had been trying to have the assistant Mr. Raymond dismissed. I would hazard a guess as to who that was; very probably the same gentleman who indited that peremptory epistle to my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) to have the two of them dismissed. However, the department in its coolness at that time, thought it ought to have charge of its own employees, and therefore, Mr. Lafleur in writing to Mr. McCallum tells him positively, that he is directed by the chief engineer to tell him not to make any changes in his staff and to keep on his assistant Mr. Raymond. In January comes a change. On January 26th, 1897, there is a letter from Mr. Laurent, resident engineer, to Mr. McCallum in which he says:

I am directed by the chief engineer to instruct you to apply to Mr. Angus McMillan,——

Who is, I believe, a brother of Duncan McMillan——

—and not to Duncan McMillan, with regard to the employment of men and the purchase of material required for the work of repairs now being carried out.

Mr. McCallum had still the complete confidence of the department. But, the department had been informed, probably by the same writer of the letter, that Mr. Angus McMillan was a more important man to consult and to have the patronage than Mr. Duncan McMillan, and so the orders of the 24th October are changed, and from this time on it is to be Mr. Angus McMillan who is to be consulted. He is to have the supreme command, and he is to say what men, if any, are to be employed, and from whom supplies are to be purchased. Mr. McCallum, as a good officer, obeys the orders of his department, and on the 17th March he promptly answers that letter, and he says:

Mr. Angus McMillan refuses to have anything to say in regard to the employment of men or purchase of material required for the work of repairs, &c., unless paid for such services.

Yours truly,

A. McCALLUM.

There is another point that comes up in the correspondence. My hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) said that Mr. McCallum laughed at him—that was the heinous offence—laughed at him in the department, but the record shows over Mr. McCallum's own hand, that as a loyal officer, he carried out the instructions that were given him, consulted Mr. Angus McMillan, and was informed by Mr. Angus McMillan, that he would not have anything to do with it unless there was something in it for him, and unless he was paid for his services. That letter was sent on the 17th of March. On March 20th that had been before the department, and had been considered. Mr. McMillan's refusal had been considered, and an urgent wire went out to Mr. McCallum, still in the confidence of the department:

A. M. McCallum,
Lockmaster, River du Lièvre Lock.

Push without delay repairs to slide. Engage men and purchase materials required yourself.

ARTHUR ST. LAURENT,

Engineer in Charge.

Now, there is something wrong somewhere, and the only reason given by my hon. friend for this dismissal—that he did not consult Mr. Angus McMillan, and laughed at the department, and consequently was to be punished—is disproved, as far as this evidence goes. Mr. McCallum received the letter; he saw Angus McMillan; Angus McMillan refused to go further unless there was something in it for him; that was properly and quickly

reported to the department; only a day intervenes; the next day a wire goes out, saying that if Mr. Angus McMillan does not choose to do anything, he, Mr. McCallum, should go on and purchase materials and employ men himself. That is all clean and clear up to that date. Then some one gets in his deadly work. On the 13th of April—that was a very interesting time in the province of Quebec—representations are made; the member for that county is active; something must be done, and he sends a letter to the department. On the 13th of April this letter goes out:

Sir,—I am directed to inform you that your services as lockmaster will not be required after the 15th instant, and have to ask you to transfer the whole of the Government property under your charge to Mr. Hugh Gorman, of Buckingham, who has been appointed in your place. Mr. E. T. Smith, of this department, will accompany Mr. Gorman to the lock to-morrow, and take stock of all articles belonging to the Government. Please acknowledge receipt of this letter.

That is on the 13th of April—they give men short notice under this regime; he is to be decapitated on one day's notice. On the 13th the letter goes; on the 14th he receives it; on the 15th off comes his head. That, of course, is despatch, and for a business Government and a business head of the Public Works Department, there is nothing like celerity and despatch in such cases. Following directly on that, the astonishment of Mr. McCallum finds vent in a very modest epistle to the Department of Public Works, in which he says:

I received a letter from the department on the 14th, dated the 13th ult., stating that my services as lockmaster at the River du Lièvre lock would not be required after the 15th—one day's notice—and no reason given. Will you kindly let me know the cause of my dismissal? I think it is only fair that I should know.

And much oblige,

Yours respectfully,

A. M. McCALLUM.

A very respectful letter, conceived in good spirit, and written in a gentlemanly and respectful way. There you have this side of the correspondence, as far as I have it. Mr. McCallum was doing the work; there is no evidence that he was not doing it well; he was a trusted officer of the department; he got his orders to whom to go for his instructions; he went to the man to whom he was ordered to go; a little while afterwards, he got his order, "Do not go to Duncan any longer, Angus is the man"; he went to Angus; Angus says, "I won't do anything unless I am paid"; he reports to the department; the department instructs him to go on with the work, and engage men and purchase materials himself; he goes on; he is told to keep Mr. Raymond, whom some one evidently wanted dismissed, but only to take his orders from headquarters; and now both of them are dismissed. I submit that the evidence before the House shows that this is an instance of a double dismissal made without any reason, and that it has a purely partisan aspect. My hon. friend has been too quick, I think, to act as the judge and at almost the same moment to wield the executioner's axe; and I am afraid he has done both without having an investigation by any proper officer and without having any evidence to warrant him in doing so. Now, I want to repeat what I said before, that Ministers are simply, after all, the executive of this country. They do not own the country; they do not own the fortunes of poor labouring men. Poor labouring men have some rights to fair and decent treatment, whatever Government is in power; and the question with me arises whether they get this fair and decent treatment under such despatch and such methods as were used in this case, if my information is correct, by the hon. Minister of Public Works.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Speaker, the facts as stated by my hon. friend are about correct. Instructions were first sent to Mr. McCallum to ask advice from Mr. Duncan McMillan. It was a mistake in the name, which was due to the fact that Angus McMillan and Duncan McMillan are brothers. On the 26th of January, Mr. McCallum was clearly directed to ask advice from Angus McMillan, who happens to be a Liberal, while Duncan McMillan happens to be a Tory heeler. My hon. friend has been a Minister, and he knows right well, as all the members of this House know, that the conductor of works should always take advice from the friends of the party in power. Mr. McCallum got a clear intimation that a mistake had been made, and instead of taking notice of the letter that was sent to him directing him to take advice from Mr. Angus McMillan, he went on taking advice from the friends of the Tory party. The hon. gentleman is wrong in supposing that I did not take care in the matter. The letters prove that I took all the necessary precautions. I am not anxious to make this dismissal, because it is a pretty difficult job, as every one knows. I would rather keep the good employees I have than dismiss them. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) may laugh; but let him look at my department as it is composed to-day, and he will find that I have kept nearly every one of the officers there. He will find that I have kept nearly every one of my officers there. I have only dismissed men who were not useful, and among those dismissed were just as many Liberals as Tories. In this case I dismissed this man because he did not carry out my orders. I am very sorry to have had to dismiss him, because I think in the past he was a good employee, but we might find good employees in the ranks of the Liberal party. If the Conservative employees who are with us to-day want to serve us faithfully

I will not dismiss one of them, but if they do not I would ask my hon. friend if it would not be my duty to dismiss every one of those who will not be faithful.

Mr. FOSTER. When the hon. gentleman says us, does he mean the country's service or his personal service, for the time being?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. For the time being we are here, and have had imposed on us the duty of governing the country. The country has changed its masters.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not know that the country had a master. I supposed that the country was master.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is a pretty small distinction, too fine for me altogether.

Mr. FOSTER. The facts of the case are clear enough, and they serve to elucidate the position taken by the Government in such matters, but I think that out of this case the hon. gentleman might take a lesson.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman has in his hands today a correspondence which has never been brought down to this House, and which was given out by some of my employees.

Mr. LISTER. Stolen.

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a point of order. I will have no man in this House shake his finger in my face and say I have stolen correspondence.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not say that.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say that you did, but the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), who sits behind you, did. I ask your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) must at once withdraw that expression.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. member for Lambton did not say that the hon. gentleman had stolen the correspondence, but he did say that the correspondence had been stolen.

Mr. FOSTER. It is just as bad for me to have stolen correspondence in my hands and used it as if I stole it myself. Will the hon. gentleman make good his statement that it was stolen? Every letter and every line that I read, went to Mr. McCallum from the department, and Mr. McCallum had a perfect right to use it in his own defence.

Mr. LISTER. If the hon. gentleman says that if these letters were stolen, he is as guilty as the thief—that is the English of it—I reply that in law he does not occupy that position, unless he has them knowing them to be stolen, unless he received them knowing them to be stolen, and I make no such accusation.

Mr. FOSTER. I ask the Speaker's ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER. I suppose that technically the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) is right when he says that the letters might be stolen without any imputation being cast on the hon. gentleman who used them.

Mr. FOSTER. But he did not say that.

Mr. SPEAKER. He says now, and I am very glad to hear him say so, because, as the remark was thrown across the House, it was susceptible of a different imputation, and I am glad he withdrew it.

Mr. LISTER. I had no intention whatever of charging the hon. gentleman with stealing.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am very glad indeed to hear the explanation that has been given, but I cannot understand how a letter written by the chief engineer to his assistant, Mr. Laflamme, found its way into the hands of Mr. McCallum. I know something about the case. The instructions of Mr. Coste to his assistants cannot have found their way into Mr. McCallum's hands in the natural order of things, and I happen to know, I think, from whom the correspondence was given out. I have already dismissed some of my officers who, I know, were dishonest men, and I am very much afraid that I will be obliged to do something of the kind again. We are not going to be dupes. Let the faithful employees know that they have nothing to fear from us, but let the traitors understand, at the same time, that they are going to be treated as they deserve. This is equal justice to all. This Government is here, we are here to stay, I think, as far as I can see, and not to be betrayed. I know that in past days, when I was a newspaper man in this place, I happened to know a great many things that were given out by employees of the day. We are not going to submit to the same treatment; we are not going to be betrayed, without at least trying to find out the guilty parties. Again, I say, let the faithful employees understand that they have nothing at all to fear, but let those who want to be active partisans of the party opposite step out or be prepared to be dismissed every time they are caught.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to call my hon. friend's attention, if he will allow me, to the fact that in all this general skirmish, which was very nicely gotten up by my hon. friend, he missed the only point. I stated that when the instructions were sent to Mr. McCallum to consult Mr. Angus McMillan, he did consult Mr. Angus McMillan, and Mr. McMillan refused to act, that Mr. McCallum reported that to the department,

and that the department then ordered Mr. McCallum to push on the work, buy the materials and employ the men himself. Not one document has my hon. friend—he may have it under his hand—put in to weaken in the least that position. That is the kernel of the whole thing. My hon. friend will be the first to admit that if Mr. McCallum carried out those orders and reported to the department and then received orders from the department to go on by himself, he is not to blame.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The facts of the case are not at all as stated by my hon. friend. Of course, Mr. McCallum tried to make good his case, but what he did was this. Instead of simply going to Mr. McMillan and asking him what men he was going to employ, he asked Mr. McMillan to go there and stay there all the time. In other words, he made it impossible for Mr. McMillan to be at all useful to us. In other words, he played the game of a very strong opponent and tried to laugh at us, and the one who laughs last laughs best.

Mr. SPEAKER. This discussion is on a motion to go into Supply. Any subject can, of course, be brought up on that motion, but I wish to draw the attention of the two experienced gentlemen who have just been speaking that I am afraid they have assumed that the House was in committee and have spoken more than once, and I hope they will not do so again.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to ask a question of the hon. Minister of Public Works. He says we are not to be betrayed.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. These hon. gentlemen seem to understand it, but I do not. What is the hon. gentleman doing that he is afraid will get the light of day?

Mr. McNEILL. I wanted to ask the hon. Minister whether any opportunity was afforded to this gentleman to meet the charges made against him publicly in the House.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I thought the case was so clear that there was no use at all wasting public money on it. Moreover, these employees are not permanent, and I am perfectly free to dispense with their services whenever I like.

Mr. McNEILL. I understand that, of course. But it was a question whether this gentleman had done something to make him deserving of dismissal. I understand now that the Minister has really never afforded this gentleman an opportunity to explain himself. I feel that we have a right to appeal to the Prime Minister to say what this is coming to.

Mr. FOSTER. Before we go into committee, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) not being present, I would like to call the Prime Minister's attention to the fact that in the Bank Note correspondence some letters have evidently been omitted, by oversight, of course. I asked for all letters and I would like to have the correspondence complete.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) spoke of the previous contract. Does he mean the letters too?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. The hon. Minister of Finance will find that four or five letters written to himself, and, maybe to one or two of the other Ministers—probably one of them to the Prime Minister—have not been included in the return. I would like to have all the letters.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I will make a note of it.

Motion agreed to, and the House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Department of Inland Revenue, including $600 to A. Clement, the private secretary of the Controller, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act	$38,540

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like the Controller of Inland Revenue to explain this item.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). On page 16 of the Estimates will be found the details of the whole staff as follows:—

Commissioner	$ 3,200
Assistant commissioner and chief inspector	3,000
Chief clerk and secretary	2,400
Chief clerk and chief accountant	2,000
First class clerks, 4 at $1,800, 1 at $1,450, 1 at $1,400	10,050
Second class clerks, 6 at $1,400, 1 at $1,350, 1 at $1,150, 4 at $1,100	15,300
Third class clerks, 1 at $680, 1 at $550	1,230
Allowance for private secretary (A. Clement) to Controller, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act	600
Messengers, 1 at $430, 1 at $330	760
	$38,540

It will be noticed by comparing this with the estimates of the previous year that the amount asked for this year exceeds by $290 the Estimates of last year, and also that there is one additional second class clerk. It happens in this way: Ever since June, 1894, we have had a temporary clerk, Mr. Hughes, who has been continually employed except for six months. In case of the absence through sickness, &c., of any officer, Mr. Hughes, owing to the experience he has acquired was able, as he has always shown himself willing, to take the place of the absent officer. He is one of those who have given the most satisfactory service in the department. I may be asked: Why do you promote him and make

him a second class clerk instead of passing by the ordinary routine and making him first a third class clerk? Mr. Hughes is well qualified to be made a permanent clerk and we are anxious to put him on the permanent staff. Under the law, 49 Vic., chap. 17, sections 21, 22 and 23, we could have appointed him a third class clerk. But, unfortunately, this has been repealed by 58-59 Vic., chap. 15, which provides for the appointment of third class clerks being discontinued. Therefore, it is impossible to appoint now a third class clerk, and we must either continue to keep Mr. Hughes as a temporary officer or appoint him to the second class. He was placed there by our predecessors, but throughout his connection with the department he has done such good service that we are anxious to keep him permanently, therefore, we put him among the second class clerks which raises the number from 11 to 12. It may be asked: With the addition of a second class clerk how is it that you add only $290 to the expenses. I will explain that briefly. Mr. Nettle, who received a salary of $1,750; was superannuated at the age of 82. Hon. members may remember that I explained last session the difficulty I had to gain Mr. Nettle's consent to his superannuation. However, ultimately, without resorting to any violent physical means which I feared last year would be necessary to bring about his superannuation, he graciously assented to it. Mr. Nettle has been replaced by a second class clerk, Mr. Doyon, who receives $1,400. Then, Mr. McCarthy, a second class clerk, died during the winter, and he has been replaced by a new clerk who only receives $1,100. Here is an economy of $300. Hon. gentlemen will understand how, upon these two, we have made an economy of $600, and this would allow us, if the committee sees no objection to it to reward the faithful service of Mr. Hughes by promoting him and making him a second class clerk as he deserves to be. And I hope this favour will be granted.

Mr. FOSTER. Might I ask my hon. friend who this favoured individual is?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. Mr. Hughes.

Mr. FOSTER. What salary was he receiving as a temporary man?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. $500.

Mr. FOSTER. And my hon. friend has appointed him at $1,100?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I have not appointed him at $1,100; I only ask leave of the House to do so. This is the only thing that I can do. The law says that the salary of a second-class clerk shall begin at $1,100, and that is the minimum salary fixed by law. As for his being a favoured individual, I beg to state that I found him in the office when I came there; that he was appointed by my friends opposite, like nearly every other officer in the office, and that he has always given me the greatest satisfaction, and I am happy to say the same of every officer in that office. I admit myself that to go from $500 to $1,100 is certainly a step which does not appear justified at first sight; but the law does not allow us to appoint a third-class clerk now, we can only appoint a second-class clerk.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend sees what he has done in this year of economy. When hard-working and deserving clerks all through the service are refused their customary $50 increase, he is taking a man who is temporary, who is getting $500 per year——

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I have not appointed him.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course, my hon. friend has not appointed him, because he can not go so far, even with all the power the Government have, as to appoint a man until this House says he should have a salary—unless my hon. friend pays him out of his own pocket, which would be even too generous for my hon. friend. Now, here are seven or eight hundred clerks, the large proportion of whom, I suppose he will agree with me, work just as hard, and just as diligently, and do their work just as well as this gentleman, Mr. Hughes. These clerks in this jubilee year of economy, have been docked the usual increase of $50, no matter how faithful their services may have been they cannot get this increase. Here is a gentleman who is a temporary clerk, not on the permanent establishment at all, and consequently less burdensome to the public service than if he were on the permanent staff. My hon. friend goes to work and raises him from $500 to $1,100, adding $600 to his salary. Now, this gentleman has not even the recommendation of having been an old temporary servant. In 1894, I think my hon. friend said, he was appointed; that is only three years ago. Does not my hon. friend think that there is a good deal of injustice, not only in the first consideration I stated, but in this other consideration, that you take a man only three years in the service, a temporary man and you give him $1,100, increasing him by more than 100 per cent, while other deserving men all through the service cannot even get their $50 increase. My hon. friend says he likes the young man—if he is a young man, I do not know him—he likes him, and he thought something ought to be done for him. He could have done something for him in the writers' class, provided for by Parliament, who can go up to $600. He had a chance to raise him gradually under the law from $500 to $600, by giving him so much per year. Those steps were not fast enough; all the rest of the service can take no step at all, but this gentleman is boosted from $500 to $1,100,

and put upon the permanent service, and made a charge afterwards in superannuation, and all that comes from adding to the permanent service. Now, my hon. friend may have been good-natured and all that, and the young man may be a very deserving young man, but that appears to me to be a glaring case of injustice. It is more than right for Mr. Hughes to add $600 to a salary of $500; and for a young man only three years in the service, it is a little too much. No other man in the service gets it. There again the irresponsible will of the Minister comes in to override the plain intention of the law. He comes down here with the force at his back and asks that force to make an enactment by which all the precedents of the civil service shall be swept away. Then does not my hon. friend see another injustice? How many third-class clerks has my hon. friend in that department?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. Two.

Mr. FOSTER. These men have been in the employment for years and years. Are they worthless men? Even those men cannot have an increase. They look for promotion. If there is to be a new second-class clerk appointed, naturally those that are in the third-class think they ought to have the step, and if these gentlemen, under that very salutary rule, have been passed over, there must be some good reason for it. But altogether it looks as if my hon. friend was led away by his good nature, and that, in following the dictates of his good nature with reference to Mr. Hughes, he has perpetrated a very great injustice to all the other members of the civil service.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. There is something intensely comical in the accusation of the hon. gentleman. He says that I have perpetrated a great injustice. I would like to know what injustice is perpetrated when I come before the House and ask the House to allow me to do what I now propose? If the House allows me to do it, then, according to my hon. friend, it is the House that will be perpetrating a great injustice. The hon. gentleman says I wish to favour this man above any others. To show how entirely the charge is without foundation, I may tell my hon. friend that if I met Mr. Hughes now on the street, I would not know him. I only know him by his work, I do not know him personally. I know he was placed there by hon. gentlemen opposite, and they have made a good choice in appointing him. Now, the law does not allow me to do anything more for him unless I make him permanent, and the only way in which I could make him permanent was to make him a second-class clerk. Now, I declare to the House that instead of wanting to use the force of the Government in this matter—and I was painfully struck when I heard the hon. member say that I had the force at my back and that I had only to use it—I beg, Mr. Chairman, to move to amend that item and to return to the estimates as they were last year, namely, make it eleven second-class clerks instead of twelve. Then I hope my hon. friend will see that I have no sinister motive, but I was merely trying to do what I consider was right.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, my hon. friend is not quite just to me. I leave it to the House if I imputed any sinister motive. The only thing I said was that my hon. friend, in his good nature, had probably gone too far. Now, I have nothing to say against Mr. Hughes. He was appointed by us, and may be a good man; I dare say he is; and if my hon. friend is satisfied with his work, that is a recommendation that he is a good man. I was only pointing out that this was a most extraordinary increase to give to a young man only three years in the service.

Mr. CAMERON. I am glad the Controller of Inland Revenue has taken that step. The Controller of Inland Revenue will always find himself wrong when he undertakes to promote to a higher postion and a double salary any person employed by the late Administration. This may be a very good man, and a very useful man, but there does not appear to be the slightest justification for increasing his salary from $500 to $1,100, especially in view of the fact that the Government have rightly decided that the usual increase shall not be given except for meritorious services only. Now, with these observations, I must say that in looking over the Auditor General's Report, and the other information that has come to my hands, I believe that the Department of Inland Revenue is still the most expensive department in the whole Government of Canada, both the inside and the outside services. I find by the Auditor General's Report that there were last year in the employment of the Inland Revenue Department, I think about fifty-four clerks, including temporaries, and not less than thirteen extra clerks, including seven ladies.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. No.

Mr. CAMERON. Then the Auditor General is all wrong. According to his report for 1895-96, there was that number of clerks, including thirteen extras, seven of whom were females. The Department of Inland Revenue should be run with a less number of employees. If I am mistaken in regard to these figures, then the Auditor General's report is wrong. Besides, the salaries paid are too high. I should like to know why the Commissioner of the Department of Inland Revenue should receive $4,000 a year; why he should draw two salaries for discharging practically the same duties? I believe this is the only department, with one exception, in which the deputy receives $4,000 salary. Why should he receive

$3,200 as deputy of the department and $800 more in connection with weights and measures? Four thousand dollars a year salary is too much for this officer. In the interest of the Canadian taxpayer, that amount should be cut down, and I trust when the hon. Controller has had further time to consider the circumstances, he will see his way clear to cut down not only the salaries of the inside but of the outside service of the department. Looking over the reports of the department and the reports of the Auditor General one is astounded at the sums paid to the outside service. The present Controller is not to blame, because this expenditure is due to the system introduced by hon. gentlemen opposite; but after this session the responsibility will rest on the head of the department and the Government, and it will be necessary to apply the pruning knife to that branch of the public service. The hon. gentleman should not be alarmed or terrified because in doing his duty hon. gentlemen opposite from the back benches to the front benches denounce members of this Administration when they dispense with the services of some of the employees because their services are not required; and allege that they are treated as having been removed from the public service, not because they were not required but because of some political or other considerations. Let the Ministers discharge their duty, and when they find officials, either in the inside or outside service, whose services can be dispensed with or whose numbers can be reduced, let them apply the pruning knife, and if necessary let the political hatchet be used and let their heads be cut off. The people of this country have not placed the members of the Government on the Treasury benches for the purpose of keeping in office men whose services are not required, and they have not placed them in power for the purpose of increasing salaries, but rather for the purpose of reducing salaries, when reductions can be made in the public interest. The public servants do not pay for the maintenance of the service, but this burden falls on the taxpayers, and they have a right to be considered. While I make these remarks, I do not attach blame to the Controller of Inland Revenue, but I do attach blame to the system and to hon. gentlemen who preceded him in office. The present Controller has the opportunity now of serving his country faithfully, as have other members of the Administration, and the people will hold him and them to strict account for the expenditure and for its reduction in his department. Unless services must be dispensed with and men must not be in the service to do nothing except draw salaries. I should like to know from the Controller how $2,226 has been expended in travelling expenses last year? Also, why no less an expenditure than $360 is required for newspapers for the office in the course of a year? We do not pay the officers to read the public press. Of course I do not object to the Minister and the deputy reading the newspapers during office hours. I am not referring to the Auditor General's report of 1895-96; I have not seen the Auditor General's report for this year, and I hope these amounts have been cut down, for I really cannot understand why $2,226 should be expended for mileage for three of the hon. gentleman's employees. No doubt they travelled on passes—at all events it is very likely they did so—and I do not see the necessity of incurring that expense, especially when there are inspectors and officials throughout the country who are capable of attending to departmental business, and do attend to it to a certain extent. The outside as well as the inside service requires a thorough overhauling and a system of economy instituted, and I tell the hon. Controller that next session the people will expect a very considerable reduction to be made not only in the inside but the outside service of the Department of Inland Revenue.

Mr. BRITTON. I desire to say a word or two at this time because I rather regret that the Controller of Inland Revenue made this motion, if this officer referred to is really as deserving as the hon. gentleman states. It is not possible at all times to do exactly what is right by the whole service without sacrificing some particular individual, and some latitude must be given to any hon. gentleman administering the department, and more particularly when he first comes into the department, in regard to the selection of men and paying them the salaries they are really worth. I know the tu quoque argument is never a good one, and that it never justifies any act done by this Government to say that a similar act was done by the preceding Government, and yet hon. members are tempted to use it when they meet with carping criticism in regard to all these items. I agree with the principle of promotion. If this system prevails, it should be open to all the officials. I have in mind the case of Mr. Dickson in Kingston, who was appointed by the Mackenzie Government, and who, according to all reports and inquiries made in the department is a first-class man in every respect, very well up in his work, of excellent habits, one who has always done his duty most faithfully, yet who from 1878 down to the present time has never received any increase of salary or promotion. Three or four years ago a person not familiar with a single detail with the work of his office, and who had never been in the public service, by name Grimason, of Kingston, was appointed deputy collector at Kingston at a salary of $1,300. Yet Mr. Dickson, who was entitled to promotion, never received it, but a new man was brought in and appointed to the position. If that has been done—and it has been undoubtedly in many

cases—by hon. gentlemen opposite, it comes with exceeding bad grace for them to criticise appointments such as those made by the Controller of Inland Revenue when he has just entered on the duties of his office.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I regret the Controller of Inland Revenue so quickly abandoned his guns. This officer, of whom I know nothing personally or officially, has won his good opinion by the merit of his work. The Controller also stated that he did not know of this official except as his work came before him, and his work seem to entitle him to better pay than he had been receiving. The objection of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) did not go so far as to suggest that the hon. Controller should in no way reward merit in his department. The chief complaint that has been made upon this side of the House is that a very great injustice has been done to many meritorious officers by depriving them of their statutory increase which in many a sense might be considered their vested rights. Outside of the technical rules of law under the Civil Service Act, the House knows that a large number of meritorious men in the service have been deprived of this statutory increase which they had hitherto been led to regard as a right. Whatever the powers of the Government may be, there is a strong case against the policy pursued by them, because the Government in this instance and in several others have assumed rather an inconsistent attitude. While depriving wholesale these men of their legitimate reward, they have singled out individuals, and this man one of them. The member for York (Mr. Foster) did not so much object to a proper reward of merit as to the extraordinary discrimination that was being introduced. The case seems to me to be one of the strongest that could be put before Parliament on behalf of many deserving officers in the different department. For instance, in the departments with which I am the most familiar, I know of men without whose services the department would be very badly handicapped, and in regard to whom very special circumstances exist. In the hydrographic service of the Marine Department, there were men appointed, wholly without regard to politics, for that special branch. The staff of the Kingston College were asked to report upon the names of graduates who from their mathematical examinations seemed to be peculiarly fit for that position; and the names submitted by the staff of the college were accepted. These young men were told what the opening really amounted to. They were led to believe—not by any absolute contract, I admit—but they were led to believe by myself as head of the department, looking at the manner in which public servants had hitherto been treated, that for meritorious work and competency and faithful attention to their duties, their progress would be gradual, and from year to year their salaries would be increased. I may say that none of these men have communicated with me, but they undoubtedly accepted their commissions under that understanding, and this case seems to be one of many in the service where we have obtained specially trained men at very low salaries; these men believing that there was a career before them in the civil service of Canada. Looking over these estimates, I find that the statutory increases are omitted, and that really amounts to bad faith on the part of the Government towards officers of that class, as well as other officials of standing and merit. It is absurd to say that while such a rigid rule of economy is adopted, it is fair to single out either temporary or regular employees for special reward and special treatment, as in this case. I venture to submit to the hon. the Controller that if he feels he cannot take the course of granting a large increase to this exceptionally good officer, whoever he may be, that instead of dropping the whole addition to his salary, the Controller should reduce the amount somewhat, notwithstanding the inconsistent position in which he would still be left, and the injustice under which many other officers of the service would be suffering. As a temporary officer, this gentleman can even be granted, under the law, an increase. After the case which the hon. the Controller has made out for this official, I hope he will not drop him altogether, so far as that increase is concerned.

Mr. McMULLEN. Any person who will look over the list of officers connected with the Inland Revenue Department must come to the conclusion at once that it is entirely over-manned, and comparing it with some other departments of the service, I say that it is not only over-manned, but that it is over-salaried as well. In the Department of Customs there are thirty-one clerks, paid $38,600, whereas in the Department of Inland Revenue there are only twenty-six clerks and they are paid $38,540. In addition to that sum, $800 extra is granted to the Commissioner. I should like to know why the Commissioner of Inland Revenue is paid $3,200, which is $400 more than is paid to the Commissioner of Customs and why, in addition to that, the Commissioner of Inland Revenue gets an extra allowance of $800 as Commissioner of Standards? That makes Mr. Miall's salary $4,000 altogether. I would like to know on what principle you pay the Commissioner of Customs $2,800 and the Commissioner of Inland Revenue $4,000? I say, Sir, that there is ample room for the pruning knife in this department, and I endorse the remarks of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron). I can easily understand that gentlemen opposite are a little sensitive in urging reductions, because it is their

own appointees who draw these salaries. I have no doubt that hon. gentlemen opposite would rather that the Controller of Inland Revenue had not moved to strike this $600 out. It may perhaps hurt a political friend of theirs, and some little feeling may arise owing to the fact that they challenged the prudence of giving this $600 increase. I am glad they did. It is the only good act the ex-Minister of Finance has performed this session, and I hope he will repeat it in many instances.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) would only support me.

Mr. McMULLEN. I will. I want to say here and now, that unless this $800 for the Commissioner of Standards is dropped, when it comes to the Supplementary Estimates I shall myself vote that it be struck out. I believe that the ex-Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), when he was acting Minister of Inland Revenue, struck this $800 off on one occasion.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I never was acting Minister of Inland Revenue.

Mr. McMULLEN. Possibly it was the leader of the Opposition.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then, if it was the ex-Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Costigan), I would like to know who reinstated it as a charge on the country. Perhaps it was done during his absence. At all events, I hold it is wrong that $4,000 a year should be paid to any one man; and I now beg to notify my esteemed friend that when we reach this item in the Supplementary Estimates, I shall move, if necessary, that this $800 be struck out. I hope that before next session the pruning knife will be applied in this department, whosoever's head comes off, as there is ample room, so as to bring the expenditure of the department down to proper and prudent dimensions. At present the expenses of this department are altogether too great.

Mr. BENNETT. When a few weeks ago, it was announced in the papers that the hon. Controller of Inland Revenue was to be transferred to another sphere—to the position of Lieutenant-Governor of the Northwest Territories—the statement was received with a little doubt. When, later on, it was rumoured that he was to go to the province of Ontario as Lieutenant-Governor, that also was received with some doubt and misgivings as well. But, from the onslaught which has been made upon the hon. gentleman to-day by his old friends, I think his first exclamation must be, "Save me from my friends." I wish to ask the hon. Controller of Inland Revenue a question. A little while ago—so the event must be quite fresh in his memory—a Mr. Bolster, who was in his department, was superannuated. May I ask him whether that was done with a view to economy, because the man is in the prime of life; and also, whether it is his intention to appoint a successor to the position.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. Eight officers of the Department of Weights and Measures have been superannuated, and it is not the intention of the Government to replace them.

Mr. BENNETT. I have to thank the hon. gentleman for the answer, although I think it must bring to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) a sigh of regret, because I understand that he has lately given the assurance that he could not support a prominent Liberal in my riding for the position, because he had a man himself for the post.

Mr. PETTET. I would like to ask the hon. Minister how many hours the civil servants work each day, and also how many weeks' holidays they have each year.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. They have three weeks holidays during the year, and the office hours are from half-past nine to four each day; but whenever they are required to continue their work further, I keep them.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I heard only the latter part of the discussion on this item, which refers particularly to the appointments of second class clerks in the Inland Revenue Department. I see it is proposed to increase the number by an additional second class clerk. I wish to say a few words; and perhaps I am in this happy position that the gentleman who has been named was not in the department in my time; but I know of his services, and I have been led to understand that no more efficient officer has been engaged in that department than the gentleman named. I know he was called in whenever extra work was to be done, on account of his capabilities, his industry, and the satisfaction he gave in every engagement he had in the department; and I was glad to learn that the department had secured his services by making him permanent and giving him a position in keeping with his capacity. While objections seem to have been taken to an increase of that kind in the department, I think I can myself congratulate the hon. the Controller on the fact that in his estimate he has not been obliged to ask Parliament to set aside the Civil Service Act. There is nothing in the Act contrary to the provision he makes; while I find that in other departments the Ministers who have, properly, recognized the services of public officers—I say properly, because I suppose they are acting on the merits of each individual case—have been obliged to ask Parliament to declare that the salaries shall be so much more than they have been, notwithstanding

anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary. Now, I would be very sorry to learn that the ability of this man is not to be recognized, and I hope the hon. the Controller will press the recommendation he has made to Parliament. With reference to the question put to me by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) in reference to another matter, when it comes properly before the House, I shall be very happy to give him the information he desires—whether the $800 was taken away from the Commissioner of Standards by my authority or recommendation, and by whom it was restored. It was done away during my time, therefore I have to assume the responsibility as a member of the Government for that reduction. I also accept the responsibility of its restoration, even with more pleasure; and when the time comes when the hon. gentleman says he will attack the item, I will give any further information I can on the subject.

Mr. LISTER. I hope the hon. the Controller of Inland Revenue will be firm in his determination not to restore this item. If the friend of the hon. gentleman opposite has any complaint to make, that complaint must be levelled against the ex-Finance Minister and his friends. I do not know anything about this gentleman, but the ex-Finance Minister, with all his experience challenged the item which proposed to increase the salary of this gentleman by some $500. The Opposition occupy a somewhat funny position. They come before the House and find fault with the Government for having increased this man's pay. The Government, or the Controller of Inland Revenue, strikes out the item, and now hon. gentlemen opposite, one after the other, get up and say that he ought to restore it. If the Controller had resisted the criticism of the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster), all the following of that hon. gentleman on the other side would have got up and said: What a dreadful pretty extravagant Government this is to be sure—increasing this man's salary to the extent of $600. Now that the hon. Controller has taken their advice, be it good or bad, the whole cry is to put the item back again. This gentleman is probably a very worthy man, the Controller of Inland Revenue may have taken all these matters into consideration, and if hon. gentlemen opposite, who have left office only a short time ago, had thought proper to remain silent, the item would have carried. They thought proper, however, to challenge it, and this, being an economical Government, at once took the advice of the ex-Finance Minister and struck the item out. If the hon. Controller were now to restore it, his friends would feel that he was a very weak man indeed. The increase is struck out and the item must stand as it is, and if this gentleman has any fault to find, he must find it with his friends on the other side.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). I think I ought to be allowed to make a few explanation after what has been said, not only on the one side of the House, but on the other. With regard to what has come from this side, I have accepted the advice of my hon. friends. I am quite willing to admit that I have a great task before me in limiting the expenditure of this department. There is one branch of the department, to which I shall have occasion to refer later, the Department of Weights and Measures, in which I hope, with the consent of the House, to be able to make a considerable reduction of expenditure. Already we have superannuated eight officers in that branch, and I certainly see my way to superannuate a great many more without doing any injustice to any one or to the country.

Mr. MONTAGUE. While my hon. friend is on that point, will he give us the names of those he has superannuated?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I would suggest that the hon. gentleman should wait until the weights and measures items come up.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I only asked because the hon. gentleman seemed to have them at his fingers' ends

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I have not the names here, but shall read the divisions. In the division of London and Windsor we saved $1,200; Belleville and Kingston, $1,300; Toronto and Orillia, $1,000; St. John's and King's, N.S., $800; Lévis and Yarmouth, $1,000; Winnipeg, $1,000. These are the different items, but I have not the names. I am quite willing to accept the advice given me by my hon. friends on this side. I know that I have a very serious task to perform, and I shall do my best to accomplish it. My hon. friend opposite alluded to the likelihood of my leaving this department in order to become, I think, Lieutenant-Governor of some place or another. I do not know why people want to send me everywhere but to the department in which I take so much interest, to which I am ready to devote all my time, and which I am anxious to improve in every possible way, both as regards reducing expenditure and increasing its efficiency. At one time people sent me to China as Aide-de-Camp to Li Hung Chang. At another time, I was to become Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Quebec. Again I was to become Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario, and then Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west. The other day when the House was opened, and when some of my colleagues appeared in the magnificent uniform which becomes them so well, I was asked why I did not wear one, and I replied that I did not know

exactly what position I was going to be in and therefore had not ordered my uniform. A short time ago I was informed by the newspapers that I was going to be made inspector of cheese factories, and I expect that by and by I shall be appointed to the position of inspector of ginger beer bottles or something of the kind, so that I must know exactly what I am going to be before getting my uniform.

To come back to the question before the committee, I explained why I put the name of Mr. Hughes among the second class clerks. According to law, I do not see how I could make him permanent unless I did so. My hon. friends opposite took for granted that I was bound to pass this item when I simply asked the consent of the House to it, and the moment there was the slightest dissent I asked the House that the name be struck out. The name is struck out and I will not ask that it be replaced. As I said a moment ago, I am quite open to every reproach that may be launched against me by my friends as well as hon. gentlemen opposite for not having, during the time I have been at the head of this department, done as much perhaps as I should towards reorganizing and improving it and especially diminishing the expense. I accept these reproaches for myself but not for the officers with whom I have the advantage of being associated and who are faithfully doing their duty. When my hon. friend speaks of the Commissioner of Inland Revenue, Mr. E. Miall, he speaks of a man who has done a great deal for that department and who has done a great deal for the civil service, and whose services entitle him to the consideration of every one in this House and the country at large. I do not know what I would do without his help, and am glad to render him that justice now. When the question comes of reducing his salary, I think that I can show the House that it would be an injustice to diminish now the salary to which he is entitled and which he has so well earned. I am not going to make comparisons between his salary and those of the other deputies; but if compelled to do so, when the time comes, I will show that he is not the only Deputy Minister who receives a salary of that amount; and that some receive higher salaries, and shall be glad to go into the details of his services, the scientific acquirements and knowledge which his position requires, and show the amount of study and experience required in order to conduct this department.

My hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Cameron) spoke a moment ago of the innumerable staff which he finds in my department—seven ladies in fact and I do not know how many temporary clerks he found there, The whole staff of the department now consists of twenty-six officers, including the messengers and one temporary clerk, Mr. Hughes, who has already been referred to, and two ladies, Miss Lawless and Miss Herring. These are all the extra officers employed. I do not know that I have ever seen the two ladies who are employed in the department, but I know they do their duty faithfully, because every day I see their writing in documents that come before me. Comparing with the past, I can show that there has been considerable reduction. In 1887-88, there were thirty officers instead of twenty-six, and the amount asked was $41,890, instead of $38,540, the amount now asked for. But while this reduction has taken place, there has been an increase of revenue from $6,504,000 to $8,041,086.

Department of the Secretary of State..... $34,950

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). The House will observe that there is a reduction there of about $2,460. This is made up as follows:—Two second-class clerkships are abolished at $1,400 each. Per contra there are a number of small statutory increases which accrued during preceding years. Eight began on the 1st October. These are complete.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman mention who the second-class clerks are who are dropped?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Messrs. Arcand and Mathon. There is a statutory increase of $25 began on the 1st January, two of $37.50, the balance of statutory increases granted 1st April, and two statutory increases, now running, which were omitted from the Estimates of the current year.

The Department of Militia and Defence... $41,050

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The House will observe here a decrease of $4,465, the estimate for 1896-97 having been $45,515. One of the first-class clerks retired, whose salary amounts to $1,550. Another of $1,800 is to be retired, and one substituted at $1,400. This makes a decrease in round numbers of $2,000 in the first-class lists.

Mr. HUGHES. Will the hon. gentleman give the names of those who are retired?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Messrs. Larose and Bacon.

An hon. MEMBER. Colonel Bacon?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes. In the second-class there is a reduction in the number from fifteen to twelve, caused by death or resignation. In two cases, officers at $1,400 are replaced by others at $1,100. In the other class there is a reduction in number from five to four. One salary of $1,000 is abolished and one officer has been appointed. In the lowest class there is a reduction n the number, from four to three, with the saving of $352,

making in all the saving I have made $4,465, and a reduction in the number of officers of four.

Mr. FOSTER. Are all the positions estimated for filled at the present time ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I understand they are.

Mr. FOSTER. We have not had the pleasure of having the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden) with us this session. We have missed his presence, of course, and are sorry for the reason, which is illness, I believe. Has the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) any information as to whether we may expect the Minister of Militia to be present this session ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have been, for many reasons, as hon. gentlemen can understand, deploring the absence of my hon. friend (Mr. Borden). I was in some hopes that he could join us, if not this week, by the end of next week. He reports himself as much better, as, no doubt, hon. gentlemen will be glad to hear, and I trust he will join us next week. But, of course, that must depend on what his medical adviser will permit.

Mr. HUGHES. Of course, the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) will understand that I am not attempting to embarrass him. But I would draw his attention to the fact that one of the retiring officers of the department was in another position in the service of the country as brigade major before he became an officer at Ottawa of the Militia Department. The hon. gentleman, no doubt, knows that the time during which this gentleman served as brigade major does not count for superannuation allowance, unless by the grace of the Government. I would most respectfully ask the Minister to take into his serious consideration whether the officer who is retiring should not be allowed for the time during which he gave his services to the country as brigade major as well as for the time he has served as an officer in the department here. It has previously been proposed in the House that brigade majors and district officers commanding should come under the Superannuation Act, but this has not been done yet. In this case I would urge the hon. gentleman to give this matter his best consideration.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I trust that my hon. friend, the Minister of Militia, will be present in person, as I have stated, within a few days. I need not assure the House that his disposition is to do all that the law will allow him to do in cases of that kind. I have not looked into the matter myself, and I could not form an opinion off-hand as to what could be done, but I think the department may be relied upon to give the matter every reasonable consideration.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

The Department of Railways and Canals, including $2,000 to L. Shannon, and $1,800 to J. E. W. Currier, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act..... $39,230

Mr. HAGGART. There seems to be some changes here, and I would ask the head of the department to explain the reasons.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). So far as there have been any changes in my department, I think they are apparent on the face of the Estimates, page 18. In the first instance, the former secretary of the department has been superannuated, and there is no longer an officer receiving the salary which was received by that gentleman. There is the sum of $600 which, of course, will have to go into the calculation as to the general result in this department—that sum is to be paid as a superannuation allowance, and has to come out of the former salary, the difference being the sum which has been saved by doing away with that officer. There has been no filling up during the past year, nor is it proposed to fill up the two vacant first-class clerkships which I found when I entered the department. Provision is being asked this year for six only, in place of eight last year. There is no difference in the second-class clerks. As to the third-class clerks, so-called, it will be observed that I am only asking that provision will be made for eight, which will be one less than was provided for last year. So that there is a saving of the salary of the secretary of the department, the salaries of two first-class clerks, and the salary of a third-class clerk, subject, first, to a reduction by the amount of the superannuation allowance, and secondly, by the increase which it is proposed shall be given to the accountant, who is made a chief clerk, that is $200 to Mr. Shannon, and the addition to the salary of Mr. Currier. Mr. Currier's salary appropriated to him as a first-class clerk last year, is $1,487.50. In addition to that, he received a very large portion of the sum allowed for private secretary. The hon. gentleman knows that Mr. Currier, who was his private secretary, has continued to be my private secretary, and I propose to allow him, if the committee will consent, a salary of $1,800. I also ask provision for a private secretary, a portion of which appropriation will be required for another gentleman to assist me in that capacity. I find it quite impossible to get along with one private secretary, the work in the department is so very considerable that I require the assistance of another man, and in these Estimates I ask that provision be made for him.

Mr. HAGGART. My principal reason in asking this question was to direct the attention of the Minister to the reasons for the superannuation of the secretary of the department, and particularly the rea-

son why he has been allowed such a small superannuation. Would the hon. gentleman please explain why he passed over the law in superannuating that gentleman, and why he gave him a less superannuation than the law allowed ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not aware that the hon. gentleman is correct in that statement ; I think Mr. Balderson receives the full amount of the superannuation which the law allows. There has been no proposal to add any term of years to his term of service. I have not done that, but I felt, in the first place, after the experience which I have had in the department, that we did not require to continue the services of Mr. Balderson in that capacity. He is no doubt a very competent man, and I felt that his abilities might be, with more advantage to himself, and perhaps to the general advantage of the country, directed in some other channel than that of secretary to my department. He had not enough to do to keep him continually employed, and I found that it was possible to make an arrangement under which the chief clerk in the office of the Deputy Minister would be able to discharge the duties of secretary of the department in connection with his own, which he has undertaken and which have been assigned to him, and which he performs without any addition to his salary. That arrangement has been made, it is working satisfactorily, and under those circumstances I feel that I was not called upon to continue a highly paid officer in the department when I could disperse with his services without any injury whatever to the public service, and without impairing the efficiency of the staff of the department. That is my sole reason I can assure the hon. gentleman, for making the arrangement. As to Mr. Balderson having been allowed less superannuation than the law contemplates, I cannot accept that statement, because no such arrangement has been made, he gets the full allowance.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman is aware that the secretary of his department is a statutory officer, it is required by law that there shall be a secretary of the department as much as a deputy head and a Minister of Railways and Canals.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The statement of the hon. gentleman is not entirely new to me.

Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps it is new to the committee, to whom I am addressing myself. The secretary is as much a part of the department as the Minister and the deputy head of the department. The office is a statutory one, in which there are certain functions to be performed by the secretary as provided for by Act of Parliament. The law allows, of course, the superannuation of any officer, for the several reasons that are assigned in the Order of Council. I suppose the superannuation of Mr. Balderson was for the purpose of promoting economy in the public service. Under that clause of the statute the hon. gentleman had a perfect right to recommend the superannuation of that gentleman for that purpose. This is the clause :

> If any person to whom this Act applies, is removed from office in consequence of the abolition of his office for the purpose of improving the organization of the department to which he belongs, or is removed or retired from office to promote efficiency or economy in the civil service,—

I suppose this was done for the purpose of promoting economy. I shall deal with that afterwards, and show, I think, conclusively that there is no economy secured in his department on the ground of superannuation.

> —the Governor General in Council may grant him such gratuity or superannuation allowance as will fairly compensate him for his loss of office, not exceeding such as he would have been entitled to if he had retired in consequence of a permanent infirmity of body or mind, after adding ten years to his actual term of service.

I think that clause requires that when you superannuate a person, after giving him what he is entitled to if he had retired in consequence of permanent infirmity of body or mind, it is obligatory to add ten years to his actual term of service.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he regards the clause to which he refers as absolutely mandatory, compelling an addition of ten years to the term of service ?

Mr. HAGGART. The clause states that the Governor in Council may grant an officer such gratuity or superannuation allowance as will fairly compensate him for his loss of office, not exceeding such as he would have been entitled to if he had retired in consequence of permanent infirmity of body or mind, after adding ten years to his actual term of service. If an officer is superannuated on that ground, I say the clause is mandatory, and there must be an addition of ten years to his term of service.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No.

Mr. HAGGART. If the hon. gentleman will grant a fiat so that this officer can go before the Exchequer Court, he will endeavour to ascertain what the law is. My opinion in regard to the law is that it is mandatory in that sense, and if an officer is superannuated under that clause of the Act he is entitled to an addition of ten years to his term of service.

Mr. McMULLEN. When two years ago the hon. gentleman superannuated a very considerable number of inspectors of timber at Quebec and Montreal, did he add ten years in each case to the term of service ?

Mr. HAGGART. They did not come under that clause.

Mr. FOSTER. They came under a Special Act.

Mr. McMULLEN. Their offices were abolished and the men were superannuated, and their offices were not filled.

Mr. HAGGART. They were not superannuated; a gratuity was given to each of them.

Mr. McMULLEN. Some of them were superannuated and some were given gratuities.

Mr. HAGGART. However, that is the interpretation of the Act, according to my view, and I do not think it can bear two interpretations. In regard to the plea of economy that has been put forward as a reason for discharging this gentleman, it will be observed that the Minister does not do away with one clerk. This man is thirty-eight years of age. There are three chief clerks. Instead of changing his position and giving him the opportunity of doing some other kind of work, if he was not required as secretary, the hon. Minister promoted another clerk to a chief clerkship. The hon. gentleman now brings down estimates to the amount of $39,230, and I brought down estimates to the amount of $42,062. The test as to whether the amount required by the hon. gentleman is less than the sum we needed must be judged by the amount expended. The whole expenditure on what is called the inside service of the Department of Railways and Canals is about the same now as was asked when I had charge of the department. So, there has been no saving, except, perhaps, a few hundred dollars, less than a thousand dollars; and if the superannuation allowance to Mr. Balderson is added, the amount expended on the inside service last year will not exceed the sum now asked. But it is on the plea of economy that the hon. Minister dismissed the secretary and chief clerk of the department. As to the ability of Mr. Balderson as secretary of the department, let me draw attention to his record. He was selected by the Auditor General to enter his department on 1st January, 1883. He was a young man of distinguished ability. He passed with marked honour his course in Toronto University, he was a medalist and one of the honour men of his year. He commenced at a salary of $800 per annum, and his services proved so valuable to the Auditor General that, in 1884, he recommended an increase, and Mr. Balderson was promoted to a second-class clerkship at $1,100 per annum. He served until 1888, when he was transferred to the Post Office Department as my secretary, he receiving simply the yearly increase of $50. Afterwards he was transferred to the Department of Railways and Canals. I have never heard a word from the head of the department that this gentleman failed to perform his duties in a most satisfactory manner. This officer could not have been removed on the ground that he was an active political partisan. If it was not thought desirable to retain Mr. Balderson as secretary of the department, the hon. Minister, who has rearranged the chief clerks, could have asked him to fill one of those clerkships. Is it fair play that a young man who has bright prospects should be induced to enter the civil service, and after fifteen years' service be superannuated on $682.50 a year? I say the law makes it compulsory on the Minister to add ten years to his service. If such is not the opinion of the Minister and the Government, Mr. Balderson asks that he be given an opportunity to appeal to the courts, and he thinks, from the advice he has received from legal gentlemen throughout the country, he is entitled to that addition to his service. I estimated for some clerkships which I intended to fill, but I did not fill them, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) does not intend to fill them either. He thinks he has clerks enough in his department, and he is getting along with exactly the same staff as I had. Sir, I wish to dispel from the minds of hon. members, the idea that there is any economy whatever in the proposition of the hon. Minister of Railways. Adding the $600 for the superannuation of Mr. Balderson, the expenditure of that department will be as much as it was before. I may say, that Mr. Balderson filled a position with credit in the office of Auditor General; and when he left that office, I received a letter from the Auditor General in which he states: You have taken away from me one of my best clerks, and I will look to you to see that a man equally as good as he shall be appointed his successor. There can be no complaint against Mr. Balderson, and there can be no reason for his dismissal—for it is a virtual dismissal—than that he happened to serve me efficiently as private secretary. He was honest and faithful in the discharge of his duty, and I believe it to be my duty now, to bring to the notice of the House the injustice which has been perpetrated in his case. A young man in the prime of life, a most efficient officer, and a gentleman who had the brightest prospects before him of any young man in Canada when he was induced by the Auditor General to enter his department; after fifteen years' faithful service, when he was entitled to nearly $1,200 superannuation under the law; he has been sent out to commence life again with a superannuation of $682 a year.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can assure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) that I am, and have been for a long time, quite familiar with the provisions of the Civil Service Act which he has read. There is nothing new

in the reading of these sections by the hon. gentleman, so far as I am concerned nor do I suppose that there are many gentlemen in the House who are not to a greater or lesser degree familiar with this provision in the Act. It came under my personal observation very soon after I became a member of the Administration and the meaning of the clause has been passed upon and has been considered fully not only by individual Ministers but by the Department of Justice or rather the Minister of Justice as well. I am bound to say with all deference to the firm and clear, and positive opinion which the hon member (Mr. Haggart) has expressed; his view is not coincided in by the members of the Government or by the Minister of Justice.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) allow me to ask him a question. Was he not in a position to add ten years to the term of service of this officer?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is not the contention which has been put forward.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But I ask the hon. gentleman the question?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I frankly acknowledge that Mr. Balderson was in a position to ask an addition of ten years to his term of service, and I say further, that the Government was in a position to refuse that application. Therefore, while this official had the discretion to make the application, we had equally and ample discretion, under this Act, to refuse it. Under this clause, it must always be in the judgment and discretion of those upon whom the responsibility rests of carrying the Act into operation, as to whether in each and every individual instance, the case is one in which we are entitled to decide or not in favour of the applicant. That is the view which is entertained by the Government upon this clause of the Act, and that view is entirely contrary to the view put forward by the hon. member (Mr. Haggart). The matter I suppose will have to rest there. It may be possible, and no doubt in the opinion of the hon. gentleman, (Mr. Haggart) this was a proper case in which to exercise the discretion which the law confers upon us. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman in that opinion. I formed the best judgment which I could upon the facts which were in my possession. Mr. Balderson is a young man, a very capable young man no doubt, a man who may be all that his friend, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) has claimed for him; and I should say, that all that would probably stand him in good stead, in almost any business in life in which he may seek to engage. Take the case as presented by the hon. member (Mr. Haggart) himself, and I do not believe that it is one which at all appeals to the charity of the members of this Government, or to the charity of the country. Take a young man of the extraordinary abilities which are credited to Mr. Balderson, and I think $682 a year is a very fair allowance for him to receive for all time from the country, to start out on a new career. If Mr. Balderson deserves all the high encomiums which have been pronounced upon him—and I do not question them for one moment—he possibly may regard it as a distinct advantage to himself that he has been relieved from the position which he held in the Department of Railways and Canals.

Mr. DAVIN. Is Mr. Balderson not bound to hold himself in readiness to be called upon by the Government to take a position if necessary?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There may perhaps be something in what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) says. He may owe some military service to the country, but I do not think he is under any obligation to the department.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes, under obligation to the civil service. This Government, or a succeeding Government, can call him to the service again and abolish the superannuation.

The PRIME MINISTER. Is he bound to accept?

Mr. MONTAGUE. He is bound to accept, or else lose his superannuation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That may be; and I presume that was in the mind of Parliament when it framed this eleventh clause to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) appeals. But it does not alter the case in any way, nor distinguish this particular instance from all the other instances in regard to which we are called upon, from time to time, to apply this clause.

Now, passing from that, I wish to make one observation to the committee upon the general subject of the economies which have been practised, as a result of what has been done by me in the department. The committee will bear me out in saying, that I sought no comparison, and I invited none, between the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Haggart's) administration of the department and my own. I am not going to say, that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) did not administer his department, so far as the management of the civil service branch of it is concerned, with a due regard to economy. I will not say that he did not do his best to reduce the cost as far as possible, and as much as he deemed consistent with the public service. Therefore, I do not see why the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) felt it necessary to invite any particular com-

parison, as I certainly did not do so, although I am quite willing that the House should make the comparison.

Mr. HAGGART. My remarks were with reference to your claim that you superannuated Mr. Balderson on the ground of economy.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no question as to the superannuation of Mr. Balderson being a distinct saving. It may not be a large sum, and a saving of $1,600 a year or $1,700 a year may not appear very strongly to my hon. friend, but there has been a saving, and will be, so far as I can judge, to all time, of $1,600 or $1,700. During the time I have been in the office, I have seen very little of Mr. Balderson, and I have found it difficult to ascertain just what duties he has performed. They have not been much, if any, so far as I have had the means of judging; and I have had no difficulty, in accordance with the views of the head of the department under me, in concluding that the department would not suffer by doing away with the office, or rather not so much doing away with the office, as doing away with the officer, because the office is still retained. To the saving of $1,700 thus effected, we should perhaps add the salary of the first-class clerkships, two of them, which were unfilled at the time the hon. gentleman retired from the department, and which I may fairly charge against him, if he wants a comparison between the present and past Administration, because he admits frankly that it was his purpose to fill those offices. So that there is a saving of $1,700 in the salary of the secretary, the saving of two firts-class clerkships, and the saving of one third class clerkship, less a slight increase made in the salary of the accountant. This is only a saving of about $4,000, but I felt that, if I could effect that saving without in the slightest degree weakening the staff of the department or impairing the efficiency of the serivce, it was my duty to do it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Did the hon. Minister of Justice give his written, formal opinion on this? And if so, would the hon. gentleman have any objection to bringing that down?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not quite sure at the moment whether we had any written opinion from the Minister of Justice, but if there is one, I shall be very glad to bring it down.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the hon. Minister answer the question put to him by the late Minister, whether the Government would have any objection to grant Mr. Balderson a fiat, so that he may test the question in the courts?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think I may say this much to the hon. gentleman, that when Mr. Balderson applies to me in that sense, I shall be very glad to consider the question and to give him a reply. I do not think I ought at the present moment to be asked whether, in a suppositious case which may not arise, the Government would take a particular course.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 39) respecting the Canadian General Electric Company (Limited).—(Mr. Lount.)

Bill (No. 48) respecting the Dominion Building and Loan Association.—(Mr. Cowan.)

Bill (No. 18) to confer certain powers on the Board for the management of the Temporalities Fund of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Bill (No. 44) respecting the Welland Power and Supply Canal Company.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Bill (No. 25) to confirm an agreement made between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Hull Electric Company.—(Mr. Gibson.)

Bill (No. 35) respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Bill (No. 37) respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—(Mr. Ingram.)

Bill (No. 41) respecting the River St. Clair Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. Ingram.)

Bill (No. 50) respecting the Atikokan Iron Range Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment.)

MINING DEVELOPMENT AND ADVISORY CORPORATION.

Mr. MAXWELL moved second reading of Bill (No. 82) to incorporate the Mining Development and Advisory Corporation of British America (Limited.)

Mr. FOSTER. We wanted some explanations of this Bill.

Mr. MORRISON. The applicants are applying in this case for incorporation as a company to carry on a general mining and smelting business in the province of British Columbia; and provisions are also being made for their engaging in the business of examining and reporting upon properties, and also advising persons who are desirous of entering into mining in that province.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Does not that come within the company's Act?

Mr. MORRISON. I think that does come within the company's Act; but section 12

of this Bill states that section 18 of the Companies Act shall not apply. With that exception, of course, the Bill will come within the Companies Act. There is nothing exceptional otherwise in the clauses of the Bill, so far as I understand, they are the usual clauses, and when the Bill gets into committee we will be prepared to give the fullest explanation on each clause.

Mr. FOSTER. What struck me about it was that so far as I can see the powers you are asking are just exactly the powers which all those mining companies get, and which they get by charter under the Companies Act. I do not see why there is any reason for this company going outside the general rule unless it wants something extraordinary. If it wants something extraordinary, it would be well worth looking after.

Mr. MORRISON. If we can get something extraordinary I do not suppose we would be above taking it; but this Bill, as I understand, does not contain any extraordinary clause, and in fact every provision here seems to be the usual provision in Bills of this kind.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 90) respecting the Montreal Bridge Company.—(Mr. Campbell, for Mr. Préfontaine.)

Bill (No. 91) respecting the Sun Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. Taylor, for Mr. Rosamond.

Bill (No. 92) respecting the Great Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Campbell, for Mr. Préfontaine.)

Bill (No. 93) to incorporate the Columbia and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Morrison, for Mr. Bostock.)

SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

The Department of Railways and Canals, including $2,000 to L. Shannon, and $1,800 to J. E. W. Currier, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act..... $39,230

Mr. McNEILL. Had the hon. Minister of Railways completed his observations before dinner?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think so.

Mr. McNEILL. I would like to call the Minister's attention again for a moment to this clause, because I think that he must surely have misapprehended the opinion that was given by the Attorney General. The clause as it stands, is in these words:

> If any person to whom this Act applies is removed from office in consequence of the abolition of his office for the purpose of improving the organization of the department to which he belongs, or is removed or retired from office to promote efficiency or economy in the civil service, the Governor General in Council may grant him such gratuity or superannuation allowance as will fairly compensate him for his loss of office, not exceeding such as he would have been entitled to if he had retired in consequence of permanent infirmity of body or mind.

When may he do this; and how may he do this? "After adding ten years to his actual term of service." The hon. Minister need not shake his head. If he looks at the clause and reads it over, he will find it is the only possible construction that can fairly be placed upon the words. The clause is equivalent exactly to what it would be if those words were inserted after the word "may," and it would perhaps have made the meaning a little more apparent, but would not have been any stronger, because this being the operative clause, and the strongest clause, it is put at the end of the sentence where the strongest clause ought to be. It would, perhaps, I say, have been a little clearer had this clause of the sentence been inserted after "may," and

> If any person to whom this Act applies, is removed from office in consequence of the abolition of his office for the purpose of improving the organization of the department to which he belongs, or is so removed or retired from office to promote efficiency or economy in the civil service, the Governor in Council may, after adding ten years to his actual term of service, grant him, &c.

That is the only possible explanation of the clause. I venture to say that if the hon. gentleman will consult legal gentlemen on his own side of the House, he will find that the overwhelming opinion of the best legal minds will be to that effect. It may be that an opinion has been given to the effect that this is optional. In a sense it is. It is optional whether the Government give any superannuation allowance at all. But it is a condition precedent to making this compensation referred to here that they shall add ten years to begin with—it is "after adding ten years," which is not optional but imperative. It is after adding ten years that the Government are to compensate for loss and make further allowance for the removal from office. If the Minister will consult the Attorney General on the subject, no doubt he will find that legal authority holds that this is the only possible construction of the clause. So much with respect to the legal aspect of the case, so far as my lights go. I want to say one word more to my hon. friend, and it is that I cannot at all take the view he seems he adopted with respect to this gentleman.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Does the hon. gentleman think the Government should have added ten years to his term of service?

Mr. McNEILL. The gentleman should have had ten years added under his moral claim, and he must have ten years added on the legal ground.

Mr. DOMVILLE. What are the moral grounds?

Mr. McNEILL. I was about to say, when I was interrupted, that I cannot agree with the view the hon. gentleman took of the moral claim this gentleman has upon the department. The fact that he is a young man, from my point of view, only makes his claim stronger and his vested rights greater. If he had been commuting his salary, the younger he was the larger the amount of commutation he would have received. It seems to me that when a young gentleman of distinguished ability reaches the position attained by this gentleman, he has a stronger claim, a larger claim, than an older man. He has more opportunities of getting advanced in the service, and he is in possession of those opportunities much more fully than a man of advanced years; and to say that because the man is a young man, his claims from this point of view are to be ignored, is to argue the wrong way about. If it were, as my hon. friend to my surprise suggested, a matter of charity, the case would be very different. If it were a mere matter of charity, then the older man, who would not be so well able to provide for himself, would have a much stronger claim than the younger man; but I venture to say that this is no claim for charity, and I repudiate on behalf of the gentleman whose claim is now under discussion, the idea that his is in any sense a claim for charity on this House and this country. What we are dealing with is a moral claim on the part of this gentleman, and not only a moral claim but a legal claim under the statute; and whether he has a legal claim or not, I say he has a moral claim. He has certain vested interests which have been interfered with, and certain rights for compensation for interference with those vested rights, and so he is not asking charity but right, justice and fair-play, and he asks that the moral obligation which rests upon this House and the Government and the people of this country should be given effect. The facile cynicism with which these moral claims seem to be ignored and set aside and resort had to nice and technical legal constructions to avoid equitable claims, bodes no good but evil to Canada, if persevered in. It has a very sinister aspect, and the future of this country will be seriously affected if the Government of the day sets the example of ignoring moral obligations and endeavouring to get rid of equitable claims by hard and fast and nice legal distinctions.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And legal claims, too.

Mr. McNEILL. Yes, but I am specially dealing with the other side of the question at the present time. Nothing could be worse, no more evil lesson could be taught to the people than that the Government should pursue a course of that kind. I do not wish unduly to occupy the time of the House, but I thought it was only right to make the observations I have made in regard to this matter. I wish to repeat that this gentleman is not coming here asking for charity, that he is coming here pressing a moral claim and a legal claim on the attention of the Government; and while I believe as much as any hon. gentleman opposite that it is necessary we should exercise every due economy in the public service, still I believe, as I have already said, there are many things even more important and valuable than economy. There are certain great principles which we must observe and maintain, and however valuable economy may be, when economy comes into conflict with those principles, it must go to the wall. If economy does not go to the wall, and dollars and cents are considered of more value than the maintenance of those great principles of justice and honour, then it will be an evil day for Canada.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) has presented his case to the committee in its two-fold aspect, and he has presented it very fairly. I find no fault with the manner in which he has made the claim on behalf of this young man Balderson. I regret to say that I cannot agree, either with the view which he takes of the moral obligation of the Government, or of the legal interpretation to which that section is entitled. As to the moral obligation, I cannot think there were any circumstances in this case which made it my duty to recommend to the Governor in Council the exercise of the discretion, which unquestionably rests with the Government under the section which has been quoted.

Mr. McNEILL. I hope that the hon. Minister (Mr. Blair) did not misunderstand me. I hope I made myself clear. I do not say, that there is not an option under the section, but I say, that if the Government exercises the option and determines to give superannuation, then there is no option whatever with regard to the ten years.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I quite understand the view which the hon. gentleman presents, but I was dealing, and I think fairly, with what I may call the moral aspect of the question. Assuming that the view which the Government has taken of that section is correct, then, the most which the section imposes on the Government is, that it shall exercise discretion in respect to each individual

case. I was unable to conclude that this case was one which made it my duty to recommend an addition of ten years to the term which this gentleman had served. I am bound to say, that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) always takes a fair view of matters with which he has to deal—he tries to, at all events, though perhaps he does not always succeed—and I regret that his view as to the course which I ought to have taken in this matter does not correspond with mine. Feeling that the responsibility rested upon me of determining whether or not I ought to recommend the Governor in Council to add any period of years to the term which Mr. Balderson had served, and having the opinion which I had, I was bound not to report in his favour. I did so conclude, using the very best judgment which I could bring to bear on the whole question. I am free to say that I did not consider that a young man like Mr. Balderson, with his admittedly great ability to succeed in some other sphere of life, should have anything at all added to the superannuation allowance which the law gave him. On the contrary, I rather consider that as a reason against giving him an extra allowance. If we had been putting out of the service a man who had been for a considerable period in office, who, by reason of his long service had, perhaps, disqualified himself from taking up any other occupation, I would then have thought that there were circumstances which would make the case different from those which obtain in the present instance. The contention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) must altogether rest upon whether or not he has taken a correct legal view of the clause. I would venture to say that none of the hon. gentlemen opposite who have had to interpret this Act, will state now that the late Government put any different interpretation upon the clause from what we have done. I will tell the hon. gentleman very frankly, that it is not a new question at all from any point of view. I have been only a few months in the Government, and hardly any sitting of the Treasury Board, of which I happen to be a member, has taken place at which this section has not come up for consideration. The section has been considered carefully, and I think a unanimous conclusion arrived at, as to what it means. That conclusion, as to the meaning of the clause, is entirely different from that at which the hon. gentleman has arrived. Let me submit to the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) one or two reasons, and I think he will admit himself to be in error. If the section means what the hon. gentleman claims, it means that the Treasury Board, or the Governor in Council, if you will, has no discretion; but that in every case in which a person is superannuated for the reasons mentioned in that clause, he is entitled to ten years, if he is entitled to anything. You would be flying directly in the face of the interpretation which the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) put upon that clause, if you are to allow him any less than ten years. I may be in error, but I think the late Government have, time and again, added an extra term of years less than ten. They have allowed ten years in many instances, but in as many, and perhaps in more they have added, perhaps, two years, perhaps five. Since the present Government have come into power, we have had under our direct observation cases in which a less term than ten years have been allowed by the late Government. If I am correct in assuming that the contention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) is that we have no discretion at all except to allow the full ten years.

Mr. McNEILL. That is my contention.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman is right in that, then it is clear, beyond peradventure, that that is not the interpretation which has been uniformly put upon this clause by hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. gentleman has fallen into a very natural error, and one which any one might fall into who reads the section hastily. He has not given sufficient emphasis, nor attached the proper importance to the words "not exceeding," which are the qualifying words in that section.

Mr. McNEILL. There is no reference to the ten years in the words "not exceeding."

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is where we fundamentally differ. The interpretation which hon. gentlemen opposite have put upon this clause is, that these words have nothing to do with the concluding portions of the clause, and I will show why. The Act says that the Governor in Council may grant him such gratuity or superannuation allowance, as will fairly compensate him for his loss of office, not exceeding such sum, with ten years added.

Mr. McNEILL. Oh, no.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The ten-year portion of the clause is intended to be read as the outside limit, beyond which the Government cannot go.

Mr. McNEILL. Will the hon. gentleman read the clause.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It says:

> The Governor in Council may grant him such gratuity or superannuation allowance as will fairly compensate him for his loss of office, not exceeding such as he would be entitled to if he had retired in consequence of permanent infirmity of body or mind, after adding ten years to his actual term of service.

Now, the words "not exceeding" are the controlling words in that clause—and the object of Parliament was to confer upon the

Governor in Council a discretion to enable them not only to allow a superannuation allowance in respect of the actual number of years which the officer had served, but, if they chose, to add a certain time, though not exceeding ten years, additional. That is what that means. If it does not mean that, then I must call upon hon. gentlemen opposite to explain how it is that in the numberless instances which I believe can be referred to, they have done such gross injustice to the civil servants of the country who have been superannuated under orders passed by them, and in whose cases they did not pretend to allow the ten years, which they were in duty bound to allow, if the interpretation now put forward by them is to be accepted, and in reducing which they must have been perpetrating this moral wrong, and flying directly in the face of an Act of Parliament.

Mr. McNEILL. I must say I think the hon. gentleman's reading of the clause is very extraordinary. The clause reads in this way:

> May grant him such gratuity or superannuation allowance as will fairly compensate him for his loss of office, not exceeding such as he would have been entitled to if he had retired in consequence of permanent infirmity of body or mind, after adding ten years to his actual term of service.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not exceeding that.

Mr. McNEILL. No, it is not exceeding what he would be entitled to if he had retired in consequence of infirmity of body or mind. What my hon. friend has suggested is, I think, the most extraordinary perversion of the meaning of plain English words that I have ever encountered. So far as the argument is concerned, that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have not construed the clause in this way, whether a mistake has been made in construing the clause, I do not know. I understand that the cases where men have not had the full ten years added are not similar to this case; but I daresay some member of the late Government will be kind enough to explain to the House how that matter really stands. So far as the clause is concerned, I think it is as clear as it can be.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals was under the impression this afternoon that an opinion had been obtained from the Minister of Justice. From what he said subsequently, it would appear that that was not an opinion after any formal reference to the department, but possibly a flying opinion, and it no doubt expressed his views as given. It would be, I think he will agree with me, exceedingly happy if the Minister of Justice had in this case been asked to look very carefully into this case. I take it that the hon. Minister of Railways, notwithstanding the strong view he has expressed in regard to the interpretation of that clause, will admit that it is not singularly well drafted.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The same might be said of a good deal of the Act.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Quite so, but the hon. gentleman will see himself that that last clause, coming after the adding of ten years to the actual term of service, enables an argument to be urged that would have been impossible had that idea of his been more happily expressed by the draftsman. I am not at the moment prepared to express a strong view one way or the other with regard to that. Not having heard the whole of this discussion, I do not know how far I may be repeating what has been said by those who think this clause is open to the construction under which special consideration would have been given to the case of Mr. Balderson. At the moment, I am inclined to think that there are words in that clause, independent of these last words, "after adding ten years to his actual term of service," that indicate that there was to be special consideration and treatment in a case of abolition of an office. The clause itself on its face is a special clause. It takes away this particular class of cases from the ordinary operation of the Act. It makes the case of the abolition of an office a case by itself, and language is used which, so far as my memory goes, is only found in the case of the abolition of an office. Now, the hon. gentleman said—and there would be a great force in his remarks, if he is accurate, but he is speaking merely from information, and that not very certain—that the practice under the late Government, or that has prevailed, has been in the direction of his view. My memory at the moment is different. There may possibly be one case.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will give you the case of one Mr. Smith, who was allowed five years.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In my time there were cases where ten years were added when an office was abolished. I am safe in saying that not during my time on the Treasury Board or in the Department of Justice was this question ever mooted. So that, instead of it being settled by practice, that offices have been abolished without special allowance over and above the ordinary superannuation, I am of opinion that investigation will show that the practice has been the reverse. But in any event that question has not in recent years been raised at all. Being now raised, it seems to me that it calls for more serious consideration than has apparently been given to it. I am not at all attempting to make

light of the hon. Minister's opinion from a professional point of view. He knows very well what I mean by a reference to the law department of the Government. All departments are controlled in these matters by that department, for the sake of uniformity, among other reasons, in regard to the administration of the laws; and I certainly think that this question is not only very interesting indeed, but that there is much in this clause which will bear out another construction than that which the hon. Minister of Railways seems inclined to put upon it. For instance, instead of saying that where you abolish the office you may do that by superannuating the officer, the language is of this special nature, that in that case the Governor in Council may grant the officer such gratuity or such superannuation allowance—not as provided for in this Act, but as will fairly compensate him for his loss of office. There is the superannuation, and, if I am right in the view I take at the moment, there is something more—I am leaving aside the addition of the ten years, there is the fair compensation for the loss of office, not from any of the reasons mentioned, such as bodily or mental infirmity, or age. There must be this special provision.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. May, not must.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Must, for this reason. It says the Government may, in that case, superannuate, but they must take care that there is, in the language of the Act, a fair compensation for the loss of office.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They must take care that they do not exceed a certain limit.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is quite right, they must not add more than ten years, but they must add something, be it a month or a day or ten years. It seems to me there is a good deal of foundation for the argument that, over and above the ordinary provision of the Superannuation Act, an allowance should be made such as would fairly compensate for the loss of office, and which, in no case, must exceed the ten years' limit. I would like to call attention to what seems to be the rather extraordinary position in which the organization of that department will be found, unless the hon. gentleman contemplates asking for further legislation. Should the present intention prevail, there will be one man holding the following positions: Mr. Schreiber will be Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals, Chief Engineer of Railways, Chief Engineer of Canals, Secretary of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, and he is practically secretary of the Railway Department, because his secretary, Mr. Jones, is to act as secretary of that department.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He is to be the secretary.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is this extraordinary position. We have heretofore had two officers, so to speak, the secretary of the department, who, according to the legislation constituting the office, has been the supervising officer of the whole department, acting under the direction of the Minister of Railways and Canals, the Deputy Minister or Chief Engineer and head of the technical branch of that department, who was bound to report to this supervising officer. Now you have the extraordinary position whereby the Chief Engineer and Secretary of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council is actually bound to report to his own private secretary. Surely that was never contemplated by the legislation. Again, at the moment I cannot give the exact reference, but the hon. gentleman has been long enough in office to see the importance of the point, that under the different Acts on the Statute-book, since there was constituted the office of Secretary of the Department of Railways and Canals there are important duties which the officer holding that office can alone perform. It may be that the legislation has gone further than I think it has and provided that the acting secretary may perform those offices, but the only provision is that, during the absence or sickness of the actual secretary of the department, the acting secretary may legally perform the functions which the legislature has put in the hands of the secretary. So that the point arises according to which the hon. gentleman, if he desires to do away with that office, will have to come to this House for amendatory legislation. Whether the hon. gentleman proposes to revise the legislation and abolish the office I do not know. Perhaps he will say whether he proposes to continue the private secretary of the Chief Engineer Department in the office as acting secretary.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I have already arranged that.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. So that we are left with a state of things such as has never before existed in that department, or in any department under this Government or any Government similar to our own, under which a high and important officer, discharging very responsible duties, instead of reporting to a practically independent officer of high grade and actually in touch with the head of the department, actually reports to his own private secretary.

Mr. McMULLEN. Let me give the hon. gentleman some cases that will be interesting as showing the policy adopted by his party when called upon to interpret the clause which has been the subject of debate to-night. Here is a man, Major C.

Tanguay, a clerk in the Department of Agriculture, who had served 28 years, and who got an allowance of $784 when superannuaed, and the reason of his retirement was abolition of office. There was not a year or a month or a day added to his term of office. Here is another, Mr. Gardner, who had a salary of $1,000 and served thirteen years and who got a retiring allowance of $260. His office was abolished but there was not a day added to his term of service. Here is the case of a Mr. Davis, who got a salary of $2,800, and had served thirteen years, and who had two and a quarter years added to his salary after his office was abolished.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He got an addition.

Mr. McMULLEN. In the other cases there was no addition.

Mr. HAGGART. How many years was he in office?

Mr. McMULLEN. I see he served thirty-two and a-half years and got two and a quarter years added.

Mr. HAGGART. He got the full allowance.

Mr. McMULLEN. You added the full allowance in that case but in the others you did not.

Mr. HAGGART. What were their offices?

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Tanguay was a clerk in the Department of Agriculture, his salary was $1,400 a year. He had served twenty-eight years and was retired with a retiring allowance of $784, and opposite his name appeared the memorandum "abolition of office." So, his office was actually abolished and there was neither a day nor an hour added to his time. Mr. S. Gardner had $1,000 a year, as an employee of the Department of the Interior. He had served thirteen years, and there was not an hour added to his term. They gave him the magnificent sum of $260 as retiring allowance and his office was abolished.

Mr. HAGGART. What was his office?

Mr. McMULLEN. He was immigration agent at St. John's. It is quite evident that hon. gentlemen opposite did not in the past interpret this clause in the way they do now in pressing their contentions upon the House. The hon. ex-Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) was very guarded, I notice, in the statements he made. But these three cases exactly meet the points he raised. I admit that not more than two and a quarter years were added in the case mentioned. But no more could be added because it brought it up to the limit, $3,500 which is the largest retiring allowance that they can give to any——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I guarded myself on that point particularly. Evidently, in this case, as I intimated, that same thing did happen. I felt before rather sure, and I feel now very positive, that the point had never been raised. Certainly I do not recollect it.

Mr. HUGHES. In regard to the retirement of Mr. Balderson from office, I may say, with those who have addressed the House on this side, that I think the case is somewhat hard. He is a young man who took the highest honours during his course in the University of Toronto and matriculated winning one of the medals of that institution. He began life as mathematical master in one of the collegiate institutes in Ontario. Had he remained in the teaching profession, he would, no doubt, have become one of the leading masters in the province of Ontario, and would have occupied most distinguished positions in the country from an educational view point. He was not an applicant for a position under this Government, but he received an offer from the Auditor General's Department, and was induced to go there on representations from the Government. The position offered to him he accepted and was promoted step by step until he became secretary of the Department of Railways and Canals, and we find that to-day there is no charge made against him of being unfit for his position or having been a partisan. Now, turning to the section of the Civil Service Act, the view that is expressed by the hon. member for Pictou, the late Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), undoubtedly, to my mind —to a lawyer's mind, that I have yet to learn that all legal knowledge is confined within the limits of the lawyers' heads— is correct. We find that the Government may grant such gratuity or superannuation allowance as may fairly compensate him for his loss of office. I maintain that an allowance of six hundred odd dollars is not a fair allowance to Mr. Balderson for his loss of office. If he had remained a teacher in the province of Ontario and became one of the fellows of Toronto University, he would undoubtedly have occupied a much higher position than he was occupying in the department and would not have been subject to be turned out in the world as he is now. This affair will more or less have the tendency to injure his future. He cannot possibly return, at his age, to the educational arena, the only one he is fitted for.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Why not?

Mr. HUGHES. For the simple reason that younger men have come to the front and are occupying these positions, and if Mr. Balderson were to step into the arena it would be impossible for him to attain the high position he would have held had he never left the teaching profession. I think the Minister of Railways and Canals will

do me the credit to say I am not a partisan in this matter. I think that Mr. Balderson is entitled to such an amount as will compensate him for his loss of office. The ordinary superannuation will not fairly compensate him for his loss of office, there is no doubt of that. Any one who knows his attainments, who knows what he threw up to come here at the request of the Auditor General's office, must know that $600 does not fairly compensate him for his loss of office. What does this next clause mean? It means, as the hon. ex-Minister of Justice has said, that the Superannuation Act provides that if taking the number of years an officer has served does not provide him with a fair compensation for his loss of office, the Government may have an opportunity to add five or ten, but not more than ten years to his term of service in order that he may be fairly compensated. Now, as a matter of fair-play between man and man I think Mr. Balderson is entitled——

Mr. McGREGOR. As between man and man, the allowance for superannuation is a very large one for the time he served.

Mr. HUGHES. I mean to say that Mr. Balderson, had he never entered the civil service could have been in receipt of a much greater allowance than the sum he is receiving under this Act. It may seem a pretty good allowance for an ordinary man, but I want the hon. member for Essex (Mr. McGregor) to understand that Mr. Balderson is an extraordinary man. His career in Toronto University and here has marked him as a man of more than ordinary mathematical ability, and one who should not be treated by any Government as Mr. Balderson has been treated here. I would ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to look fairly into this matter, in the light of this clause, and if he will not allow Mr. Balderson to bring the matter up in court, let him make Mr. Balderson a fair allowance, and not merely his bare superannuation allowance. They say: Oh, he is a young man and can earn a living elsewhere. The next section precludes his entering into any other vocation in life. To all intents and purposes, under this Act, he must hold himself ready on the call of the Government to resume his duties in office, and, if he fails to do so he must lose not only his chance of office, but his superannuation allowance. It says:

> Every person who receives a superannuation allowance, and is under the age of sixty years, and is not disabled by bodily or mental infirmity, may be called upon to fill, in any part of Canada, any public office or situation for which his previous services render him eligible.

Then it says in conclusion:

> If he refuses or neglects to do so, he shall forfeit his said allowance.

So that if Mr. Balderson chooses to join the legal profession, or to resume his duties as teacher, or to go off and become a miner, why, he might possibly be called upon to resume his duties here.

Mr. MACDONALD. It is not very likely.

Mr. HUGHES. Never mind. What is the meaning of this section of the Act? We are taking the Act as it reads. He would, at all events, have to hold himself in readiness to return to his duties, and if he failed to do so, he would lose his superannuation. Now, I trust that the Minister of Railways, at the entrance of his career, may preserve the name that he has had, I am glad to say, in his own province for fair and square dealing. I am satisfied that if he will give an impartial consideration to this case, he will do justly by Mr. Balderson: and if he cannot grant him the ten years additional to his service, then let him grant him what the section calls for, such a gratuity as will fairly compensate him for his loss of position. I maintain that under the Order in Council retiring Mr. Balderson, he has not been fairly compensated for his loss of the office.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to say one word with regard to Mr. Balderson. I have known him very well for a great many years, and I believe him to be a thoroughly efficient man. He lived in the town from which I come, for some time, and I know he is looked upon as a very able young man. I would not, for a moment, contribute to any slur upon his ability, or anything of that kind. I believe he is a thoroughly capable young man, and passed his examinations with great credit.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not wish to prolong this debate, nor is it necessary to go over the ground that has been so ably taken by hon. gentlemen who have criticised this transaction. But I must say that I think any intelligent man listening to this discussion, would be very much embarrassed to arrive at the reasons which have induced the Minister of Railways and Canals to make it necessary. Now, Sir, I had the honour to be Minister of Railways and Canals for many years, and there is no person, perhaps, better able in this House to speak as to the necessity of such an officer in this department, than myself. At the same time that I was Minister of Railways and Canals there was a very able deputy Deputy Minister, and in addition to the Deputy Minister, there was the chief engineer of the Railway Department and the chief engineer of the Canals Department. In addition to these three gentlemen, there was a secretary whose time was devoted from morning until night, and very often until late in the night, in order to discharge duties absolutely necessary and essential to the proper conduct of that department. He was clothed under the law with very important functions that at this moment, according to the

Minister of Railways and Canals, cannot be performed at all. I maintain that, nothwithstanding that the hon. gentleman who is at the head of that department is himself a lawyer, he is to-day violating the law of the land in the administration of one of the most important departments in the public service.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In what way?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will tell the hon. gentleman in what way. The law assigns duties of a most important character to be performed by the secretary of that department; the law directs the Governor General in Council to appoint a secretary to the Department of Railways and Canals, and assigns him important functions to be discharged. Sir, you have no secretary in the Department of Railways and Canals.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You are a little in error in that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Very well, then you are in error in stating to this House that you have abolished that office. If you have not abolished the office, the appointment of a secretary of Railways and Canals still exists, and then this House has not been treated with candour by the estimates which you have laid upon the Table of this House, which profess to detail the mode in which the department is organized, and in which the office of secretary is left vacant. I put that to the hon. gentleman; and I say that inasmuch as the law assigns important functions to a secretary which can only be performed, not by a private secretary to the chief engineer, but by an independent secretary of the Department of Railways and Canals, that office still exists. But you declare to this House that you have abolished that office, and you have got rid of one of the most able, one of the most independent officers, a gentleman of the highest standing and character, as testified to by yourself, and by every other gentleman on that side of the House who has spoken. Here is a gentleman that was brought into the public service, not seeking the office, a gentleman not connected with party. The Auditor General, holding his office as a parliamentary officer independent of the Government, and with wide discretion as to the parties he employs, goes out and searches for the ablest man, the most reliable and independent man, that he can get to perform important duties connected with the Auditor General's office, and he invites and presses this man, who had distinguished himself before, and who was known to him as a man of the highest character, and of the greatest ability, and he takes him into the public service. You have driven him out, Sir, and I tell the hon. gentleman that he has inflicted the greatest discredit he could inflict upon that gentleman who had thus been invited and brought into the public service. The hon. gentleman has not only inflicted all the injury that he could upon him, but he has damaged his future. It is said that he may go abroad; the hon. gentleman said himself that he would have been disposed to look with greater charity upon this transaction, if the gentleman was not so able. What has the hon. gentleman done? Why, Sir, so far as his act is concerned, he has branded this man with the disfavour of the department, he has driven him out of the high position that he held in the public service, and he has vacated an office without abolishing the office that the law of the land declares is absolutely necessary to the proper working of the department. Sir, is that calculated to raise the civil service of this country? Is it not desirable, in the interest of the public service of Canada, that men of high character, that men of great ability, should be tempted to come into the civil service? Will they do so when they find that after fifteen years of laborious service in discharging their duties in the most efficient manner, they are driven out of office by a pretended abolition of their office? I say pretended abolition of the office advisedly, because either the office has been abolished or it has not. The hon. gentleman says he has not violated the law because he has got a secretary. Then I say that this estimate that is put on the Table of the House is a delusive estimate, because there is no secretary in this department, but the office of the secretary is left vacant. I understand the matter perfectly. The hon. gentleman could not remove this man from his office, he could not get the sanction of the Governor General to the removal, because he could bring no charge against him. The man's character and standing, and his devotion to the public service were such that the only way the hon. gentleman could get rid of him was by pretending to abolish the office. And yet he says the office is not abolished, he says the law is not violated, because he has got a secretary, and yet he has not got a secretary in the Estimates. Why, because he could not have got the vacancy, unless, as I say, he had pretended to abolish the office. In my judgment, a most serious damage has been inflicted upon the public service. Suppose that to-morrow the Government sees that it is desirable to bring into the public service a man of high character, a man of ability, and standing, and education, a man who has distinguished himself; let the Government make him an offer of a position in the service, and he would say: No, thank you. If men like Mr. Balderson are to be driven out of the public service with reputations tarnished—because it is tarnishing a man's reputation to get rid of him in this way—then I say you do a great injury to the public service. Why did not the hon. gentleman do him the justice, in the exercise of the judgment which he himself admits he had power to do, of adding ten years to this man's service for superannuation, and give him

something like a respectable retiring allowance.

On a paltry $600 a year the Minister of Railways and Canals has turned adrift Mr. Balderson, who was brought into the public service, and has got rid of him. Why? Because he did not require him? When I had the honour of being Minister of Railways and Canals, with an able and efficient Deputy Minister, Mr. Trudeau, with an able and efficient engineer of railways, Mr. Schreiber, and with an able and efficient engineer of canals, Mr. Page, with all these three officers there was abundant work to demand the untiring and assiduous labour of the secretary of the department. Now, what is the position? Mr. Schreiber, a man of great ability, standing and character, is there occupying the combined position of Chief Engineer of Railways, of Canals, and Deputy Minister, the whole of these important functions being performed by one man, whereas formerly they were performed by three men. Yet the Minister declares there was no employment for the secretary, an officer charged with the duty of superintending all the work of the department that is not absolutely technical and professional. I am sure there is no hon. gentleman on either side of the House who at this moment can understand and who will admit that any legitimate reason sufficient to carry conviction to any intelligent mind has been adduced to show that it was in the interest of the public service and in order to save public money that this officer was got rid of. There is now the astonishingly ridiculous spectacle presented of the Deputy Minister of that great department, the Chief Engineer of Railways and the Chief Engineer of Canals and the secretary of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, all combined in one officer, reporting absolutely to his private secretary. Such a spectacle was never presented by any Government that professed to carry on public affairs with any regard to the maintenance of an appearance of doing public work in a proper way. The hon. gentleman by this act has taken a step that will reflect no credit on himself, no credit on the department, and no credit on the Government of which he is a member. There is an Act respecting the Department of Railways and Canals. What does it say? It provides that there shall be a secretary appointed, and it says that in the absence of the secretary or of his inability to act, the Minister may, in writing, authorize some other officer of the department to act for the time in his stead. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) seems to be very anxious to turn away attention from the position in which the Minister is placed, and it would be a little more respectful to the House if the hon. gentleman, on an occasion like this, did not exhibit the appearance of feeling that the hon. gentleman to whom he defers so much, requires to have attention drawn away from what is being said.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am listening.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. By attempting to interrupt the statements made on this, which is one of the most important questions that can occupy the attention of this committee.

Mr. DOMVILLE. As the hon. gentleman refers to me I wish to say——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. member for King's should have more respect for himself than to present himself in that light.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Does the hon. gentleman refer to me?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. DOMVILLE. What have I done?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is most improper on the part of the member for King's to endeavour to occupy the attention of the Minister at the time his attention is being called to a great dereliction of duty.

Mr. DOMVILLE. We are all tired of the hon. gentleman's ramblings.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The law provides that there shall be a secretary of the Department of Railways and Canals. The Minister has shown this House that there is no secretary of the department, that there is no such officer as is named in the Act, and that he is not taking a vote for such an officer. On the contrary, the hon. gentleman has declared that he has abolished the office of secretary of the department. Am I correct?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You are not correct in that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then how does the hon. gentleman superannuate Mr. Balderson, if he has not abolished the office? My hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) has handed me the Order in Council superannuating that officer. It says:

> That, to promote economy in the public service, Mr. John H. Balderson, secretary of the Department of Railways and Canals, be, from the 1st July, 1897, placed upon the retired list, with an annual allowance of six hundred and eighty-two 50-100 dollars ($682.50), calculated as under, the Treasury Board having reported accordingly.
>
> Age, 38; service, fifteen years; average salary, past three years, $2,275 per annum; and that Mr. Balderson be granted leave of absence from the date of this Order in Council to the 1st July, 1897, the duties of the secretary of the department to be performed, during such absence, by the secretary of the Deputy Minister and Chief Engineer, without increase of salary.

This was done on account of the hon. gentleman's anxiety to get Mr. Balderson out of office. The duties of secretary of the

department have to be performed in the absence of the secretary of the department by the secretary of the Deputy Minister and chief engineer, without increase of salary. But the authority on which I mainly rely is the hon. gentleman's own statement made half a dozen times to-day, that the office of secretary of the department has been abolished, and that a certain amount is thereby saved. The Estimates show the organization of the hon. gentleman's department. Is there any secretary provided? No. The office of secretary is left vacant and no provision is made. The hon. gentleman having abolished that office, I would like to know how the work of the department is to be conducted. During the absence of the secretary, before the office was abolished, the Minister could have appointed another person to perform the duties, but he could not do so after the office ceased, because it is only in the absence of the secretary or in the event of his inability to act that the Minister has power to appoint. The business of the department is, therefore, being carried on at this moment in violation of the law of the country. These important duties with which the secretary is charged under the law, cannot be performed by any person in the absence of a regularly appointed secretary as provided in this Act. Here is what the Act says:

> The secretary of the department shall, unless otherwise directed in any case by the Minister, keep separate accounts of the moneys appropriated for, or expended on, each railway or canal under the management of the Minister; he shall submit such accounts to be audited in such manner as is appointed by law, or by the Governor in Council; he shall have charge of all plans, contracts, estimates, documents, titles, models and other like things relating to any such railway or canal; he shall keep proper accounts with each contractor or other person employed by or under the department; he shall see that all contracts are properly drawn out and executed; he shall prepare all certificates upon which any certificate for the payment of money is to issue; he shall keep minutes of all proceedings of the department; he shall prepare reports and conduct, under the direction of the Minister, the correspondence of the department; and, generally, he shall do and perform all such acts and things pertaining to the business of the department as he is, from time to time, directed by the Minister to do and perform.

Mr. Jones is a gentleman of high character, of excellent standing, and of great ability; but Mr. Jones is the private secretary of the Deputy Minister, the secretary of the Chief Engineer of Railways, the secretary of the Chief Engineer of Canals, and of the Secretary for the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, and notwithstanding all his industry and all his ability, and I grant he has both, his time is more than occupied now in discharging these duties, without having the duties of Mr. Balderson thrust upon him. Any member of the House acquainted with that great department must know that. I do not hesitate to say, that the Minister of Railways took this course to get rid of a gentleman he did not want in the department, and the mode in which he has done it, is alike discreditable to himself and damaging to the public service of Canada.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I have not said anything against the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper), nor have I paid much attention to what he has said during the present session, and I do not see why he should have picked me out, in the midst of a debate, to criticise me. To-day in Canada we are looking to the great future, and we are not particularly interested in what the hon. gentleman may have done in the past. He and his generation are things of the past. When I chose to speak to the Minister of Railways on a private matter, it is extremely rude of him to call attention to me before the House, when I was really doing nothing that could affect him in any way. To listen, day after day to this continual wretched criticism about some one who has been dismissed, or superannuated, makes me think that I have been sent to Parliament for nothing else than to defend civil servants whose services the Government have dispensed with. Is the country to be taxed for gaslight and electricity, to hear such petty things as this? If the hon. member (Sir Charles Tupper) did himself justice he would have left me alone. I am aware that in the past I have called down his criticism, but I am here to-night in defiance of him and his wishes. In olden days, he could crack the lash over me, because I had the honour to support him, if it was an honour, but to-day I will not permit him in this House to make such remarks about me, when I have not in any way given him cause to do so. If the hon. gentleman can tell us anything new and fresh, I will be only too glad to hear what he has to say. I respect men older than myself, but I say, that he is trespassing on the time of the House by repeating over and over again, references to this young man who drew $2,250 a year from the country, and who he claims has been so outraged. If Mr. Balderson's abilities are so great he can earn his living elsewhere. The hon. gentleman said that a slur was thrown upon Mr. Balderson, but what effect can that have, when he has a good character from the hon. Baronet from Cape Breton, who so lately, in Europe was hand and glove with the aristocracy——

An hon. MEMBER. You are going over there soon.

Mr. DOMVILLE. My time is coming and I shall apply my time to the best advantage. I shall try to get some lessons from my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper), because probably he can put me on the right lay over there. Mr. Balderson can point to the high character given him by a late Minister

of the Crown, and it will no doubt be found useful to him in seeking other employments. The Minister of Railways does not say that he dispensed with Mr. Balderson for any other reason, than that it was not necessary to have him in the department, and there is no slur in that. I do think, that this House of Commons can occupy its time better, than by having members on the opposite side jumping up one after the other, to discuss little questions like this which the country is not interested in. Six hundred dollars a year for a young man of 38 years, will provide $30,000 insurance for his family at the time of his death. He has youth and ability, and he can get work elsewhere. But my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) lays down the doctrine, that all the men he and his Government have appointed to office are to remain there as long as they choose whether the Government of the day or whether the country wants them or not. He seems to think that the farmers and the taxpayers of this country should supply an extravagant superannuation allowance for young men who have ability and who are well able to work. The farmer when his time for work is past, and the officers in banks, and other people in private situations, do not become pensioners when they cease to occupy their positions. I am glad to see, Sir, that we are to have the superannuation Bill amended, and that the time will soon come when these officials who are well paid during their term of office, will have to provide for their families at their own expense, just the same as people in other walks of life have to do. I do trust that my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) will not again have occasion to castigate me.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear, I hope not.

Mr. DOMVILLE. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear," but he will not be here for very long. He is going over to Europe——

Mr. HUGHES. Are you going together ?

Mr. DOMVILLE. My hon. friend is too facetious. We have often heard of Major Sam, but we do not want to hear from him to-night. In due time we will hear from him ; he may reply to me. But I was sorry to see the hon. member for Cape Breton (Sir Charles Tupper) show such excitement. Why such excitement ? Why lash himself into such a fury ? One would think that somebody connected with him was hurt. The Minister of Railways and Canals, has not, I think, discharged any of the people the hon. member put in office. I saw the statement the other day that his connections were drawing at one time some $30,000 a year among them all. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has not discharged any of them yet, although he might properly do so before he is done.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps my hon. friend will allow me to tell him that if he were to search the county of Cumberland from end to end, he would only find one relative of mine drawing a salary to the extent of $200 a year. That is the only extent.

Mr. DOMVILLE. My hon. friend has confined himself to Cumberland. I was not confining myself to Cumberland at all. But let that go ; it is not neither here nor there. But I hope the hon. member for Cape Breton will call attention to me whenever he thinks it necessary, and I will undertake to call attention to him in a way that he would prefer I did not. I have not been connected with this House for twenty-five years for nothing. I have been very civil since I have been here this session, but if necessary I can make myself just as unpleasant to the hon. member for Cape Breton as he wanted to make himself to me to-night.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I desire, Mr. Chairman, at all times to treat the hon. member for Cape Breton (Sir Charles Tupper) with the respect which befits his position and his advanced years ; but I am bound to say to him that he will be making a very large draft on my forbearance if he thinks it necessary to insult any gentleman in this House who happens to be for the moment, while he is speaking, engaged in conversation with me, or who ventures, while he is enlightening Parliament, to ask my ear for a moment. Now, I have said nothing, and I do not desire to say anything, which will be at all disrespectful to the hon. gentleman. I want to assure him that while he was addressing this committee with such heat a few moments ago, I was following him with the utmost attention. I was submitting myself to him, so that, if it were possible for him to arouse a shade of feeling, I might be made the subject of that feeling. I wanted the hon. gentleman to stir me up a little. But I am bound to confess to him, with all frankness, that the fuss and fury which he has exhibited to-night for the hundredth time has entirely failed of its purpose. I have heard this over and over again until it has become absolutely nauseating. I am only a new member in this Parliament, but I would have thought that the hon. member who has filled a conspicuous place in the public eye, who has, no doubt, for a long term of years been connected with important events in the history of this country, would have been able to rise above this incessant and perpetual talk on the subject of dismissals. When the hon. gentleman does speak, he always indulges in superlatives. There is nothing ordinary for him. No event on which he is remarking is of a commonplace character. It is of the gravest importance, of the utmost significance, of the profoundest inter-

est, until we find ourselves soaring away above everybody's comprehension, and we are lost in the immensity of the subject engaging the hon. gentleman's attention. Now, I submitted myself to the hon. gentleman's influence with every desire to get under that influence, and I entirely failed.

One or two things the hon. gentleman did say which I think it only fair to remark upon. He insisted on assuring this committee that I had said, not once, but many times, that this office was abolished. I told the hon. gentleman that I had made no such statement. I did make no such statement. I think I did say once, but I immediately corrected myself, as "Hansard" will show——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The statement is made in the Estimates which you put on the Table.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman made the statement, and I think he ought frankly to abide by it, and let me answer the statement just as he made it. He repeated over and over again, notwithstanding my denial, that I had deceived and misled the committee, by telling them that I had abolished the office. I say, and say it confidently, that I made no such statement. I believe I did inadvertently make the remark, but I immediately followed it up by saying that I had rather abolished the officer; I abolished Mr. Balderson.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Did the hon. gentleman tell the Governor General, when he got his sanction, that he was abolishing the officer and not the office?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman wants to know, I had no conversation with the Governor General and told him nothing. All that the Governor General was told has been told to the hon. gentleman in the paper he has in his possession, and that paper does not state that the office was abolished or that it purported to abolish the office. I happen to know enough—and if I did not know, others associated with me in the Government knew enough—to say that we could not abolish the office, because the office is created by law, and can only be abolished by law. We do not need the hon. gentleman to tell us that. Profound and vast as is his knowledge on all subjects, he does not know that particular fact any better than the present Minister of Railways and Canals or the Government——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman, then, explain to the committee——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman will have one moment's patience, I will explain.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not wonder that the hon. gentleman does not wish to be interrupted.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not understand why the hon. gentleman gets so furious over these trifling matters. I thought he would have been large enough to handle small subjects in a manner appropriate to them; but, instead of that, he wants to discharge artillery at every fly he sees. Nothing will do him but "most profound," "of the greatest importance," "extreme gravity," "tremendous interest," as though the pillars of the constitution were coming down when any little thing occurs that does not happen to meet with his entire approbation. Now, I suggest to him that all this sound, this fury, this indignation, this wrath is simply thrown away. I do not know whether it affects any of the gentlemen associated with him; but it does not make a particle of impression on the minds of any of those on this side of the House. Let him take my word for it, he has been battering away in this fashion for so many years that the subject has become weary, stale, flat and unprofitable. The whole manner of it has become unprofitable, and has certainly lost interest even to a small fragment in the country. Let him come down to the level of ordinary life, and discuss things of ordinary size as rational men would discuss them, and he will find that what he desires to go to the country will have much greater interest than it has when delivered in the manner in which the hon. gentleman delivers himself on such questions. Now, I claim that the hon. gentleman misrepresented me and that I did not state what he has more than once attributed to me. We do not pretend to abolish the office for the very simple reason that we have no power to abolish it. But we have power to abolish the officer, we have power to do away with an unnecessary officer. The hon. gentleman tells us about the magnitude of the duties which were imposed upon the secretary of the Railway Committee in his day. Well, if he has given us anything like an accurate statement of the condition of affairs in the office in his day, I can only assure him that things must have entirely changed. I can assure him that it would put me to very serious difficulty to tell what were the actual duties which were discharged by the secretary of the Railway Committee further than the formal, the official, the largely mechanical duties which we know the law enforced upon him. While I have not said anything, and while I do not intend to say anything in the slightest degree reflecting upon the gentleman who filled that office, Mr. Balderson, I am justified in saying that the duties which did devolve upon him and which he did discharge were not such as to make any very serious drafts upon his time or of such a character that they could not be adequately and efficiently performed by Mr. Jones, and I have the opinion and the report and judgment of the Deputy Minister in favour of the course I have taken. The Deputy Minister advised me that, in making reforms

in the department and reducing the cost of administering it, it was a proper and convenient and most reasonable thing to do to dispense with the secretary of the Railway Committee, and hand over the duties of that office to some other officer in the department.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman lay that report on the Table.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What report ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The report of the Deputy Minister advising that the office of secretary should be abolished.

The MINISTER OR RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman, I suppose, will say to-morrow that I stated that the Deputy Minister had made a report to me in writing ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not stated whether he did or not give a written report. It would be time enough to ask me to lay the written report on the Table when the hon. gentleman learns that such a report has been received. I do not say that it has or has not. It is quite open to me to have conversations with my deputy and to take his opinion in the ordinary conversational way, if I choose. I am entitled to do it and may act upon an opinion so given, if I choose, and will continue to take such means of ascertaining the opinion of or obtaining information from the officers of my department, in a conversational manner or otherwise, and confidentially, or otherwise, as may commend itself to my judgment. Now, the hon. gentleman is exceedingly anxious, he has made a great discovery, he has discovered that there is something irregular in these Estimates, he has discovered that we have made no provision whatever for a secretary of the department, and that therefore things are getting involved and chaos is bound to result. Let me set the hon. gentleman's mind at rest, because I would not have him leave the House in the state of uncertainty and anxiety which would be likely to ensue if the facts were not fully understood by him. Immediately upon Mr. Balderson ceasing to be secretary of the department, an Order in Council was passed appointing Mr. Jones secretary of the Railway Department, so that there is no such chaotic condition existing in the department as the hon. gentleman would have us believe there is. There may be some grave anomaly in the appointment, there may be some serious objection to Mr. Jones becoming secretary of the Railway Committee, but if there is I must confess I have not discovered it, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that no such objection has occurred for one moment to the mind of the Deputy Minister. We are therefore now labouring under the impression, although it may be a complete hallucination on our part, that there is no injury likely to ensue in the administration of the department because we have added the duties of secretary of the department to those which have been hitherto performed by Mr. Jones.

Now, I pass to another charge made by the hon. gentleman. We are assured, and solemnly assured, by him that there is something misleading, something highly misleading in these Estimates.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman says " Hear, hear." He is entitled to the credit of having made a discovery ; he has actually found a mare's nest at last. He has found that we are deceiving Parliament by the manner in which our Estimates are presented. What is the cause of his indignation ? It is that we are not asking Parliament to vote any salary for the secretary of the Railway Department. But is there not a very good reason for our not doing that? I apprehend there is. The reason why we have not any salary in these Estimates opposite the title of office of secretary is because we are not going to pay him any salary. Why should we put in a salary when we do not intend to pay him any ? Will the hon. gentleman kindly explain to me where this marvellous error comes in when we are assigning the duties of the secretary of the department to another gentleman in the office and are paying him for the duties which he performs in connection with both offices the salary he formerly received for one. It is to me an utter impossibility to see how I can be guilty of misleading the House in any respect in the Estimates which I have brought down.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat paid himself a very poor compliment, but I do not feel disposed at all, after the weak and laboured effort which he has made to defend an indefensible cause, to question his judgment. He found that we were using very heavy artillery to kill a fly, and I think the hon. gentleman has depicted himself in terms not at all flattering to himself. The hon. gentleman says that I have made a discovery. Well, I tell the hon. gentleman this, I have been a member of this House for a good many years, and it has always been the practice in making up Estimates, when an office has been abolished, to put in italics, just as the hon. gentleman has done, the title of the office and leave blank where the salary comes in. The italics are used for the purpose of drawing the attention of the House to the fact that the office has been abolished and the salary saved. I am in the judgment of gentlemen on both sides as to whether that has not been the invariable practice. But what do you find here ? You find the office of secretary and chief clerk, which Mr. Balderson held, put in italics, and

you find the salary for the last year in the column for 1896-97 and none in the column for 1897-98.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We do not intend to pay him.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In his reorganization of the department, the hon. gentleman has left out the secretary altogether. He admits that the law compels him to have a secretary and that he cannot carry on the business of the department without one, and yet there is no secretary in the organization of his department, and he led the House to believe that he had made arrangements by which the chief clerk was to perform these services that formerly devolved upon the secretary. The Act which detailed elaborately the duties to be performed by the secretary. The hon. gentleman undertakes to tell us that the duties of the private secretary of the Deputy Minister, the private secretary of the Chief Engineer of Railways, the private secretary of the Chief Engineer of Canals, the private secretary of the Secretary to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, are all to be performed by this gentleman who has been holding the position of private secretary to the Deputy Minister. No person in this House or out of it who has the slightest conception of the immense transactions of the Department of Railways and Canals can fail to understand the importance of having a high officer like the secretary of the department to overlook and supervise all that portion of the official duties that were assigned to that office. But the hon. gentleman proposes to have all this transferred to the private secretary of the Deputy Minister, who, instead of, as under the law, reporting to an independent officer, the secretary of the department, who is the medium of communication between the Minister and his officers, is to report to the Minister's private secretary. I have no hesitation in saying that nothing approaching this has ever been announced in this House in reference to the management of any department whatever. Now the hon. gentleman says that he has "abolished the officer." That is exactly it, Sir, that is the whole story. And the only way he could "abolish the officer," was to put this scheme forward of transferring duties of the utmost importance to a private secretary who, in the work he has to do as private secretary to the Deputy Minister, has quite sufficient to occupy all his time. Why, Sir, does not the hon. gentleman know the duties that were assigned to the secretary of the department? What were they? The secretary was to have charge of the law clerks and clerks, the accountant and clerks, the correspondence clerks, the record room clerks, the mailing and stationery clerks, the copying clerks, and messengers. The entire administration and management of that important department were all under the secretary, the chief engineer having charge of official duties on the other side. On the technical subjects connected with the engineering department, railways and canals, bridges, hydraulic works, &c.—all the technical officers were under the control of the chief engineer, while the others were under the control of the secretary. It is now pretended to assign all these who were formerly under the control of the secretary to a gentleman who is private secretary to the Deputy Minister. I have no hesitation in saying that the ablest man you can find can fill every hour of the time usually devoted to the public service and many more to the discharge of his duties as secretary of the Minister and chief engineer of canals. I speak with thorough knowledge of the subject. I am quite sure that the committee will feel that this is a most lame and impotent statement which is put forward by the Minister in defence of what is admitted to have been his aim and object, and what he has succeeded in accomplishing, and that is, not abolishing the office, as he said, but of "abolishing the officer." Ay, Sir, there's the rub. There is the real intent. If the hon. gentleman thought Mr. Balderson was too able, too astute, too capable a man for him to have in his department, if he wanted to get rid of him, why did he not, knowing Mr. Balderson's high character and standing before he came into the service and during his eighteen years of service here, transfer him to some other department and secure some one else who would suit his mode of transacting public business better? The hon. gentleman said he had a report from Mr. Schreiber. I took it for granted that on such a question of reconstructing a public department and removing an officer charged with most important functions, there must have been a written report. I never dreamed that the mode of conducting public business under his administration had fallen so low that grave matters of this kind were treated as of so little importance as to be based upon mere conversation instead of being fortified with the report of his chief engineer. Surely the hon. gentleman knows that in his department there is a memorandum for the guidance of the secretary pointing out what he is to do. The secretary is to have a general supervision of the corresponding clerks, the law clerks, the clerk of the Railway Committee, the recording clerks, the accounting clerks, the mail and stationery clerks, and the messengers, and to see that they occupy the rooms allotted to them and no others. The hon. gentleman knows that every day in which an officer is absent from duty is to be noted in the attendant's book in red ink, stating the reasons for his absence, whether on leave, through sickness or otherwise. He knows that all inward correspondence is to be sent to the Deputy Minister as soon as

marked and registered in order that he may note action to be taken thereon. The secretary's duty is to receive and open all this correspondence, all this mass of correspondence that comes from every part of this wide Dominion, note it, enter it, and have it sent to the Deputy Minister for the action to be taken upon it. All outward correspondence is to be sent to the Deputy Minister before being signed and despatched. All the correspondence he maintains with the important officials and public officers all over this Dominion is to be prepared by the secretary and sent to the Deputy Minister before being signed and despatched. All reports of Council are to be sent to the Deputy Minister for examination before being presented to the Minister for signature. A most important part of the secretary's duty is to prepare these reports to Council. All contracts—and I draw the hon. gentleman's attention to this little matter that comes in at the end, and it is not a very unimportant one—all contracts are to be sent to the Deputy Minister to lay before the Minister for execution. All these multitudinous duties, all this labour that occupies the most constant attention, not only through the office hours of the day, but far into the night, under Mr. Mackenzie's Administration, under my own, and under the administration of those who succeeded me—all these duties which were performed by the secretary are swept aside by the hand of the hon. gentleman whose only ambition was to "abolish the officer."

Now, the hon. gentleman commenced his observations to-night by a statement that I fully believe explains the reason why he regards the question of dismissals from office as a trivial one. The hon. gentleman, in the plenitude of his importance, during last session, got his friends into great trouble by a declaration that, so far as workingmen were concerned, who were mere employees, and not regular officials, he had not time to look into their case, and he proposed to send them about their business whenever a hungry office-seeker, either the member for the county or a defeated candidate, claimed the place for one of his friends. That was the statement that the hon. gentleman made last session. It was a statement that he was obliged materially to qualify, but which, I believe, he has carried out to the letter. I believe the hon. gentleman treats every official in this country holding a position below that of a Minister of the Crown, as utterly insignificant in importance, too small a matter to occupy the attention of this House, or of any person in this country. I undertake to tell the hon. gentleman that he will meet with a rude awakening; I undertake to tell him that this contemptuous attitude which he has assumed towards the public officials of this country, will be fully recognized by the intelligent people of Canada, and that a time of reckoning will come when he will feel that, instead of strengthening his own hands or the Administration of which he is a member, he was cutting the ground from under their feet and placing them in the most ignoble and unenviable position. The hon. gentleman may feel that it is a small matter to take the bread out of a poor man's mouth, as he says he is prepared to do, whenever any hungry office-seeker comes to him and says he has a friend that he wants to put in his place—for that is the declaration that the hon. gentleman has made. Not only is the hon. gentleman treating in this manner every employee in the public service, from the humblest to the highest, but he is going to treat all their claims as utterly unworthy the slightest consideration at the hands of this great magnate, who, having been raised to a much higher position than he has ever been accustomed to occupy before in his life,——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPER. Yes, I say that the hon. gentleman is clothed with an amount of power, an amount of influence, and has the destinies of thousands of people placed in the hollow of his hand to-day, which gives him a position that he never occupied before, or anything analagous to it, and which seems to have completely turned the hon. gentleman's head.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, turned the hon. gentleman's head, and led him to stand up in this House and treat with utter contempt the claims of the operatives of this country to the bread they were honestly earning in the public service. Now he intends to carry that principle into the ranks of the highest officials. Sir, I repeat that a more damaging blow has never been struck at the character of the public service of this country. This case is one that will not bear the light of day being let in upon it for one single moment. He has in this way got rid of an able officer of high character, he himself has vouched for his ability and his standing, and the mode in which he performed his duties. And yet be it remembered that this man was brought into the public service, he did not seek it, but he was himself sought by a gentleman of the high position of the Auditor General; and, in driving him out of the service in this way, the hon. gentleman has struck a blow at the character of the public service that is not easy to overrate. Sir, this discussion will go forth through the country, and the country will form its own judgment on the arraignment of the hon. gentleman here to-day, and the utterly inefficient manner in which he was able to meet it, and the humiliating position in which he has been placed by his inability to meet the charges that have been brought against him.

Mr. DAVIN. I think the Minister of Railways will admit that the real question before this House, and, I humbly submit, before this country, is whether he has fairly, to use the language of this clause, compensated Mr. Balderson. I have been one of those who have been opposed to superannuations. I was opposed to superannuations long before the matter was taken up by the late Government; and this Government, in taking it up, is only following in the wake of the late Government. Therefore, I am not speaking to-night in favour of giving excessive superannuation to any Government official whose services may be dispensed with. But the question raised now is, whether the Government has carried out the intention of this clause. I listened to both speeches of the Minister of Railways, and I must say that he avoided the real question with great skill. I differ slightly from the view taken by the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill); and I was not able to hear the speech of the hon. member for Pictou. But I may say, with reference to some of the remarks that have been made, that the question seems to me to be very important, whether the Minister of Railways has carried out the intention of this clause. In my view, this is really a question of interpretation. I want to look at this matter as a lawyer. I want to consider the interpretation of this statute. Here we have a number of instances, prior to this clause, under which superannuation may be given, and then comes the clause which provides for the case of a man being superannuated and sent out of the service under these circumstances:

If any person to whom this Act applies, is removed from office in consequence of the abolition of his office for the purpose of improving the organization of the department to which he belongs, or is removed or retired from office to promote the efficiency or economy in the civil service,——

Well, palpably, this case of the removal of Mr. Balderson comes under one of these heads. He is not removed because he is incompetent or because of any blemish in his conduct. The Minister of Railways tells us expressly that he does not come under any other clause but this 11th clause.

—the Governor in Council may grant him such gratuity or superannuation allowance as will fairly compensate him for his loss of office, not exceeding such as he would have been entitled to if he had retired in consequence of permanent infirmity of body or of mind, after adding ten years to his actual term of service.

Now, I could not agree with the way the Minister of Railways dove-tailed the ten years on to the earlier part of the clause. This clause is a charter for the civil servant, and it is also a guarantee for the public. It is a charter for the civil servant, because it provides that, if his career is broken, if the Minister takes a man who has entered on a career and is in full vigour of life, and breaks his career, tells him, You must go out of the public service, this clause is a charter for that man that he should be treated in a certain way. On the other hand, there is also a guarantee to the public that under the circumstances a Minister or a Government will not err on the side of generosity. The Government is prevented from giving him more than could be given to a man who, after the same term of service, left the service because of age or infirmity, with ten years superadded. I will not go the length of saying that you may not put what I hold would be a strained interpretation on the clause, and say that this is the maximum that is allowed by it, but it is optional with the Government to go beneath it. I will not say that that could not be contended, but I hold that is not the natural construction of the clause. I have been glancing over some cases that would bear on this point, and I say here, speaking in the presence of lawyers whose opinions on subjects of this kind are entitled to a weight that I would not be prepared to ask the House to attach to any utterance of my own, that if a man sent out of the public service under the conditions prescribed in this clause, were to have his case go before a court, that court would inevitably, in my opinion, decide that the fair compensation to make him for his loss of office would be a sum not to exceed such as he would have been entitled to if he had retired in consequence of permanent infirmity of body or mind, after adding ten years to the actual term of service. Where the Minister of Railways and Canals failed in his earlier speech—in his later speech he did not touch the point—was when after touching on the matter briefly, he proceeded to take up this position: He took the amount of superannuation granted to this gentleman, for whom I do not profess to speak, for I am not advocating the cause of Mr. Balderson, and the cause I am advocating I will presently state, and the hon. gentleman said that in his judgment the amount given to Mr. Balderson was sufficient. But he does not give us the grounds on which his opinion was formed. The hon. gentleman also made some reference to charity, and I really thought he was not quite just to himself, or to this clause of the Act, or to the House or to the country. We have had to-night remarks made by an hon. friend of mine, who I think is not now in the House, in which he seemed to think that the question whether or not a clerk in the public service was justly dealt with or not was wholly beneath the dignity of this House, was a matter of so trivial a character that hon. members should not consume gas or electric light in order to consider it, or waste his precious time, or make any extravagant claim on his attention. That is not the view I take, it is not a doctrine in accordance with British law or British institutions that obtain in this Em-

pire, or in that august Parliament whence we draw our example and our inspiration. The most humble individual in this country if wronged by any man, no matter how highly placed, has a right to be heard. The question whether he has been wronged or not is a question of ample importance to occupy our time, and in no fitter occupation could this Parliament of Canada be engaged than that of inquiring whether or not that man was wronged. I know very well that throughout the country there is a diffused opinion against superannuation. I share that opinion myself. But I do not believe that among the people of this country you will find any percentage, who, while they wish to get rid of what is confessedly a bad system—a bad system at least as most of us think, and at all events those who think with me in regard to the matter—would wish to strike an unjust or unfair blow at any individual. I speak here now not for Mr. Balderson. I speak for something much more important—I speak for the justice of Parliament. I speak for the justice that is in the bosom of the Canadian people, and I say that while I respect the great ability of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and while I listened with all the deference that is due to the distinction of his office and to his own personal distinction, I think the hon. gentleman fell short of attaching that importance which the people will attach to the question whether justice has been done. I will in this connection make an appeal to the hon. Minister. I say that with a clause like that in the Act—it is true we have one distinguished lawyer saying it is not well drafted, and confessedly there is a difference of opinion as to its interpretation, although I do not share the doubt as to its interpretation—the Minister will do injustice to himself, to Parliament and to the people of Canada, and injustice to morality if he will not say that a fiat shall issue so that this question may be tried, whether or not the hon. gentleman did what this statute says shall be done, fairly compensate this young man. I do not plead for the man—I am not pleading for him now; but I say it is most important that the impression should not go abroad, an impression that may be shared by people outside of partisan feelings, that a Minister has done a kind of underhand injustice to one of his officers. I do not say the hon. gentleman has done so. I am guarding myself in that respect; I am not saying that the Minister of Railways and Canals has wilfully done any injustice to this young man. I am going to give him credit with having fairly weighed the situation, and that in the terms of the Order in Council he thought he was doing what was right and fulfilling whatever behest was contained in that clause of the Act. But with the diverse opinions, apart from all partisanship in regard to what he has done, it is the hon. gentleman's duty to see that a fiat issue, and that the question goes before the Exchequer Court to decide whether or not the Government have fairly compensated this young man. Although I have not risen in the interest of Mr. Balderson, and although I have risen in a higher, larger and greater interest than that of any individual, let me say this in regard to him. I hardly know him; I have met him once or twice in the Department of Railways and Canals when I have gone there on business, and I have also met him as secretary of the late Minister of Railways and Canals when he was Postmaster General. He is going on to middle age, and the Minister of Railways confesses, what Mr. Balderson's career bears out, that he is a man of ability. He is a man that could have shone in a professional career. Can any one reasonably contend, that if in the middle of a man's life like that, you take the career to which he has devoted himself and you snap it in twain, that you have not done that man a great wrong, and that you are in a position to put your hands in your pocket and say: You are a young man, you are a man of great ability, you can go into something else, or you can go abroad. Is it so easy a thing to commence a new career? Is it so easy a thing, above all, to commence a career, on the part of a man who has been in the public service for years, when we know well, that it has become an axiom in regard to men who have spent 12 or 15 years in the Civil Service of England or here, that it unfits them for wrestling in the other walks of life. Clearly, here it is a pure question of compensation, and I say that the proper way is to take the course which will secure that the provisions of this clause shall be measured out impartially and with even-handed justice to this young man.

I want to say a word, before I sit down, in regard to a remark that was made respecting the leader of the Opposition. My hon. and gallant friend (Mr. Domville) complained, that there was something stale and old in what the hon. the leader of the Opposition gave the House; and the hon. the Minister of Railways said—I took down his words—that, they had been listening to what the hon. member for Cape Breton had said about this man Balderson for so many years, that it was stale, flat, and unprofitable. Sir, I thought that this matter about Balderson had only come up recently. I thought the dismissal had taken place only the other day; but any way, it is only a small slip, and I shall not dwell upon it.

What I want to point out is this: That the opinions that up to a few months ago were the opinions that had been advocated by the leader of the Opposition; these opinions that he had in England and elsewhere advocated with his great energy, an energy that was felt in England and was felt in Canada; these opinions, and these banners, and these watchwords, have been

taken by you opposite there, and the Minister of Railways, and the Prime Minister, and the rest of you, are boasting of these opinions to-day. The only new thing proposed to this House, and the main new thing that will be agitated in this country in the immediate future, has been proposed by the leader of the Opposition this session. These men opposite got up and talked of the leader of the Opposition, in a way that I thought was almost indecent; and yet the only new thing that has been proposed in this Parliament, is the new departure in favour of manhood suffrage, and that has been proposed by the leader of the Opposition. And Sir, in that respect the leader of the Opposition has been consistent with his great past, because he has been in the forefront of every new movement and at the top of every climbing wave, from the first time he entered public life. When I saw the hon. and gallant member (Mr. Domville), who is not in the House now, who had been a follower of the leader of the Opposition, and who had received many courtesies and kindnesses from him, when I saw that gentleman cast a slur on the hon. member for Cape Breton, merely because he is a man in his 77th year, my thoughts recurred to other times and other events. Sir, I have seen Lord Palmerston in his 80th year, still the grand old Palm, leading the great Liberal party of England, and his name was a terror to the enemies of the Empire the world over. And, do not suppose for one minute, that the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) merely because the hand of 77 years is upon him, has lost any of the brightness of his intellect, or the vigour of his undaunted and fighting spirit. If there was even a sign of age upon that grand old man I would say:

> Fear not; 'tis but a passing spasm; the Titan is unconquered still.

When I saw a man, who had received many a time and oft, favours from the leader of the Opposition, strike at him, merely because in the opinion of that gallant gentleman he was old—why, Sir, the man who did it is an older man than the leader of the Opposition; he has not as many years but he is practically an older man. When I remember, what I knew to be a fact, that from my late illustrious leader (Sir John Macdonald), and also from my present leader (Sir Charles Tupper), that young-old-gentleman from King's or whatever else he is, had received many favours, I could not help thinking of the lines of Moore:

> Yes, fed every day (and this makes it a dark case)
> With the choicest of sops from the lion's own pan,
> He lifts up his leg at the noble beast's carcass,
> And does all a dog so diminutive can.

It was an unworthy cause for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Domville) to make, because, if we gave honours and decorations for political services, the breast of the leader of the Opposition would be covered with stars. I have no desire in any way to minimize the claims on the country of the hon. gentlemen opposite, but they must bear this in mind, that if service in department, and service in this House, and turning away their attention from their private business, gives them a claim on Canada—and it properly gives them a claim, for I know that there are men in that Ministry and men in the Liberal party who have made great sacrifices for Canada—if they thereby have a claim upon the consideration of Canada, as they have, surely there must be great claims centering in the present leader of the Opposition. It was an unworthy spectacle for the honourable and gallant gentleman (Mr. Domville) to make the display that he made. I felt, Sir, that I could not sit down without making these few remarks on that incident.

The Minister of Railways and Canals is a lawyer, and I have no doubt he has given consideration to that clause. I assure him that I am not speaking from the standpoint of a partisan but from the standpoint of a citizen of Canada, and in the interests of justice, and in the interests of the dignity that should attach to the way our affairs are conducted in this House, and speaking as such, I say, that there is an appearance of the too-clever-by-half about the way that Mr. Balderson has been got rid of. I say that the compensation to which he is entitled, is a compensation that should be measured by an equitable interpretation of that clause, and that the equitable interpretation of that clause should be declared by an impartial court.

Mr. McNEILL. I do not intend to delay the committee more than a moment after the very brilliant, eloquent and logical speech which we have had from my hon. friend (Mr. Davin); but I would like to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals to be kind enough to turn for one moment to clause 3 of the Act. He will find there that:

> The Governor in Council may grant to any person who has served in an established capacity in the civil service for ten years or upwards, and who has attained the age of sixty years, or is incapacitated by bodily infirmity from properly performing his duties, a superannuation allowance calculated on his average yearly salary during the then last three years, and not exceeding the following rates.

That is the compensation which is to be given to the civil servant who is incapacitated by bodily infirmity. Now, if my hon. friend will turn to the 11th clause, he will find that it deals with something entirely different. It deals, not with the case of a man who is incapacitated, but with the case of a man who is ready and willing and able to continue to perform the duties of his office, and who has had (as my hon. friend has expressed it so graphically), his career

broken by the Government in the interest of the country. Surely no reasonable man will suggest that the compensation which is to be given in the latter case should equitably be only equal to the compensation given in the former case. The Act deals with the two cases on a perfectly different basis, and it says that there shall be something more done for the man who has had his career broken. It follows very much the line which had been adopted in the mother country, but a very few years before in the Irish Land Bill of 1880 or 1881, when compensation was given to the tenant for disturbance. Even a tenant from year to year was compensated for disturbance, and the tenant was entitled to a lump sum equal to many years rent of the farm. Following the same principle, the framers of this Act have held that the vested right of the civil servant being interfered with, he is entitled to a certain compensation for disturbance; that is to say, ten years are to be computed and added to his service before his case is dealt with in the same way as you would deal with the case of a man who was obliged by misfortune to leave the service. It is utterly impossible for any reasonable and fair-minded man to say that the two cases should be dealt with in the same way, and the Act deals with them in perfectly different ways.

Mr. HAGGART. Before the resolution is adopetd I have a few remarks to make in reference to the clause which has been so ably discussed by my two hon. friends who have preceded me. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) adopted the 'tu quoque' argument in reference to the interpretation of the clause 11 which has been so much discussed. He stated that no matter what interpretation lawyers might put upon the clause, the interpretation put upon it by the late Government was entirely different. I was astonished at the hon. gentleman making that statement, because, having been in the Government for a long time, I did not remember a case in which any such occurrence ever happened; and when the hon. gentleman quoted from a return to the House of the superannuation retiring allowance, I thought I surely had been mistaken as to what the late Government's view of the law was. First of all, he quoted the superannuation of Mr. Tanguay, and said he had been receiving a salary of $1,400, that his office had been abolished, and that he received a superannuation allowance of $784. The hon. gentleman never read "age and abolition of office." He never read to the House the return as it was placed on the Table of the House. There was no other possible manner in which the Government could deal with the case.

Mr. McMULLEN. Did the fact of the man's age prevent your carrying out the Act, and adding ten years to his time of service?

Mr. HAGGART. We had the right under the age clause to add ten years to his time of service; but the clause of the Act providing for superannuation for age, directs that he shall receive a certain allowance, and he received that allowance. What was the age of the gentleman who was superannuated? Seventy-three years. The hon. gentleman quoted another case, that of a Mr. Gardiner, immigration agent at St. John What was his age? 'Seventy-nine years; cause of superannuation, abolition of office.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was any addition made to his time of service?

Mr. HAGGART. No, he came within the qualifications required by the Act. It provides what the superannuation shall be over the age of sixty years. The third case mentioned by the hon. gentleman was that of Mr. David. At the time of his superannuation he had been thirty-two and a half years in the Government service, and so only two and a half years could be added to his time, as thirty-five years is the utmost time under the Act for which an allowance can be given. So that the hon. gentleman's 'tu quoque' argument based on these cases does not amount to anything. The first gentleman was superannuated on account of age and abolition of office, the second I have no doubt, on account of age, and the third had two and a half years added to his service to entitle him to the utmost superannuation the law allows. A few minutes ago I asked the hon. Minister of Railways if he would be kind enough, under the circumstances, to grant a fiat under which the gentleman interested might bring his case before the courts. The hon. gentleman said that if a petition were sent to him, he would take it into his consideration. I do not know what technical meaning he may put upon the Act. But does he not know that when that Act was before the House, the then leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Edward Blake, took the view that any man in this country, whoever he was, had as much right to sue the Crown, following the precedent set in Great Britain, as any individual in the country, and that the application for a fiat was only a very prefunctory matter. These hon. gentlemen, in their mightiness, however, have given a different interpretation to the Act. The view was ably supported by the then leader of the Opposition, Mr. Blake, that any man who thought he had a claim against the Government of this country or Her Majesty, had as much right to go into court and bring an action as he would have in the case of a claim against a private individual. But now, forsooth, he has to petition His Mightiness the Minister of Railways and Canals for the liberty to bring an action, who will take it into his serious

consideration whether he shall grant the petition or not. Now, what are the reasons assigned by the hon. Minister for the abolition of this office? Here are the words he has put into the mouth of His Excellency the Governor General, and I ask whether these words give a correct statement of the facts or not :

That, to promote economy in the public service, Mr. John Balderson, secretary of the Department of Railways and Canals, be, from the 1st of July, 1897, placed upon the retired list, with an annual allowance of $682.50.

Was it for the economy of the public service that this was done? The hon. gentleman's words are contradicted by the estimates he has brought down to this House. By these estimates he asks a vote of $38,230 for carrying on his department during the next year. Is that an economy, adding to it the superannuation allowance to Mr. Balderson, compared with the expenses of the department for the last year? It is not. The amount which the hon. gentleman calls for this year, adding to it the superannuation allowance to Mr. Balderson, is as great as the expenditure of last year.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. HAGGART. I have the information at my hand, and can give it to the hon. gentleman, if necessary. If necessary, I will read out the details for the benefit of the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman says : Oh, it was for the purpose of economy that I got rid of this officer, and I did not do away with the office. I was of the opinion of the leader of the Opposition, that the hon. gentleman said that there was no necessity for the office. The hon. gentleman has corrected that, but I have weightier information at my hand here. In these estimates, he says that there is no necessity for the office. He knew that the statute provides that there shall be a secretary, he knew that a great many things done in his office, that a great many acts of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, unless certified by the secretary, would be illegal, so that there is absolute necessity for a secretary. The hon. gentleman saw the position he was in, and he said that he merely intended to superannuate the officer and did not intend to do away with the office or violate the statute at all. But the course which the hon. gentleman intended to pursue is predicted by the estimates he brought down ; and if he intended to follow that course, he should have introduced into this House a Bill to alter the law of the country with regard to the Railway Department. He saw the position he was in, and, to protect himself, he said : Oh, no, the office of secretary is not to be abolished at all. I am going to give it to another person, and another person has been appointed acting secretary.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not acting secretary, but secretary.

Mr. HAGGART. Secretary without salary. The Order in Council, which I have in my possession, and which was furnished by the Clerk of the Privy Council to Mr. Balderson, who had a perfect right to it, says :

The duties of secretary of the department to be performed, during such absence, by the secretary of the Deputy Minister and chief engineer, without increase of salary.

That does not come within the meaning of the Act. Was there an enforced leave of absence of the secretary? There is no word of it in the Order in Council. That order simply states that :

The secretary of the department be, and from the 1st of July next is, removed from his office.

What authority has the hon. Minister to appoint an acting secretary from now to the 1st of July? The only authority, under the Act, is contained in these words : "In the case of the absence of the secretary." But the secretary was not absent, he was there performing his duties. The statute says : "In the absence of the secretary or his inability to act." Those are the only two reasons which justify the Minister of Railways in appointing a temporary secretary. There is, I maintain, no absence of the secretary of the department. The hon. gentleman says he gave him leave until the 1st of July, and that the other party was appointed by Order in Council. The Order in Council does not say anything about leave. It says that Mr. Balderson be, and from the 1st of July is, placed upon the retired list. He is, therefore, secretary of the department until the 1st of July, 1897. Then, it says, "the duties of secretary of the department to be performed, during such absence, by the secretary of the Deputy Minister and Chief Engineer. But the hon. gentleman cannot appoint a secretary until the 1st of July, 1897.

The hon. gentleman put the words into the mouth of His Excellency the Governor General that, in the interests of economy, he intended to dispense with the secretary of the department. As I have said, there is no economy in it. I challenge the hon. gentleman to rise in his place and show that there is $500 economy in it. The simple fact of the matter is this as the hon. Minister said himself. A gentleman who was in every way well qualified for the office, who was induced to leave the other walks of life for the purpose of entering the civil service, is, at the mere whim of the Minister of Railways and Canals, sent out into the world in defiance of the statute. The hon. gentleman said that he had seen the statute, that his attention had been drawn to it, and he intimated that the interpretation he put upon it should prevail

over that put upon it by other parties who have not his intelligence and information, and that that should put an end to discussion. But I think the hon. gentleman has found out that there are other parties in the House who are just as intelligent and as capable of giving a legal construction to a statute as he is, and that there is ample room for difference of opinion. The hon. gentleman may be right, and I may be wrong, but there is certainly some justification for the position I have taken. At least, it is worthy of consideration, and the common justice which Mr. Blake, when leader of the Opposition, said was the basis of the amendment made in the law, under which, according to his interpretation, the fiat should be given, as a matter of course, to every one, no matter how humble, in the community, who thought he had a claim against the Government which should be adjudicated upon by the courts, should be extended to this man. The hon. Minister of Railways ought, at least, to have stated that the Government would act upon the interpretation given by the Hon. Mr. Blake, and that, as a matter of course, a fiat would be granted at once, on a petition being presented to the Governor General in Council by the party aggrieved. I have no particular friendship with the gentleman who was secretary of the department. He was my private secretary and he performed his duties as such faithfully and honestly. I believe him to be a capable and honest civil servant. I have no particular feeling in the matter one way or the other. But what I say is that no graver injustice was ever done, no greater blow was ever struck at the civil service of the country. And the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) states that the time of the House is being taken up by minor matters like this. The hon. gentleman seems to think that an act of injustice done to an individual in the community is not to be considered in this House, that the individual has no right in that respect because the amount is a trifling one, but more than the individual is injured in this case, for this affects the whole civil service. The information given to His Excellency the Governor General upon which he acted is unfounded. No economy is secured in this department by the dismissal of this officer. When His Excellency was induced to put his signature to this order of dismissal or superannuation, it was upon grounds which are not fair, upon grounds upon which my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) state were never contemplated by the Act. So that justice even under the Civil Service Act was not done to Mr. Balderson. No clearer wrong was ever done, no greater blow was ever struck at the civil service than the superannuation of this person upon the grounds stated in the Order in Council.

Mr. McMULLEN. I cannot allow the remarks of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) to go unchallenged. The hon. gentleman's first address this afternoon was based upon the assumption that in the case of the removal of a civil servant ten years had to be added to his service if the office was abolished. I drew attention to four cases, which I marked and sent across to the hon. gentleman. He read three, and one he did not read, which is clearly on all fours with the case of Mr. Balderson. That is the case of A. Dingman, inspector of agencies in the Department of Indian Affairs, salary $1,800, served 13 years, age 68. I would like to know if age precludes the addition of ten years to the term of service. The hon. gentleman did not answer that. The statute does not say anything about it. This gentleman was superannuated for age and economy and abolition of office, and they gave him $468 retiring allowance and there was not a year added to his service. The hon. gentleman, perhaps, will challenge that statement. I will send the paper across to him again. This is a case clearly in point with that of Mr. Balderson.

Mr. HAGGART. Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) not aware that Mr. Dingman petitioned for superannuation?

Mr. McMULLEN. The return says that he was superannuated and his office abolished.

Mr. HAGGART. And he petitioned for superannuation.

Mr. McMULLEN. It does not say so. You abolish his office after he had served 13 years, and you add nothing to his time. Does the hon. gentleman want to see it again; I will send it across to him.

Mr. HAGGART. Why, in this very paper the hon. gentleman refers to age is stated as the reason for superannuation, the same as in the other case.

Mr. McMULLEN. No.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, it is. Here is the case—A. Dingman, inspector of agencies, and reasons for superannuation are: "age, economy and abolition of office."

Mr. McMULLEN. Does the statute provide that owing to a man's age, years are not to be added to his time of service if his office is abolished?

The Office of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, including $1,800 to F. K. Bennetts, $1,600 to S. Lelievre, $1,100 to F. Chadwick, $800 to G. G. Kezar, $700 to H. W. Lothrop and $500 to L. Burns, which may be paid, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act..... $29,700

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). When I took possession of the office, after having looked into it, I came to the conclusion that the work could be done with a

much reduced force, and, after having consulted the deputy head upon this point, the views which I had formed were confirmed. The office has been reorganized in a way which I shall now explain. The deputy head remains as before, so also do the chief clerk and the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. Among the first class clerks there is a change. There are still to be three first class clerks; but one of those in the office when I entered it, Captain Lee, is to be superannuated. Mr. Bennetts, who was in the service gets an increase of $200. Mr. Lelièvre is to be promoted from the second class to the first class. The reason why I made this promotion is because I found it impossible to carry on the business with a single private secretary, and I have to have the service of another man. Having a great deal of correspondence in both French and English, I found that my secretary, though a very competent man, could not overtake the work. I selected Mr. Lelièvre who was in the office, and, as he has had considerable work added to his ordinary duties, I decided to give him the promotion. In the second class clerks, there has been a promotion, that of Mr. Lelièvre, and there will be two additions. There is a promotion from the third class to the second, that is of Mr. Chadwick, who was in the third class at a salary of $900 and who is now to receive $1,100. There is to be an appointment in the person of Mr. Boudreau, who has been acting as my private secretary. In the third class clerks there is a dimunition of four. One, Mr. DeBrisay has been transferred to the Public Works Department, and Mr. de Lanaudière, Mr. Lefebvre, and Mr. Bliss will be superannuated. Mr. Kezar will receive an increase of salary of $150 a year, and Mr. Lothrop the same. In the messengers' branch, Mr. Burke, who was an old messenger, will receive an increase of $150, making the new salary $500. The staff to-day, then, will be composed, after these changes, with this difference from what it was when I took possession of the office. Mr. Payne has been transferred to the Railway Department, and Mr. Campbell has been brought into the place of Mr. Payne. Captain Lee is to be superannuated; Mr. de Lanaudière is to be superannuated; Mr. Lefebvre is to be superannuated; Mr. Bliss is to be superannuated, and Mr. DeBrisay has been transferred to the Public Works.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What amount has been charged upon the superannuation in connection with the Privy Council office?

The PRIME MINISTER. I could not say. I do not think the Treasury Board has passed upon it yet.

Mr. DAVIN. It would seem to me that if the salary, for instance, of Mr. DeBrisay, which will still be paid from the public chest, is added on to get this $30,600, taken in connection with the superannuation allowance of Captain Lee, it will be found there has been no economy?

The PRIME MINISTER. How is that?

Mr. DAVIN. Because the public will pay just as much as before.

The PRIME MINISTER. Not at all. The public will continue to pay for the services of Mr. DeBrisay certainly. He was working in the Privy Council office, and he is now giving his services to the Public Works. He will be paid in the future as he was paid in the past. But Captain Lee will not be paid, nor will Mr. DeLanaudière, nor Mr. Lefebvre, nor Mr. Bliss. These four men go out of the service, of course, they will be superannuated. Whatever charge that may entail upon the country, and the Treasury Board has not yet passed upon those cases, that charge must be less than the charges which have hitherto been entailed upon the country. Moreover, if I find, or if any Minister going into the department comes to the conclusion that the work can be done with this reduced staff, will my hon. friend pretend that he should not carry out the economy, and that the staff must remain as it was? Is it not the duty of the Minister, under these circumstances, to reduce the staff so as to have the same amount of work performed at a less cost to the country?

Mr. HUGHES. Will the Minister say the ages of these four gentlemen who wer superannuated?

The PRIME MINISTER. Captain Lee, I think, is a man between 50 and 60; the others are about 30 or 35.

Department of Customs..... $38,600

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What has become of the chief clerk?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). It is proposed to dispense with the services of the chief clerk, whose salary was $1,800. There are some increases for some of the other officers, amounting to $412.50. We hope to effect a saving of $1,387.50.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What superannuation did the chief clerk get?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. No superannuation.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Why was he dismissed?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Well, he is not dismissed. He has only been in the service since June last, and speaking from memory, I think it is proposed now to give him a gratuity.

Mr. HUGHES. Who was the chief clerk?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Mr. Webster.

Mr. HUGHES. What is the reason for dismissing the chief clerk ?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. To effect a saving in the expenditure of the department.

Mr. HUGHES. Is the office abolished ?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Not formally abolished. The office was only filled in June last. I think there was no chief clerk for some two or three years, at any rate. I think Mr. Webster came in in June, 1896, and by a reorganization of the staff, we expect to be able to effect this saving.

Geological Survey..... $50,525

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). There is a reduction of $150 ; in other respects, hon. gentlemen will see that the items are identically the same.

Mr. HUGHES. Are there no superannuations, and others appointed in their places ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. So far as I am aware, there are not. I do not see the Minister of the Interior present, but I believe there are no changes of any kind.

The Department of Trade and Commerce.. $9,500

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). The only alteration is the sum of $37.50. That was the statutory allowance granted last year, which has been carried out.

Mr. DAVIN. What purpose distinct from the report of the Customs Department is to be served by the report from the Department of Trade and Commerce ? I am not carping at it all, because I have found it useless, and I ask with a view of making it more useful.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It contains a lot of information tabulated in a fashion supposed to be in a more convenient form for general use, than the information contained in the Trade and Navigation Returns. The items are divided in such a fashion that anybody at a glance can see what has been the current of trade for five or six years together, and also with what nations our trade is chiefly carried on, and how far it is increasing or diminishing with those particular nations. The information no doubt could be extracted from the Trade and Navigation Returns, but it is not possible to do it without going through minute calculations, which are made in the Trade and Commerce report. There is likewise a considerable amount of information with respect to treaties with other countries, and the reports of the several agents that are or have been lately in the employ of the department.

Mr. HUGHES. I take the liberty of suggesting to the Minister of Trade and Commerce that the report of his department would form a very useful book to be circulated among the various colleges and educational institutions in all the provinces of the Dominion, as well as in foreign districts. I have frequent application from the masters of leading schools and institutions in various ridings, for information of this kind. The Trade and Navigation Returns are bulky, and hard to understand by many. We have in the past been getting the Statesman's Year Book, but that has got so bulky it is almost useless. I would suggest to the Minister that the report of his department would perform a useful service if it were supplied to the leading educational institutions throughout the country.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I may say to my hon. friend that I have already asked for a larger quantity for that express purpose ; but most of the additional number has already been applied for on the part of the High Commissioner. I will bear in mind the hon. gentleman's suggestion, and so far as Council will sanction increased expenditure, I will endeavour to have trade and commerce reports placed in the hands of the various bodies to which he has alluded.

Office of High Commissioner for Canada in England $9,150

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This is, I believe, almost identically the same sum as was voted in previous years. It may be found, however, to obtain some small increase in the Supplementary Estimates.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I saw with extreme regret that the statutory increases have been withheld from the clerks in the High Commissioner's office, in conformity with the rule applied to the service here. I am sure if any hon. gentleman will take the trouble to ascertain the qualifications possessed by those officers, they will come to the conclusion that the salaries, especially of the third-class clerks, are extremely low. They are, I believe, without an exception shorthand writers and in every instance very good accountants, as well as good correspondents. If the First Minister will investigate this matter, I think he will admit the propriety of looking further into it ; in fact, I think when he returns after his visit to London, he will entertain the opinion that from the secretary down to the third class clerks, those officers are entitled to further consideration, and I shall be very glad if it is given to them.

Resolution to be reported.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 10th May, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, a certificate of the election and return of John Gunion Rutherford, Esq., member for the Electoral District of Macdonald.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 102) respecting the Ottawa Gas Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

POSTMASTER GOULD, BARTONVILLE.

Mr. HUGHES (for Mr. McCleary) asked:

1. When was R. T. Gould appointed postmaster at Bartonville, Ont.?
2. Has he been dismissed from that position?
3. If so, were charges made against him, and by whom?
4. Was an investigation held as to the truthfulness of such charges?
5. If no charges were made, why was Mr. Gould dismissed, if such has taken place?
6. If Mr. Gould has been dismissed, has his successor been appointed? If so, who is he?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). 1. He was appointed on the 7th December, 1893. 2. His appointment has been cancelled. 3. There were no charges against him. 4. There was no investigation. 5. Mr. Gould's appointment was cancelled in order that his predecessor in office, Mr. W. J. Gage, who was unjustly dismissed in November, 1893, might be restored to his position. 6. Mr. W. J. Gage has been reappointed to the office.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That will be a very good precedent for me, by-and-by.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). You can use it by-and-by.

KINGSTON PENITENTIARY.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron) asked:

When will the report of the commission appointed to investigate the affairs of the Kingston Penitentiary be brought down?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The report of the commission appointed to investigate the affairs of the Kingston Penitentiary is now engaging the consideration of the Minister of Justice. It is expected that it will be brought down at an early day.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

EXHIBITION AT STOCKHOLM.

Mr. DAVIN asked:

1. Whether a person styling himself "Dr." Walton Jones has been appointed Canadian commissioner to the Exhibition at Stockholm?
2. Whence derives he his title of Dr.?
3. Is he an LL.D. or a Ph. D. or a D.C.L.? If so, from what university?
4. How long has he lived in Canada?
5. What are his qualifications for the position of commissioner to Stockholm?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). 1. No person has been appointed Canadian Commissioner to the exhibition at Stockholm. 2. I am unable to say. 3. Dr. Jones is understood to be an LL.D., but the correspondence in the Department of the Interior does not show of what university. 4. It is within the knowledge of the department that Dr. Jones has resided in Canada since 1893; that he may have been a resident for a much longer period. 5. As Dr. Jones has not been appointed Canadian Commissioner to the exhibition at Stockholm, his qualifications for that office have not been considered.

CORRESPONDENCE IN THE INDIAN DEPARTMENT.

Mr. DAVIN asked:

The hon. the Minister of the Interior said on May 4th, in Committee of Supply, in regard to the Indian Department: "I may tell the hon. gentleman that one of the first things I encountered in connection with the department was a deluge of letters in which my attention was called to the fact that people had written letters one, two, three, four, and even five years ago and had not received any replies."

1. How many letters does the hon. gentleman seek to indicate by Noachian word "deluge"?
2. Who are the writers of the letters?
3. How many letters had remained unanswered (a) one year, (b) how many two years, (c) three years, (d) four years, (e) five years?
4. Did the Minister inquire from the permanent head of the Indian Department whether such letters had been received, and if unanswered, why?
5. Will the hon. the Minister give a list of the letters which are left unanswered?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). In reply to the hon. gentleman's first question, I may say that the word "deluge," which was used in a former debate and to which the hon. gentleman refers, is a very common English word which a person of ordinary common comprehension can readily understand. It does not require any explanation even for a person of ordinary comprehension, much less for a gentleman who is so eminent for his scholastic attainments as the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). To the second and third question I beg to say, I have not at present the information at my disposal which would enable me to answer these questions. I hardly think

I would be doing my duty as the head of the department if I use the time of the clerks of the department in acquiring information for the purpose of answering questions which are evidently frivolous. In reply to the fourth question: There is no permanent head of the Indian Department, and therefore the letter was not referred to him. In regard to the fifth question, I am not able to give the list the hon. gentleman asks for.

INDIAN OFFICE AT REGINA.

Mr. DAVIN asked:

1. Whether it is the intention of the hon. the Minister of the Interior to remove the Indian Office at Regina to Winnipeg?
2. Whether any, and what clerks in the Indian Department, Regina, have been notified that their employment will cease, and when?
3. What will the Indian Commissioner's staff in future consist of?
4. What clerks from the Indian Department, Regina, does the Minister propose to remove to Ottawa?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). 1. Yes. 2. If any clerks in the Indian Office at Regina have been so notified they have been notified by the Indian Commissioner, who has not yet reported the action taken, and it is, therefore, impossible at present to answer the question definitely. 3. The commissioner's staff will probably consist of three persons taken from the office at Regina. 4. There is no present intention of removing any of the clerks from the Indian Department, Regina, to Ottawa.

POSTMASTER AT ESQUIMALT.

Mr. PRIOR asked:

Is it the intention of the Government to appoint a telegraph operator as postmaster at Esquimalt, B.C.?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The matter referred to has never been before the department.

TREATY BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND JAPAN.

Mr. McINNES asked:

1. Has the Government received any communication from the Imperial authorities, asking if the Canadian Government intended to accept the provisions of the treaty lately entered into between Great Britain and Japan?
2. If so, what was the Government's reply to such communication?
3. Has the Government taken, or is it the intention of the Government to take any action under the said treaty, or otherwise, which would interfere with the right of Canada to prohibit, restrict or otherwise deal with Japanese immigration?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Yes. When the Government came into office they found a communication from the Imperial authorities asking the Canadian Government to accept the treaty between Great Britain and Japan, which has been before the Government for over a year. The present Government considered the matter, and determined to answer that they would not be bound by the Japanese treaty.

INDIANS OF PEACE RIVER DISTRICT.

Mr. OLIVER asked:

Is it the intention of the Government to treat with the Indians of the Peace or Athabasca River regions during the present season for the occupation of those regions by settlers?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). This question has never been brought to my attention since I have taken charge of the department, and I am not able to express any intention in regard to it at the present time.

LOCAL JUDGE IN ADMIRALTY.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to appoint a local judge in Admiralty of the Exchequer Court of Canada, in lieu of the late Honourable George Irvine?
2. Or, is it the intention of the Government to amend the Exchequer Court Act as to allow the appointment of a second judge of the Exchequer Court with residence at Quebec and exercising the jurisdiction and functions of local judge in Admiralty?
3. Is it the intention of the Government to announce its policy on this question during the present session?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). It is the intention of the Government to appoint a local Judge in Admiralty to the Exchequer Court of Canada, in lieu of the late Hon. George Irvine. The question whether the Government will amend the Exchequer Court Act, is now under the consideration of the Government.

TRUSTS AND COMBINES.

Mr. BENNETT (for Mr. Henderson) asked:

1. Is the Government aware that there exists at the present time in Canada, any trust, combination, association or agreement of any kind among the manufacturers of any article of commerce, or the dealers therein, or any portion of them, to enhance the price of such article or in any other way to unduly promote the advantage of such manufacturers or dealers at the expense of the consumers, and where such disadvantage to the consumer is facilitated by the customs duty imposed on a like article when imported?
2. If so, in what manufactures do such trusts or combines exist?
3. Is it the intention of the Government to reduce the duties at once on any articles affected by any such existing trust or combine?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). From general information obtained by them, the Government believe there are in Canada some associations of the

character mentioned in the question, but the information in their possession is not sufficient to call for a reduction of the duties at present.

ST. ANDREW'S RAPIDS, RED RIVER.

Mr. JAMESON asked :

1. What steps have been taken by the Government to ascertain the cost of construction of such works as are necessary to render the Red River navigable through the St. Andrew's Rapids ?
2. Has the Government procured an estimate of the cost of the works?
3. Is it the intention of the Government to proceed with the work, and if so, at what time ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). In the absence of the Minister of Public Works I beg to answer the question as follows :—1. A thorough survey has been made. 2. Yes. 3. The matter is under consideration.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Would the hon. gentleman object to state what the estimate was ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am not able to answer the question, but I shall call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the inquiry made.

MR. WILLIAM McGIRR.

Mr. DAVIN asked :

Will the Minister of the Interior say what notification Mr. Wm. McGirr received of his superannuation, and whether he is receiving the same treatment as all other officials whose services are being dispensed with? Whether all others have not received leave of absence until the 30th June?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). Mr. McGirr received notice of his superannuation on the 2nd April. The rule in the Department of Indian Affairs is to pay an official who is placed on the retired list up to the end of the month in which he received notification, and this rule will be applied to Mr. Wm. McGirr. It is not true that all other officials whose services are being dispensed with have received leave of absence until 30th June.

HUDSON'S BAY EXPEDITION.

Mr. DAVIN asked :

1. What are the conditions of charter between the Government and the owners of the "Diana," engaged in the Hudson Bay expedition?
2. What is the price per month?
3. What is the value of the vessel?
4. Is she insured? If not, why not?
5. If she is lost, who is responsible?
6. What is the length and beam, horse-power and tonnage (net and gross) of the "Diana" ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The conditions of charter are : "Diana" to be placed at the disposal of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, from the 1st of May to the 1st of December, for the sum of $9,800, payable in monthly instalments of $1,400 in advance. The ship to be insured by the Government for the benefit of the owners for the sum of $40,000. In the event of loss or abandonment, the Government to be responsible for the proportionate hire to the date of such loss or abandonment. Government to find master, officers, engineers, firemen, crew, coals, provisions, engine-room and boatswain's supplies. "Diana," length, 151 ft. 2 in. ; breadth, 27 ft. 1 in. ; depth, 16 ft. 6 in. ; net tonnage, 275 tons ; gross tonnage, 473 tons ; horse-power, 70.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is it registered horse-power or nominal ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Registered.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the rate of insurance ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The ship is to be insured by the Government. I do not know whether insurance has been effected or not ; we have applied for it.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman says the Government will be proportionately liable for the vessel up to the time of abandonment or loss.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have read the terms of the charter party.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) If the vessel is frozen in, will the Government be liable ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We have hired the ship for seven months, from 1st May to 1st December, at a rental of $9,800.

HUDSON'S BAY EXPEDITION—OFFER OF MESSRS. MILBURN & COMPANY.

Mr. DAVIN asked :

1. What was the offer per month of Messrs. Milburn & Company, of England, for the ship "Port Perie" for the expedition to Hudson Bay?
2. Did the offer include the ordinary insurance?
3. What is the length and beam, horse-power and tonnage (net and gross) of the "Port Perie"?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The offer of Messrs. Milburn & Company, was £700 sterling or $3,500 per month. For seven months that would amount to $24,500. The ordinary insurance, namely, £5 5s. 0d. per annum was included, but what risks that would cover is not known. The charterers, however, were to find and to pay the crew, engineers, coals, stores, provisions, and all port charges. The extra insurance, if it could be effected at all, would be about £10 10s. 0d. per cent, or $2,800 for the time occupied. It is not known whether such insurance could be obtained. Net tonnage,

1,928 tons; gross tonnage, 3,109 tons; length, 353 feet; breadth, 39 ft. 4 in.; depth, 27 ft. 5 in.; horse-power, 450.

SEED GRAIN—NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. DAVIN asked:

1. What number of farmers in Manitoba and the North-west owe for seed grain sent them by the Government for use on their farms?
2. What number owe for seed grain as bondsmen for other farmers?
3. How much is owed the Government in the former case? How much in the second?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The chief clerk of the department who has charge of this matter, informs me that the statement cannot be prepared before two or three days, as it involves a large amount of work. I will have to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) to wait until it is prepared.

MAIL CONTRACTS, ANNAPOLIS COUNTY.

Mr. MILLS asked:

Is Lewis A. Dickie a contractor for carrying the mails in Annapolis county? If so, what is his route? When did his contract commence, and by the terms of said contract how long was it to continue? Has said contract been renewed? If so, when was it last renewed, and for how long? Is this contract to be terminated? When and for what reason?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Lewis A. Dickie is contractor for the following mail services in Annapolis county, viz.:—Bridgetown and Dalhousie West, and Bridgetown and Lawrencetown. The Bridgetown and Dalhousie West contract commenced on the 1st October, 1896, and the Bridgetown and Lawrencetown contract on the 1st July, 1896. Both of these contracts were renewals of the former contracts on the same terms and conditions without tenders being invited, and are the usual four years' contracts, terminable on three months' notice. The contract for the Bridgetown and Dalhousie West mail service will be terminated on the 1st August next, as it was represented to the department that if tenders were invited a lower rate would be obtained. The other contract has not yet been considered.

QUEBEC BRIDGE COMPANY.

Mr. DAVIN asked:

Whether the Hon. Mr. Dobell has become a director of the Quebec Bridge Company?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I have to inform my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) that the Hon. Mr. Dobell is not a director of the Quebec Bridge Company.

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Mr. OLIVER asked:

1. What is the number of the officers, of non-commissioned officers and of men at present actually belonging to the North-west Mounted Police Force? 2. How many officers and of non-commissioned officers will be retained after the proposed reduction has been made? 3. On what terms are the officers, the non-commissioned officers and the men, whose services are to be dispensed with, to be retired?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The present strength of the force is: 47 officers, including five surgeons and two veterinary surgeons, and 664 non-commissioned officers, constables and special constables, making a total of 711, all told. In regard to the second and third questions, I have to inform my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) that a scheme is now being perfected to decrease the force without impairing the efficacy of this service. It is not possible to give all the details at the present time, but all the details will be given when the Estimates are being discussed.

THE NEW YORK "SUN."

Mr. MILLS (for Mr. Maclean) asked:

Has the attention of the Postmaster General been called to a scurrilous attack on Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen in the New York "Sun" on Tuesday last, and whether it is the intention of the Postmaster General to allow that journal to circulate through the Canadian mails?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The attention of the department has not been called to the article in question; nor have I myself seen it. I have not the slightest idea of what it contains. I have inquired of Mr. LeSueur, the secretary of the department, who informs me that the department has never yet suppressed any foreign newspaper coming to Canada, simply because it might contain an attack upon any members of the Royal family.

Mr. MILLS. I have the paper here and have just read the article. I may say that it is a most scurrilous attack.

ENQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. FOSTER. In the early part of the session a return was ordered with reference to the commissioners appointed, and their reports, as to partisan officials. It would facilitate matters if we had the return before we proceed with the Estimates.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Orders have been issued to the departments concerned to prepare the return, and I hope to have it at an early date.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

John Gunion Rutherford, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Macdonald, introduced by

the Prime Minister (Mr. Laurier) and by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton).

BRITISH COLUMBIA SALMON.

Mr. MAXWELL moved for :

Copies of all papers, correspondence and telegrams relating to charges made affecting the quality of British Columbia salmon sold in the British market.

He said : In asking for this order, it may not be inappropriate if I call the attention of the House to the charges which have been made on this subject. A great many hon. members know that the salmon industry is one of our principal industries in British Columbia, one in which we British Columbians take considerable pride, in which millions of dollars are invested, and the value of which to the province is worth many millions more. The cannery men of that province have worked hard in order to raise the quality of these fish, and in order to command the British market for their sale ; and, after great perseverance, labour and expense, they hold at the present time the chief position in the British market. Not long ago a startling letter was published in one of the leading newspapers in London to this effect :

THE DANGERS OF FISH FOOD.

To the Editor of the "Globe," London :

Sir,—While in British Columbia last summer, I read a reprint in a Yorkshire paper of an article published by you upon this subject, in which it was suggested that "all tinned fish should be given the go-by." Being at the time in the thick of the salmon-canning industry at Steveston, Fraser River, I was much interested in the statement, and made particular observations of the whole canning process. The recent case of direct poisoning from tinned salmon at Poole induces me to trouble you with a few facts supplementing your advice. I say direct poisoning, because it would probably be impossible to trace the number of deaths due indirectly to the eating of tinned salmon. The large, very large number on record of undoubted poisonings, however, makes the subject of the gravest importance. And as very few but the cannery proprietors and their Chinese coolie employees reap any material pecuniary benefit from the industry, it becomes a duty to endeavour to have the present dangerous and criminal methods of canning immediately abolished. There is ample time before the ensuing canning season to have new and effective measures established, so that no more of these veritable death-traps may be thrust upon the working classes' market. Indeed, the cargoes of last year's pack aboard certain ships shortly expected at Liverpool should be carefully examined officially before being permitted to be sold, and in one instance, at least, I would say on oath, seized and destroyed !

Allow me to state why I make this assertion. At a cannery at Steveston I saw fish received from the fishermen in large and small lots, varying generally from thirty to thirty-five fish, and kept piled upon one another just as thrown in from the boats, for several days, until something like two or three thousand fish were on hand, before cleaning and canning, so as to save the expense of steam, &c. The thermometer is rarely below 70 degrees, and often 90 degrees, Fahr., in the shade during the greater part of the canning season; so that you may imagine the condition of the fish first received, which would be underneath the later lots, at the time of putting into the cans. The Chinamen who gut the fish use the keenest knives, constantly ground and sharpened, but are often unable to make a clean cut or to prevent the flesh tearing away, owing to its rotten state. But however bad the fish is, it is canned. This is the usual state of things, but I have seen at the busiest times so many as 15,000 or 16,000 fish piled up three or four feet high, and the stench arising abominable. When there were such quantities, the fishermen's catches had been supplemented by some thousands which came from the traps near Point Robert, U.S.A., some twenty miles distant, and which were collected by a steamboat about twice a week. The manager of the cannery had an interest in the traps, and sold the fish to the canning company. I saw every lot of trap fish, and not one lot was good on delivery, except the last and smallest lot (about 300 fish), which was received in comparatively cold weather, at the end of the season. I called the manager's attention to the fact of the fish being tinned in a bad state, and he stated that his fish were better than those of any other cannery, although I saw them put into the tins in a putrid condition ; and pushed my finger right through some of the fish before they were cut ! The carbonic acid gas generated in a tin of such fish surely must be deadly !

But no matter how bad the fish may be when put into the tins, no smell arises after the long cooking they get. The tins are soldered up and put into rapidly boiling water and kept boiling hard for an hour, when they are pricked to let out the steam, &c., and immediately resoldered and put into a retort and subjected to a heat twice that of the boiling water for another hour. But if the fish were fresh and good when gutted, there is another element of danger in the method because the fish after gutting are washed in the river water, which, in addition to its normally dirty state and prolific of products of decomposition, is, at the canning season, really shocking from the fish offal, which is all dropped from the canneries into the water through holes made for the purpose in the flooring ; and as every bit of the riparian land at Steveston is occupied by canneries, and eddies obtain all along in front of the buildings, the accumulation of offal which washes up and down and to and fro, makes of the water a breeding pond, so to speak, for bacterial organisms. I was informed by a competent authority that it takes six weeks or two months after the canning is finished for the river to get anything like clear of the offal, a good deal of it remaining to decay. This is the "water" in which all Fraser River salmon is "cleaned" before putting into the tins.

In making and soldering the tins, too, muriatic acid is used in dangerous quantities. If the cannery proprietors were less greedy of profit, this dreadful state of affairs might be abolished, and a fairly wholesome article put upon the market. There is an abundance of pure water easily obtainable from New Westminster, and at small cost, and if Government inspectors were appointed to see that such pure water was used, and none but fresh fish dealt with, and to stamp every tin, the poisoning would be reduced to a minimum. They had, I believe, to adopt some such plan in Newfoundland and Eastern Canada, with regard to barrelling codfish, &c. White men, too, should be employed in place of the Chinese coolies, who are of the filthiest, and handle every

bit of salmon in such manner that I am sure no one who saw the tins packed would ever again voluntarily eat the contents. This year is supposed to be the "big" year for salmon. Every fourth year has hitherto proved the largest, and the present is the fourth from the last "big run." Something should be done beforehand. Last year's pack, on arrival, should be thoroughly overhauled first, as a warning, and all loss to the packers would be richly deserved. The salmon cannery business was in the past exceedingly profitable, so that during the last few years the canneries have trebled in number; but, as a consequence, the fishermen get four or five times as much for their fish, and the competition in business has greatly curtailed the profits; and many proprietors are trying to form companies of their concerns. In a prospectus lately published in this city, it was stated that the daily consumption of salmon in England was not less than 121,370 pounds. Therefore, all the more necessity for Government supervision to prevent the criminality I have attempted to describe.

The cannery I refer to—the name of which I will readily give—and many others also, artfully provide so much as can be against exposure by adopting many brands or labels, all tins containing exactly the same kind of fish and packed in precisely the same way, so that the order of the jury in the Poole case to have all fish of the same brand destroyed was of little good. It is the output of this cannery that I would seize on arrival in England. I should be glad to furnish you with further and comprehensive details relating to the subject, which comprises many features not even touched upon here, and which cannot be adequately dealt with in a letter which, I fear, I have already made far too long, and for which I beg to apologize. Kindly make what use you please of my information.

Your obedient servant,

C. WOOD,

14 Kirkmanshulme Lane, Longsight, Manchester, March 8.

P.S.—Several of the employees in the cannery spoken of were stricken with typhoid fever last summer. One, a fireman, recovered after three or four weeks' serious illness, and another, a watchman, died; both of these were whitemen. I am prepared to swear to the accuracy of the whole of the above.

I think you will agree with me that the charges made by this gentleman in the London press are very serious. They are all the more serious because he claims to have seen every one of these things which he describes. It is difficult to imagine what influence such a letter might have upon the minds of the people, and evidently the intention of the writer was to strike a blow at the salmon industry in British Columbia. It is no surprise to us to find that the "Globe" itself should, in an editorial, speak as follows:—

DEATH IN THE TIN.

The revelations of the canned fish industry, as carried on in British Columbia, are of such a nature as to demand the most searching investigation. Mr. Wood, who frames this indictment, offers, it will be seen, to supply additional evidence should it be required. The charge he brings forward is nothing less than an imputation that enormous quantities of fish are so dealt with as to give them an absolutely poisonous character. Whether this applies to one particular cannery or to all is comparatively of little consequence. The British consumer has no means of discriminating between the different brands; he buys and eats on the assumption that every possible care was taken to tin the fish while fresh and well cleaned. Our correspondent shows that this is not the case: the fish are stacked like hay and corruption sets in long before the canning takes place. Not only that, either, but the cleaning is performed in foul water, full of decaying offal. But we must leave our readers to gather the full details from Mr. Wood's letter; there will be few among its readers but will endorse our opinion that the matter urgently calls for thorough investigation, "without partiality, favour or affection." It is with much regret that we feel called upon to give this warning, calculated as it is to seriously injure a British colony. But the number of deaths traced directly to the consumption of canned fish would render it almost criminal to keep back disclosures which, if found to be true, trace this mysterious mortality to the fountain head. We are quite prepared to receive indignant denials of our correspondent's statements, but something more than that will be required to allay public misgiving.

In another part of England we find an influential paper stating:

The regulations of the canned fish industry, as carried on in British Columbia are of such a nature as to demand the most certain investigations.

And this paper goes on in pretty much the same style as the editorial I read from the "Globe." I need hardly say that, so far as my own personal knowledge in the matter is concerned, this man's letter is a tissue of lies. I have no doubt that the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) will be able to tell us something, not only of what the department has done, but also of the character of the man who made these charges. I have the information myself, but I am sure he has it likewise. I believe our cannery men have a conscience, and pack their fish according to the best and cleanest methods. I have frequently seen them at work, and I never saw anything of all this which Mr. Wood says actually happened. So far as the water itself is concerned, we all know that there is not a purer stream in the world than the Fraser. It is a mass of cold ice water coming from the mountains and rushing on with such impetuosity as to make it comparatively clean. Of course, the banks of the stream are more or less soily, and that colours the water to some extent, but in reality it is comparatively a pure stream. We know likewise that the cannery men have a large share of pure water in the cannery into which they put the fish, and that the fish are also salted before they are put in the tins, so that there is nothing can possibly happen in the canning out there. I may say that this letter caused considerable consternation in British Columbia, and I am sure that the House, and the province of British Columbia in particular, will be glad to know

what the department has done in order to contradict the misstatements of this gentleman in England, and I am sure that the department will leave nothing undone to restore confidence in the public mind with regard to the canned salmon industry of British Columbia.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). There is, of course, no possible objection to bringing down the papers called for. The salmon industry, as we all know, is a most important one and allegations such as those made by Mr. Wood in a leading London journal would be calculated, if not promptly contradicted, to do untold injury to that industry. The first knowledge which the department had of these statements was contained in the following telegram, received on the 11th of March, from the High Commissioner in London :—

C. Wood writes to the paper from Manchester, that at a Steveston factory last year salmon remained days before canning ; saw salmon tinned in putrid condition, and manager stated his fish better than other canneries. Says use river water for washing fish, source of danger from decomposition offal ; that typhoid fever was prevalent, and that muriatic acid used dangerous quantities making soldering tin. Have asked for name factory. Please make inquiries and cable. Statements injurious to trade.

And the next day we received the following telegram :

Wood's letter nominally refers one cannery, Steveston ; but by inference covers canneries generally. Described present methods canning as dangerous, criminal. Says also, no one who saw tins packed, Chinese coolies, would ever again eat contents. Name factory not yet ascertained.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Was that in March of this year ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes. Immediately on receipt of these telegrams I referred them to Commissioner Prince, who has a thorough knowledge of the salmon-packing business, for report.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Who is this Wood ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not know at the time, but I find by the papers that he was a clerk employed by one of these salmon men who had gone to British Columbia, and visited the rivers, and, returning to England, made the statements over his signature. As these statements were published in a very prominent journal, they were calculated to do untold injury to the industry. Commissioner Prince authorized me to forward this cable to London, which I did the same day as Sir Donald Smith's telegram was received :

Professor Prince, Dominion Commissioner Fisheries, who personally inspected British Columbia salmon canneries, and is thoroughly conversant with methods canning there, concurs with local fishery inspector, who is equally well informed about facts, in giving unqualified contradiction to Wood's statements cabled by you respecting salmon pack. Wood's statements are direct variance all other official and other information possessed for years by department. Give fullest publicity this contradiction.

This was signed by myself. I may say that the same evening I received a further cable from the High Commissioner saying that Wood declined to give the name of the factory or write further particulars, though in the letters to "The Globe" he had said he was ready to do so. The cablegram proceeded that Wood is :

Not averse give information and other particulars personally, if his expenses to London paid. Says lost money through improper canning at factory. Hopes to receive information through you from Steveston canneries, supported by fisheries inspector.

My cable crossed this one, and we heard nothing more about the matter until the arrival of the papers from London, when we received from the High Commissioner a letter acknowledging receipt of the cablegram which I had sent, and which I have just read, and going on to state :

On the morning of the 16th instant, a further letter was received from Mr. Wood, a copy of which is inclosed. It was a reply to my letter of the 13th instant, a copy of which accompanied my former letter.

Mr. Colmer took the opportunity of personally seeing the editor of "The Globe," in order that he might be fully aware of the steps that had been taken, so far as possible, to investigate the charges brought forward by Mr. Wood, and show him your telegram. He informed Mr. Colmer that, as Mr. Wood gave his full name and address, he inserted the letter—which he would not have done, had it been written under a nom-de-plume. Mr. Colmer pointed out the injury which might result to an important industry in British Columbia from general charges such as those which had been put forward. At the same time, he remarked that the trade was necessarily one which had been built up on the reputation of the product as a wholesome popular article of food, and that the business could not have developed to anything like its present dimensions, had the canning been carried on according to the methods mentioned by Mr. Wood. Further, that the consumer is not likely to purchase an article that does not commend itself to him, and that any complaint about the food being unwholesome would inevitably lead to a prosecution on the part of the public health authorities. Besides, that neither the retailer nor the merchant would be prepared to accept the loss that would certainly follow, and that the manner in which the business is conducted on this side provides, therefore, the best possible protection for the consumer.

The editor recognized the force of what Mr. Colmer said. It appears, from what he said, that Mr. Wood had mentioned the names of two ships, the "Tercera" and the "Glenogil," in his letter, as having on board some of the salmon to which he specifically referred. The information was not, however, published, for obvious reasons. He promised to insert a letter from Mr. Colmer, and to make some editorial comment in the matter. Inclosed please find cuttings from yesterday's issue of the paper, giving Mr. Colmer's letter and the comments.

On receipt of my cablegram containing Commissioner Prince's unqualified contradiction of Mr. Wood's statements, Mr. Colmer wrote a letter to the "Globe" which I need not read, as I have already given the substance of it. There was also published, about the same time, a letter from Mr. Robert Ward, one of the canners in British Columbia, contradicting the statements. Mr. Wood refused to give the name of the canner, which he had promised to give, and, ultimately, proceedings were taken against him in the criminal court by one of the canning companies called the Federation Salmon Canning Company, charging him with an offence under the Libel Act. He was brought up before Mr. Headlam, the commissioner in the police court, and, after some evidence had been given, he expressed regret for what he had done, and undertook not to publish any more statements of the character complained of. And so the matter dropped.

The statements made, as my hon. friend (Mr. Maxwell) says, if permitted to go unchallenged and uncontradicted, might, and probably would, have caused great injury to this important branch of industry. I am happy to say, however, that whatever injury might have been effected by Mr. Wood, if his statements had gone uncontradicted, were more than neutralized by the cablegrams from this side and the letter of Mr. Robert Ward. There is a large number of other papers which I will be happy to bring down, according to my hon. friend's motion, which will prove interesting to those who desire to follow the matter further. I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Maxwell), however, that notwithstanding the unqualified contradictions which have been given by the officials of the department, and by Mr. Ward, and others, there are still people in British Columbia who persist in asserting that there may be a modicum of truth in some of the statements which Mr. Wood made. I merely make that statement for the purpose of warning my hon. friend that there are those in British Columbia, I fear, who are supplying Mr. Wood with many of the statements he published. The papers, when they are brought down, if he reads them, will show that to him. I repeat today what I stated a day or two ago, that in a short time Mr. Prince will go to British Columbia and remain for the larger part of the canning season, for the purpose of making a personal inspection of the fishing business and of the manner in which the fish are canned, so that he may be enabled to speak authoritatively and beyond doubt from personal knowledge as to this industry. I hold in my hand a memorandum, which I need not read, from Mr. Prince, speaking of the personal investigation he made some years ago. So far as he is concerned, he entertains the highest opinion of the skill and knowledge brought to bear by the British Columbia canners in putting up the salmon product. He seems to think that they are far ahead of the canners of the maritime provinces, and of the canners in the adjoining American territory. He fears that the Americans who can in the Sound, a few miles south of British Columbia, owing to the fact that the quality of their fish and the manner of their preparing it for market are not so high as the character and quality of the British Columbia salmon, are accustomed to label their salmon with British Columbia labels, and that possibly in that way some English consumers of this valuable food product may, at times, be led astray. I may say, that this matter is also one which will receive a very strict investigation at the hands of Mr. Commissioner Prince when he goes to British Columbia in a short time. The industry is an enormous one, the value of it runs up in the millions, and it behooves the department, of course, of which I am the head, not to slacken in its efforts to have the industry placed upon the best possible footing so that there shall not be left the shadow of a doubt in the minds of any of the great buyers or consumers in England, of the nutritious and honest character of the salmon which is put up for sale on the London market.

Motion agreed to.

NORTH PEROTT POST OFFICE.

Mr. MILLS moved for:

Copies of all petitions, letters, notices, bonds, papers and documents in relation to the establishment of a post office in the county of Annapolis, called "North Perott," and the appointment of Mr. Alfred Spurr to the postmastership of said office.

He said: I move for an Order of the House for the papers according to this motion, because I was not satisfied with the answer that I received from the hon. the Postmaster General to the question I put to him on April 5th. The answer was so inconsistent with my knowledge of the facts with reference to that post office at North Perott, that I deemed it my duty to call for the papers, for there may be, perchance, some papers on file that may have been overlooked by the Postmaster General. My knowledge of the affair is this: The people of North Perott, time and again, asked, by petitions and by letters, for better postal accommodation at North Perott. Those petitions, those letters and those desires were duly placed before the Government of that day, and I received a notice from the department in the regular way calling upon me to make a recommendation for the Postmaster General for the new post office to be called North Perott. I recommended for that post Mr. Alfred Spurr. I am informed by Mr. Alfred Spurr that he received a notification from the Post Office Department asking him to enter into the obligations required for the execution of a bond, and he did execute a bond, and gave two bondsmen, James A. Spurr and George E.

Corbett; and this bond was sent to the Post Office Department. Now, notwithstanding these things having been accomplished, I am still informed by the Postmaster General that there has been no office established at North Perott. If the department has seen fit to take no notice of this postmaster, Alfred Spurr, and have come to the conclusion, perhaps, that the bondsmen were no good, or something of that sort, it may be that they have an excuse for abolishing the office. Surely the desire of the people should be considered by the Postmaster General, and I think that if the Postmaster General reconsiders this, he will go on and establish a post office at North Perott. It is a settlement that requires better postal accommodation; the people ask for it, the people desire it, and the people should have it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). From the memorandum furnished me by the secretary—I did not have the handling of the records myself—the position of the matter in connection with the North Perott post office, is as follows:—That a nomination has been made for a postmaster for the proposed office at North Perott, and another nomination was made. The office was offered to the nominee, who declined it, and since then no further action has been taken towards opening an office. The inspector reported that the prospective revenue of this office would be about $15, and the salary of the postmaster would about absorb the most of that revenue. I have no objection whatever to the order.

Motion agreed to.

VIRGINIA POST OFFICE, N.S.

Mr. MILLS moved for:

Copies of all petitions, letters, notices, correspondence, bonds and papers in relation to the establishment of a post office in the county of Annapolis, called "Virginia," and the appointment of Mr. Ezekiel Banks as postmaster for such office.

He said: The remarks that I made with reference to the proposed post office at North Perott may also apply here. On April 5th, I asked:

"1. Was there ever a post office established in the county of Annapolis, N.S., called 'Virginia'?

"2. Was Ezekiel Banks made postmaster of that office?

"3. Is there such a post office now or such a postmaster?

"4. If not, why not?"

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (for the Postmaster General). There has not been a post office established in the county of Annapolis, N.S., under the name of "Virginia."

Now the facts, according to my personal knowledge of the case, are these: There were petitions, letters, and requests of different kinds, from the people of the settlement of Virginia, a rising settlement in the back country of Annapolis county. They held a meeting of the settlement and appointed a chairman, and Mr. David M. Wright was appointed secretary. At that meeting it was voted unanimously:

That we require a mail twice a week; also voted that the post office be at or near John B. Coombs. Voted that the mail days be requested to be Wednesdays and Saturdays.

Signed, DAVID M. WRIGHT, Sec.

These matters were placed before the Government by myself, and I received a notice from the Government that such a post office had been established called Virginia, and I recommended that Mr. Ezekiel Banks be appointed postmaster. This Ezekiel Banks filed his bonds and entered upon his duties, and received the mail for fourteen weeks, coming from Clement's Vale to Virginia, and that mail was carried by one Alfred Brown. But after the present Government came into power he ceased to be postmaster, and naturally considers that he has been badly used in the matter, as well as the entire people of that district. They desire postal accommodation; they are four or five miles away from the post office, some of them six miles. Although it is not a very large settlement, still there are hundreds of post offices throughout the country in just such places, and the wants of these people should be attended to in some manner as well as of people living in cities. I would therefore ask the Postmaster General to take this matter into his consideration and establish that post office at Virginia; and if he does not see fit to appoint a man at my recommendation, let him appoint somebody else at somebody else's recommendation. I do not care so long as there is a post office established there. Let the recommendation for postmaster come from the Attorney General of Nova Scotia or Hon. W. H. Ray. I do not care so long as the people of Virginia receive postal accommodation. I call the attention of the Postmaster General to the fact that Alfred Brown actually carried the mails between Clementsport and Clement's Vale for fourteen weeks, and has not received one cent of payment. This matter should be taken into consideration. The work having been done, the man should be paid.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). There is no objection to the Order of the House moved for. I am instructed by the department that the proposed post office would be within about two miles of an existing post office; that the revenue is estimated at about $15 a year; that there would be expense in carrying the mails from the terminus of the existing railroad to this post office; that there would also be expenses in connection with the salary of the postmaster. My hon. friend seems to think that because notice has been sent deciding to establish a post office, that such estab-

lishes a post office. I presume when the department used the word "established." and says a post office has been established, it means that a post has been fully equipped not only as regards the department at Ottawa, but that a postmaster has been installed in the office, and that the office has been duly gazetted as a place for receiving Her Majesty's mails. It is in that sense, I presume, that the department furnished me with the information that the post office had not been established.

Mr. MILLS. This man E. Banks actually received the mails for fourteen weeks, and the mails were carried by Alfred Brown for that time.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It may be so. Those might all be preliminary arrangements with the view to establishing an office there. That is the only explanation I can give. However, all the papers will be produced and the hon. gentleman will then see exactly what is the legal position of the matter.

Motion agreed to.

POSTMASTER AT ANNAPOLIS, N.S.

Mr. MILLS moved for:

Copies of all letters, telegrams, papers and correspondence in relation to the resignation of Mr. Arthur W. Corbitt, as postmaster of Annapolis Royal, N.S.; the appointment of Mr. Henry A. West; the dismissal of said Henry A. West, and the appointment of Mr. George Andrew Hardwick to said office.

He said: On April 7th of the present session I asked the following question of the hon. Postmaster General:

1. When was H. A. West appointed postmaster of the town of Annapolis Royal, Nova Scotia?
2. Has the said H. A. West been dismissed from the said position? If so, when?
3. Was any complaint preferred against the said H. A. West of malfeasance in office or offensive partisanship? If so, by whom?
4. If any complaint was made, was the said H. A. West apprised of such complaint, and was any investigation held? If so, by whom?
5. If said H. A. West has been dismissed and no complaint made, why has he been dismissed?

The Postmaster General replied as follows:—

After the defeat of the late Government, but whilst they were still in office, it was represented to the then Postmaster General, the Hon. Mr. Taillon, that Mr. A. H. Corbitt, the then postmaster at Annapolis, was prepared to resign his office on condition that Mr. H. A. West was appointed in his stead, such representation being contained in a certain telegram dated the 27th June, 1896, sent by John B. Mills, M.P., to Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, then Solicitor General, in the following words:—

"Annapolis, N.S., 27th June, 1896.

"Annapolis postmaster, Corbitt, will resign, if Harry A. West can be appointed in his stead. Do this if possible. Important. They won't disturb West. I have resignation for Ottawa.

"(Sgd.) JOHN B. MILLS."

Such representation was then communicated to the late Postmaster General by a letter dated 29th June, 1896, from the said Sir C. H. Tupper, by letter in the following words:—

"June 29th, 1896.

"My dear Mr. Taillon,—Pray initial inclosed papers, and ask Colonel White to put them through. Corbitt resigns, and Mills of Annapolis recommends Harry A. West as successor.

"Yours sincerely,

"(Sgd.) CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

"To Hon. L. A. Taillon, Postmaster General."

Thereupon the Hon. Mr. Taillon did, on the 29th of June, 1896, six days after the defeat of his Government, appoint Mr. West to said office. That it having been brought to the knowledge of the present Government that Mr. Corbitt's resignation was not unconditional, but was only given in consideration of the office being given to Mr. West, and it appearing that such action came within the spirit of section 137 of the Criminal Code, which declares that every one is guilty of an indictable offence who sells or agrees to sell his resignation of any office or any consent to an appointment or resignation, or agrees to receive any reward from the sale thereof, the Government deemed it their duty to vacate an appointment made to fill the vacancy thus improperly brought about, the making of which vacancy under which circumstances, appears to come within the class of evils sought to be remedied by the Criminal Code. Hence Mr. West's appointment was cancelled.

That answer, I may say here, if made beyond the walls of this House, would have been followed by a libel suit, because the information before them, based entirely upon a telegram sent by myself to Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, that "Corbitt will resign if Harry A. West is appointed in his stead," could not be strained by any legal ability or acumen so as to bring the case within the Criminal Code. But in order to accomplish their own desires in this matter, they did so strain it, and said it came within the Criminal Code, and hence this appointment must be cancelled. If any hon. member will look at the telegram he will see the fact was that I held Corbitt's resignation in my hand when I sent the message. I have not seen the papers in the department, but I know what they contain. Corbitt's resignation was unconditional, and that telegram was sent five or ten minutes before I boarded the train on 27th June, 1896, at which time I held Corbitt's unqualified and unconditional resignation in my hands. So there was no qualification and no condition as regards Corbitt's resignation. But this Government, composed of no less than ten lawyers, has come to the conclusion that this action comes within the Criminal Code of Canada, and hence this man West must be punished, because forsooth on this paltry evidence it is considered by them that this man has done something which is covered by the Criminal Code. What are the facts with respect to this mattter? They are these. On June 27th, 1896, Corbitt placed his resignation in my hands. The Government having been defeated, I

did not at that time deem it desirable that I should suggest a good Conservative for the appointment, for I knew that as soon as the Conservative Government resigned, he would be turned out of office. But, if we were to have a Liberal, if we were to have a Grit, I was going to have a respectable one, and I suggested the name of Harry A. West, a man who had always opposed me, a man who had not only voted against me, but had subscribed to the Liberal funds to my own certain knowledge, not only in the last election but in the election before. Therefore, I recommended that Harry A. West should have that appointment, and the notice of his appointment came to Mr. West on the 29th June, 1896, in the following words :—

Post Office Department, Canada,
Ottawa, 29th June, 1896.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that you have been recommended to the Postmaster General as a fit and proper person to be appointed to the postmastership of Annapolis, in the electoral county of Annapolis, in the province of Nova Scotia, and Dominion of Canada, and that, if you are prepared to furnish the necessary security, your appointment to that office will take place in due course.

The inspector of the Halifax division, Mr. Macdonald, will furnish you with all necessary instructions in regard to the security required.

It will be further required that you and any person whom you may desire to employ as assistant, shall, in conformity with the Post Office Act, before entering any post office duty, subscribe to the oath (or declaration) of office, and shall also take the oath (or affirmation) of allegiance, in accordance with the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1886, Chap. 112, with which you will be supplied by the inspector.

I am, sir, your very obedient servant,
WM. WHITE,
Deputy Postmaster General.

To Mr. Henry A. West, Annapolis, N.S.

A letter from the inspector was also forwarded to Mr. West, calling upon him to furnish bonds to the extent of $1,000. The letter from the inspector was as follows :—

Post Office Inspector's Office,
Halifax, 1st July, 1896.

Sir,—I inclose herewith notification of your appointment to the postmastership of Annapolis.

You will be required to furnish a guarantee company's bond to the amount of $1,000. I inclose herewith forms of application to the recognized companies, one of which you will please select, fill and return to me as soon as possible. The amount of the annual premium will be $4, which sum you will please remit to me.

The inclosed oaths must be taken by yourself and your proposed assistant, and returned to me.

On completion of the necessary preliminaries, the office will be transferred to your charge.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
CHS. J. MACDONALD.
Inspector.

Mr. Henry A. West, Annapolis.

That letter was handed to Mr. West on the 1st of July, 1896. Mr. West complied with the provisions ; he furnished his bonds, his assistants took the oath ; he had two assistants in that post office which was not a $15 post office, but which was a post office in the town of Annapolis Royal, one of the most important post offices in the western portion of Nova Scotia. The order of the transfer of the post office from the late Postmaster Corbitt was also given to Postmaster West. Then, when the Conservative Government resigned there was a confirmation of this appointment. It was always recognized that Mr. West was a good Liberal, and except in the minds of a clique in Annapolis town, it was not in the mind of any one but that the appointment was a good one. Mr. West was an honest and respectable man ; there was not a more respectable man in the western portion of Nova Scotia.

An hon. MEMBER. Notwithstanding that he was a Grit.

Mr. MILLS. Notwithstanding that he was a Grit, as my hon. friend says. There are a great many just such men in Annapolis county who are personal friends of mine. After the present Government came into power Mr. West received the following letter, dated Ottawa, 24th August, 1896 :—

Letter of Appointment to Postmastership.

Post Office Department, Canada,
Ottawa, 24th August, 1896.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that the Postmaster General has been pleased to appoint you to be postmaster of Annapolis, in the electoral county of Annapolis, in the province of Nova Scotia, and Dominion of Canada.

You are, therefore, hereby authorized to exercise all the functions and discharge all the duties appertaining to the said office, according to law.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
WM. WHITE,
Deputy Postmaster General.

Mr. Henry A. West, Annapolis, N.S.

This letter has, what we in law consider to be of more weighty significance, namely, it has the seal of the Post Office Department attached thereto. Mr. West entered fully upon his duties. He had two young men there employed, and everything passed off without a whimper or a word : not a sign was given to him that he was to be dismissed ; no charge was made against him of malfeasance in office, nor of partisanship, nor charge of any kind whatever. But behold, on 18th January, 1897, the first intimation he ever got of any change in his circumstances was the following letter :—

Post Office Inspector's Office,
Halifax, January 18th, 1897.

Sir,—I beg to inform you that the Postmaster General has decided to cancel your appointment as postmaster of Annapolis, and has instructed me to transfer your office at an early date to the charge of Mr. G. Andrew Hardwick.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
CHARLES J. MACDONALD,
Post Office Inspector.

Mr. H. A. West, Postmaster, Annapolis.

That was the first intimation Mr. West had of any change being made in his position as postmaster of Annapolis. As a reply to that letter, Mr. West wrote as follows to the Postmaster General :—

Annapolis, N.S., 19th January, 1897.

The Hon. W. Mulock,
Postmaster General, Ottawa.

Sir,—I am to-day in receipt of a letter from Mr. Macdonald, post office inspector for this division, informing me that he had instructions from you to cancel my appointment as postmaster for Annapolis.

I must say, to be summarily dismissed in this manner is most unexpected, and, in justice to myself and family, I beg to ask for an explanation, for up to the present moment no charge whatever has been brought against me, and I am completely at a loss to know the cause of my dismissal.

I hold a confirmation of my appointment from yourself, and surely, unless some cause is given, it will certainly be a piece of gross injustice to be thrown overboard in this way, and I would respectfully ask you to reconsider your decision until an investigation is made. My father had always been an active Liberal up to his death last year, as my friend Judge Forbes, of Halifax, can inform you, and never asked nor received a Government favour during his lifetime, and I am as strong a Liberal as he was, and the party has always received my support and assistance. I feel positive I have been in some way misrepresented by some one, and I trust you will, in justice to myself, investigate the matter before proceeding further, and if no charge is substantiated, I would ask you to kindly rescind the order for dismissal.

Your obedient servant,
H. A. WEST,
Postmaster.

The Mr. Forbes referred to in this letter is Mr. Frank Forbes, ex-M.P. for Queen's. In reply to that letter, Mr. West received the following :—

Post Office Department, Canada,
Ottawa, 23rd January, 1897.

Sir,—I am directed to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 19th instant, requesting to be informed of the reasons for your removal from the postmastership of Annapolis ; and in reply, am to inform you, that upon full consideration of the circumstances under which you were appointed to the Annapolis office in the month of June last, from which it was apparent that Mr. Corbitt, the former postmaster was induced to resign by the promise that you should succeed him, the Postmaster General decided to cancel your appointment.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
W. D. LeSUEUR.

H. A. West, Esq., Annapolis, N.S.

Now, what information had the Government, or what information had they, that :

It was apparent that Mr. Corbitt, the former postmaster, was induced to resign by the promise that you should succeed him.

Is there a scintilla of evidence before us ? If there is I want the Postmaster General to show it or the Government to show it. If they base their evidence on that telegram, it does not amount to a snap of your finger for, when I sent that telegram, I sent it in haste, about five minutes before I stepped on the train on my way to Ottawa on a very important mission for myself, when I would not be very particular what sort of telegram I would send. However, it was sent, but I had in my hand at the time the unqualified and unconditional resignation of Mr. Corbitt. If an investigation had been held, there would have come out what I will now read to the House. I will give the solemn declarations of both Mr. Corbitt and Mr. West in reference to the matter, and these men are well known in the county of Annapolis as highly respectable and reputable men, who would not put in a solemn declaration statements that are not true. This is the declaration of the late postmaster, Arthur W. Corbitt, giving his reasons for resigning :

I, Arthur W. Corbitt, of Annapolis Royal, in the county of Annapolis, gentleman, do solemnly declare, that I was postmaster for the town of Annapolis Royal for about fifteen years previous to the month of July, 1896. That in said month of July, 1896, I resigned said office, and Henry A. West was appointed in my place. There was no collusion between said Henry A. West and myself with regard to my resignation of or his accepting said office, and there was no consideration of any kind for my said resignation, nor have I received any consideration or any agreement for any consideration from any person whomsoever.

Owing to the fact that I was becoming advanced in years, I had for some time had in contemplation the resignation of said office ; and I resigned said office on account of my age, as aforesaid, and not otherwise.

I never, directly or indirectly, sold or agreed to sell my resignation of said office, or my consent to such resignation, or received or agreed to receive any reward or profit from the sale thereof.

I never, directly or indirectly, received or agreed to receive any reward or profit for any interest, request or negotiation about said office, nor under pretense of using such interest did I make any such request, nor was I concerned in any such negotiation, nor did I solicit, recommend or negotiate in any manner as to any appointment or to my resignation of said office, in expectation of any reward or profit.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of "The Canada Evidence Act, 1893."

ARTHUR W. CORBITT.

Declared before me, at Annapolis Royal, in the county of Annapolis, and province of Nova Scotia, this 15th day of April, A.D. 1897.

HENRY DWIGHT RUGGLES,
Notary Public for Nova Scotia.

Mr. Corbitt is long past the allotted term of three-score years and ten. I have also the solemn declaration of Henry A. West :

I, Henry A. West, of Annapolis Royal, in the county of Annapolis, merchant, do solemnly declare, that I was appointed postmaster for the town of Annapolis Royal, and took charge of said office on the fifteenth day of July, 1896. Said appointment was confirmed by the present Do-

minion Government under instrument or writing dated August 24th, 1896, signed by William White, Deputy Postmaster General, and bearing the seal of the Post Office Department of Canada. In the month of January, 1897, I received notice in writing from Charles J. Macdonald, post office inspector for Nova Scotia, that my said appointment had been cancelled by the Postmaster General, and that the office would be transferred at an early day to Mr. G. Andrew Hardwick; which said transfer was made February 1st, 1897. I had received no intimation previous to said notice from said C. J. Macdonald, of any charge against me, and no reason was given in said notice for my said dismissal.

There was no collusion between said A. W. Corbitt, the late postmaster at Annapolis, and myself with regard to his resigning and my accepting said office, and no consideration of any kind for his said resignation, nor has said A. W. Corbitt received from me any consideration or any agreement for any consideration of such resignation.

I never, directly or indirectly, purchased or gave any reward or profit for the purchase of the resignation of said office by said A. W. Corbitt, nor for his consent to such resignation, nor did I agree or promise so to do, to any person whomsoever.

I never, directly or indirectly, gave or procured to be given any profit or reward, or made or procured to be made any agreement for the giving of any profit or reward, for any interest, request or negotiation about said office, to any person whomsoever.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of "The Canada Evidence Act, 1893."

HENRY A. WEST.

Declared before me, at Annapolis Royal, in the county of Annapolis, and province of Nova Scotia, this 15th day of April, A.D. 1897.

HENRY DWIGHT RUGGLES,
Notary Public for Nova Scotia.

I may further state that I have not spoken to Postmaster Corbitt since the year 1891; I have had no communication with him with reference to this matter. He resigned his office, it was given to me to recommend an appointment, and I recommended the very best Liberal I could find—Mr. Henry A. West. The appointment of Mr. West, however, did not suit. Pressure was brought to bear upon the Hon. Attorney General Longley, if the truth is to be given to this House—pressure from a clique in Annapolis town. He was asked: "Use your influence to put West out; West was appointed by Mills, and that very fact is sufficient to justify you in putting him out and puttting in our man, Mr. George Andrew Hardwick." So Mr. Longley used his influence with the Government. He boasted on the 27th of June, the very day I left Annapolis and sent that telegram, on the court-house steps of Annapolis, that the people of Annapolis had made a great mistake in not sending him to represent them, as they would then have had a very important Minister to represent the county of Annapolis. If the truth were known, Mr. Longley was thoroughly disgruntled with the people at Ottawa for throwing him overboard. To give his own language, he said: "I have shaken the tree, and the Finance Minister has picked up the plums." Mr. Longley had to be appeased in some manner, and the Government took this method of appeasing him. I do not care how many lawyers there are in the Government, I say that any man who can say that the evidence before the Government can bring this case within the Criminal Code of Canada, is no longer fit to be a lawyer; yet the Postmaster General, who is a lawyer, says the Government have come to the conclusion that it comes within the Criminal Code of Canada. The Government have for Minister of Justice Sir Oliver Mowat, an eminent man. I do not believe that Sir Oliver Mowat has come to that conclusion, and I do not believe there is a lawyer in existence who will take the evidence as placed before this Government, and will honestly and conscientiously say that this case comes within the Criminal Code of Canada. Taking the evidence with which I supplemented this case, the whole matter is perfectly absurd. It is a disgrace, a blot upon the Government, to treat a man in the way Henry A. West has been treated. The practice in which the present Cabinet Ministers appear to glory is to strain themselves to discover and then condemn and punish without a hearing, as they have done in this case.

What has taken place within the knowledge of all of us? Mr. Francis G. Forbes was returned from Queen's County a member of this Parliament on the 23rd of June. He vacated his seat by taking the office of tide-waiter. He accepted the office of tide-waiter or some other such office in Prince Edward Island in order to make way for the present Finance Minister. He afterwards resigned that office and was appointed County Court Judge in Nova Scotia. One of our leading journals at the time, in noticing this shuffle, did not say much of Mr. Forbes's capabilities as a judge in law, but emphatically affirmed that he was a good judge of an opportunity. Then, again, what have we in New Brunswick? We have Mr. King, who was returned a member of Parliament for one of the constituencies in New Brunswick, voiding his seat by accepting the position of postmaster. What for? It was in order that he might afterwards become a senator, and he is now senator at Ottawa. Then, what was the case of the late-lamented Senator Béchard? He resigned: Mr. Tarte sits in his place, and Mr. Béchard was made a senator. Then there was Mr. Devlin, who also resigned and was afterwards appointed to a lucrative position in Ireland. Will any one say that these people did not know what their reward was going to be before they resigned? Will any one tell me that Mr. Francis G. Forbes, when he resigned, did not know that he was booked for a betterment? No one who knows the man will say that such was the case.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I say so.

Mr. MILLS. Of course, I have to accept the hon. gentleman's affirmation. Does he say that Mr. Forbes did not know ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman may possibly understand what was running in Mr. Forbes's mind, but I have considerable doubts of his statement even though it comes from the present Finance Minister.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Did Mr. McKeen know ?

Mr. MILLS. I do not know. I am only putting the facts before the House, and people may draw their own conclusions. I say this, that if the Government came to the conclusion that there was collusion between ex-Postmaster Corbitt and ex-Postmaster West, we have infinitely more reason for concluding that there was collusion in these matters of Mr. King and Mr. Forbes and Mr. Béchard and Mr. Devlin, and that they came within the Criminal Code of Canada. It is more logical for any lawyer to say that these cases came within the Criminal Code of Canada than to say that the matter of ex-Postmaster Corbitt and ex-Postmaster West did so. That is what I submit, and I simply put the facts before the people, and let the people judge for themselves. I do not pretend to say what was in the mind of this man or the other, but simply state the facts. I know Mr. Forbes well enough to know perfectly well that he would never have resigned his position as member of Parliament for Queen's County unless he was convinced that he was booked for a betterment.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What would you think of Mr. McKeen ? Tell us that. You know him pretty well.

Mr. MILLS. As I have said before, the hon. Postmaster General referred to the criminal law, he even went so far as to give us the section, in his reply to my question, and the section, section 137, reads as follows :—

> Every one is guilty of an indictable offence who directly or indirectly—
>
> (a) sells or agrees to sell any appointment or resignation, or receives or agrees to receive any reward or profits from the sale thereof ;
>
> (b) or purchases or gives any reward or profit for the purchase of any such appointment, resignation or consent, or agrees or promises to do so.

The hon. Postmaster General, in answering my question, quoted those two subsections A and B, which shows that he had looked in to the matter and placed upon record his opinion. I must confess that I have not much respect for the law of the hon. Postmaster General ; I must confess that I have not much respect for his legal knowledge if that is a sample of it. There is not a lawyer in Canada who will take the evidence of that telegram, or anything else they may have, unless it was an affidavit of lies—and if so, they must bring down the affidavits here in reply to this motion—who will come to the same conclusion. The hon. First Minister said that no one would be dismissed from office without an investigation unless it had come to the knowledge of the Minister that he was guilty of undue partisanship. If it has come to the personal knowledge of the Minister in this case, how has it come to his knowledge what has come ? The only thing we have in the House that has come to his personal knowledge is the telegram I sent, which shows, upon the face of it, that I held at that moment the resignation of Mr. Corbitt in my hands. I have not seen the papers, but I know that the resignation was an unqualified one, and as I have not spoken to Mr. Corbitt since 1891, there could never have been between him and me any reference to that matter. He resigned and I was called upon to make the appointment, and I made it. I appointed the best, the most respectable Liberal I could find in Annapolis to that office, and he has been turned out without an investigation. He held the office for a few months, no doubt believing he would hold it for life, or for a reasonable time, at all events, and he went so far as to make his family, and other, arrangements for carrying on the office. He engaged assistants, the young men were there. Now where are they ? They are out of the country altogether, in the United States seeking for other employment.

Now, if ever there was a case where tyranny has been exercised, this is that case. If ever there was a case in which the action of the Government should be condemned by the people, this is that case. Wherever this case is known in Annapolis county, the action of the Government is being condemned, except by a few personal enemies of the parties concerned—and every one has his personal enemies. It should be condemned by every right-thinking Liberal in this House : and I know I am looking into the eyes of dozens before me who, hearing these facts, if we could get at their inner consciences, would be found to condemn it, as it should be condemned.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there no defence ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). If the hon. gentleman desires me to speak on the question, I will.

Mr. FOSTER. I love to hear the hon. gentleman speak.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Speaker, the facts connected with this matter as appearing on record, perhaps should not be interpreted in the light of events that happened last June. But these events, while not, perhaps, material in connection with the formal act of dismissal, are not irrelevant to the matter in hand. The Government that preceded the present Administration was defeated at the polls on the 23rd of June last. Mr. Corbitt, the post-

master at Annapolis, so far as anything that appears in the department shows, had no intention of resigning that office until after that defeat. The first communication on record is one from the hon. gentleman from Annapolis (Mr. Mills) in the form of a telegram to the then Solicitor General (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), offering the conditional resignation in question. My hon. friend (Mr. Mills) explains that in case he should have misstated the case there were, at the time, disturbing and pleasing circumstances more important at the moment to him, more pleasant, and therefore, very properly, more fully engaged his mind. If the hon. gentleman did not fully state the position of the matter, the mistake, of course, is his. He states that his nominee was a good Liberal. I am not aware that the Liberal party transferred the patronage of the riding to the hon. gentleman who made this motion. I am not aware that the person recommended by him was the choice of the Liberal party. There is a circumstance, perhaps, not connected with the matter, but yet it might go to indicate that the appointment of the Liberal in question was hardly made because he was a Liberal in politics. I am told that it is the advantage of the hon. gentleman who made this motion that he is not altogether a stranger to his nominee, Mr. West. I am told—it may be a mere coincidence—that Mr. West is a son-in-law of Postmaster Corbitt. I am told that the hon. gentleman who made this motion is likewise a son-in-law of Postmaster Corbitt, and that therefore Mr. West and the hon. gentleman who made this motion are what are commonly known as brothers-in-law. And so, perhaps, the desire to benefit a member of the Liberal party was not the dominant object of my hon. friend in telegraphing on the 27th of June to push through in all haste the appointment of his Liberal friend. Perhaps what he urged was more particularly the appointment of his brother-in-law, thinking that his brother-in-law being a Liberal, the Liberal party would not disturb him in the office. I think that we can cast aside this reference to the Liberal party by the hon. gentleman who made this motion. If they desired to have a representative in office they would probably choose a mouthpiece of their own; they will, at all events, when they have to deal with the Liberal Administration which is now in office here. Now, my hon. friend has proceeded to read affidavits and make statements concerning matters of which we have no record of any form in the department. The department has on record a telegram from the hon. gentleman himself, not an unconditional resignation of Mr. Corbitt, I presume—I have not had a chance to overhaul the papers to see if there is not an unqualified resignation. But when the hon. gentleman proceeds to say that he had an unqualified resignation in his possession, I ask him why he did not send up that unqualified resignation without qualifying it himself. Why did he hold on to the unqualified resignation, and send instead thereof a telegram in the following words:—

Annapolis, N.S., 27th June, 1897.

Annapolis postmaster, Corbitt, will resign, if Harry A. West can be appointed in his stead.

Where is the unconditional resignation in this telegram?

Mr. HUGHES. That telegram was not sent to the department.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It was sent to the Solicitor General and the Solicitor General transmitted it to the Postmaster General with the request that he would act upon it. The telegram proceeds:

Do this if possible. Important. They won't disturb West. I have resignation for Ottawa.

(Sgd.) JOHN B. MILLS.

How is it, if this postmaster intended to resign unconditionally, he did not send his resignation in the regular way, instead of placing it in the hands of a representative of the party that had been defeated at the polls? The resignation in the telegram carries the qualification that it is only to be used in the event of the Government being parties to the deal and appointing the son-in-law of the person who holds the office. A straight bargain is to be made with the Government, a direct bargain and sale between the Government and the former postmaster. That is what is on record, unless the hon. gentleman discredits his telegram and says it never had an existence in fact. I have the original papers here, and here is the telegram to Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper in the very words I gave in my answer to the question that was asked me. And attached to the telegram is Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper's letter in the following words:

June 29th, 1896.

My dear Mr. Taillon,—Pray initial inclosed papers, and ask Colonel White to put them through. Corbitt resigns, and Mills of Annapolis recommends Harry A. West as successor.

Yours sincerely

(Sgd.) CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

To Hon. L. A. Taillon, Postmaster General.

The "inclosed papers" referred to consist of the telegram from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills). In the margin of this letter of Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, are the initials of Mr. Taillon, which means, according to the practice of the department, the appointment of the person named in the letter. So that there we have the Government in possession of these two documents, and two documents only, the telegram from the gentleman giving this unconditional resignation, the direct transmission of that telegram by a member of the late Government to his colleagues, and the action of the late Postmaster General on those papers, acting

upon that supposed deal and transferring the office to the nominee Mr. West. Sir, there was a direct bargain and sale of an office. The resignation was not an unconditional one; it was a simple conditional resignation upon the consideration of the son-in-law getting the office instead of the father-in-law. All this matter that my hon. friend reads is entirely off the record. We have no knowledge of it, it is not binding. He may introduce extraneous matter now, but the plain fact remains that the late Government, acting upon this telegram, was proposing this improper deal. Now, my hon. friend refers to the Criminal Code. I did not proceed upon my own opinion. I did not proceed upon my own construction of the law. The Criminal Code that refers to such matters, is as follows:—

Every one is guilty of an indictable offence who directly or indirectly sells or agrees to sell any appointment to or resignation of any office.

Now, leaving out that part of the section which does not apply, the clause reads: Every one is guilty of an indictable offence who directly or indirectly sells a resignation or on office. The selling of the office is giving the office to another man for a consideration, a valuable consideration.

Mr. POWELL. That is a new version of the law.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It may be a new version of the law, but one of the highest legal authorities in this country, at all events, has expressed his opinion that this transaction was contrary to the spirit of that section.

Mr. POWELL. Who is he?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Sir Oliver Mowat. I did not take action myself, on my own responsibility, nevertheless I would not have hesitated to do so. I submit that the transaction, quite apart from the circumstances, was one that should not have been allowed to stand, it was not a resignation in ordinary course. I will admit for the sake of argument, that a defeated Government may carry on the Queen's business, by appointing in the regular course; but that is a wholly different thing to creating a vacancy after the defeat of the Government in order that the defeated Government may exercise patronage. In this case there was an attempt to forestall the duly constituted Government that was about to be called in, there was an attempt to anticipate their duties. There was no necessity for this resignation so far as appears of record, but the whole transaction was an attempt to make use of the powers of a defeated Government, of a moribund Government, and if they had had any regard for the propriety of the situation, they would not have been parties to that improper deal. It was an improper transaction, so far as appears of record, in all these lights. It was an improper transaction for an hon. gentleman to be mixed up in this supposed deal; it is an improper thing for him to stand up in this House and profess that he was choosing a good Liberal to represent the Liberal party, when he knew full well that he was recommending a person who had, as a relative, at all events, so far as this Conservative nominator is concerned, much higher claims than as representative of the Liberal party. When did the hon. gentleman become so in love with the Liberal party that he picks out a Liberal in his riding and asks the Government to place him in office? Sir, commencing with that one wrong, that one improper act, the transaction is tainted with impropriety from that time until its conclusion, and the only time there was any purification or redemption for the transaction, was when it was righted by a duly constituted Government. My hon. friend says this transaction was inspired and instigated by the Hon. Mr. Longley, but that the people of Annapolis are entirely against it. Why, Sir, assuming that Mr. Longley is responsible for this transaction, never since he appealed to the people of Annapolis for support did he receive so large a measure of support as he did a month ago since this transaction took place. If that is the voice of public opinion, then the public of Annapolis at the polls endorsed Mr. Longley with a more marked degree of confidence than on any other previous occasion.

Mr. FOSTER. On 60 cents a ton for coal.

Mr. MILLS. And a deal with Whitney.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is one instance the hon. gentleman may refer to, but when the hon. gentleman says that the people of Annapolis are bursting with indignation against Mr. Longley, I think he ought to give them credit for not being purchasable by improper means, but rather, as the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) says, they are standing up for their ideas of virtue. No, Mr. Speaker, I think that Mr. Longley will be able to take care of himself in the future as he has done in the past few weeks as far as this act is concerned. I think this Government will be quite able to select the office-holders themselves, instead of appealing to the hon. gentleman from Annapolis to nominate Liberals when vacancies occur. I think, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing further that need trouble the House at this moment. I take full responsibility for the appointment, I defend it and endorse it in every respect; and if any other such transactions are brought to my notice, I will deem it my duty to pursue the same course as I did in this case, to submit the question to my colleagues, and to act upon their unanimous advice, as I did in this case.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman has worked himself up into that condition of

feeling in the consideration of this case that, encouraged by the successes to which he has referred, the accidents of political life, he will pursue a bold policy, even if it be a cruel policy, and an absolutely unjustifiable one. I give him full credit for that, but he was not always so confident, he was not always so certain as to the correctness of the line upon which he had ventured in this very case. The hon. gentleman tells us to-day, as he felt it necessary to bring to his aid some other authority than the spirit which he displayed in this discussion—he tells us that the Minister of Justice has been consulted, that a great authority, such as the Minister of Justice undoubtedly is on questions of law, has given an opinion. And what is the opinion? The opinion is as to the spirit of an act. We know the spirit of the Government in connection with this matter, and it did not require Sir Oliver Mowat to stretch his legal conscience very far to be able to give the hon. gentleman the consolation of believing that the spirit of the Act was not wide enough to forbid the perpetration of the acts to which the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) has called the attention of the House. But I wonder whether the Minister of Justice considered the spirit of that same act, and considered the spirit of several other transactions with which he was so very intimately connected. If we are to assume that the construction of the Postmaster General is correct in regard to the Criminal Code, it may be a very bad matter for Mr. West, and it may be a very bad matter for Mr. Corbitt; but I wish to point out that it is equally a bad matter for Sir Oliver Mowat, it is equally a bad matter for the Minister of Finance, for the Minister of Railways, and the several parties to the deal, as the hon. gentleman expresses it, that was had with this gentleman. There was a deal, a bargain and sale, if the hon. gentleman's argument be right, if his construction of the Criminal Code be sound, and there was a deal between Sir Oliver Mowat and the present Prime Minister, between the Minister of Finance and Mr. Forbes, also between the Minister of Railways and Canals and Mr. King. In each of these cases, as I shall show before I resume my seat, the evidence is on the same line as the evidence in this case, if not a little stronger. These are cases that it will be necessary to consider if the House comes to the conclusion that the extraordinary construction of the Criminal Code given by the Postmaster General be correct. But before going into that question, I should like to call the attention of the House to the letter of 30th January. It was an official letter going from the department under the supervision of the Postmaster General to the parties in question. This insinuation, and more than an insinuation—this very serious charge was not made in that letter, which was written perhaps under some protection of privilege. He did not couple the names of Corbitt and West in connection with that provision of the Criminal Code outside the walls of this House. No doubt after hearing the hon. gentleman's exposure of the extraordinary attitude assumed by the hon. Minister, he will take good care not to make those charges or insinuations without being sheltered and protected by the privilege that he here enjoys. The letter of 30th January is evidence that the Postmaster General at that time, at all events, knew there was no connection between the facts of this case and any criminal conduct, and that such a position was absolutely absurd. If, however, the hon. gentleman expects that we are to take seriously the construction he put on the transaction, it becomes necessary to ask hon. members' attention to the extraordinary circumstances that surround it. For that purpose, dealing first with the case of Sir Oliver Mowat, and following the hon. gentleman's own line of interpretation, I may say that such an interpretation will bring Sir Oliver Mowat within the same provision of the Criminal Code, and that is section 137. There is the same evidence of bargain and sale and the same evidence of a deal. I am not saying that such a monstrous construction of the code is sound, but that is the construction given by one of the hon. gentleman's own colleagues in a transaction in respect to this letter. After negotiations between the present Prime Minister and his colleague the Minister of Justice, Sir Oliver Mowat wrote, when the present Prime Minister was leader of the Opposition, in the sense in which one of the Prime Minister's colleagues now considers to be a negotiation for an office, a deal for an office, a bargain and sale for office, all being not only venal but highly criminal acts and within the Criminal Code. Sir Oliver Mowat wrote to the Prime Minister a long letter, of which the following was a part:—

> When first the application was made to me, some weeks ago, to give up my position as Premier of Ontario and become candidate for a seat in the House of Commons, with a view to accepting a position in the Dominion Reform Government, which is confidently expected to follow the general elections, the proposal seemed to me to be out of the question, there being in Parliament, under your leadership, many able men and the general elections being likely to add to that number.

And he goes on later in the letter to discuss the proposal in regard to taking an office. This is not a question as to whether it was conditional, though the condition obtains in both transactions, but the parties are arranging in regard to acceptance of an office under the Crown. The Postmaster General thought that the action in the case now before the House was criminal and entirely unjustifiable.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). A senatorship is not an office under the Crown.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The offer to Sir Oliver Mowat, as the hon. gentleman well knows, when he asked him to resign his position as Premier of Ontario, was not only the offer of a senatorship but also that of a member of the Government, and he said so in this letter, because, with his characteristic modesty, Sir Oliver said there were in Parliament many members under the leadership of the Prime Minister who were as fully entitled to the position as he was. Heaven forbid that, either as a lawyer or as a public man, I should accept such a monstrous and ridiculous construction of a transaction of this kind as the Postmaster General has put forward, but I am testing the absurd and ridiculous position in which he has placed himself in answering the question put to him in the House, and afterwards in seriously debating it and by attempting to bring those two gentlemen, as he said, within the spirit of the Criminal Code. Certainly any fair-minded man, I hesitate not to say, would hesitate before he brought that sort of a charge against men outside the House, the man making it occupying a position of privilege; unless the men were within the letter of the law any one would hesitate in expressing an opinion that they have brought themselves within the spirit of the law. I venture to declare, knowing the hon. Minister of Justice as I do, that Sir Oliver Mowat never intended that the weight of his name should be dragged into a debate here or anywhere else in regard to Corbitt or West.

Mr. MILLS. Did the hon. Postmaster General get the opinion of the Minister of Justice in writing?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I doubt whether the Minister of Justice ever had such a proposition put before his department either verbally or in writing; or that any such absurd question was sent to the Department of Justice. The Postmaster General could not himself say that these men brought themselves within the provisions of the Criminal Code, but there was an unfair and utterly unjustifiable attempt to make the public believe that they had brought themselves within the code, because every one does not understand what is meant by the spirit of the code or the letter of the code. Those men are not guilty of crime, even in the opinion of the Postmaster General; he has not gone that far and is not prepared evidently to go that far, and I am glad to see that he does not go that far. But while it is admitted that those gentlemen have not brought themselves under the provisions of the code, the impression is spread abroad that they have been actually guilty of the offence. But in order to carry out this analogy, to show how ridiculous is the position of the Postmaster General, I want to refer to the case of the present Finance Minister. What is the position of that hon. gentleman, if the contention of the Postmaster General be correct? There was a bargain and sale, here was a deal between the Finance Minister and a former member of this House.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You would like to turn out the Finance Minister, too.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Why does the hon. gentleman say so? If the hon. Minister were not entitled to his seat, I would be prepared to give my opinion on the matter being called to the attention of the House. Let me proceed and illustrate the position in which the construction of the code given by the Postmaster General places some of his colleagues. According to the hon. gentleman's argument, a bargain and sale was made. It makes no difference what was the understanding made with Mr. Forbes, who had represented Queen's for some years, and who accepted a sub-collectorship of a port in Prince Edward Island at a salary of $125 a year. There was an understanding that Mr. Forbes should not altogether be lost track of in that office, and that his career would not end as a sub-collecter of customs at Tignish, or some other place in Prince Edward Island. It is even stated to me by friends on this side of the House, that Mr. Forbes openly stated when he left here, that he would have judicial perferment in his native province, and that he did not give up public life with a view of becoming unknown in the future. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) has placed his colleagues in an unfortunate position, in view of that understanding and in view of that resignation of Mr. Forbes, followed by the accession of the Finance Minister to this Parliament—and I believe the exchange was good for Parliament, no matter what I may think of the Finance Minister. The Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) in coming into Parliament under these circumstances, was, according to the idea of the Postmaster General, guilty of a bargain and sale, and corrupt deal, and he came within the spirit of these serious provisions in the Criminal Code.

So in the case of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair). That hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) was even bolder about the business than the Finance Minister. In St. John, on the public platform, he talked about the way in which he got into Parliament, and spoke of his attempt being first directed towards borrowing a senatorship. Talk about the bargain and sale of office; here was a Minister of the Crown, a colleague of the Postmaster General, stating to the electors in New Brunswick that he found it impossible to borrow a senatorship for a little while.

And what was done in connection with that bargain and sale? Why, the Postmaster General must have passed sleepless nights over that transaction, because a member of

this House was approached, and a member of this House was retired to a nominal office, and his seat vacated, and he at once placed in the Senate where he is at this moment, and presto, the Postmaster General had a colleague in the person of the Minister of Railways. The elements which are so objectionable to the Postmaster General in the Annapolis case, appear in those two other cases in a still more glaring light. Let us transpose the names in this telegram, and let us see the position into which the Postmaster General has so unfairly and uncharitably dragged his colleague. Let us take the first telegram, and see how it works out:

Annapolis.

To Postmaster General.

Forbes will resign, if Fielding can be appointed in his place. Do this, if possible. Important. They won't disturb Fielding. I have resignation for Ottawa.

Then again:

Pray initial inclosed papers, and have them put through. Forbes resigns, and Longley, of Annapolis, recommends Fielding as successor.

Any one knowing the Minister of Finance and Mr. Longley the Attorney General of Nova Scotia, will understand how willingly Mr. Longley would lend his name as a recommendation to the present Finance Minister for a position in this Cabinet. We could make this even more interesting by reading the name of the Minister of Railways into the correspondence. For instance:

King will resign, if Blair can be appointed in his stead. Do this, if possible. Important. They won't disturb Blair. I have resignation for Ottawa.

And so in the letter to Mr. Taillon, a very easy transposition of these names could be made. If that be so, and if there is any sense in what the Postmaster General says; if his construction of the spirit of the Act will hold water, there is no doubt that the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Finance are in a very awkward position, and they have the serious opinion of the Postmaster General to contend with.

But, there seems to be another charge against postmaster West, and it seems that this other was the real offence. Mr. West got no reason for his dismissal other than that stated in the letter of January 13th, namely, that his predecessor had been induced to resign on the promise of Mr. West's succession to the office. That is the offence that we have been discussing, not put in the language, the offensive language if I may say so, used by the Postmaster General in this House. But the real offence came out in debate, and that was, that in some way or other the present hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) is indirectly connected with Mr. West. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) dwelt for a long time on that feature of the case. He spoke about conditional resignations, and a casual listener might have supposed that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) brought this transaction within the provisions of the Criminal Code. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) founded his argument on the telegram of the 27th June, 1896, and the letter of the 29th of June, which was my own. But the hon. gentleman will not, on reflection, claim that the offer of a civil servant today, that he will resign if his brother, or if his father, or if his son be appointed, comes within clause 137 of the Criminal Code. The hon. gentleman values his position at the bar too highly to offer any opinion of that character. What is there in either of these letters outside of unfair suspicion, outside of the ex parte statements that may have been made to the Postmaster General, and outside of party exigencies; what is there, at the worst, except the simple fact that the offer was made: If you can appoint West, I, an officer of the service, and old at that, will resign in favour of West. No Minister on the Treasury benches will say that that is within the spirit of the Criminal Code, or, that it can be visited with punishment of any kind whatever. There was nothing clandestine in this. The correspondence was sent in the most open manner to the Postmaster General, and there was no suggestion that these papers should be treated in any other way than they have been. He was asked in my letter to initial the matter and to put it through, and his initials were required for the action to be taken by the Deputy Postmaster General at that time, and having taken the action the foundation for it remains on record. These two letters constitute, as the Postmaster General has told us, the evidence upon which he has dismissed this man. I am satisfied that no fair-minded man will say from reading that correspondence, that there is anything more than a conditional offer of resignation. I am certain that neither Sir Oliver Mowat, nor any member of the legal profession in the Cabinet will say that that transaction comes within the spirit of the Criminal Code.

Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) referred to Mr. Longley's majority in 1897. I may tell him, that so far from this transaction having assisted Mr. Longley—if that be an argument in the matter—I find that Mr. Longley had 76 votes in Annapolis town in 1894, and, that after this indefensible treatment was accorded to Mr. West, Mr. Longley had 64 instead of 76 votes in Annapolis at the last election.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copy of the report of the commissioner appointed to investigate into the charges made against the postmaster at Cobourg and the collector of customs there, and others implicated in such charges, and the evidence taken in such investigation, and all papers, letters, telegrams and documents filed in such investigation, and

all correspondence to and from the Government relating thereto.—(Mr. Cameron.)

Copy of the evidence taken by Inspector Fletcher when investigating charges made last November against the postmaster of Northfield, British Columbia.—(Mr. Davin.)

Return of all correspondence between officers of the militia and others with the Minister of Militia and the Major General Commanding relating to brevet promotion and General Order 73, 1896.—(Mr. Bain.)

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

After Recess.

EXPORT DUTY ON PULP-WOOD.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I want to take the opportunity of bringing a matter of considerable urgency before the Government. I am glad to see the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) in his place. I mentioned to the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that I would take the opportunity at 8 o'clock of drawing the attention of the Government to this matter. I have received a communication stating :

The season for peeling the bark from pulp-wood has now arrived. It lasts two months. The custom is to peel wood now, and ship it next winter. It is very important to know if the Government, in case they impose a duty on pulp-wood, will allow that peeled this spring to be exported free of duty next winter. Unless the Government will declare that they do not intend to impose an export duty, or that, if they do impose one, they will allow wood peeled this spring to go out free of duty, no one will dare to contract for peeled wood, and in that case very little will be done.

I do not, of course, expect a declaration from the Government on this matter, but as it is one of great urgency, and as it was intimated by the Minister of Finance that the Government would state their policy upon this question at a later period, I wish to draw the attention of the Government to the importance of making as early a declaration as possible of what their policy is to be ; and if it be to impose a duty on pulp-wood, I hope they will state that that which is peeled now will be allowed to be shipped next winter free of duty. I will leave this memorandum in the hands of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). The matter, I perceive, is one of importance. Of course, the hon. gentleman does not expect an answer immediately, but I will take note of the matter, and will give an answer at the earliest possible moment.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 80) respecting the Quebec Bridge Company.—(Mr. Langelier.)

Bill (No. 81) respecting the Great Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Langelier.)

Bill (No. 98) respecting the Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Hughes.)

Bill (No. 101) respecting the Montreal and Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

Bill (No. 97) for the relief of Adeline Myrtle Tuckett Lawry.—(Mr. Landerkin.)

CIVIL SERVICE ACT.

Mr. McMULLEN moved second reading of Bill (No. 29) in further amendment of the Civil Service Act. He said : In moving the second reading of this Bill, I desire to state as shortly as possible the reasons why I consider it necessary that some measure of this kind should be placed on the statute-book of this country. Any person who has read the reports of the Civil Service Commission, that of 1881 and that of 1892, which inquired into the question of improving the condition of our civil service, must come to the conclusion that there are considerably more civil servants in this country than are really required. I have given these reports considerable attention, and after a thorough and careful perusal of them, I have come to the conclusion that there is no other way in which the civil service of this country can be reduced to proper proportions and made efficient to render the services to which the country is entitled in return for the ample salaries that are paid, than by the appointment of a board of civil service supervisors. I do not want to deprive any Minister of the patronage of the department over which he presides ; that is not intended. It cannot be expected that any Minister is going to watch so closely the details of the work performed in his own department as to be able to judge accurately the exact number of civil servants that should be employed, and the amount of work performed by each. That duty devolves largely upon the deputy head of the department. It is admitted in the reports to which I have referred that most of the deputy heads, partly out of sympathy for those placed under them, do not desire to reduce their staffs. They are not personally interested, and they cannot be expected to handle the staffs of their departments with that measure of economy that would secure to the country an ample return for the money paid and the staffs provided. A board of civil service supervisors is not a new thing. In some of the Australian colonies such a board exists. Its duties are very well defined—to inspect the several departments, to readjust the labour of those departments, to report to the heads of the several departments recommending certain changes, and to ask the concurrence of the heads of those departments therewith. I do not say that the Bill I have submitted

is the best that could be framed. It may be amended and improved, but what I contend is that some measure of civil service reform is absolutely necessary. I have stated that, in my humble opinion, there are thousands of civil servants in the service of the country more than is absolutely required, and I have reached that conclusion from a perusal of the reports of the various Civil Service Commissions which have inquired into the matter. No one who examines those reports can come to any other conclusion. In the evidence given before these commissions, the statement is made in several cases clearly and distinctly that there are more civil servants than are really required. In the report of 1881 you will find, at page 21, the following recommendation by the Civil Service Commission :

Having arrived at the conclusions above stated as to the advantages of the system we recommend, we have now to propose the means for giving effect to our suggestions. This, we believe, can only be satisfactorily accomplished by the constitution of a Board of Civil Service Commission as free from political influence as the judiciary happily is. Through the action of this board we propose to refer all those cases which have hitherto hampered and impaired the administration of the civil service. We propose that this board shall be composed of men holding an independent position and capable of commanding general confidence. It should consist of three members, one of whom should be a French Canadian, and they should be appointed in the same manner and hold office on the same tenure as the judges. We believe that the judgment and decisions of an impartial tribunal thus constituted would command the respect and confidence of the public and of the service.

Then again they state further :

It has been made abundantly manifest to us that, as stated in the order of reference, there are in the service men who, from causes therein named, are not and never will become efficient public servants, and that the number employed is largely in excess of the requirements of the service.

This, we believe, is mainly due to the prevailing manner of making appointments and promotions. We have found, too, that there are men working side by side, performing duties of an identical character, between whose salaries there are material and unreasonable differences.

That I take from the report of 1881. Then let me take the report of 1892. In the report the commissioners recommended :

A Board of Civil Service Commissioners shall be constituted, consisting of five members, to be from time to time appointed by the Governor in Council

From time to time, either by direction of the Governor in Council, or of its own motion, to inquire into and report upon the state and management of the business of the several departments of the service and the conduct of the persons employed therein, so far as relates to their official duties.

That is the recommendation of the board of 1892. Then we have, in Appendix Q of the same report, evidence of the over-manned condition of the departments :

As long as politics and politicians, party and patronage have so much to do with the working of a Government department, and judging from the reports of all Civil Service Commissions during the past twenty years, I do not believe the civil service can be very much improved unless the Government really intend to reorganize or reform all the departments, unless common sense and businesslike system, principles and management are introduced into all the branches of the Post Office Department, and every man employed, from deputy to messenger, realizes he is earning his bread and butter and his services are recognized, it will be impossible to expect all clerks to work efficiently. Before an improvement can be carried out, it is necessary that all idlers, loafers, incompetents and redundants should be "weeded out," as they are and always have been a nuisance, if no help to any official or efficient clerk, and a disgrace to the service.

* * * * * * * * * *

In fact, too many men and women are appointed to the civil service merely to give them the means of receiving pay or salary, and many of them not educated or qualified for office work.

That is in the report of 1892, and it clearly proves that the departments are altogether over-manned. Hon. gentlemen opposite, wherever there was room at all to put an additional clerk, crowded one in, and the result is that to-day we have employees in the departments far in excess of what is absolutely necessary. Now, we know perfectly well from the evidences we have met, when we come to pass the Estimates, the growing tendency, from year to year, on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to make new appointments by dividing up work, and thus finding places for men who never should have entered the service at all. To such an extent has this been carried on that it has become a matter of great moment to devise a means by which the service may be reduced to its proper proportions, and these superfluous men dispensed with. It is not right that the country should be loaded down with an enormously expensive staff, which is not giving any fair return or measure of service for the money they receive. I am satisfied that if the head of each department were to set to work and attempt to make these reductions, he would be met on all hands by ardent appeals not to dismiss some of those unnecessary clerks. There may be some in the service with families wholly dependent on them who are entitled to the sympathy of the Minister, but a case came under my notice in which a most ardent appeal was made to continue a man in office simply because he happened to be the son of a widow. I investigated the case myself, and I found that the appeals made on his behalf to the department were entirely fictitious. There was no ground whatever for sympathy under the circumstances. The other members of the family were employed, earning fairly good salaries, and quite capable of living without the salary of this young man. By the method I have outlined in this Bill, I believe a lot of those men will be got rid of. The fact of the matter is that the

civil service has been turned into a breeding ground of indolent men and loafers, because idleness will produce loafers. Men in the service are standing around virtually doing nothing. I do not say that the service is entirely composed of men of that kind. I quite admit that there are spendid men in it. I quite admit that there are a great many put there that were failures in other callings in life, who tried many things, and at last have been foisted on the country through the efforts, possibly, of the representatives of their constituencies appealing to the Government or in some other way. We know that there are plenty of that stamp there from the abstract I have read of this report in 1892. An officer who had been thirty years in the service declares that the service is full of loafers and idlers, men who do not perform the service for the country for which they are paid. Under these circumstances I hope the Government will lend their confidence and assistance to the passage of this Bill. I believe that if they do, it will relieve them of a great amount of trouble. These supervisors, if appointed, will go through the departments, inspect the work that has been performed and will easily detect those who are doing little or nothing in the service. They will be empowered, if the Bill passes, to dismiss these men. They will be called upon to report to the head of the department in such case, what they have done. At the end of each year a statement will have to be presented to the House within fifteen days, just as now in the case of the superannuations, giving names of those servants whose services have been dispensed with, and stating fairly and distinctly the reasons why. I think that this will result in a very considerable reduction in the numbers of civil servants. But what I consider will be far better in the interests of the country is that the service will be just as complete and just as satisfactory. I have given a good deal of consideration to this question; I have read the several reports, and I have come to the conclusion that there is no method by which we can purge the civil service of unnecessary, incompetent men except by some such method as I suggest. That is the reason of introducing this Bill, the second reading of which I have now the honour to move.

Mr. SPROULE. While I fully agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) that some change is desirable, in the interests of the country in order to secure economy, still I think that if the Bill passes it will be far from accomplishing what the hon. gentleman aims at. The Bill seems to be very crude, very brief, and would be of very little use if it were crystallized into law. Some of its defects are so apparent that they may be seen at a glance. Some defects which the hon. gentleman hopes to remedy by this Bill would not be touched at all. My first objection is that the effect of the Bill will be to create three new offices, to be filled by men who hold office during good behaviour and can only be removed on a joint address from the House of Commons and the Senate—three irresponsible officers who are to hold their places so long as they endeavour, according to their own lights, at all fairly to discharge their duties. It must be apparent to any one that these three officers cannot understand the demands of the service in the various departments. They are not clothed with power to arrange the service in the various departments so as to economize labour. They cannot do as a man would in his own private business—arrange the labour under his direction so as to make the best use of the time; but they will be obliged to leave the work go on according to the system arranged under the superintendence of the Minister or Deputy Minister in each department. This being so, it will be impossible for them to say that a smaller number of men must do the work. It is provided that the board of supervisors may suspend or remove civil servants. For what? For misconduct or unfitness. Who is to be the judge of the fitness or unfitness? Is not that man the best judge who is charged with the responsibility of distributing and supervising the work of these officers from day to day? Or would it be more likely that a stranger coming in, whose duty it is to inspect the books of the department once a year, though he is to have access to the department at all times, will understand the fitness of the men rather than the chief clerk or Deputy Minister under whose eye they are working from day to day? I think it would be unreasonable to expect it. If the supervisor acted at all, it would be upon the recommendation of the men whose duty it is to take cognizance now of the work of these civil servants. If this board were constituted under the present law, I think it would practically be of little value in improving the service. While I admit that there is great need for some such measure it should be a very comprehensive measure that will cover the whole ground and put the civil service under some other authority than the political authority. I do not think that this Bill will accomplish that object. Even if the Bill were to pass, we should soon fall back into the old channels. When a civil servant was discharged pressure would be brought to bear on the head of the department, and if the Minister happened to be friendly to him, that might be easily enough to secure his reinstatement, competent or incompetent, regardless of the judgment of the board of supervisors.

Mr. CRAIG. I have been looking at this Bill, and I would like to state some objections that occur to my mind, and which, no doubt, will occur to the mind of the public. I first ask: What is the object of this Bill? As stated by the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) who has introduced it, the object

is a very good one. But I think that the accomplishment of that object would depend in a great measure upon the composition of this board of civil service supervisors. If the members of this board were all appointed from the Liberal party, I think that the natural conclusion on the part of the public would be that the board was appointed not to improve the service so much as to get rid of a good many Conservatives who are now in the service. I do not say that that is the object that the hon. gentleman has in mind, but I repeat that, if all the members of the board were appointed from the Liberal party, that would be the object apparent to the people, and especially to Conservatives throughout the country. If a board like this is to be appointed, it should be appointed in such a way as to give confidence to the country and to carry out the object sought which is the improvement of the civil service. I think that a Bill of this kind should not be introduced in this House by a private member, but should be introduced by the Government and be taken charge of by the Government who would then have full responsibility for the measure. In looking at the Bill as it stands, it seems to me that there are some objections apparent on the face of it, as stated by the hon. gentleman who preceded me (Mr. Sproule).

I find there are to be three members of this board. Now, why three members? It is stated that one of the duties of this board is to inspect all books kept by members of the civil service:

> All books kept in those places should be open to their inspection, and should be inspected by them at least once during every fiscal year.

Now, the question comes to my mind, What is meant by the word "inspect" there? Does it mean merely turning over the leaves and looking at those books to see if the writing is clear and orderly, or does it mean a thorough inspection? I hold, if it means a thorough inspection, that it will be impossible for these men to inspect all the books in the course of a year, and it says they are to inspect them at least once a year. Then, the question arises, Are all three to inspect the books, or may one inspect one book and another inspect another book?—only in that case, I think the matter is made still worse because then the whole responsibility, instead of resting on the three members of the board, would rest on one member of the board, and we might just as well have one member as have no real responsibility. So I think that is one very great defect, because if we are going to have three, all three should be responsible and all three should know the circumstances of each case, and I think that would be impossible under the circumstances. But their duty is not only to inspect the books once a year, but I find that they are to be clothed with very great powers in regard to dismissals. Now, there are three reasons given for which they may dismiss any employee: First, misconduct; second, unfitness; and, third, if they consider he is not required. Well, now, I imagine that they might be given power to dismiss for misconduct. It says when the servant is clearly shown to be guilty of misconduct. If he was guilty of misconduct that everybody could see the misconduct, there might be some force in that; but as has been already asked, Who is to be judge of what misconduct is? Is the Government, is Parliament, to lay down a rule by which misconduct should be known, or is that to be left entirely to this board, consisting of three, who, as I say, may belong to one party? And is the employee in the civil service to be left entirely at their mercy as to what is misconduct? We know that misconduct is a very wide term. It may mean something very bad, or it may mean something which hardly amounts to anything. Yet if they say that he is guilty of misconduct, without any trial, with just their own word for it, then they are to have power to dismiss him. It seems to me that that is a very great power indeed, it is clothing them with far too much power. I think if they are to have power to dismiss for misconduct, then the word "misconduct" should be defined by this Bill, and should be defined by this Parliament. But if he be not guilty of misconduct, and still they want to get rid of him, what is the next step? Then this board may dismiss him if they consider that he is unfit for the discharge of his duties. Well, now, that is giving them still more opportunity to get rid of a man whom they want to get rid of. They can say, He is guilty of misconduct, or, We do not think he is fit to discharge his duties, he does not discharge them in a way that, in our opinion, he ought to do. If they decide in their own minds without any standard at all, that he is unfit, then by this Bill they would have the power to discharge that employee and dismiss him from the service. But he may not be guilty of misconduct, and he may not be unfit, even in their opinion, to discharge the duties of his office, and yet they have another power at their disposal, that is they may say that he is not required. They may say, We do not say that he has been guilty of misconduct, we do not say that he is unfit to discharge the duties of his office, but we do say that he is not needed in the service. Now, what greater power can they have? I think this is giving them greater power than the Government themselves would take. The Government now assumes this power. They have said in this House that they will not dismiss any member of the civil service unless he is proved guilty of offensive partisanship. They have laid down that opinion; and here they propose to constitute a board that shall be able to dismiss any man from the civil service just because they want to do it. I am not saying they would

do it, but I am saying they will have power to do it if this Bill becomes law. Not only that, but the board does not need at all to give the employee a chance to defend himself. If he is charged with misconduct he may have no opportunity to defend himself at all. They may say, You are guilty of misconduct. Well, that settles the whole question. The Bill says they must report to the Government and report to Parliament within fifteen days after Parliament meets, but then the mischief is all done so far as that is concerned. He may be out of office months before that time, he may have to turn himself to something else, and he may be branded before the country of being guilty of misconduct without an opportunity of defending himself. Then he has no chance to prove that he is not unfit, and it may be said that he does not require to, because he can show his record. But he is subject entirely to this board, composed of three members. Besides, so far as I can see in that Bill, there is no appeal from their decision in time to do him any good. Now, as I said before, the effect of this Bill depends altogether on the composition of this board. At the present time, as the Liberal party is in power, I will say that if the three members of this board were members of the Liberal party, it would be very difficult to make the country believe that this board would be impartial. It would be almost impossible to make them believe it, such is the position of politics to-day; and I think the civil service employee would a great deal rather have things left as they are, and trust to the Government itself to deal with his case than to have a board of this kind judging him and pronouncing sentence upon him. Of course, it is said that the object of the Bill is to improve the service. Then if this Bill is to be pressed forward, I think there should be no question that one member of this board should be a Conservative. I notice in the extracts read by the hon. member for North Wellington, that the board proposed in his Bill is called an impartial board. Well, I should call an impartial board at the present time and in the present condition of affairs, a board composed of, say, two Liberals and one Conservative. If the finding of the board is not unanimous then, of course, the Conservative member would be entirely overruled; but if three men were picked out who were fairly impartial, as impartial as we can find men, if two Liberals and one Conservative were appointed, then this board might do some good. But if all three were Liberals, then I am afraid there would be very little confidence felt in this board throughout the country, and I am afraid, almost, that we would find that a great many of those who were dismissed would be Conservatives, especially as at the present time a great majortiy of those in the service are Conservatives, and that is where the difficulty would come in. Now, Sir, this Bill, I think, is directly contrary, as it is proposed, to all the principles of the Liberal party. Instead of being a Bill which gives a man every chance for his liberty, it would give a man no chance at all for his liberty. The same board would be judge and jury and executioner. I think, under these circumstances, that we ought to hesitate before we give our assent to this Bill. I would say again in conclusion that I think a Bill of this great importance should not be introduced into the House by a private member, but if we must have a Bill of this nature, let it be introduced by the Government, let them take the responsibility, and let them try to frame a Bill which will give satisfaction to all parties.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not suppose that the House is going to read this Bill a second time without the Government showing its policy upon it.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Certainly not.

Mr. FOSTER. I should like to ask my hon. friend if he will say what he is going to do?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The matter to which my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has directed the attention of the House is no doubt one of very considerable importance. The proposed scheme is novel so far as this Parliament is concerned, and differences of opinion have been expressed in this House to-night, as might reasonably have been anticipated under the circumstances. The debate, no doubt, has had the effect of directing attention to the matter, and perhaps a further opportunity of considering the scheme would be in the public interests. I would therefore request my hon. friend, after this discussion, which has brought out some useful expressions of opinion, to allow the Bill to be withdrawn for the present, and he may again introduce it at a later session, after the public have had a fuller opportunity of considering its provisions. I listened to my hon. friend's remarks, and he will perhaps permit me to say, lest some misunderstanding might arise, that I am sure he did not intend to characterize the whole civil service as unfaithful servants. It may be there are some whose services to the public could be very well dispensed with; but speaking of the large staff with which I have more or less to do, representing, perhaps one-third of the whole service of Canada, I would not be doing my duty by them if I did not say that on that staff are to be found as faithful men as in any walk of life. Of course there are exceptions, and those exceptions have to be dealt with by legislation. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will withdraw the measure now.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have no desire to press on the consideration of the House this

Bill in any hurry. My conclusions have been formed from the attention I have given to the organization of the civil service during the last fifteen years. I have no desire to appoint a board of this kind for the purpose of decapitating a lot of Conservatives, as the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Craig) has stated. I am not actuated by any such motive.

Mr. CRAIG. I did not attribute any such motive. I said if the services were composed wholly of Liberals, the country might look at it in that way; but I did not attribute to the hon. gentleman the motive he has suggested.

Mr. McMULLEN. My only desire is to have the civil service purged of unnecessary and incompetent men. While I respect the statement made by the Postmaster General, I say this, that I have read the evidence of one of the officers of a department who said that he had been in the same room with men for thirty years who were incompetents and loafers. Now, incompetent men must be there when such evidence is given by an officer over his own signature.

Mr. SPEAKER. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that he has no right to reply. I understood he was going to make a proposition to withdraw the Bill.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have been asked by the Postmaster General to consent to the withdrawal of the Bill. I should like a more definite statement from the Government with reference to this Bill before I consent to withdraw it. There is, however, an evident desire to have a short session, and it appears to be the feeling on both sides of the House——

Mr. FOSTER. That is a good statement to sit down on.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman need not talk about backing down, because he knows I am not accustomed to do that kind of thing. I state now to the House that I give the recess to the Government for the consideration of this question. I will, however, take the earliest opportunity next session to introduce the same Bill, and I will press it to a division, unless some move has been made in the meanwhile in the direction of purging the civil service of the unnecessary number of officers we have there to-day.

Bill withdrawn.

WOOD MOUNTAIN SCOUTS.

The House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Davin:

That in the opinion of this House the time has arrived when the claims of the Wood Mountain Scouts to secure scrip or land warrants for services rendered by them during the rebellion, should be settled.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier.) I had not the advantage of being in the House the other day when the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) moved this motion. Looking at the remarks he made on that occasion, I find he is prepared, so far as he has an opinion on the subject, to advise the Government at once to grant scrip to the persons who are known in this motion as the Wood Mountain Scouts. I have had occasion since I have been in the department over which I now preside, and having the North-west Mounted Police under my charge, to look over the claims of these men. They are comparatively few, and if these stood alone, probably it would be possible to deal with them at once in the manner suggested, that is to say, by granting scrip to those who, during the rebellion in 1885 acted on the American frontier as scouts in order to preserve peace in that part of the country and in order to prevent the invasion of our territory by American half-breeds. My hon. friend is aware of this, that there are to-day in the North-west more than one class of Her Majesty's subjects pressing for claims to be adjusted. There are not only the Wood Mountain Scouts, but there are several parties who are petitioning the Government and strongly urging on the Government that many of the claims for losses accruing during the rebellion have not been satisfied. We have received numerous petitions, from all parts of the territories, and especially from the seat of the rebellion, stating that many of Her Majesty's subjects who suffered at the time grievous losses have not yet obtained the satisfaction which they ought to obtain. Another class of claimants are also pressing their views on the Government. My hon. friend is aware that the half-breeds have petitioned for the extinguishment of the Indian title and to be treated as the Manitoba half-breeds were treated. The Manitoba half-breeds were treated in this way: In 1870, when we took possession of the country, the law which was then passed was to the effect that all those half-breeds at that time, that is all the heads of families and all the children born before 1870, were entitled to scrip. The head of a family received 120 acres of land and a child born before 1870 received 240 acres. A commission was issued in 1885 to settle the half-breed claims. Shortly after the opening of the rebellion, they were settled with under that law, that is to say, the half-breeds of the North-west were treated in the same manner as the half-breeds in Manitoba had been treated, and arrangements would go back to 1870 and not before that year; whereas, the claim now put forward by the half-breeds of the North-west is that the date of their claims should go back to 1885—that fathers of families and children born since 1885 should receive scrip. I am not prepared to say whether it would be fair or unfair, just or unjust to accept these claims made by the half-breeds. But one point I want to press on the attention of my hon. friend is this: It is the intention of the Government during

the recess to investigate all these claims, those of the Wood Mountain Scouts, those of the half-breeds for additional scrip in order to extinguish Indian claims arising out of rebellion losses, and in so far as possible, to acknowledge all these claims for scrip. I would therefore ask my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) not to press his motion further at the present time. I may add this: My hon. friend is aware that the scrip which has formerly been given to compensate half-breeds or others, has not been a source of profit to those in whose favour it has been issued. My hon. friend will, I think, agree with me, that the scrip issued in the settlement of claims has been squandered, and that it would perhaps be advisable for the Government to endeavour to find some method, by which the scrip thus issued should be more profitable to the parties receiving it, than has been found to be the case up to the present time. That is a question, as to which also, the Government intend to have some investigation. I repeat, that it is the intention of the Government, during the recess, to investigate all these claims. This is a subject which will be taken in hand by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior with a view, first of all, to ascertain how far and to what extent these different classes of subjects of Her Majesty are entitled to compensation for losses, for service, or otherwise; and secondly, if they are entitled to compensation, whether scrip is the better way to compensate them; and, again, if scrip is issued, what would be the best method to be followed, so that the scrip might be as profitable to them as possible. This being the statement I have to make to my hon. friend, I hope he will not press this motion further, and that he shall be satisfied to leave the case in the hands of the Government, reserving to himself of course, upon a future occasion—if this settlement we have to offer is not satisfactory to him—to have liberty of action to move in the manner which he thinks best in the interests of those he represents.

In so far as this claim of the North-west mounted scouts is concerned, I may say that my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) has shown on all occasions (whether his friends were in office or not) the most creditable efforts to have these claims considered. He has not succeeded so far, but I hope that perhaps the day is not far distant, when his efforts shall be crowned with success.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I am going, Sir, to act on the suggestion of the Prime Minister. But, preliminary to saying a few words in regard to the ideas propounded by my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier), I may be allowed to say, that in acting on the suggestion of the Prime Minister, I am going against the views laid down by some of his colleagues and by some of his principal supporters. If the Conservatives were in power and the Prime Minister of the day suggested to me to withdraw that motion, and I acceded to his request, we should have heard in this House some jeers and we should have had in some of the Liberal papers in the west, and probably in the enlightened Liberal journals of Toronto, statements that I had backed down. That, Sir, would not deter me from doing what is the right thing to do. I wish to point out, now that there is a Liberal Government in power, that in the interests of parliamentary life and in the interests of the country, the usefulness of a member of Parliament, be he Liberal or Conservative, is limited, if it be erected a principle in the minds of the people, that whenever he moves a motion in this House he is invariably to divide the House. That is a proposition that would not have received much welcome at the hands of the supporters of the Prime Minister in other days. But, now that he and his friends have the responsibility of office on their shoulders, it is a proposition which will be pleasing to them. I must say for the Prime Minister, that when he was leader of the Opposition he never descended to lay down any such principle, which he as a statesman knows, limits the usefulness of a member of Parliament on whichever side of the House he sits. I am not afraid, Sir, to do at the suggestion of the Prime Minister what I would do if my own party were in power. When the leader of a political party, having a majority in this House, tells you that he intends to consider the views that you have placed before him, and that he will do his best to embody and crystallize your views into legislation; what on earth, except clap-trap, is to be had by dividing the House? There are occasions I grant you, and those occasions I have availed of when my own party was in power, when a member should divide the House, as in 1891, when I divided the House and reduced the majority of the Government to fourteen. Statements have been made, even this session (but I cannot refer to a past debate), statements have been made from time to time in this House, that I have put forward propositions, and that in no case did I divide the House. Well, Sir, I have been looking over "Hansard," in respect to a remark that was made by one of the colleagues of the Prime Minister, and I could give him a pretty long session if I undertook to show the number of times I divided the House, and even opposed my own party in fighting, sometimes for the half-breeds in the North-west, and sometimes for the farmers, and accomplishing things which to-day the statute-book shows that I accomplished.

My hon. friend the Prime Minister, very properly says, that this question is one that concerns the Wood Mountain scouts, the half-breeds generally, and it was probably a lapse of memory that he did not mention the North-west Mounted Police. I am exceedingly glad the Prime Minister is determined to take up all these claims, and

especially the claims of the North-west Mounted Police. In that rebellion they behaved as gallantly as any other set of men. Why is it that they have been refused the reward that has been given to others; why is it that they have been refused the decorations that have been given to others, except in rare instances? Why should they have had this injustice, as I hold it was, dealt out gratuitously to them. I am exceedingly glad, therefore, that that question is about to be taken up. I am exceedingly glad that the claim, generally, of the half-breeds will be taken up, and above all, I am glad to have the assurance, that during the recess the Government will consider the claims of those gallant men, who, on the border that divides Canada from the great republic below, so controlled the turbulent half-breeds and Indians who were ready to burst into fire and flame at the bidding of Riel, and who on that perilous border guarded the interests of Canada and performed as effective work as was performed by any in that rebellion.

I am quite sure, Sir, that when the Government looks into the matter they will find that in the Mounted Police there are men who will stand out in their true colours as having behaved heroically for Canada. I am also sure, that even if their attention be directed to corps after corps of those who fought in that rebellion, no corps, or no body of men among any scouts, will they find more gallant, and more chivalrous, than the Wood Mountain scouts. I look upon the promise of the Prime Minister as a guarantee, and I hope fondly that we shall not be disappointed. I take the promise of the Prime Minister as an assurance that the claim of these men will at least be satisfied. The Prime Minister referred to the fact that I had fought for scrip for others. He seems to have forgotten that, in regard to the volunteers in the North-west Territories who were deprived for some years of the scrip to which they were entitled, I moved year after year against my own friends when they were in power; and that in 1891 I divided the House and brought down their majority to fourteen, when Sir John Thompson came across the House and told me that he would put all my Bills in the Government paper, and he did so. It was in that year that I got the second homestead question settled, as well as several others. I do not throw that out as a hint to the hon. gentlemen behind the Prime Minister; but they may be certain that if they want to carry anything, the best thing they can do is to reduce the majority of the Prime Minister, and we on this side will give them all the support we can in doing that. I have only to say that I believe now, from the promise we have had, that after this matter has been considered by the Government, Canada will be no longer in the position that while hundreds have been rewarded for the services they have rendered, these poor but gallant people at Wood Mountain have been left without the scrip which they are entitled to. I beg, at the suggestion of the Prime Minister (Mr. Laurier), to withdraw my motion.

Motion withdrawn.

MOUNTED POLICE PENSIONS.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan) moved second reading of Bill (No. 59) to amend the Mounted Police Pension Act, 1889. He said: This Bill requires very little explanation. As the law now stands, a member of the North-west Mounted Police must serve twenty-five years before he is able to retire from the force with a pension. By the amendment I propose, a man will be allowed to retire and draw a pension after serving twenty years, if he wishes to do so. The Bill does not interfere with the scale of pensions or prevent a constable remaining in the force for twenty-five or thirty-five years; the longer he remains the larger his pension. But I think it is a hardship for a man to be forced to serve twenty-five years before he can draw a pension. When we consider the conditions of climate and the hardships which these men have to undergo, often making winter trips 200, 300 or 400 miles, and sometimes having to camp out with the temperature at 45 below zero, it is evident that a man will soon be used up, and when we consider that in England the men only have to serve 21 years in order to retire with a pension for life, I think 20 years is long enough for a man to be required to serve in order to be entitled to retire in a country where the conditions are such that men have to endure the hardships they have in a new country like the west.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). So far as I am personally concerned, I can see no objection to this Bill becoming law. It is proposed to reduce by five years the time of service which entitles a man who serves the country in the Mounted Police to retire with a pension. At present he has to serve twenty-five years, and my hon. friend suggests that he be required to serve only twenty years. At the same time, he properly remarks that if the principle of the Bill is adopted, the amount of the pension would be correspondingly decreased; that is to say, instead of a man receiving the same pension that he would receive after twenty-five years service, he would be entitled to twenty twenty-fifths of the amount. I had hoped to receive from the members from the North-west Territories generally some expression of opinion on this question, with which they are perhaps more familiar than we are from the east; and, as I have not yet had the opportunity of having their opinion, I will conclude by moving that the debate be adjourned. In the meantime, I would say I would be in favour of the Bill, and unless I hear to the contrary from those whose opinions I am bound to respect in this

matter, I shall have great pleasure in seeing that this Bill becomes law.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

DOMINION LANDS ACT.

Mr. DAVIN moved second reading of Bill (No. 61) further to amend the Dominion Lands Act. He said: I do not think there will be any difficulty about this Bill, because with its main clause I know the Government agree; and when we get into committee, if there is any doubt upon the second and third sections, we can eliminate them. The main section of the Bill provides for getting rid of a grievance. That grievance is this, that a rancher who has probably any amount of herds, and any amount of sheep, and any amount of horses, unless he has ploughed land which is not susceptible of ploughing, and cultivates it arably when it is not susceptible of being cultivated arably shall not own a piece of land in the North-west Territories. I know that the getting rid of this grievance will commend itself to the hon. Minister of the Interior, who is familiar with these matters.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I think I can, on the whole, assent to the principle of the first section of this Bill, and I have no objection whatever to it passing its second reading, with the explanation which the hon. gentleman has made, that he does not insist on the second and third clauses, with regard to which I think there may possibly be some question.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

MOUNTED POLICE ACT.

Mr. DAVIN moved second reading of Bill (No. 62) to amend the Mounted Police Act, 1894. He said: This Bill has a provision with regard to promotion from the ranks in the Mounted Police force and recruiting the staff of officers which will prevent men being appointed officers who have not served in the ranks or were not graduates from the Royal Military College. My hon. friends on the Treasury benches will remember that when they were in Opposition, they held the views I have given expression to and have embodied in this Bill, and I am crediby informed that they still hold the same opinions. Not only will this legislation be productive of good in the force, but it must be useful especially to the hon. First Minister, as Superintendent General of the Mounted Police, and I will tell you, Sir, why. It will put him in this position, that when people pester him for appointments on the force of their sons who have failed in every mortal thing and are not graduates of the Royal Military College, he will be enabled to say to them: "What can I do, the appointments are a statutory matter, and unless certain conditions are fulfilled I cannot do anything." It will be thus of great advantage.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It would have been a few years ago, but not now.

Mr. DAVIN. I am so fond of my hon. friend that I cannot bring myself to say anything harsh to him even when he interrupts. He is so pleasant to look at that I love to look at him. He is like Keat's Thing of Beauty—"a joy for ever." The next section is this:

> The Civil Service Superannuation Act shall apply to all commissioned officers of the force, and their service shall be computed from the time they enter the ranks.

Of course in committee I could not insist on that second clause, because it might be considered as adding to the burdens of the public, and, therefore, if the Government should allow the Bill to go into committee and object to that clause, I will drop it. But let me point out that nothing so necessary could be done with regard to the Mounted Police, and the reason is evident. Suppose a man is a sergeant-major in the force, he can retire as such with a very good pension, but let him become a commissioned officer and have to retire a year after, his superannuation will be calculated only from the date of his commission, so that you could safely say, as I have said myself to deserving sergeant-majors, who were properly ambitious to hold the rank of commissioned officers: Would it not be better for yourself and family that you should remain sergeant-majors? They would admit that it was better from the point of view of superannuation, but still the natural desire to hold the rank they were entitled to led some of them—I could give their names if it were proper to do so—to choose promotion although it would imperil the allowance that would be given them on retirement.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I am not prepared to say that there may not be something meritorious in the suggestions of the hon. gentleman, but still I would ask him not to press this Bill unduly until we have had some occasion to confer together as to how far this Bill may be necessary. I do not think that the appointments which have been hitherto made in the force are such as to warrant so drastic a measure as this. The manner in which the officers of the force have been recruited is according to the following system:—

> First, by promotion from the ranks.
> Second, graduates and cadets of the Royal Military College, at Kingston.
> Third, officers who have served in the active militia of Canada.
> Fourth, special appointments.

There are forty-two officers in the force exclusive of surgeons. Their previous services are as follows:—

17 have been promoted from the ranks.
1 has been transferred from the Indian Department.
1, Superintendent Gagnon, was appointed on the organization of the force.
6 were cadets of the Royal Military College, Kingston.
13 from the active militia of Canada.
2 commissioned officers of the British army.
2 farming in Manitoba or the North-west Territories.

So that, after all, the special appointments have been very few, and if the hon. gentleman himself had had the management of the force, I doubt whether he would have followed a different system. Such being the case, perhaps, my hon. friend will agree with me that, as there has been so far no abuse of power that I can see, there is no occasion to limit the selection of the force as proposed. However, this is a matter as to which I am open to conviction and argument. I am anxious to administer the force in such a way as to meet as far as possible the views of those who, like my hon. friend, represent the North-west Territories. I would not presume to insist on my own views in preference to those of others in this matter, who have had perhaps better facilities for forming a judgment. I came to the administration of the force with very little, indeed no experience at all. But taking the administration of the force on the whole, as I found it, with the exception of perhaps a little too much politics, I think that when any politics which may have found their way into the force are eliminated, as I think they ought to be, and the force become an absolutely military body and nothing else, it will be a most creditable body. It is already a very creditable body and has given great satisfaction, and with a little more effort would give absolute satisfaction. I do not know whether I would surprise my hon. friend but I am inclined to be somewhat conservative with regard to this force.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman does not surprise me at all.

The PRIME MINISTER. With regard to the second proposition of my hon. friend, I do not think there is any reason for introducing it into the law because I think the Act, as it is, meets the case. I refer my hon. friend to section 10, of the Police Act, which reads as follows :—

> Whenever any officer or member of the force is serving with the militia as a military force, by order of the Governor in Council, every such officer and member of the force shall be subject to "The Militia Act," and any Act amending the same, in the same manner and to the same extent as the active militia are subject thereto.
>
> In any such case the commissions of the officers of the force shall, for the purpose of seniority and command, be considered equivalent to those issued to the officers of the militia of corresponding rank, from the date of their respective commissions, according to the following scale, that is to say :—
>
> Commissioner, as lieutenant-colonel ;
> Assistant commissioner, on appointment, as major ; after three years' service, as lieutenant-colonel ;
> Senior superintendent, as major ;
> Other superintendents, as captains ;
> Inspector, as lieutenant ;
> Senior surgeon, as surgeon ;
> Assistant surgeon, as assistant surgeon ;
> Veterinary surgeon, as veterinary surgeon.

Mr. HUGHES. Do I understand that these that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) has read are proposals ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No, that is the law. I made the statement just to show my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) that there is no occasion whatever for the second section of this Bill. I, therefore, move that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. DAVIN. Would my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) tell me the section he quoted from ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Section 10, of the Mounted Police Act.

Mr. DAVIN. I rather think that the Prime Minister misinterprets that section. I was not unaware of that section, but it applies only when the members of the force are serving with the militia. The North-west Mounted Police officers, unless when they serve with the militia have no rank whatever except titular. If they have to be exchanged from the Mounted Police into a militia corps they do not get an ad eundem, as a university of equal standing with another would give to its graduates. And also the hon. gentleman, if he will excuse me for saying so, missed the point of my second clause. What it provides for is not official rank, but solid cash in the shape of superannuation ; and I am sure that that will commend itself to him. I do not think I was able to impress my argument about that upon him. My argument is this : Suppose a man has been 25 years on the force and has reached the rank of sergeant-major. He can retire with the full pension of sergeant-major. But if he becomes inspector and retires twelve months after that, he has a superannuation calculated on twelve months' service. Is not that an injustice ? What is required is that it shall be provided that his superannuation shall be calculated from the time he joins the force, which is palpably just. I would urge that upon the Prime Minister, and I hope that this part of the measure will commend itself to his judgment. His argument, if he will allow me to say so, is based upon a misunderstanding of my Bill, and also, if he will not misunderstand me, on an erroneous interpretation of the tenth section. That would apply to the Bill I introduced last year or the year before, which had a clause in it providing for the rank of the officers. I thought I had that in the Bill this time, and it is through an oversight of myself or of the draughtsman that it does not appear. I have a memo-

randum to have it inserted in committee. But, in regard to the Bill as it stands, that argument has no application whatever. What I would suggest, with all deference to the Prime Minister, would be that he should allow the Bill to be read a second time, and do me the honour to give me the conference of which he spoke; and probably he will be able, to favour the Bill, if only in part. If he only selects the second clause, we shall have accomplished something. I can assure him this is not an attempt at toy legislation, but the outcome of a desire to benefit the force over which he presides.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) will serve his interest better if he allows the debate to be adjourned.

Mr. HUGHES. I presume that the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has inadvertently left out of the list of those from whom selection may be made for the offices named, qualified officers from the militia of the country.

Mr. DAVIN. That was probably an inadvertence.

Mr. HUGHES. That will be a matter for amendment in committee. I think that the principle of the Bill is good and I would commend the second section of it to the Prime Minister. I think he will find a good deal of merit in it. It is customary in some cases to allow two years' service in the ranks or in a non-commissioned position to count for one year in a commissioned office. However, he can talk that over with the hon. member for West Assiniboia. I would suggest to the hon. member for West Assiniboia, when the Bill gets to committee, if it does get to committee, to insert the clause I have spoken of regarding the officers of the militia.

Mr. DAVIN. I have noted that.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

DOMINION LANDS.

Mr. DOUGLAS moved second reading of Bill (No. 60) in further amendment of the Dominion Lands Act. He said: It is not necessary that I should detain the House more than a moment. The Bill has already been explained and it is exceedingly simple. It is well known to the House that under the late Act settlers who had performed their duties prior to June, 1889, were allowed to homestead a second time. In performing their duties for the second homestead they were called upon to leave their first homestead and reside upon the land. That has been felt to be a grievous burden and not in the interests of the settler, and the Bill contemplates doing away with the residence, while leaving the law with regard to the improvements the same as before. The Bill also contemplates that the son of the settler who makes the entry shall not be required to reside upon the land while making the improvements. The tendency of the law as it now stands, morally, has not been good. It has been the custom generally to sleep upon the land at night and make the improvements, but it was not in reality actual residence, and this entailed a burden upon the settler without any corresponding gain to the Government. To do away with the residence clause in this case would take nothing from the Government treasury and would relieve the people of a very considerable burden. I may also state that in the case of sons of settlers residing alone on the lands under these conditions it has been fruitful of evil especially to their health and some have even lost their mental balance and have found their way into our public institutions in consequence. Therefore, we will be very glad to have this Bill pass. I move the second reading, seconded by Mr. Lewis.

Mr. DAVIN. With the explanation given by my hon. friend (Mr. Douglas) I heartily support the second reading of his Bill. I may point out to him that he will have to make some change in order to make the Bill square with the explanation, but, as explained, I entirely concur with him. But as explained, I entirely agree with him. I think it is most desirable that if the farmer's son wants to homestead, he should be able to perform his duty without going through the farce that has often been gone through, and which my hon. friend has described as going and sleeping there, and yet boarding at home. It does not, as he said, and it has not been conducive to morality, nor to successful farming, and it has been very useless. I think it is desirable that if there is land within five miles of a farmer who has sons, the lads should be allowed the homestead and perform their duties while living under the paternal roof. I entirely support my hon. friend's Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SOUTHPORT, BELFAST AND MURRAY HARBOUR RAILWAY, ETC.

The House resumed debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Martin for:

Copies of all correspondence, petitions, resolutions and other papers in possession of the Government relating to the proposed branch railway from Southport to Belfast and Murray Harbour, and other proposed railway branches in the province of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has the floor by consent of the House, as the adjournment of the debate was moved by

another hon. member. It was the understanding at the time that the hon. gentleman should have a right to resume his speech; but it is not the rule, it is the exception.

Mr. MARTIN. When I had the honour of saying a few words not very long ago upon this motion, I showed that considerable dissatisfaction exists in the province from which I have the honour to come, in regard to railway expenditure. I think I pointed out to the House and made it very clear, that large railway expenditures had been made in different parts of this Dominion, and that the system introduced in the early days of confederation and continued to this day, have not been applied to Prince Edward Island. I also pointed out that Prince Edward Island had been, as it were, the pioneer in railway construction, and I think I made it clear to the House that Prince Edward Island as a province had contributed more to railway construction than any other province in the Dominion, according to its population. I read a statement which showed that Prince Edward Island had contributed out of its own resources the sum of $15,400 for every mile which we have to-day in that province, and that the province of this Dominion which approached nearest to that sum had only spent something like $4,656 per mile. I also made a claim that since Prince Edward Island entered confederation the expenditure on railways was greatly in excess of the amount stipulated as necessary in the financial arrangement made with Prince Edward Island. I think I succeeded in making that pretty clear. I was proceeding, Mr. Speaker, to refer to some misleading statements in some of the reports of the Department of Railways and Canals, as well as the report on the Public Accounts. But before I resume that branch of my subject, I wish to offer a further tabular statement in regard to expenditures made by the little province of Prince Edward Island. Hon. members may say that this is not relevant, but I think, considering the departure that was made in 1883 by Parliament in regard to railway subsidies, that it is very pertinent indeed, because I think I can show from the Statistical Year-Book and the utterances of hon. members in this House, that the object which this Parliament had in making that departure in 1883 was to relieve the provinces of the burden of railway construction. I can prove that this Dominion has gone into railway construction in different parts of Canada and did not apply that policy to Prince Edward Island, and that that province had had, as it were, to pay out of its own resources the money for railway construction which the other provinces have received out of Dominion funds. I have here a tabular statement which will support my contention a little more fully, if that were possibly required.

Province.	Railway Expenditure.	Population.	Per Head.
	$		$
Ontario.....	17,470,181	2,114,321	8.26
Quebec	14,615,233	1,488,535	9.95
New Brunswick..	4,989,800	321,263	15.53
Nova Scotia.....	2,306,601	450,396	5.12
Manitoba.. .	1,336,275	152,506	8.63
N. W. Territories.	Nil.	98,967	Nil.
British Columbia.	75,000	98,173	*
P. E. Island....	3,150,000	109,078	28.90

* Less than $1 per head.

I am fully justified in saying that there was more progress made in Prince Edward Island in regard to railway construction than in any other province of the Dominion. It is very unjust and unfair to say that a province which believes in railways and which had more than its share of railways at its own cost when it entered confederation—because I have brought to the notice of the House the fact that in 1875 there were only 4,856 miles in the Dominion, while Prince Edward Island had at that time 200 miles—had not built its share, and much more than its share, of railways. Two hundred miles of railways would represent one-twenty-fourth of the railway mileage of the Dominion in 1875. To-day, however, we find that Prince Edward Island has only one-eightieth, and that the large addition to railway mileage we have in the Dominion has been made at the expense of the Island. I have here a return which was brought down in 1896, from which it will be seen that in subsidies the large sum of $42,713,-468 had been paid out in railway subsidies alone, besides $62,500,000 in the Canadian Pacific Railway and $55,000,000 on the Intercolonial Railway—in all $160,213,468. No doubt Prince Edward Island is paying its share of the interest on that expenditure, and so where a claim is made for railway construction by the Island, I do not see how the Government or this House can treat it otherwise than by extending to the province that justice which is due to it. I will show this House that where the provinces—and this is true especially of Prince Edward Island—has paid large sums, the Dominion Government has paid very little, and where the Dominion Government has paid largely, the province has paid little or nothing at all. If hon. gentlemen will turn to page 645 of the Statistical Year-Book they will find that the Dominion Government has expended $153,-996,778 on railways in this country up to June 30, 1895; of course there may have been some expenditure since. Beside, there have been 50,000,000 acres of land granted. I take it that we may estimate that land at

a value of $1.00 per acre. That, in round figures, would give a total expenditure in the neighbourhood of $200,000,000 for railway construction in this Dominion. I do not think I will be very far astray in saying that the debt of this country is represented by money invested in railway construction, in canals and other public works. I wish to show what share of that expenditure has gone to Prince Edward Island. Two hundred million dollars expenditure, counting the population of the Dominion at five million, gives an expenditure per head for railways alone of $40. How much has been expended in Prince Edward Island? The expenditure there for railway construction has been something like $600,000; and in order to be fair, I will add to that sum the amount of $20,000 a year which was added in 1888, and represents at four per cent a capital of $500,000. Five hundred thousand dollars added to $600,000 will give in round figures an expenditure by the Dominion Government on railways in the Island equivalent to $10 per head, counting the population at about 110,000, which is as near as we can make it. According to that calculation, we arrive at this conclusion: that the Dominion Government have expended $200,000,000, or $40 per head throughout the Dominion, while in Prince Edward Island the expenditure has been $1,100,000, which gives a rate of $10 per head, or a difference against the Island of $30 per head. That amount multiplied by the population, leaves the island short of railway construction the sum of $3,000,000, which is pretty nearly the estimate I laid before the House on a previous occasion. When the question was before the House on a previous occasion I stated that the report of the Minister of Railways and the Statistical Year-Book were misleading in this respect, and the fact that the minds of hon. members are not clear as to the amount of money spent by Prince Edward Island, arises from reading the report of the Minister of Railways, and the compilation by Mr. Johnson, who prepares a very clever book known as the Statistical Year-Book, which in many respects is a credit to this Dominion. If my hon. friends will turn to page 12 of the annual report of the Minister of Railways and Canals they will find the following:—

RAILWAY CONSTRUCTION EXPENDITURE.

Before and Since Confederation.

The following shows the total amount expended by the Government for construction of railway works, or granted in aid of such construction: embracing the period prior to confederation and extending down to the 30th of June, 1896.

The statement goes on to point out the amount expended on the Intercolonial Railway, $55,267,044. The expenditure on Prince Edward Island railways is stated at $3,750,575. I ask the House if that is a fair statement. Is that a statement that will bear examination? I think I shall be able to show that that statement is not in accordance with the facts, and that the Island itself as a province has paid most of that expenditure. How such a statement has crept into the report, I cannot say. It may be said that this mistake has only occurred during the past few years; but I have looked back at the reports of the Minister of Railways for some years, as far back as 1876, and I find this error has been continued from year to year, attention apparently never having been called to it. On page 23 I find that the Dominion Government is represented as having spent $3,114,735 on the Prince Edward Island Railway. I am at a loss to find out the ground on which the Minister of Railways places that statement in this report. I think it is entirely misleading. I find in the Public Accounts that a sum of $3,750,000 is set down among the assets of the Dominion for the Prince Edward Island Railway. The railway is worth that I suppose, and there is no doubt that it is an asset, but I think the Government should have put a foot note to it, in order to state that that railway did not cost them a penny, because when Prince Edward Island entered into confederation, she handed that railway over to the Dominion as a gift, for them to operate.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Would my hon. friend (Mr. Martin) take the railway back, and run it at the expense of the Island?

Mr. MARTIN. We might reconsider the terms if my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) would open the question, and see whether or not we would part company with the Dominion altogether.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, no.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not know, but we might take him at his word. I do not think my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) has been very generous to the province, and I believe that almost every project advocated for the benefit of the Island has been opposed by him. Some years ago he opposed giving our little province $20,000 a year, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce then said, that the Government was opening the door wide for corruption. The hon. gentleman may remember, that at one time he referred to Prince Edward Island as one of the shreds and patches of the Dominion. Time has its revenges that may now come home to the hon. gentleman, in view of the fact that the men who occupy the most prominent positions in the Government to-day come from the so-called shreds and patches, and nearly crowded the hon. gentleman out. The figures I shall give to the House to-night I shall take from the blue-book, and everything I say I shall have a statement from an official document to support me. I have met hon. gentlemen on both

sides of the House, and we have talked about Prince Edward Island, its isolation and the difficulties we have in crossing to the mainland in winter. They tell me: Oh, but you have a very fine system of railways on the Island, and I answer them: We have not to thank the Dominion for that. Almost every hon. member of this House that I have met, is under the impression that the Dominion Government has built us those two hundred miles of railway that we have in the province. But to return to the statement in the Public Accounts, which counts as assets of Canada $3,750,000 for the Prince Edward Island Railway. It was a very profitable investment for Canada. They spent $600,000 on the Prince Edward Island Railway, and to-day they call it an asset of $3,750,000. Lord Beaconsfield, in 1875, purchased from the Khedive of Egypt $20,000,000 worth of shares in the Suez Canal. Six years later Mr. Gladstone admitted that those shares doubled in value or an increase of 100 per cent in six years. About the same time Prince Edward Island handed over to the Dominion 200 miles of railway, which cost that province $3,150,000, but which the Dominion received gratis. In 22 years the Dominion, having meantime spent about $600,000 extending it 13 miles for improving and providing for wear and tear, place it down as assets in the balance, of $3,750,000, or an increase of 700 per cent, against 100 per cent in the shares bought by Lord Beaconsfield. Had the Dominion Government invested as largely as Lord Beaconsfield, and if the speculation turned out equally profitable, those assets would not now be $3,750,000, but $75,000,000.

Now, Sir, I am going to lay before this House a statement from the public accounts of the year 1873, when Prince Edward Island entered the confederation, and this statement will show who paid for the Prince Edward Island Railway. If hon. gentlemen will turn to No. 12, Part IV. of the Public Accounts of 1873, p. 12, they will find that when Prince Edward Island entered the Dominion, it was entitled by Imperial Order in Council to the sum of $4,701,050, which was placed to the credit of the Island at confederation on the 1st of July, 1873. I believe that the mistake that has been made in regard to the Dominion Government paying for our railway, arises in this way. In the first place the Dominion actually paid the bills for this railway, but they charged the province with them. In the Public Accounts for 1873, I find the following, which I will give in tabular form, every dollar of which was charged against Prince Edward Island:

1873.		$ cts.
July 1	Debit against the province for railway debentures issued	1,324,606 54
" 29	Draft paid on account P. E. I. Railway	110,083 33
Aug. 11	Paid on contractor's account per A. Drummond	83,133 00
" 11	Interest on $100,000, unpaid warrants from June, 1873	493 15
Sept. 17	Paid A. Drummond on railway account	143,068 37
Nov. 18	" "	135,528 56
Dec. —	" "	32,406 35
1874.		
	Paid contractor on railway account	1,072 67
Jan. 19	Bill of exchange on railway account	103,848 39
Feb. 5	" "	23,207 30
" 25	" "	19,511 55
May 14	" "	2,160 00
Mar. 23	" "	11,818 43
April 16	" "	88,340 69
May 12	" "	26,108 80
June 19	" "	229,725 86
" 19	" "	72,590 09
Aug. 31	Baring Bros., on account P. E. I. Railway	238,511 83
Sept. 30	Glynn, Mills & Co., an account P. E. I. Railway	106,077 00
Oct. 31	" " "	89,236 39
Nov. 30	Baring Bros., on account P. E. I. Railway	84,884 67
Dec. 31	Glynn, Mills & Co., on account P. E. I. Railway	140,000 00
1875.		
Oct. 30	Paid Bank of Montreal P. E. I. Railway account	38,815 36
1878.		
Jan. 1	Payment on accouut of land damages, P. E. I. Railway	30,355 98
Sept. 13	Paid Hon. G. W. DeBlois, on account of land damages	8,174 00
1882.		
Dec. 15	Paid Provincial Secretary land damages on account of P. E. I. Railway	375 00
1888.		
July 25	To Provincial Secretary on account of land damages, P. E. I. Railway,	81 07
	Total	$3,144,214 41

All these items total up to the sum of $3,144,214.41 paid in the first instance by the Dominion Government and charged to Prince Edward Island. When these sums were paid by that province out of the sum which went to the credit of Prince Edward Island, $4,701,000, all that the little province had left was a little over $1,000,000, and from that day Prince Edward Island lost the interest on $3,144,214.41, and the Dominion was the gainer. And to-day, forsooth, after burdening itself to the amount of $28 per head, against between $8 and $9 per head by the other provinces, when Prince Edward Island comes before this Government and makes a demand for railway construction in the province, how are we met? We are met with the statement, "Oh, these blue-books do not bear you out." I put this statement against the blue-books, and if those blue-books are misleading, it is time they were looked over and corrected. I tell this House that when Prince Edward Island spent, as it did spend, $28 per head for railway construction, it did something for which it should obtain a great deal of credit. Hon. members may remember that when this Dominion undertook the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, it was held forth for the admiration of the world that the great Dominion of Canada had undertaken a work which was to become a factor in binding the different parts of the Dominion together; but the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway only entailed on the taxpayers of this Dominion the sum of $16 per head. Divide the sum which Canada contributed to the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway by the population of Canada and you will find that it does not very much exceed $16 per head, while the province of Prince Edward Island has contributed out of its own resources the large sum of $28 per head for railway construction. Not only was a hard and fast bargain driven between the Dominion Government and the province of Prince Edward Island at the beginning with reference to the handing over of the Island Railway to the Dominion, but I have in my hand a return to an address of the House of Commons, dated the 17th of March, 1875, "for copies of all papers and correspondence between the Dominion Government and the Prince Edward Island Government relative to the construction of the Prince Edward Island Railroad, and the transfer of the said railroad to the Dominion Government." Not only did the Dominion Government make a hard and fast bargain with the little province of Prince Edward Island, that it should hand over its railway for nothing to the Dominion Government, but sent down to the province an engineer to see that the railway was fully equipped and in every particular up to certain specifications which that Government imposed upon the contractors. The Dominion Government then exacted its pound of flesh—whilst to-day this great Dominion shelters itself behind a supposed impossibility in carrying out its compact with Prince Edward Island. And now we are met with the statement, "We would like to do justice to Prince Edward Island, but did you pay for your own railway? That is not very clear from the Public Accounts, or the report of the Department of Railways, or the Statistical Year-Book." I think I might as well refer to the Statistical Year-Book, though I do not attach any blame to the gentleman who compiles the statements in it, because he has been mislead by the reports of the departments from which he compiles them. At page 645 of the Statistical Year-Book, section 1012, you will find the following summary statements of aids granted to railways constructed and under construction by Governments, to 30th June, 1895:

Dominion Government	....	.....	$153,996,778
Ontario	do	.....	7,265,533
Quebec	do	.....	16,463,115
N. Brunswick	do	.....	4,656,300
Nova Scotia	do	.....	2,036,916
Manitoba	do	.....	2,626,612
B. Columbia	do	.....	37,500

Is there a cent there for Prince Edward Island? Not one. That is the way hon. members are misled in regard to Prince Edward Island. The very books the Governments issues to the public are misleading in this respect. After the statement I have read, I do not think any hon. member can stand up in this House and say that Prince Edward Island has not contributed largely to railway construction; and when that province which has so generously contributed out of its own resources for railway construction, and is to-day paying the interest on large sums of money expended in other parts of the Dominion—when that province comes before this House and puts in a claim for a small amount for railway construction, I do not think it should be met with a refusal. I think there is a spirit of honour and justice and fair-play in this House, and I hope there is also in the Government that rules this country, though I am sorry some of them are absent to-night. I hope that long-delayed justice will at last be rendered to that province. I am sure that if hon. members study this question, they will no longer be willing to see the smallest province of the Dominion paying its share of interest on moneys which have been used for building railways in the great provinces of Ontario and Quebec and all over the Dominion, and give a deaf ear to all appeals for railway construction in Prince Edward Island. I hope that the present Government will take hold of this question and put the little province of Prince Edward Island on a proper footing in this respect. I think I need not apologize for taking up so much time, and I do not think that I would have been justified in saying less.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). As it is

desirable that the gentlemen more immediately connected with Prince Edward Island should have an opportunity of replying to my hon. friend's arguments, unless indeed he accepts the sporting offer I make him to take back the railway and run it himself, I think it desirable that we should adjourn the debate in order to give my hon. friend the opportunity of replying. I move that the debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

RAILWAY COMMITTEE.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). By unanimous consent of the House, I move that the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) be added to the Railway Committee.

Motion agreed to.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 11th May, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 103) respecting the Canadian Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Landerkin.)

Bill (No. 104) to incorporate the Restigouche Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Domville.)

THE LOBSTER FISHERY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to a matter of very great importance to my constituents in the Island of Cape Breton. It will be remembered that the hon. Minister (Mr. Davies), stated that he was considering with great care the important question of the close time for lobster fishing. I have received a communication from a gentleman of great experience in that matter, and I think it desirable that my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) should have these views before him when he is considering the matter. The writer of this letter says:

Sir,—I have packed lobsters in Cape Breton during the past thirteen years, and on the mainland of Nova Scotia for ten years, and this experience enables me to give you fairly accurate information on the subject. When the eggs or berries first appear on the female lobster, they are black and remain so for several months. These black eggs are formed on them at one season of the year, but principally in April, May and June in Nova Scotia proper, and in May, June and July in Cape Breton. As these eggs develop, they change from black to red or brown until finally two small black points, like eyes, can be seen through the skin of the egg, and a few weeks after this the young are hatched. In Nova Scotia proper, the red or brown eggs appear about the 15th June, while in Cape Breton they do not develop to this stage until about the 15th of July. The young are hatched in Nova Scotia proper about July 15th, and in Cape Breton from August 15th to the 30th, according to the locality. The hatching season in Nova Scotia then is from July 15th to July 31st, while that in Cape Breton is from August 15th to August 31st, perhaps a little earlier from Isle Madame, in Richmond West.

The season for everything in Cape Breton is later than on the mainland. Trout and salmon spawn later here. Birds hatch later, and crops of all kinds are later. To have our lobster season regulated by the conditions that exist in the mainland is contrary to nature. We do not ask to have the season lengthened, but to have it adjusted. The present law gives us from January 1st to July 15th, or six and one-half months. All we ask for is three months, May, June and July. Why close our Cape Breton canneries fifteen days later than those of Yarmouth, while Yarmouth begins three months earlier than we can, and when the lobster here spawn at least five weeks later than there? I have never seen soft-shelled lobsters in Cape Breton until late in August, while in Nova Scotia proper they cast their shells early in July.

It is of the utmost importance that the law regarding spawn or berried lobsters be enforced, and packers should be compelled to observe it. This can best be effected by having packers save the eggs, and hatching them in cans built for the purpose.

Size.—The law regarding size can never be enforced, so long as canneries are permitted to operate at all. At least 50 per cent of the lobsters packed consist of these undersized fish, and fishermen who can scarcely earn enough to support themselves now, would be in a sorry condition, if deprived of half their scanty earnings. The secret of success in protecting the fisheries lies more in the preservation of the eggs than in anything else.

Heat or temperature is necessary for the development of lobster eggs. At present writing (May 5th), this coast is blocked with fields of drift ice from Richmond to Cape North, while the canneries in Nova Scotia are in full blast. Is it not, therefore, conclusive that our season for spawning is later on this coast? Fishermen and packers of other districts complain when Cape Breton asks for three months' fishing, while not one of them would be satisfied with that short period. We ask for a special season here, on account of our geographical position, which causes different conditions than those which exist on the mainland.

I have the honour to be, &c.

I am sure my hon. friend (Mr. Davies) will appreciate the strength of the statements which are made here, as to the entirely different conditions of the lobster fishery in the Island of Cape Breton, from those which exist in other parts of Nova Scotia. I am certain that the hon. gentleman will be prepared to give very full consideration to the strong reasons which are pointed out in this letter, not for an extension of time, but for an adjustment of the time so as to do equal justice to each section of the country.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I need hardly say to the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) that I shall be very pleased to give every consideration to the representations made in this letter, on this important subject. If we conceded the correctness of all the statements of alleged facts made by this gentleman, the conclusion he draws might be perhaps irresistible, but, from the information at my disposal at the present time I am not prepared to accede to the correctness of all these statements. I have read an immense mass of literature on this subject, sent from different parts of the Dominion, and I find it almost impossible to get any two men who have great experience in the industry, to come to the same conclusion with reference to the time that the lobster berries are hatched. There is a great deal to be said against a uniform time, where conditions are different. The same arguments which are urged from Cape Breton are urged with great force by the lobster packers in Prince Edward Island, and I have not been able so far to accede to their demands. Last year, the hon. gentleman who preceded me in the department, received a large number of communications similar to this, and he referred them to Mr. Bertram the inspector of fisheries in Cape Breton. Mr. Bertram made the report which I read the other day, representing that the conditions around Isle Madame in Richmond county, I think, were not materially different from the conditions along the south-east coast of Nova Scotia; but, that the conditions further north on the Island of Cape Breton were somewhat different. Mr. Bertram said, that with a good deal of diffidence he was inclined rather to advise the department that they might extend the time for ten days without injury to the industry.

I call the attention of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) to a very important fact which must not be lost sight of, and that is, that the size of the lobster is gradually diminishing. The reports we have from the inspector of fisheries and from others indicate that to be an indisputable fact.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is stated here.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That being the indisputable fact, it weighs somewhat with me in coming to a conclusion. The scientific gentleman Mr. Prince, by whose advice I am somewhat guided, largely guided, is considering the matter very carefully, and before very long I hope to be able to make an announcement to the House as to the conclusions which he and I have conjointly reached. I hope our conclusions shall be the same. I should be very sorry to form a conclusion adverse to his, and I have reason to believe that we will be able to come to some arrangement which may not be unsatisfactory to all concerned.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I wish to direct the attention of the Minister of Marine to two orders of the House of last September; one calling for the reports and correspondence respecting the appointment and dismissal of the sub-agents of the Department of Marine and Fisheries at Port Pictou; the other for the reports, correspondence and reasons for dismissal of Mr. Daniel McLean, captain of the Pictou Island lifeboat, and the appointment of Mr. Alexander Currie. The papers have not been brought down yet.

SUPPLY—DUTY ON FARM IMPLEMENTS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, before the House goes into committee, I have got a few remarks to make. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) told us that a tariff had been constructed by the Government which they were not too proud to alter, and I think it is exceedingly desirable that he should be told, and that the hon. Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) should be told, at the earliest possible moment, that their tariff is not satisfactory to the North-west Territories, a fact which I think they have learned, not merely from this side of the House. Sir, the tariff has been received with profound dissatisfaction and disappointment, not merely in the North-west Territories, but amongst the farmers of the whole of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. DAVIN. I hear an echo of "noes"; but if I look at the papers which express the opinions of the farmers of Canada—if I look at the weekly "Sun," which expresses the opinions of the farmers of Ontario——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. DAVIN. It used to at one time, I believe, when hon. members were on this side

of the House, but now it does not. This Government is very powerful, but there is one thing it cannot do: it cannot manufacture public opinion. The public opinion is there; they may shut their eyes to it; they may adopt an ostrich policy, and hide their heads in the sand. I will tell you why the tariff is unsatisfactory to the farmers of Canada: it belies all the promises made to the farmers by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), by the Prime Minister (Mr. Laurier), by the Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson), by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and by a dozen others—by my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), who, although he is not in the Government, while he does not play the cards, overlooks the hands. I can assure these hon. gentlemen that there is profound dissatisfaction amongst the farmers of Canada, especially amongst the farmers of the North-west. If hon. gentlemen will not believe me, I have in my hands the Winnipeg "Free Press," which may be said to be an independent supporter of the Government. Since this Government came into power, this paper has given it a general support, and this is what it says about the way the tariff is received in the North-west Territories:

> If the Dominion can buy its cottons and woollens and all those other articles which it is thought necessary to protect with heavy duties, more cheaply in a foreign country than it can make them for itself, why tax the country to maintain those industries? That used to be the Liberal policy, but it is not embodied in the present tariff. * * * The North-west approved of the Liberal fiscal policy, as laid down in the platform adopted at the Ottawa Convention. That policy was opposed to protection in any form, and declared for the utmost freedom of trade consistent with the requirements of the revenue. * * * A step in this direction was made in freeing barbed wire and binder twine, although perhaps more extreme than was necessary. A longer and weightier step would have been made if the duties on agricultural implements had been scaled down to ten or twelve and one-half per cent, and it is all the more regrettable that this was not done, when we realize that substantial reductions might have been made without prejudice to those industries. The implement makers are to-day better off than they were under the old tariff. They lose something of the protection against foreign manufacturers, but for this loss they have more than a compensating gain in the reduction of the duties on their raw material. They can now manufacture at so much less cost that the Government would have been fully warranted in reducing the implement duties to a very low point, and still leave the makers in a position to hold their own against foreign competition. The saving in duty that might have been made on one binder, would be more to the average farmer in Western Canada than would pay his small binder-twine tax for five years. Here was an opportunity lost. The "Free Press" does not make this point because of local prejudice or partiality. It recognizes that the farmers of Western Canada have as much right to stand their share of the public burden as any other. But, in the interest of the whole Dominion, whose hope is in the North-west, it is necessary to encourage settlement here, and the most effective encouragement is to make the lot of the settler as light as possible. The opportunities for this are not confined to implements.

I wish to-day to confine myself to the subject of implements used by the farmer, and I want to ask the attention of those who are engaged in revising the tariff, or manipulating it, to the way in which the farmer of Canada is treated, especially the farmer of the west, for whom I speak. I will take five articles in which the farmers of Canada, especially the farmers of the North-west Territories, are deeply interested. On these articles the duty remains as before, namely, 20 per cent. In the year 1895-96 Canada paid in duty on harvesters and binders, $26,216, of which Manitoba and the Territories paid $23,939, or 91 per cent. We imported 1,628 seed drills, worth $40,496, paying a duty of $8,099, of which Manitoba and the Territories paid $6,994, or 86 per cent. Of horse-rakes, we imported 747, worth $13,583, on which we paid a duty of $2,721, of which Manitoba and the North-west Territories paid $1,616, or close on 60 per cent. Of mowing machines, we imported 2,172, on which we paid a duty of $14,467, of which the west paid $7,694, or more than 50 per cent. Of ploughs, we imported 3,187, worth $51,443, on which a duty was paid of $10,288, the west paying of this $7,613, or nearly 74 per cent. Here are five items in which the farmers of the North-west are deeply interested, and on which we pay a vast percentage of the duty. Then, again, we were told, not merely in Winnipeg, but in Prince Edward Island, that either agricultural implements would be made free or the duty upon them brought very low. Yet the duty on agricultural implements has not been touched, but, on the contrary, those who manufacture them are placed in a much better position than before, because of the reduction of the duty on iron. But not only that, not only will the farmer pay his share of the duty but he will pay henceforth his share of the bounty on iron as well. Those gentlemen who went about the country, and their language is still ringing in our ears, saying they were going to relieve the farmers, that not a vestige of protection was to remain, that everything in the shape of raw material was to be free, that the farmers were to be liberated, that the manacles were to be taken from their ankles, and that they were to be taken out of the slough in which they were, and who inspired such confidence by their oft-expressed determination to do all these things that we had artists limming and painting and embodying, with their artistic genius, all that was to be done by the Liberal party for the farmers—these gentlemen have accomplished what? Not a single duty has been taken off, but the tariff remains just as it was before. In support of that statement, let me give you

the evidence of a witness, an unimpeachable witness, the same to whom I have already referred. That witness used to be in 1895 and down to June, 1896, a brilliant sun in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite, but how it will strike them now, I really do not know. I take the following from the "Sun:"

BROKEN PLEDGES.

The National Liberal Convention, convened in Ottawa in 1893, resolved: That the customs tariff of the Dominion should be based, not as it is now, upon the protective principle, but upon the requirements of the public service; that the highest interests of Canada demanded the removal of this obstacle to our country's progress by the adoption of a sound fiscal policy, which, while not doing injustice to any class, will promote domestic and foreign trade and hasten the return of prosperity to our people; that, to that end, the tariff should be reduced to the needs of honest, economical and efficient government.

Here is the comment of the "Sun" on the tariff brought down by this Government:

The Liberal Government, in 1897, placed a duty of 5 cents a gallon on coal oil, which is equivalent to an ad valorem duty of 60 per cent. The old duty of 6 cents a gallon brought to the Treasury only $685,000. This duty is based on the protective principle. So are the duties of 4 cents a gallon on vinegar, 35 per cent on wall paper, 35 per cent on knitted goods, 27½ per cent on biscuits, 35 per cent on lead pipe, 35 per cent on window shades, and a great many others which might be enumerated. We are of opinion that every duty which exceeds 25 per cent, is unquestionably based on the protective principle. If the Government had kept rigidly to the "needs of honest, economical and efficient government," the tariff might have been safely reduced to 25 per cent.

Will any man doubt for one moment that I speak by the book when I say that the farmers in Canada, the farmers in Ontario and the North-west, are dissatisfied? Why, even in Quebec we have evidences of dissatisfaction. I could quote a paper published in Chicoutimi, which is not an agricultural paper, but occasionally gives its attention to agriculture, and it condemns strongly the features of this tariff, and amongst others that feature of taking off the duty from Indian corn. I am sorry the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) is leaving, because I am going to call him in as a witness, and I feel satisfied that the inspired words of that great Liberal will have more influence with the Government than anything I could say. With regard to this tariff: Is it possible, says this witness, for this Government to do anything by wholesale? Must they tinker out every proposal they make? And again he says:

The hon. gentleman's proceedings have done this, at any rate: they import an element of great uncertainty into the trade and business of this country.

Sir, it will be remembered that we listened to a speech from the Finance Minister and the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Controller of Customs and others, and we asked for information, we asked for light, we asked for some intimation as to what the tariff was going to prove. And when these hon. gentlemen sat down, after making those speeches, we were as ignorant as when they stood up. And to this hour they do not know themselves how they stand with regard to certain features of the tariff, or how that tariff is regarded by those who are more particularly interested in the only portion of it that some people who do not understand it have received with favour—the preferential clause. We learn from what was stated in another place that, up to a few days ago, not a word has this Government received from any Minister of the Crown in London, as to how the English Government regard this preferential clause. Listen to my witness.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What witness?

Mr. DAVIN. The Minister of Trade and Commerce. Here is the witness and here is what he said:

Mr. FOSTER. But he is not here.

Mr. DAVIN. Oh, we have him in spirit and his spirit is much more pleasant than his concrete existence:

We asked him to let us know what his calculations were as to the extent to which these varied changes would affect the revenue of the country. What was the answer we got? We wanted to know the loss of revenue that was likely to accrue in consequence of the reductions of duties; but the hon. gentleman did not know. We asked to know the loss which was likely to accrue from the bounties he proposed to give;—

Mr. SPEAKER. Is the hon. gentleman referring to a previous debate?

Mr. DAVIN. I am referring to the debates of 1894. I am too much on my guard, Mr. Speaker, to be caught in that way. You have barred me out of the whole animal kingdom, insects and all, which I thought were fair prey for the imagination and fair subjects for simile, and am therefore under a very wholesome dread of your ruling:

—but the hon. gentleman did not know. The hon. gentleman told us that it was all guess-work, and that the result of his lucubrations was, in brief, this: that he was about to make a leap in the dark, and he did not know where he would land.

I myself have described this tariff as higgledy-piggledy. Now, here is what my witness said of it, and mark how suitable are his words:

I do not say that no relief is going to be given, but I say that, for a thoroughly revised tariff,

I never saw more disturbance, with more pitiful results. If I were going to coin a word for it, I would be very apt to describe it, not exactly as a tariff of shams perhaps, but certainly as a tariff of makeshifts. There is no sort of finality about such a tariff as that. The hon. gentleman will find that you cannot stop here. He will have to go further. He will have to make more concessions. He will find himself compelled, whether he likes it or not, by reason of the very concessions he has given and of the very steps he has taken, to surrender or to quit.

And again :

We have a tariff embodying no principle ; we have a tariff which I have declared, and I think, rightly, to be merely a makeshift tariff. There, and there alone, perhaps, hon. gentlemen have been consistent.

And now I ask the attention of the Controller of Customs to this :

We find a reduction of two and a half and five per cent in cases in which four times that reduction should have been made. I am sure the Ministers do not know, and I think the trade cannot yet judge, how far the abrogations of the compound duties and the substitution of very considerable ad valorem duties will, for the time being, produce any substantial relief. It may, in the long run, by reason of mechanical improvements constantly going on in mechanical processes, but I doubt exceedingly if much of the readjustment is at all fair. Take a case——

Mark this, Mr. Speaker, how prophetic this is :

Take a case with which I am somewhat familiar, the article of agricultural implements. It is right there should be a reduction.

If it is right why did he not make it, had he not a hand in framing the tariff ? But no reductions were made. "We find reductions of from 2½ to 5 per cent." Why, Sir, a clever writer in the "Mail" has made an analysis of the actual reductions in this tariff before us, the reductions under the preferential system, and he has used very expressive language, though I do not know that it will be regarded as parliamentary. He says the Government did a clever Yankee trick before they brought down the reduction, that they increased the duties before reducing them under the preferential rate. "First, he butters them up and then he slithers them down." The "Mail" goes into a calculation showing these reductions, and a very interesting one it is. I made an abstract of it. The greatest reduction made, according to this is 3¾ per cent, as compared with the tariff of 1894, and yet these gentlemen are representing to the country that they have made great concessions to the people, and have effected great reductions. The writer in the "Mail" takes carpets, for instance. That duty was 30 per cent, maximum 35 per cent, minimum 26½ per cent. And what is the difference between that and the present duty ? Simply 3½ per cent. On shawls, the duty was 25 per cent, maximum 30 per cent, minimum 22½ per cent. And what is the difference between the duty under the late Government and that imposed by the very clever gentlemen who sit opposite ? The difference is 2½ per cent—the 2½ that excites the scorn of the hon. gentleman who strutted out a few moments ago determined to hear no more—he knew what was coming.

And the Bengal tiger has ceased to be brave.

The following are some further items :—

	Old Duty.	Maximum.	Minimum.	Reduction under New Tariff.
	pc.	pc.	pc.	pc.
Linen	30	35	26½	3½
Dress goods	22½	25	18¾	3¾
Laces	30	35	26¼	3¾
Sewing thread	12½	15	10¼	2¼
Cotton fabrics	30	35	26¼	3¾
Braids	30	35	26¼	3¾
Musical instruments	25	30	22½	2½
Cutlery	25	30	22½	2½

The reductions, therefore, Mr. Speaker, are 3¾, 2½ and 1¼ per cent. And mark the corn of my witness of such petty reductions. He says :

We find reductions of 2½ per cent and 5 per cent in cases in which four times that reduction should have been made.

Oh ! my prophetic soul ! The prophetic element in this speech has now the endorsation of history, as truly inspired prophecy must surely have.

I repeat,——

says our witness,

—speaking generally and looking at this tariff as a whole, that I believe you have about the maximum of disturbance and the minimum of real relief, and it is not an insignificant consideration, that you have imported a great element of uncertainty into trade and commercial transactions. So far as the people have been relieved, good ; but at the same time it does appear to me, that when you are overturning the whole tariff, some reasonable or substantial relief, vastly greater than that proposed, might have been afforded.

That is exactly what we say. You remember, Mr. Speaker, because you were a member of the House at the time, that I propounded some years ago the doctrine of scientific protection. I contended that things may be done under a tariff based on scientific protection that cannot be done under a tariff based on protection by the rule of thumb or on free trade. On that ground I differed, as I have shown, from the tariff put forward by Sir Leonard Tilley in 1879. I told the farmers of the west that. And I told them in the last election that they would never get relief on these implements from a Liberal Government. I told them

that, notwithstanding the assurances they had, they would not get that relief. But I said: You can get that relief from a Conservative Government that believes in protection, if it proceeds on a scientific basis. Now, in regard to that, a paper in the west that differs from the "Free Press," and would, in fact, say anything that suited certain persons that are believers in the present Government, tries to make a comparison between my criticism of the Foster tariff and my criticism of this tariff. I said that the Foster tariff was a very bold tariff. It did not confine itself merely to 2½ and 5 per cent reductions, as I showed at the time. On the contrary, in regard to these very implements that I am now interested in mainly, in this speech, it took off 15 per cent—reduced them from 35 per cent to 20 per cent. We expected, of course, that the Liberal Government would go more than one better than that. We expected that they would take off at least 15 per cent, or make them free. Now, it would seem that I have, to some extent, made a convert of the witness I am citing. I do not think I have thoroughly converted him. He seems to lean for a moment to the idea of scientific protection. I do not think I was very successful. I was somewhat like the shipwright of Sir Hugh Allan. Sir Hugh bought a schooner that had belonged to a butcher, designing to use it in doing the coasting trade in Ireland. The name of the boat was changed from the name of the butcher to the "St. Patrick." Sir Hugh went down to the dockyard and saw the shipwright working at the effigy. He asked him what they were doing? The foreman shipwright said: "I have a hard job in hand—to make a saint out of a butcher." I have a hard job in hand to make a scientific protectionist out of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), but I do seem to have been to some extent successful, judging from this quotation:

> Putting the whole case together, I say, that for a protective tariff, scientifically constructed, if such a thing be possible—some people say it is, but I have my doubts—but for a protective tariff something is to be said;——

There is the Minister of Trade and Commerce—

> —for a revenue tariff a very great deal is to be said; but for this amorphous botch nothing is to be said.

Take this present tariff, which nobody can describe, which its author heralded with eulogies of free trade, for this amorphous botch nothing can be said. Hear again our witness:

> It is neither fish, flesh nor red herring. It really does nothing at all but disturb everybody, make a certain number of corners, which will appear as we go through it in minute detail, and conciliate for a time, until the elections come on, a certain number of gulls, whom the hon. gentlemen have deluded in times past.

Now, Sir, could anything be more appropriate? It is quite clear, the temporarily dominant party and their gulls believe in humbug. Let us build altars to humbug, and let us peal out from steeples of humbug and steeples of sham, notes glorifying a policy gulling the people. Now, Sir, hear our witness as to the capacity of the Government, and this is really very fine:

> One thing I must congratulate the Government upon, and that is their capacity for swallowing, not only their own previous professions upon the subject, but their predecessors', too.

This is a mere sketch of his colleagues, but it is dashed off in glowing colours from the rainbow palette of a political Rubens. You will remember what Biglow says:

> A merciful Providence fashioned us holler,
> A' purpose that we might our principles swaller.
> It can hold any amount of them, the belly can,
> And bring them up whole again, like the pelican.

One thing our witness is specially strong on, is the importance of the United States market and the folly of retaliation. Mark what he says about retaliation, and retaliation is one of the cardinal principles of this tariff:

> Did Mr. McKinley impose, or threaten to impose, new taxes? The House will remember that straightway the hon. Minister of Finance imposed new taxes.

And he indicates that he was a great fool for doing so. He goes on further:

> The Government, largely by their own foolish conduct, has barred us out of one market; at any rate, it has done nothing, and is doing nothing, to secure us access to the American market.

And this leading member of this Government proceeds to dwell on the importance of the American market to this country, especially to the people of the maritime provinces and to the North-west. Now, Mr. Speaker, bearing in mind another feature of the new departure of hon. gentlemen opposite, we are not ignorant of the fact that leading men opposite were hand in glove with Mr. Dana, of the "Sun," of New York; we are not ignorant at all of the intimacy that existed between Mr. Dana, of the "Sun," and leading Liberals of Canada, nor of the communications that took place between them, nor of the projects that certainly some of them mutually cherished with that very objectionable United States editor. Bearing in mind their glowing loyalty now, and the large amount they try to make out of the preferential feature of this tariff, without knowing at this moment whether England will accept it or allow it to go into operation, here is what our witness again says:

> And the only true and real valuable market is the market which extends for three thousand

miles along our southern border. You must remember that, when you talk of the British market, you talk of a market in which no special privilege is, or can be, given to us.

So that at that time, and it is not very long ago, we thought the fact that we could get no special privilege there, was a matter for some serious consideration. And again:

But after all said and done, you are not going to get the English people to give you any special privileges or to pay more for wheat, or Canadian beef, than they can buy it for in open market. Disabuse your minds at once and for ever of that idea. The British people cannot do it, and the British Government, whether they be Conservative or Radical, have not the faintest intention of doing it either.

Now, in connection with this, he spoke about the duty on iron. In the same speech he indicates that the duty on iron should have gone. Now, Sir, I want to give the witness's description of protection, that protection which is now admitted by the "Globe," which is admitted by every paper, Liberal and Conservative, in the country, to be still in this tariff of this Liberal Government. This is what our witness says of protection:

Protection, Sir, is like the measles: in itself it is not very formidable, but it has very dangerous secondary symptoms, and the most dangerous of these is, as I have often pointed out, the inevitable and terrible corruption which, under the system of protection to manufacturers, is the certain consequence of protection.

And again:

The Government have done worse. They have introduced a debasing and degrading element in the body politic. If there was no other reason, if all they say as to our material progress was true, as I know it to be false, it would be enough for ever to condemn the protective principle in the eyes of honest men, that, wherever you have protection, you have corruption, and corruption in the highest degree. Protection and corruption are political Siamese twins.

And yet, Sir, he walks between the legs of the two Siamese twins, now worshipping them with the zeal of a devotee.

They have never been separated in this world, and I do not think they will be in the next

Then he goes on to announce his policy, and what do you think his policy is? What is the policy of my witness who now is a member of the Government that has kept the protective principle of his predecessors and added their protective principles to it?

You demand our policy; you demand mine, and you shall have it. I announced it years ago. My policy, from first to last, ever since this infamous system was put on the statute-book, has been to do away with protection, how I do not care. If free trade would do it, I was for that; if continental free trade or reciprocity with the United States would do it, I was for that.

And, therefore, meaning discrimination against England.

Always and at all times, from the time I was Finance Minister until the present hour, I have set my face like flint against recognizing in any shape or way the tyranny of protection.

Sir, tell it not in Gath. The same man who uttered that here in this House in 1894, who told us then that from the time he was Finance Minister he had set his face as a flint against protection, who told us from his place that that tariff that was in his hands, which is admittedly a protective tariff, was a tariff that he was going to introduce himself in 1876—why, Sir, it is terrible.

Sir, they demand our policy. Well, Sir, they shall have our policy. Our policy is death to protection and war to the knife to corruption.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, and I am afraid the shadow of corruption has already cast its upas influence over you.

Sir, we strike, and we will strike, for liberty and freedom from this system of protective taxation; and I tell the hon. gentleman, that we will not rest until the slavery they have imposed upon us, has become a thing of the past, and until Canadians are free, as Canadians ought to be.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say that the feeling in the North-west at the present moment about agricultural implements is not merely one of disappointment, but a feeling that they have been deceived, that promises have been made to them which have not been fulfilled. They have read these protests of the leading financial critic of the Opposition for eighteen years, and with these protests ringing in their ears, and resting in the hearts of many of them, they have a right to expect something very different from what they have received. Now, Sir, my hon. friend the Prime Minister, referring a few days ago to an indiscretion of one of his supporters, the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) said, that he wished to have more business and less poetry. There is sometimes a great deal of business even in poetry, and a poet down by the sea has managed to put a great deal of matter and business in some verses that bear closely on the tariff. These verses place in a light that will not rapidly pass away the treacherous action and broken promises of the Liberal party. The verses are as follows:—

A statesman spoke to a statesman
In the hush of the midnight hour:
By a fluke we have won the battle,
By a chance we have gained the power.
We have promised to make a tariff
That shall be a joy to those
Who live in the land that the poet calls
Our Lady of the Snows.

We have lied to the sunburned farmers
Who sweat through the toil-long day
On the league-long western furrows,
On the dykes of Fundy's Bay,
And to the fishers who face the spindrift
When the bitter norther blows,
The men who make up the strength and wealth
Of Our Lady of the Snows.

We've promised them freedom in traffic,
We've promised them freedom from toil,
We've promised to break up the "robber combines,"
For the tiller of the soil.
But we've helped our friends whenever we could,
We have made it rough for our foes,
And we've saddled the same old "robber combines"
On Our Lady of the Snows.

Said a statesman unto a statesman :
In my province by the sea,
I talked Free Trade, and I talked Repeal,
It was all the same to me
So long as I got me back to power
In the land where the Mayflower blows,
And I made no shift to cut adrift
From Our Lady of the Snows.

So now we'll give them the loyalty cry
In this, the jubilee year,
And if it takes, our salaries are safe,
And there's little else to fear.
But if preference in trade can be carried out,
There is never a one of us knows,
So we'll have a try to blind the eye
Of Our Lady of the Snows.

Said a statesman unto a statesman
In the flush of the morning bright :
The gudgeons have taken the tempting bait
That we fixed for them over night.
We have fooled the poet, we have fooled the people,
For how long, God only knows,
And we'll stick to the wreck while there's money to get
From Our Lady of the Snows.

In regard to the implements, there is general dissatisfaction, because the relief has not come that might reasonably have been expected, and because the promises made by the Government have not been kept. I, therefore, move :

That all the words after "that" be omitted, and the following substituted :—That good faith with the western farmers demands that agricultural implements should be placed on the free list.

Let me say here that the disappointment is general, as is shown by the fact that this motion is moved by a member from the west and seconded by a member from the east. I do not make this motion as a vote of want of confidence, but in order to obtain the opinion of this House on the question, and because I want to impress on the minds of members of the Government when they are making changes in the tariff that they should place agricultural implements on the free list.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Bain) read the amendment.

Mr. DAVIN. With the permission of the House I will substitute the words :

Good faith with the western farmers on the part of the Government demands that agricultural implements be placed on the free list.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Too late.

Mr. LANDERKIN. This is very posterior.

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Post Office Department, amount required to pay those officers of the Savings Bank Branch engaged in the balancing of and computing interest on depositors' accounts, to 30th June, 1897..... $2,850

Mr. FOSTER. What is the cause of the increase ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). That covers an extra allowance of $100 because of the increased number of savings bank accounts, so many cents extra being paid on each account.

Civil Service Examiners..... $2,450

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Are the examinations carried on the same as before ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of this increase of $150 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Better let the item stand if it is objected to. I have not the papers now.

Contingencies—Privy Council Office..... $7,500

Mr. DAVIN. I want to call attention to the fact, that in 1894 it was declared on the authority of the great financial critic of the Opposition, that this country could be run for much less money than it was run for. The present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) then declared that it was absurd that $36,000,000 or $37,000,000 should be spent by Government, and he declared that it should not cost more than $813,000 to meet the claims of Civil Government. And yet, what have we at the present moment ? We have $44,000,000 asked for by this Government, three years after one of the leading colleagues of the Prime Minister declared, that it was a monstrous thing to ask $37,000,000. In regard to this item I say, that we ought to commence right away and prune down the expenditure. We have a Government in power pledged to a reduction of expenditure, pledged to give relief to the agriculturists, pledged to give relief in regard to coal oil, pledged to give relief in regard to iron and timber, and still more deeply pledged to the curtailment of expenditure. But, instead of the pruning knife being

used, instead of the banner of economy being elevated by these gentlemen, we find that the expenditure is placed at over $44,000,000. I will not take the responsibility of moving a reduction of this item, but I say, that it will be a scandal to the country, and it will be a thing the country will ask us all to give account of, if with a Government in power that is pledged to economy, we do not see, in regard to every item, whether we cannot reduce the burdens that the people are groaning under. I have shown already that on five items the farmers of the North-west pay on an average from 75 to 85 per cent of the duty on the things that come into this country. That is a serious matter, and there is not an item in these Estimates that the farmers do not pay their share of. We have heard from you, Mr. Chairman (Mr. Lister), in your eloquent and impressive manner in this House and elsewhere in the past, and we have heard from distinguished members in the Liberal party in the same strain, strong words condemning the high expenditure. We have heard from you, Mr. Chairman how the farmer was bled white, and we have heard the Minister of Trade and Commerce ask indignantly: Are we to be taxed to death? Mr. Chairman, I echo his words here to-day, and I echo your words: Are we to be taxed to death; are we to be bled white? Sir, the amount of money that at the present time is asked to carry on the business of the country is so great, that the most sanguine amongst us must feel alarmed as to whether or not we can face the future. If, with a Liberal Government in power, a Government pledged to economy, a Government that when in Opposition declared that it was a scandal to spend from $36,000,000 to $37,000,000; if the first thing they do is to ask for over $44,000,000 to run the country, what are we to expect for the future. If they do these things in the green tree, what shall we have in the dry? If they do these things when they are young in power, what shall we have when the more sinister elements of the party have asserted themselves with more vigour, and more force, and more persistency, and more organization than to-day? These $44,000,000 look menacing as to the amount that will be asked for by hon. gentlemen opposite in the future. If we on this side of the House, do not protest vigorously this year, we shall have them next year asking probably for $45,000,000, and pledged as they are to economy, they will go on, year after year, adding to our expenses. Mr. Chairman, I for one am determined to hold these gentlemen opposite to their professions in regard to economy, and I will call attention at every suitable opportunity to the painful contrast between their loud promise and their poor performance.

Mr. FOSTER. What items are included in sundries?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Telegrams, cab-hire, travelling expenses, newspapers and petty items of that kind.

Mr. FOSTER. How much for newspapers?

The PRIME MINISTER. I cannot tell at the present time, but they are just about what they were under the last Administration. I do not think the number of newspapers has been increased by five.

Mr. FOSTER. I would call my hon. friend's attention to the very strong declaration made the other evening by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron), who stated his creed in very emphatic language. My hon. friend does not seem to have profited by that.

The PRIME MINISTER. What was it? I was not here to profit by it.

Mr. FOSTER. I would rather he would consult his friend himself.

Contingencies—Department of the Secretary of State..... $5,500

Mr. FOSTER. Would my hon. friend tell me who are employed and paid under the item for clerical assistance. We have always had the impression from hon. gentlemen opposite that this was a very much over-manned department. I see it is kept up pretty well in the regular list.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). It is reduced $637.98.

Mr. FOSTER. But only $256.66 on clerical assistance. Has my hon. friend the names of those employed?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have not the names, but I think they are the same as those employed in 1896, except one or two changes. I think I heard that one lady got married. I will get the names.

Contingencies—Department of the Interior $18,395

Mr. FOSTER. We would like an explanation of this.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The increase in the salary of J. A. Bollard is the item which perhaps requires explanation. Mr. Bollard was employed in the civil service in September, 1884, at $1.25 a day. He was transferred in 1887 to the Department of Agriculture, and his salary was increased later to $600 a year. When the immigration work was transferred from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Interior, this gentleman was brought with the Immigration Department, and his salary was reduced to $400. I therefore found this young gentleman, after having been ten years in the service, receiving a salary of $200 less than it was some four years ago. If he had

been treated in the way that other employees had been treated, his salary would have been $750 or $800; and in view of the length of his services and their satisfactory nature, it seemed only fair to me that he should receive an increase, and most unfair that his salary should have been cut down to $400, as it was by the late Government. Careful inquiry failed to elicit any possible reason for the action that was taken. Nobody seems to know any reason why he was treated in that way. It is not because I have any special interest in the gentleman himself, but because I think he was unfairly treated as compared with other employees, that I have made the recommendation that his salary should be increased to $700, which is a fair salary compared with the salaries of other clerks doing the same class of work, and not doing it any better than he is. The other special item is $395 for T. W. Hodgins. Mr. Hodgins has been employed in the department as a temporary messenger since 1887. For several sessions, however, another assistant was obtained in the department, and Hodgins was given leave, without pay from the department, to act as a messenger during each session to the parliamentary library, so that he would receive a better salary than he was being paid in the department. He has not passed any civil service examination; but, notwithstanding this fact, he would be eligible to be continued in the department as temporary messenger had his employment in the department not ceased at the expiration of the 31st of December, 1895, Parliament having been called for the 2nd of January, 1896, and Hodgins having been given leave to accept employment during the session as a messenger, and not having been paid for the 1st of January, 1896, by reason of the fact that he was not technically in the employ of the department on that day. One day elapsed between the end of the year, when he was given leave to come over here, and the commencement of the session on the 2nd of January. The Deputy Minister of Justice advised the department that he did come within the rule, and he was left out apparently because nobody had taken the trouble to protect him. Of course, he was not aware of the provisions of the Act, and could not do it himself. I found, however, that Mr. Hodgins was there performing the duties as usual, and Mr. Burgess said he thought it was a hard case and that he ought to be provided for, and I believed that to be the correct view. His services are required, and it would be a mistake to dispense with them and put on somebody else. In connection with this vote, I may say that $600 of the salary of my private secretary is paid out of it.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman could find no reason for the treatment given to Mr. Bollard. If he would look into the matter carefully, he would find that Mr. Bollard's is not the only case. There were quite a number of transfers at the time when the Immigration Department was removed to the Department of Agriculture, and at that time a large number of temporary employees were dispensed with or put on the permanent list. Those put on the permanent list were men who were entitled to be put on, under the civil service law, as having been there since 1882. They were eligible to appointment without examination, but the civil service law requires that the first appointment shall be at the minimum salary. These men had the choice of becoming permanent, beginning with the minimum salary, and a number of them took it. Mr. Bollard's case was not the only one. There were about a dozen in the Railway and the Interior and some other departments, so that I am not saying that Mr. Bollard's services are not worth the $700, but I say that when he receives this treatment and has his salary raised on that ground, if the head of the department will look into the matter he will find a dozen cases of the same kind, and cases in which clerks were longer in the service than Mr. Bollard, who was there from 1884.

Contingencies—Auditor General's Office.... $2,500

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). This is an increase of $700, which the Auditor has asked for, in view of the immense amount of work and the bulky volume he gets out. And no doubt he expects to have still heavier work and wishes to be fully prepared for emergencies.

Mr. FOSTER. On that consideration I would not object to the increase. No doubt his labours will be considerably enlarged, but would it not be possible to have the volume made a little less bulky? My impression is that it largely now defeats its object in being so bulky that it is almost impossible for a man to wade through it. I know that the pockets of my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) have had to be greatly enlarged of late in order to enable him to carry round this book, as his vade mecum.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I will consult with my hon. friend from North Wellington.

Mr. FOSTER. For the convenience of others, does not my hon. friend think something might be done to whittle down this volume? The accounts in it are very largely duplicated, as they appear, in numerous cases, in the departmental accounts, and it seems to me the bulk could be diminished without lessening its intrinsic value.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I will confer with the Auditor General on that point. It deserves consideration, for the volume is a bulky one, I admit.

On the other hand, we must bear in mind that it is an advantage to have all these things in the one place. The public at large do not find it easy to have access to our various departmental reports, and one bulky volume is better than a dozen. I have no doubt that the Auditor General will be glad, for the sake of himself and his staff, to reduce the size, provided he may do so without laying himself open to the charge that he is endeavouring to excuse our infamies while he always gave expansion to those of my hon. friends opposite

Mr. FOSTER. I have not the least doubt that the Auditor General will deal perfectly fairly with hon. gentlemen opposite, just as he did with us.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I was about to suggest whether it would not be better to discuss this in the Public Accounts Committee, where the Auditor General would be present.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is a good suggestion. I rise merely to say, and it will come with greater force from this side, that it is a pity the Auditor General does not follow more closely the English practice. I have had several times occasion to look into the Auditor General's Report over there, who has a vastly greater expenditure to examine into, and his report is smaller than ours. If he attempted anything like the system of the Auditor General of this country, his volume would be enormous. I do not think any public interest is served by the publication in full of correspondence with the different departments over most trifling matters. Attention might be called to such expenditure, but I do not see that it is necessary to fill page after page with little discussions between deputy heads and the Auditor General with regard to comparatively insignificant matters, involving an enormous amount of clerical work. I think the work would be far more satisfactory if the practice of the Auditor General of England was followed, and that is the practice which, I think, our Auditor General followed when he began his career.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The point is well worthy of consideration, but I think the suggestion of my hon. colleague that we should discuss this matter in the Public Accounts Committee is one we should follow. That committee is in a position to investigate the subject and would very likely strike out something or make some modifications in the present system. It could be discussed there whenever the hon. gentleman likes.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to say a word or two. I consider that the Auditor General's Report is the most valuable book that is issued from any of the departments in Ottawa. There is no blue-book issued that is more generally inquired for or more closely and carefully read. I believe the people of the Dominion are becoming generally informed as to the receipts and expenditures of the several departments and of the general management of affairs, and they are getting that information more by the perusal of the Auditor General's Report than any other document that is issued by the Government. I do not at all challenge the action of the Auditor General in increasing the size of the volume. He has had extended experience as Auditor General, and I think he has proved a most valuable officer to this country in discharging his onerous duties. He has frequently brought to light in that report matters that have deeply interested the people of this country and that have been largely discussed on the floor of this House. I am sorry that the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) appears to find the book so voluminous that it is almost useless to him. After he has sat in Opposition for fifteen years, as I did, and has as closely perused this volume, he will find no difficulty. He will grow accustomed to it. I recommend this volume to his attention, and I hope he will read it closely and will grow as familiar with it as I have become. When he has done so, he will respect and commend every page in that valuable volume.

Contingencies—The Dept. of Customs—	
Clerical and other assistance.....	$2,770
Printing and stationery.....	2,000
Sundries	2,730
	$7,500

Mr. FOSTER. I am sorry to see that the economical Controller of Customs has raised one item of his Estimates.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. He has reduced it $300 on the whole.

Mr. FOSTER. What he cuts off counts for nothing, of course. It is the increase that attracts attention.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The hon. gentleman refers, no doubt, to the addition to the item for clerical and other assistance. There is an advance of $30 granted each year to the extra employees till they reach a maximum of $600. There are five of them getting the addition of $30 and one other whose salary requires only $20 to bring it up to the maximum. This makes up the $170 of increase. Then there is a decrease in sundries of $400, making a net saving of $300 on the item.

Mr. FOSTER. That opens a new phase of the question. I must ask the attention of the Prime Minister (Mr. Laurier) to that and also that of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright). It was stated by the Prime Minister and others that the statutory increases were to be cut off.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. To be.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, and that has been stated with reference to the year for which we are now voting the Estimates. We were told that they were cut off in every case except those that had accrued during the previous half term. Now the Controller of Customs gives expression to the principle that in the writers' class the statutory increases which are provided for by the law have currency. Is the Government going to be consistent or not? If statutory increases are cut off from one class of clerks, how is it that they are given to the other? I would like to have an explanation from the Minister about that.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. This, the hon. gentleman will see, is for the extra clerks, whose maximum salary is $600, and I am providing to give them the increase of $30 in those cases where they are below the maximum, and in one case where it requires only $20 to bring the salary up to the maximum that is provided for. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) take exception to that?

Mr. FOSTER. The principle was laid down that the Government are going to do away with statutory increases in all other departments. I have heard that enunciated and have seen it carried out in the Estimates. But the Controller of Customs states a different principle—that so far as one class of clerks are concerned, namely, the writers (who are by law made eligible to increases in exactly the same way as the others are) this system of statutory increases is to be continued, while it is discontinued with respect to the others. The Government ought either cut it off these or else give it to the other classes. My own view is, and I have previously stated it, that the statutory increases ought to be given to all those who deserve it. But the Government surely has no defence for giving it to one class of clerks and denying it to the others. I think I ought to have an answer to that. I think I must have an answer to that.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. My answer is that the salaries are too small in some cases, and I think these clerks deserve an increase. The maximum salary is $600. I ask the hon. gentleman if he objects to this proposal.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is not going to cow me by demanding to be told if I object to it. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well what my criticism is, and so do all the members of the Government. Are they going to answer that criticism or are they not. I take the same position now that I took the other day. I say that the better principle is to give every deserving clerk his statutory increase. But, surely, there must be consistency. The dictum of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), which he caused to be made public before he became a member of the Government, about the time he assumed his present position, that he had made a condition that he should be allowed to do as he liked in his own department cannot be carried out by Ministers under the form of Government we have. One Minister must do the same as another in regard to questions of general policy. Here seems to be a clear contradiction as between members of the Government on a question of public policy, and it is that that I want to have cleared up. I must appeal to my hon. friend the Prime Minister, whether he is to have the same principle throughout or not.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am sorry to say I have not followed the discussion.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not my fault, but, for the sake of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) I will state the point again. I understood the Government to have adopted this as their policy with reference to increases of salary to clerks. It was stated here by all the responsible Ministers who have so far passed Estimates that they have changed the old principle. The old principle, which has been acted on for many years, was that the statutory increases of $30 and $50 should be given each year to deserving clerks on the representation of the Deputy Minister to the Minister. Now, the Government say: We are going to sweep away all these statutory increases, and we are going to allow each Minister to pick out the deserving ones as he pleases and give what he pleases, and can get the committee to assent to. On that principle the Minister of the Interior picks out eight, and made increases up to $100 to $250 to their salaries, leaving out all the others. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries picked out two, I think, and gave them increases, and all the rest got no increase at all. So that hereafter the principle is to be one of selection, and statutory increase goes. If the Minister thinks there is a deserving increase he comes down and signalizes that case, and asks for a vote. Now, when the Controller of Customs comes up he speaks of a class that had not been spoken of before, that is a class under the civil service, under the law just the same as the others, the writers' class, which come in at $300 or $400 and may go up to maximum of $600 by regular statutory increase, the same as from minimum to maximum in the other classes. Now, the Controller of Customs states in explaining his Estimates that he has added the $30 increase all the way through. He is doing what I think is the right thing to do. I argue that it should be applied to the whole civil service, and I ask the Government to explain the inconsistency of applying it to three or four classes and taking it away from the others. My own impression certainly is—and I do not want it to be weakened in the least—my own impression is, more particularly with regard to the lower grade of clerks, that it is a great injustice to take away

from them the little accretion that they get for faithful service upon the expectancy of which they entered the service. Now, there are a dozen or more in the civil service to-day that went in from the time that I became a member of Parliament, cases in which those young men applied to me and I placed the matter before them in this way: Here is the law, here is the custom. You go in and be a good clerk and do your duties well. You go in at the minimum of $400 and you get your $50 increase until you get to the maximum, then you will have a chance for promotion. But all this is now swept away, and I want to know where the consistency comes in, if you sweep it away in one Minister's department and keep it in another, if you sweep it away in certain classes and keep it in other classes of clerks. I wish the Government would go back to the old principle, guarding it, if you please, in this way; giving no increase except when the case has been inquired into, has been reported upon by the Deputy Minister and approved by the Minister, if it is found that he is really a good clerk. That would keep back the non-deserving class, but it would give the deserving clerks their increase upon somewhat of a principle. I would like to see that done, and if that were done I would find no fault with what the Controller of Customs is doing. But we all see that there is an inconsistency somewhere, that the Government is not acting upon a certain principle.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The hon. gentleman draws no distinction. These, as I have explained, are extra clerks.

Mr. FOSTER. No, not in a way.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. They are extra clerks, and I have taken the responsibility of asking the committee for something that will enable me to give them $30 a year more, in certain cases.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a very good afterthought.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. No, it is what I explained from the first. If the hon. gentleman wants to take the ground that one of those that I consider is doing her duty faithfully, receiving $360 or so, is not entitled to any increase, well, I suppose I will have to consent to strike it out. But I have taken the responsibility of recommending these increases. They are not on the regular staff, as the hon. gentleman knows, they are extra clerks whose services are continued from time to time. Some of them entered the service at a low rate. I suppose we are not bound to give them any increase at all, but I have taken the responsibility of recommending it.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend, if he wants my views, can have them in short order. I think it is a shame to take any deserving people who entered at a rate of $300 a year, under a law which contemplates an increase of $50 per year, and take Government service out of them, and not give them their increase. I think it is equally a shame to take a third class clerk in at the small sum of $400 on a basis which for years has been the basis practically carried out, and which is contemplated by the law, and get service out of him for the Government, and not give him his increase, if he is deserving. That is my opinion as to both of these cases. But the Government still go on with their inconsistency of applying their rule to one class and not applying it to the other. My hon. friend slid out on his skates on this assumption: Well, then I will come down on the principle that I think these are all deserving of an increase, and I will ask the committee to increase the whole of them. That is not a principle of selection, that is a principle of wholesale addition.

Mr. CRAIG. None of us on this side object to the increases. What the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) is trying to do, is something which I am afraid he will fail in doing, he is trying to make the Government act consistently. But I think he may give that up, and let these increases go. I feel satisfied myself that from what the Controller of Customs has said, this estimate ought to be passed, that these parties ought to have this increase. While I think the Government should be punished for acting inconsistently, I do not want to see these clerks punished for the sins of the Government; therefore I would support this increase.

Mr. McNEILL. I would urge very strongly upon the Government to reconsider, if possible, their position in a sense favourable to these men, not merely those who are under discussion now, but all those who were induced to come into the service under a well-defined understanding that they would get that recompense for their services which they believed they were going to get when they entered the service. Now, there can be no doubt that these men, when they entered the service, understood that they would have $50 of an increase annually up to a certain point, that then they would get promotion and that their salaries would then go on increasing—I mean if they were deserving, if they did not do something that was improper. That was the distinct understanding, there was no kind of misunderstanding, there was no doubt whatever in the minds of any one of them with regard to that. I have heard these young men over and over again speak of it, we all know that this is what was understood. I do not think the Prime Minister would say for a moment that that was not the understanding. I do not mean to say there may not have been some abuses. I do not mean to say that these statutory increases may not sometimes have been

given to men who had acted in such a way as not to deserve it. Well, that ought to be corrected. Let there be a firmer hand over these clerks in future, and if any of them do not deserve an increase, or if the Deputy Minister is not prepared to say that they deserve it, and if the Government do not believe that they deserve it, then by all means withhold the increase.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is what we are doing.

Mr. McNEILL. But don't lay down the rule that, as I understand, is being laid down now, that this increase does not come as a matter of course to the deserving clerk. I understand that the rule laid down now is that it does not come as a matter of course to the deserving clerk. I say that there is a moral obligation upon the Government and upon the people of this country to pay to the deserving clerk that $50 increase regularly. I do say to-day, as I said before, that if dollars and cents are going to overbear justice and honour in Canada, it is a bad lookout for Canada. I urge strongly upon the Government that, however they may desire to promote economy —and I am with them every time in their efforts to promote economy honourably— let them not allow their desire to promote economy interfere with the principles of justice and fair-paly between man and man.

The PRIME MINISTER. Since my friend appealed to me a moment ago, I will give my views upon this question. I do not at all agree with my hon. friend that there is an implied contract between the Government and every clerk who enters the service that he should have a yearly increase of salary. The old system was one which could not but lead to abuse, because the impression was general, not only among the clerks but even among hon. members of this House, that every clerk—that every deserving clerk—as my hon. friend puts it—was entitled to a yearly increase of $50. The impression prevailed that every clerk was in this sense a deserving clerk and entitled to this increase, and in fact every clerk got it. The reason the law was not observed arose from a different cause. I quite agree that every deserving clerk should have a reward, or that some hope of advancement should be held out to him. At the same time it is not very difficult to obtain clerks, it would not be difficult to obtain members of the service to fill it to the brim, even without such inducements; but as a matter of simple justice a man who does good service, or better service than the clerk who sits beside him, should receive a larger reward than the man who does not render so much value to the country. I think my hon. friend will agree with me in this; but we find that the impression is prevalent everywhere in the service that every clerk is entitled to that increase of salary, and therefore in order to put a stop to that impression, we had to take somewhat drastic measures, which we did take. So that my hon. friend will, no doubt, be prepared to admit that the exception has confirmed the rule, for one or two ladies have received increases. They appeal to the chivalry of the hon. gentleman, and I do not think the hon. gentleman objects to this item specifically.

Mr. FOSTER. Quite the opposite.

The PRIME MINISTER. The exceptions prove our consistency. The Controller of Customs did not give a promiscuous increase to every clerk, but he increased the salaries of two or three ladies whom he thought to be deserving, and I am very glad that the item, although criticised, at least in substance is approved.

Mr. McNEILL. I wish there were many more items of the same kind. My objection is that there are not enough of them.

The PRIME MINISTER. We will try and do better another year.

Mr. McNEILL. Where the Prime Minister and I fundamentally differ in regard to this matter was pretty well laid down when he referred to the old system as being an objectionable system. It might be an objectionable or a bad system. I am not here to discuss whether it was a good or bad system, but it was the existing system, and there was an idea prevalent among those who entered the service that it was the rule of the service that a clerk should receive an increase of $50 a year. If the hon. Prime Minister thinks it was a bad system, it is quite competent for him to change the system, and let those coming in under the new system understand what the new system is. But I hold that so long as there were clerks induced to come in under the old system, whether it was a good or bad system, those civil servants should have the benefit of what the hon. gentleman himself says was the "prevailing" understanding in the department at the time.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I want to take issue with one remark made by the hon. Prime Minister, as it seems to me to be incorrect. The hon. gentleman said that they found when they came into power that practically all the clerks received $50 increase yearly, whether they were deserving or not. Admitting that to be so, that was a reflection on the conduct of the deputy heads which was not altogether to their credit. I do not think the hon. gentleman was correct in making that statement without qualification, because in one department with which I had to do the statutory increase was quite a valuable force in the hands of the deputy in connection with his control over the staff, and I have a distinct and clear recollection that in one or two cases, on consultation with

the deputy, the statutory increase was withheld for cause, because the deputy would not make the necessary recommendation. The point on which I take issue with the hon. gentleman is, that because this law has not been properly administered, deserving servants admitted into the service on the plain understanding that if they did their work satisfactorily they would receive that statutory increase, are now shut out. I think that is violent treatment. If the law has not been properly carried out and proper discretion exercised by the Deputy Ministers, that was a matter between the political heads and the departmental heads; but surely those men, with each of whom a quasi contract had been made, should not suffer unless they were themselves guilty of some wrong. Whatever the law may be, I think its application is exceedingly severe with the system such as has obtained, and which has enabled the Government to secure admittedly good men, as the Postmaster General himself admitted in regard to his very extensive department the other day, when he said there were men in it who were a credit to the department and a credit to the civil service of Canada.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, and no one will say that this remark is not of general application to all the departments, and that certainly not very generous treatment is extended to any officer in the service, certainly not every good officer; and it seems to be unworthy of Canada and of the Canadian Government to suddenly cut into the emoluments of those men for the reason the First Minister has given, namely, because the existing system had been imperfectly administered and it had been deemed to be a bad system.

Mr. SPROULE. What I object to is this, that while the old law and regulations provided that every diligent and efficient clerk should receive an annual increase of $50, the interpretation of the present Government is that this shall apply only to those whom they decide are entitled to it. That amount was considered a fair increase of remuneration to induce clerks to show diligence in the departments. But hon. gentlemen opposite have departed from that principle and from what was considered to be a salutary rule, and have taken it into their own hands to make increases in special cases, those increases ranging from $50 to $200 per annum. That seems to be a large increase to make at one time, and for this change of policy no good reason has been shown to the committee up to the present time. It is susceptible of this interpretation at least, that the Minister at the head of a department may have his own special favourites to whom he may give a larger increase than the merits of the case would demand, while to the great bulk of the civil servants he gives no increase whatever. If $50 was a fair increase in the past it ought to be a fair increase now, and I see no reason why the Minister should give an increase of $150 or $200. If the increase of $50 was given in special cases it would be in the direction of economy, and it would at the same time be carrying out the spirit of the Civil Service Act. It cannot be denied that the salaries of most of these civil servants are high when compared with the salaries of equally efficient persons in other walks of life, and an increase of $50 to a young man, would be considered a fair annual addition to his salary. I do not see any reason why the Government should give $200 extra at one jump.

Mr. McMULLEN. The present Government have a perfect right to take whatever course they consider right in the interests of the country. For the last eighteen years, as a general rule, increases were given indiscriminately in every department, and the Government will be justified before the people in putting an end to this. My own impression is that the proper way would be to hire clerks at the intrinsic value of their work and pay them for it. While I am opposed to increases as a general rule, yet at the same time there may be exceptions to that rule, and this case may possibly be an exception. We know what the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) has done in past years, and I understand that he has expressed himself that he would rather defend an increase of $100 than attempt to justify a reduction of $5. That has been the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite during the time they were in power. It may happen that there is a wheel within a wheel, for in turning over the civil service list, I find that there are five McNeils, and also the name of Sproule appears.

Mr. SPROULE. No relation of mine.

Mr. McMULLEN. Hon. gentlemen opposite may be pleading for their own relations in this matter.

Mr. SPROULE. How many McMullens?

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not know of any, but at all events we find these names in the civil service list. When these hon. gentlemen opposite are advocating an indiscriminate increase of $50 for each civil servant, possibly they are thinking of the interests of their own relations. I have not the slightest doubt that there is not a civil servant in Ottawa to-day who, if he or she resigned, there would not be a dozen to fill the place at the same salary, and probably fill it equally efficiently. In some instances the Minister may find it necessary to recognize the services of a very efficient clerk by giving him an increase, and that clerk may be working at a very small salary, as in the case in the present instance submitted by the Controller of Customs. These are

not really statutory increases but they have been made customary by the Conservatives when in power, and I believe that the present Government will be sustained by the country in cutting them off.

Mr. McNEILL. I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) that if I had any relative in the civil service, I should not at all be ashamed of it, and I should not have thought of replying to what the hon. gentleman has said, except for this reason, that perhaps the argument which I have been endeavouring to lay before the House might to some extent be discounted if it were thought that I was speaking on behalf of a relative of mine. For the information of the House, and for the information of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen), I wish to state that I have only two relatives in this country, and that neither is in any way connected with the civil service of Canada.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I believe that on this side of the House we are all prepared to support the Controller of Customs in granting these increases which he has proposed. That hon. gentleman says that after careful consideration he has found these officers deserving, and he therefore asks the House for this small increase to his salary. There are two important questions to be considered in this connection. One is, justice to the civil servant, and the other is, what course is best calculated to secure that efficient and energetic civil service upon which the good government of the country to a very considerable extent depends. I do not hesitate to say that the policy pursued by both parties in Canada down to the present time was a true and sound policy. That policy was to require at the end of each year the Deputy Minister of the department to report as to what officers, by reason of their efficiency, were entitled to this small annual increase. That policy naturally would have the effect of stimulating the officials to a better performance of their duties than if they found that whether they worked industriously and efficiently, or neglected their duties, they were not affected one way or the other. The hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce has said—and I am not inclined to dispute it—that that system has rather grown into an abuse, and that it had become a matter of course that the annual increase should be given to every civil servant. If such a practice as that had grown up, it is quite right that measures should be taken to check it, and that the increase should only be granted to those who are entitled to it because of a careful and efficient performance of their duty. But I think the Controller of Customs had an additional reason for the course he has pursued in this matter. The practice of an indiscriminate increase has been suspended by the present Government, the reason for that course, as given by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, being that the civil service had become a very onerous charge upon the country, and that it was desirable to lighten that charge. I would meet that proposal with the suggestion that if a smaller number of persons could efficiently perform the duties of the public service, then, as vacancies arose, and they arise constantly, they might not be filled, and in that way the service might be reduced to as small a number as could perform the duties; and I would still continue the practice of giving the annual increase to those civil servants who, by careful and faithful performance of their duties, show that they are entitled to it. But the Controller of Customs, very properly assuming that that change was to be made in the practice, by which the annual increase was not to be given to all civil servants, has drawn what I think is a very proper distinction between the general staff of the office and those writers who are brought in at $300 or $400 per annum, under the expectation of annual increases in their salaries until they receive a fair remuneration for their services. There are two reasons why I think that course should be adopted by all the departments. Wherever there are persons who are not in the civil service, but who have been induced to take the position of writers in the hope of ultimately reaching a position that would bring them into the service, if they perform their duties faithfully, I think, both in justice to them and in the interest of the civil service itself, that you should stimulate them by giving them this increase. It must be remembered that they come in at a salary at which it is absolutely impossible for them to live—to obtain their board and clothing—or if they do, only by the greatest possible economy; but they enter with the hope that their remuneration will be gradually increased until they receive a little above what is required to provide them with the absolute necessaries of life. I am glad that the hon. Controller of Customs has adopted this course, and I would like extremely to see the same course adopted with reference to that class of employees by the other members of the Administration, with the view of stimulating them to the faithful discharge of their duties, and with the view of inducing persons of character and standing to enter the service.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. The last speaker seems to have grasped the point which was lost sight of by others who have spoken. The statutory increase of $50 does not apply to the class of persons to whom the hon. gentleman has alluded, because they are not properly-speaking members of the civil service, but extra clerks. But I am permitted to recommend, under an Order in Council, that a certain increase be given to the parties whom I have in my mind, and who are deserving of the increase.

Contingencies—Post Office Department... $40,000

Mr. SPROULE. There seems to be a very large increase here.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, a decrease.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. Minister explain how it is brought about?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. SPROULE. It is sometimes quite as important to explain why there is a decrease as why there is an increase.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The whole decrease in this item is for clerical and other assistance. The words explain themselves. We have reduced the staff.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the hon. gentleman followed the same rule as the Controller of Customs, and made provision for increases for the writer class?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think there is no provision for any increase.

Mr. McMULLEN. I most heartily commend the effort made by the hon. Postmaster General to reduce the expenses, and I beg to reply to the long harangue which we had from our esteemed friend the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), to draw his attention to this matter. I hope he will recognize that this is in the right direction.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat is wonderful in some respects. He is ready to approve of everything, anxious to approve of everything. When the Controller of Customs violates the rule laid down, and gives the statutory increase to every one of his writers, my hon. friend rises and approves; and when the hon. Postmaster General gets up and declares that he has not given the statutory increase to his writers, my hon. friend is the first to get up and approve of that. My hon. friend said a little while ago that there are wheels within wheels. There are some wheels that are not going around just as they used to in this House.

Contingencies—Department of Agriculture $15,000

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to have an explanation of the increase.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I am very glad to be able to explain the increase. As a matter of fact the item of $7,500, which was in the Estimates last year for clerical and other assistance, has been found inadequate. When I came into the department last summer, I found that there was a large staff of temporary clerks, whose salaries could not all be paid out of the item in the Estimates, and in 1895-96 the sum of $9,000 was actually paid. This present year, 1896-97, I hoped to be able to reduce this extra assistance to such a point that I would get it within the item of $7,500, but notwithstanding the fact that I have dismissed some seven or eight of these temporary clerks, I find that this year I shall be obliged to ask for a supplementary estimate, of a little over $2,000, to cover these assistants, really making the expenditure, under this item, $9,000 this year, as it was last year. I therefore ask that for the ensuing year we should vote the amount of $9,000, so as to be sure that I will not have to ask next year for a supplementary vote. But I am satisfied that I will be able to bring the expenditure some $400 or $500 under the amount of $9,000.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to call my hon. friend's attention to what I consider is a case of injustice and ask him to see whether he cannot remedy it. He has in his department quite a large number of temporary clerks, in the Patent Branch especially. I draw his attention to the case of a young man named Bassett, from King's county, N. B., my own county, who came up here in 1886, and was appointed temporary clerk in the Marine Department. He did his work well, and in 1890 was transferred from the Department of Marine and Fisheries, bounty work, to the Patent Branch of the Agriculture Department, where he remained until 1895. I invite my hon. friend to ask the officers of his department whether they have not found that this man was always faithful and attentive to his work and a clerk of more than ordinary ability, who did his work to the entire satisfaction of his superior officers? In 1895, he was made permanent at the same salary he was receiving as temporary clerk, $550 a year, not a large salary, and from 1895 to 1897 he has been in that department as a permanent clerk. Now he has received notice that on the 1st of July next his services will not be required. He did not engage in any political work but stuck to the office. Although a personal friend of mine he did not go to New Brunswick, nor did I ask him to, but he remained here and worked faithfully and well. My hon. friend has fifteen or sixteen temporary clerks in his department. He has some that have been taken in since this man came there, some who were taken in last year, and I think he is doing an injustice to this man by dismissing him from his position, the duties of which he performed to the utmost satisfaction of the department, and keeping on or putting on temporary clerks in his place. If there is any fair rule to go upon—and my hon. friend will, I think, admit that there is—the preference ought to be given to the older clerks, if not so old as to be inefficient, and this young man was not. I would ask my hon. friend to consider the case and consult with his officers and I hope

he will be able to retain the services of Mr. Bassett. I am not asking any favour and neither is the young man. There is no charge of offensive partisanship against him or of inefficiency. On the contrary he has always proved highly commendable. He was permanent but has been given his dismissal from the 1st of July, and temporary clerks have been taken on during the year and are being kept on. It is on that ground that I appeal to the hon. Minister to look into this case and see whether he cannot remedy the injustice, because I certainly think it is unjust to treat this man in this way.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am very glad indeed to give the hon. gentleman a full explanation of this matter. I quite agree in what he says with regard to Mr. Bassett's non-interference in politics, because politics had nothing whatever to do with his dismissal, and I have had no complaints of his having taken any part in the elections nor in any political movement at all. But I required to reduce very considerably the staff of the Patent Branch. For that purpose I consulted the leading clerks and deputy heads to find out in what way reorganization could be best effected and economy brought about. With that view, I asked the gentleman who is now acting as chief clerk, Mr. Lynch, to give me a scheme by which he could reduce the number of employees in the branch and rearrange the work so that fewer men could do it. He brought me a complete scheme, apportioning to each individual the work he thought he was best adapted to perform, and in that scheme I found Mr. Bassett's name left out. I do not know Mr. Bassett even by sight. I believe I met him with the other employees when I first came in and shook hands with all the clerks, but from that day out I have not spoken to him. The hon. gentleman says that there are temporary clerks who have come into the department since Mr. Bassett was dismissed. I think the hon. gentleman is incorrectly informed. Only one has come in since I have been in office, and that is a young lady stenographer, whom I engaged in the place of the stenographer who was there at a much higher salary, and whom I put on some work in the Dairy Commissioner's office, which he is able to perform and which an ordinary stenographer could not. No other clerk at all has come into the department since, so that the hon. gentleman is somewhat in error. The hon. gentleman takes the ground that we should dismiss the temporary clerks before dismissing the permanent ones. That is the only possible ground on which discrimination would be made in favour of Mr. Bassett, but I do not accept altogether that principle. We have temporary clerks who are really permanent because they have been in the departments some fifteen years doing their work efficiently and doing work which others, if put into their places, even permanent clerks, would not do as well. I do not think any hon. gentleman would ask me to remove a temporary clerk who is doing special work, and who has been doing it for a number of years, in order to put in his place a permanent clerk who has only been in the department a short time. It happens that the work which Mr. Bassett was doing can be done without him, and I did not feel justified in keeping him on. As the hon. gentleman says, I have nothing against him in any respect whatever. I believe he was efficient enough and did his services as required, but in the interests of economy I felt that I was justified in dispensing with him. As a favour to Mr. Bassett, I gave him leave of absence and am paying his salary until the end of the year as a gratuity, because he was not entitled to anything under the Superannuation Act, not having been sufficiently long in the department. So far from having any idea of doing injustice to Mr. Bassett, I have tried to treat him with every consideration.

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

After Recess.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) to give me the names of those who are to be paid from this appropriation for clerical assistance and the dates when they came into the department.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). The following is the list asked for by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) :—

Name.	Salary.	Entered Dept.
	$ cts.	
Miss G. Fitzgerald	912 50	1890
Miss M. W. Casey.	821 25	1891
Miss G. Bowden...	638 75	1885
T. H. Morgan.....	600 00	1887
L. A. Kingsmill...	547 50	1885
G. Bury.....	547 50	About 1890
U. Dorion.....	547 50	1881
M. Casey.....	540 00	1882
E. A. Rodman.....	450 00	Three months ago.
J. Kilgallon.....	400 00	Several years ago.
F. S. Armstrong..	400 00	1891
H. J. Hamilton....	400 00	1890
M. Casgrain.....	400 00	Several years ago.
Miss Braden.....	400 00	About three years ago

— Lafleur, $300. He entered the department in the census branch about three or four years ago ; became a messenger in 1896.

G. O. Gorman, $300. A messenger ; has been in department for many years, in charge of models in the model room.

This is the list of clerks who are expected to be paid out of this item. This does not cover quite the $9,000, but I may point out to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) that it is

occasionally necessary to engage temporary clerks for a short time, and I have thought best, in order to make provision ample for the work of the year, to have a few hundred dollars more than sufficient for the staff at present engaged.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not intend to make a long story of this. I think that the statement I made early in the afternoon is fully borne out by the facts given by the Minister. I find that there are sixteen temporaries who are to be kept, and the provision is made for some other help which may be necessary. Now, Mr. Bassett, of whom I spoke in the afternoon, came into the service in 1886. Of these names by the Minister, I find that Miss Fitzgerald came in 1890, Miss Casey in 1891, G. Bury six years ago, E. A. Rodman, three months ago, Kilgallon, some years ago, Braden, three years ago, and Lafleur three years ago. That is, quite a considerable number of those clerks who have come into the service, in one way or another, several years after Mr. Bassett, who has been dismissed. Now, Mr. Bassett's case is not an easy one for another consideration, that under the law which was passed two years ago, he was not eligible to be placed on the superannuation list, his age being a little over forty-five at the time that he was appointed; so that he gets nothing at all in the shape of a superannuation. Those are the facts of the case, and I think my hon. friend might have retained Mr. Bassett, as an old servant and a good servant, and not done any disservice to his department, or any injury in any way, and at the same time done a simple act of justice, I think, to Mr. Bassett and his friends.

Contingencies—Dept. of Marine and Fisheries—	
Clerical and other assistance.....	$ 2,000
Printing and stationery.....	6,000
Sundries	2,000
	$10,000

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) if the item for clerical assistance covers increases for the third class clerks?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is a small increase given to Mr. Quinn, a young gentleman who came into the department about eighteen months or two years ago. He was recommended very highly to me by the accountant of the department. I do not recollect the exact amount of the increase, but I think it is $33.30.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the only increase?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, that is the only increase.

Department of Trade and Commerce..... $6,350

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). The hon. gentleman will note there is an increase of $750; but I expect to save about that sum in civil government proper. The circumstances, I may say, are these: That I am about to lose the services of one lady at a salary of $700, and I will have to replace her by a temporary clerk at some $400 or thereabouts, and I will want a couple of hundred more for sundries in the department, I think, including expenditures of last year. The hon. gentleman knows that when I lose a third-class clerk I cannot replace him except by appointing a second class clerk.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to point out to my hon. friend that he is violating the canons, he has mixed up his sundries with clerical and other assistance, and it would be well, for the sake of perspicacity, to keep it in line with all the others, and, as was contemplated at first, keep the clerical part by itself.

Mr. DAVIN. I would like to learn from the Minister of Trade and Commerce whether my impression is correct, that it is contemplated to do away with the office of Minister of Trade and Commerce, carrying out his own views, and restore the old state of things, and also move in the direction of getting rid of the sixteen Ministers which he used to denounce in other days?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member does not intend to do away with himself.

Department of Agriculture..... $49,242 50

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). There is a considerable reduction, amounting to $2,745. I found on the death of the Commissioner of Patents that I could make some alteration in the administration of that branch of my department, and for the purpose facilitating these changes and making that branch, I think, more effective, I took upon myself to superannuate Mr. J. F. Dionne, who was the chief clerk of that branch, and in his place I promoted Mr. W. J. Lynch, who had been a first class clerk at the highest salary which a first-class clerk may obtain, and put him at the bottom of the list of chief clerks, at the same salary. He is there now.

Mr. HUGHES. Is that the gentleman who drafted the report for you concerning the removal of this clerk that was spoken of a little time ago?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes. He is now the head of the department under the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, who is acting as deputy commissioner of patents.

Mr. HUGHES. He is now running the department.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The Deputy Minister of Agriculture is running the department, and the chief clerk is in charge of the rooms of the department under the Deputy Minister of Agriculture,

who is now acting as the deputy commissioner of patents. I found that I was able to reduce the number of first class clerks in this way, and I also reduced a number of third class clerks from twenty-three to twenty.

Mr. FOSTER. One of them by promotion.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, the additional second class clerk is my private secretary, whom I put into the department as second class clerk, he not having been formerly in the department, but having been paid last year out of the contingencies of the department the amount which we assigned to the secretaries over and above the ordinary allowance in the Estimates for secretaries.

Mr. HUGHES. What was the salary of the late commissioner ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. $2,800. That does not appear in these Estimates because it was a statutory increase, and I propose to introduce a Bill into the House before the end of the session to do away with the office, and do away with the salary.

Mr. HUGHES. What is the salary of the present chief clerk of that department, Mr. Lynch ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The salary of the chief clerk whom I have promoted, is the same as it was before. He is now chief clerk at the bottom of the list, at $1,800. Last year he was at the head of the first class clerks at $1,800, and his salary remains the same as it was last year.

Mr. SPROULE. Could the Minister tell us how long Dionne was in the service, what superannuation allowance he is getting, and whether any time was added to his service for the purpose of making that superannuation larger ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. Dionne was appointed to the service in 1865. His last promotion took place in 1894, when he was made chief clerk. His salary last year was $1,900. Mr. Dionne was superannuated with the usual allowance ; I cannot tell exactly what it amounted to, but no years were added to his service. He received a superannuation that will be proper for a salary of $1,900 and the number of years he has served.

Mr. SPROULE. When was he superannuated ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. His superannuation will take effect on 1st July, when the Estimates we are now discussing will come in force. I have given him leave of absence until that date, wishing the new arrangements to take effect from 1st April.

Mr. SPROULE. What is his age ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If I remember rightly, it is seventy-two ; at all events, he is quite an old man. The hon. member for York asked me whether my secretary was now receiving $1,700 a year. I answer, no ; I only allow him $1,500.

Mr. FOSTER. Then what will become of the other $200 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It will not be spent.

Mr. FOSTER. I advise the hon. Minister not to take it, if he is not going to use it.

Dominion Police..... $22,000

Mr. FOSTER. There is a slight increase, I believe.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This is the amount which has been voted for several years. For some reason there was a proposed decrease of $539, but it is proposed to revert to the original estimate.

Salaries and contingent expenses of the Senate $63,188

Mr. FOSTER. How do these increases occur, for they seem to be very large ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. If the hon. gentleman will turn to the details, he will find that the Senate is setting this House a good example. In miscellaneous items there are many decreases, running through different branches, and amounting altogether to $17,000. The salaries and number of officials remain as heretofore, but in reporting debates and stationery there are very considerable decreases, and smaller decreases all along the line.

Mr. FOSTER. There are decreases in pages, sessional messengers and charwomen. The Senate is going to do with half the number of pages, half the number of sessional messengers, one-third the number of charwomen and about one-half the quantity of stationery formerly required. This looks to me a little suspicious if the House of Lords is going to give up its equipment.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I believe the real fact is, that they took a little more money.

Mr. HUGHES. I notice that the usher of the black rod is still continued. I understand the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is anxious to have the office abolished.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) covet the place ?

Mr. HUGHES. I have a much better one. I am not in search of office, but perhaps some of the hon. gentlemen on that side of the House might be looking after it.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That pillar of the constitution is not yet to be removed.

Salary of the Deputy Speaker..... $2,000

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to inquire where the Deputy Speaker is now, and where he has been for the last three or four weeks.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am happy to inform the hon. gentleman. I rather think his health has required a change of air to the latitude of the province of Quebec. Whether he was in Quebec or Montreal I cannot say, but he will be here shortly, I have no doubt, to report for himself.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have been informed that he has been taking an offensive and active part in politics for the last three or four weeks, stumping the counties in the province of Quebec. He is an officer of this House, and as such should be here to attend to his duties. To-day when the Speaker left the Chair he had to call on one of the hon. members to preside, and that has been the custom for the last three or four weeks. Now, if we can get on, by having hon. gentlemen who are willing, as you, Mr. Chairman, are willing, to preside in the committee, I think we can dispense with a Deputy Speaker. I therefore move that the item be struck out.

Mr. DAVIN I read a few days ago with great profit, a speech of the Minister of Trade and Commerce delivered in 1894, in which he stated that he did not see the necessity of having a Speaker and a Deputy Speaker, any more than he saw the necessity of having sixteen Cabinet Ministers. At present we have sixteen Ministers of the Crown, but the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) does not seem to suffer greatly by the companionship of fifteen Ministers around him; in fact, he has grown sleek and happy ever since he passed from this side of the House to the other. I have great respect for the judgment of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. He has been a long time in Parliament, and when he so recently as a few years ago declared that there is no necessity for two Speakers, and when we have had for the last week such a flagrant demonstration of the futility of having a Deputy Speaker, it is nothing short of a reproach to this House to have one. Let me ask you, Mr. Chairman (Mr. Lister), is it not a scandalous thing that the farmers of this country, the farmers of Ontario and the farmers of the North-west Territories should be taxed to pay the salary of a Deputy Speaker who is not here to attend to his duties, but who is away on a political stumping tour? The farmers of this country have waked up, to look into their household affairs, and to ask how their money is spent? They have a literature and an organization of their own, and things of this sort can no longer be done in the unblushing manner that we have seen for the last week. The Deputy Speaker away playing the part of an offensive partisan. He is an officer of this House, and he should sit in that Chair perfectly impartial as Mr. Speaker does when he is there. We cannot suppose that a gentleman taken from either side of the House will be as impartial as one who is devoting his whole time to preside over our proceedings, but if we are to have a man presiding over our committees, and presiding in the Chair when the Speaker is absent as a paid officer of this House, that man should not, while the House is sitting, at all events, fall into the indecency of going into his province to act the part of an offensive partisan. I say it is a scandal, and scandal or no scandal, in the interest of the taxpayers, and in the interest of propriety, I shall support the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor).

Mr. ROGERS. It is a wonder to me that the hon. gentleman from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) and the hon. gentleman from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin have not seen this salary of $2,000 in the same light years ago as they do now. I agree to a certain extent with what they have said, and I would be very glad to move an amendment that the salary of the Deputy Speaker be reduced by one-half, namely, $1,000. I believe it is necessary to have a Deputy Speaker on certain occasions, in case of the illness of Mr. Speaker, and therefore I move as an amendment that $1,000 be the salary of the Deputy Speaker.

An hon. MEMBER. You cannot do that. There is no amendment allowed.

Mr. FOSTER. The position taken by my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) in making this motion, has good ground for it. It is not taken simply for the fun of the thing, and it is not taken as some hon. gentlemen opposite may think, because we on this side of the House are opposed to having a Deputy Speaker. The ground upon which that motion is based, and the ground upon which I propose to vote for it, is that we have had a most indecent exhibition apparent in this House during the last week or ten days. No one asks that a member of Parliament who comes here, representing either the Liberal or the Conservative party, shall be perfectly impartial. That is asking a little too much of human nature. The members who are sent here by their constituents on certain party bases, are here to represent the principles, and to vote for the policy, of their party. We cannot expect them to be thoroughly impartial, but, Sir, when the members of this House elect an officer of this House, and pay him a competent salary, it is at least to be expected that he shall not outrage proprieties, and that he shall not pit himself against either side of the House. What would you think, Sir, with regard to the Speaker who is the First Commoner,

and who has to preside impartially over this House, if when an election were going on in the province of Ontario, he should throw off his robes and hie away to the province, and engage in a heated political campaign? What would you think of the First Commoner coming back here, and attempting to preside over this House in a perfectly impartial way. It is quite true that he might be able to bring his mind back to perfect impartiality, after he returns, but there is not a man sitting on either side of the House who would not say that the Speaker had demeaned his office and had conducted himself in a way unworthy of it, if he should throw off his robes and go down to a political partisan struggle in a by-election which took place when the House was in session. The Deputy Speaker occupies the place and succeeds to the dignity of the Speaker, when the Speaker is absent, and the Speaker is very often absent from this House. The Deputy Speaker then takes that Chair, and presides impartially, or is supposed to preside impartially, over this House. When the House is in committee he is also expected to preside. He is a representative of the dignity and impartiality of the House; we pay him a salary, and we expect him to be in his place: but instead of that he takes the part of the veriest partisan. He goes down to the province of Quebec and orates, as my hon. friend says, and electioneers, away from his duties here. What has taken place? The cardinal principles on which these men opposite have been masquerading for the last six or eight months has been that offensive political partisans ought not to be officers. The very moment an offensive political partisan is scented in an officer, if he is a Conservative, his death warrant is signed; off goes his head. Hon. gentlemen opposite, in order to keep themselves consistent, have also stated on the floor of this House, the Premier amongst them, that if offensive political partisanship is shown by officers of the present Government, they will see that justice is done, and that a Grit shall be no more an offensive political partisan than a Tory. Here is their own officer, nominated and elected by themselves to preside over this House, and paid a salary of $2,000 for doing it. Here is their own officer assuming the part of a political partisan of the most offensive type, going down to the province of Quebec and engaging in heated political discussion while the House is in session, and while his duties imperatively demand his presence here. Tories who have gone off for a single day to attend a single political meeting, though it could not be said that their duties were not perfectly attended to in the meantime, have been dismissed because, as hon. gentlemen opposite say, they have forgotten to keep themselves entirely free from political partisanship. Here is a man who deserts his impartial place as an officer of this whole House, who is paid by the whole House, and who goes and commits acts of the veriest political partisanship. And yet hon. gentlemen sit opposite and think the country will do anything but laugh in their faces when they talk of the principle of the civil service being purged of offensive political partisanship. I protest, and will continue to protest, against such a prostitution of the position of an officer of this House, and will vote on every occasion to have this vote reduced or struck out. I end by saying, as I said at the first, that it is a most indecent spectacle which is presented to this country and this House.

Mr. McISAAC. From the statements made by the hon. member who has just sat down, we may assume that in his view it is an indecent spectacle for a Deputy Speaker of this House to engage in a political contest. I think every person will admit that for an officer of this House to engage in a provincial contest is a very different thing from an officer of this House engaging in a federal contest. The charge made to-night is that the Deputy Speaker of this House went to his own province of Quebec and took part in the provincial elections to-day. If that is a charge against the Deputy Speaker to-day, what do hon. gentlemen opposite say of the Deputy Speaker of the last Parliament, who not only went to take part in the provincial elections in his own province, but went to the province of Nova Scotia. I call the hon. senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) to corroborate the statements I make here to-night when I say that at the time of my by-election in the county of Antigonish in 1895, he and the Deputy Speaker of this House went down there and stumped that county from one end to the other. If an officer of this House is to be censured because he takes part in a provincial campaign, surely hon. gentlemen opposite will condemn the conduct of their own Deputy Speaker for having at the opening of the House gone and stumped that county for a whole week, assisted by the hon. member for Pictou and another member of the late Government. When this fact is brought to the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite, I think they will certainly drop the charge against the Deputy Speaker.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not think the hon. gentleman can get away from the question by referring to the conduct of the late Deputy Speaker. In the first place, the Conservative party never took the extreme attitude in regard to official partisanship that hon. gentlemen opposite take. In the second place, the late Deputy Speaker attended the session in the year to which the hon. gentleman refers, and performed all the duties of his office. The election to which the hon. gentleman refers took place before the session opened. The Deputy Speaker of that Parliament, instead of being absent during the session,

was actually here performing his duties from the opening of the session to the end of it. He was in one section of the county of Antigonish two days. What part he took in the contest the hon. gentleman knows better than I do, because I was not with him.

Mr. McISAAC. You were on the platform with him.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I saw him in the county. He was there doing what he could to vindicate Conservative principles and to assist the party to which he belongs. I do not dispute that at all; but the House was not in session, and neither the Conservative party nor any other party had ever propounded the stringent and unreasonable rule which the Liberal party have propounded with regard to political partisanship. But this is a motion put under very different circumstances. Here we are not only in session, but we have reached that period of the session when the Deputy Speaker's presence is particularly necessary here, and he is absent from his post. I may refer to some other reasons why this motion should be acceptable. The hon. gentleman who last spoke took part in the late provincial campaign in Nova Scotia, and had to suffer a reduction in his indemnity for the number of days that he was absent. Why should a different rule, even in that sense, be shown to an officer holding the position of Deputy Speaker of this House? For all these reasons, I think the suggestion that an expression of the opinion of this House should be given is timely, and I will vote for the motion.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would find no fault at all with the Deputy Speaker of this House for taking part in a by-election when the House is not in session. The Deputy Speaker has taken part in elections both in the province of Quebec and elsewhere. If a member is absent during the session, the law provides that his indemnity shall be docked for the days he is absent; but the sum of $2,000 is paid to the Deputy Speaker as a salary specially that he may be here to perform his duties during the entire session. We have been in session six weeks, and the Deputy Speaker has not been here one week, but instead has been stumping all the time in the province of Quebec. Are we going to pay him $2,000 for going throughout the province of Quebec and stumping? I say that it is an outrage for the Deputy Speaker to have taken this course, and I think it would be wrong to vote him money for doing duties which he has not performed, especially when we can get on just as well without a Deputy Speaker as with one, as we have done so far this session.

Mr. MACLEAN. The rule of conduct which governs the Speaker ought to apply equally to the Deputy Speaker. Every one will agree that it would be wrong for the Speaker to take part in elections while the House is sitting; and if the former Deputy Speaker did what he is said to have done, he did wrong. I hope the hon. First Minister will at least assure us that hereafter such a glaring breach of the proprieties and of parliamentary rules will not occur again.

Mr. CRAIG. I think it will be acknowledged by all sides of the House that the Deputy Speaker should be considered impartial by everybody, and in order that he should be so considered, he ought not, during the term of Parliament, take an active part in politics. I do not know whether that view has been taken in the past or not, but it would be a good rule to lay down for the future. Apart from this consideration, the Deputy Speaker ought to be here discharging the duties of his office. I have noticed that he frequently is not, and this cannot fail to lead the House to believe that we can get along without a Deputy Speaker at all. For my part, I think it is a good thing to have a Deputy Speaker. It has been found by experience that we need one at times. Not very long ago we had a session when the necessity forced itself upon us, and we never know when such another great necessity may occur. I feel perfectly free to speak as I do on this question because I do not intend to support this motion, but I do insist that the rule ought to be laid down by the hon. First Minister that in future the Deputy Speaker shall not take an active part in any election, by-election or otherwise, during the course of any Parliament for which he was elected Deputy Speaker. The necessity for that rule is obvious. He is supposed to be impartial and to replace the Speaker when required, and all admit that it would be very unfortunate if the Speaker should go out and take an active part in any elections, whether Dominion or local, between which I do not think we can draw any distinction. The hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac) said the course of the Deputy Speaker did not amount to anything, because this was a provincial election, but it is a party election all the same, and the conduct of the Deputy Speaker in taking an active partisan interest in it must weaken our confidence in his impartiality. It would be a good thing now that this matter has been brought up, to settle it once for all, and I hope the hon. Prime Minister will lay down the rule that while a member of this House holds the important position of Deputy Speaker, he should not take an active part in politics, but should, unless prevented by sickness, be always on hand here to do the work which he was elected to perform.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am very sorry to hear my hon. friend (Mr. Craig) say he is not prepared to support this motion. I did not think it could be possible to offer a motion in this committee more deserving of support. If we are to have a Deputy Speaker—and there are many in this

House and the country who think we could get along very well without one, as we did for a long period—we should have one who will occupy the same position in relation to this House as the Speaker does. You, Mr. Speaker, could not engage in elections without incurring the condemnation of every member of this House and of every intelligent man of this country. If that be your position, Mr. Speaker—and I believe there is no one in this House who would more willingly admit that position than the gentleman who leads this House—why should your deputy be allowed to abandon the House and desert his duty in order to take part in local elections? I regret very much that my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Craig), in his extreme good nature, should feel unable to support this motion. It is a motion which I hope will be sustained by every member on both sides who values the independence of Parliament and the position which the Speaker of the House occupies and which the Deputy Speaker occupies. I do not expect the members of the Government to support this motion, because I have under my hand evidence of the lengths to which they are prepared to go in this local election in the province of Quebec. I have received to-day the following telegram from Valleyfield :—

> Lock broken this morning on Beauharnois Canal. A new lockmaster just appointed in place of an old and reliable employee. The new one is the man who was serving liquor in a bar-room at Beauharnois on the day of nomination. All Conservative employees notified yesterday not to vote, on peril of dismissal. Will show you the letter.
>
> J. G. H. BERGERON.

There is an indication of the extent to which the Government are prepared to go. They are prepared to turn out reliable and valuable employees engaged in a most important part of the public service, the management of the canals. They are prepared to risk and destroy public property by dismissing old reliable and trustworthy men who understand their duty and putting in their places men who are incapable and unreliable. This man no doubt was drunk.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, if this man was serving out liquor in a bar-room on nomination day, the probability is that he who served out liquor to other people would drink it himself. At all events, the fact remains that public property is destroyed, while in the charge of this man who was appointed in the place of a reliable and trustworthy employee. In addition, it appears that this Government have notified the employees in the province of Quebec that if they vote in the provincial elections for a Conservative candidate they will forfeit their offices. I do not expect the Government to support this motion, but every independent man in this House I expect to vote for it, not out of any feeling towards the individual, but out of respect for the principle. I expect every independent man to put on record the declaration that, so far as he is concerned, he is not prepared to stand before the intelligent people of the country and justify the desertion by the Deputy Speaker of the high and important position he holds in this House in order to take part in a local election. I believe that the intelligent electorate of this country will mark with their approval the action of every man who discharges his duty here as an independent representative of the Speaker, by insisting that the man whom we elect to represent the Speaker, when the Speaker is not in the Chair, should attend to his duties and do nothing which would lead us to lose confidence in his impartiality

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I am sorry that the wise remarks which have just fallen from the lips of my hon. friend from East Durham (Mr. Craig) have not been heeded on his own side of the House. It may be as well that at this juncture we should have an understanding as to the duties of the Deputy Speaker. If it be the opinion of this House that the Deputy Speaker should act just as the Speaker does, for my part, I have no objection to the establishment of that rule. But that has not been the rule that has prevailed up to this time. Hon. gentlemen opposite seek to apply to the present Deputy Speaker a different rule from that which was applied when they were in office and one of their friends was Deputy Speaker. It has been a rule of all parties in this House and in the mother country as well that the Speaker of the House should be above party politics, that the duties of his office, while he is in the Chair, should make him absolutely impartial. There is no case on record of a Speaker of this House or of the House of Commons in England taking part in an election. Those gentlemen who have occupied the Chair in this House have understood the duties of their office, and never have we had the spectacle of a Speaker interfering on the stump or otherwise in a political contest. But if that has been the rule applied to the Speaker, hon. gentlemen opposite know as well as I do that while they were in office no such rule was ever laid down for the guidance of the Deputy Speaker. While I have no desire to enter into a discussion of the manner in which the Deputy Speakers who formerly held that office have discharged their duties on the floor of this House, hon. gentlemen opposite know as well as I do that, outside of this House, the Deputy Speaker was as much a partisan as any of us. Why, Sir, a crime is imputed to the Deputy Speaker of this House to-day because he took part in a provincial election which has been going on in the province of Quebec. If it be a crime for an hon. gentleman occupying that

position to take part in an election, and if it is to be the rule that he should not do so, for my own part, I am quite willing to apply that rule in the future, if that be the sense of the House. If it be a fault in the Deputy Speaker to have taken part in a local election, I say that it is a ten times greater fault for the Deputy Speaker to take part in an election to this House. Why should a Deputy Speaker not be allowed to take part in an election? We are told that it is because it may interfere with his impartiality on the discharge of his duties while in the Chair. But if that is to be the rule laid down as applied to general elections, it must be manifest that that rule must apply with ten times greater force to elections to this House. Never, to my knowledge, has it been made a crime hitherto for the Deputy Speaker in former Parliaments to take part in an election, and we all know that all former Deputy Speakers, and especially the hon. gentleman who was Deputy Speaker in the last Parliament, never scrupled taking part in elections to this House. It has been my privilege to meet the late Deputy Speaker (Mr. Bergeron) on the platform again and again in the province of Quebec. I met him in the election in Jacques Cartier in 1895, in the Montreal Centre election in 1895; I met him in Two Mountains, I met him in Soulanges —and in almost every election that took place in the province of Quebec. More than that;—not satisfied with taking part in the elections of Quebec he went to Nova Scotia to speak to the Roman Catholic French electors of Antigonish. No one questioned the right of the Deputy Speaker to exercise his rights as a citizen. It might have been in better taste, perhaps, not to have done it. But I am only showing what has been the rule observed so far as the Deputy Speaker is concerned, and I cannot conceive with what grace or justice or equity the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) reproaches the present Deputy Speaker for having taken part in a provincial election.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) allow me to ask him if he ever knew before the scandal of a Deputy Speaker deserting the House during a session to go away and take part in an election?

The PRIME MINISTER. I have only this to answer—that the scandal of the Deputy Speaker deserting the House to take part in a provincial election does not approach in magnitude the scandal of the Deputy Speaker taking part in an election to the House. What was the late Deputy Speaker doing in the cases to which I have referred? He was taking part in an election to the House which he was to preside over. Surely that is ten times a greater scandal than the Deputy Speaker taking part in a provincial election—and as to that I place myself in the judgment of every right-thinking man in this House. As to the charges made by my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) as to what took place in Beauharnois, I have to say that public opinion as to the conduct of the Government will not rest upon a mere telegram of this kind; the conduct of the Government is open to criticism from everybody and under any circumstances whatever.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Chairman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh, give us a rest.

Mr. DAVIN. I can tell hon. gentlemen that they had better not try that on. I object on principle to a Deputy Speaker. And now let me read what my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) said in 1894:

> What on earth do we want with fifteen or sixteen Cabinet Ministers?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He was referring to extinct volcanoes.

Mr. DAVIN:

> It would be treason to say it, or I would ask: What do we want with a couple of Speakers?

Now, that is what I re-echo.

The PRIME MINISTER. Two years after.

Mr. DAVIN. How does the hon. gentleman know that I did not thoroughly endorse it then?

The PRIME MINISTER. By your votes —that is the only way.

Mr. DAVIN. If he or any other gentleman had asked for a vote on this question, I would have voted with him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. DAVIN. Certainly I would. Now, here is the position we are in: Here is a gentleman appointed to a position whose duties are almost perfunctory. There may be times when it is necessary to have somebody to take the place of the Speaker. Before we appointed a Deputy this was efficiently done by a member of the House, and we have members of this House quite as capable of acting as efficiently in the Chair as is the Deputy Speaker at the present time. What I wish to point out is that this gentleman is paid $22 a day, counting upon a session of three months, for merely sitting in that Chair as Deputy Speaker. He is paid $2,000 for a session of about three months. My hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) will be able to calculate what this represents in the form of the crop upon a good well-managed farm. Why, Sir, that is thirty-six bushels of wheat at 60 cents a bushel that we give that hon. gentleman per day for occasionally sitting in the Chair. We give him a farm larger

than a homestead, we give him a homestead and a pre-emption, well managed and well farmed, for sitting occasionally in the Chair and preside over our committees. Sir, let me say that although you (Mr. Lister) and I have crossed swords in debate, although you do not get a cent for sitting there, you discharge the duties as efficiently as the Deputy Speaker; and if you were to sit in the Chair behind you, I have no doubt that the same dignity that characterizes your presidency over our committees would characterize you in that Chair. Yet we have not to pay you a cent, nor is the hon. gentleman unwilling to give his services, nor is there any hon. gentleman on either side of the House that would be unwilling. Yet, Sir, when we ought to be retrenching, we pay the Deputy Speaker $2,000. $22 a day for a session of ninety days, and then when he is away ten or twelve days stumping, we give him $22 a day for stumping, thirty-six bushels of wheat at 60 cents for stumping in Quebec. Why, Sir, it is pretty hard, and I think we ought to have the Patrons supporting my hon. friend. Certainly I am not going to throw a well-managed wheat farm of 320 acres away on the Deputy Speaker to perform a perfunctory office, especially when he does not come here. Now, let me say one word with regard to the practice in England. The Deputy Speaker is not called, if I remember rightly, Deputy Speaker in England; he is called Chairman of Committee; and he always belongs to the party in power. But I think I can say with authority that such a thing as the gentleman occupying that position in England taking part in partisan warfare, is not known, although he is a good party man. If we are to have a Deputy Speaker—which I deprecate. I will vote for this motion. But we do not need the officer, and I hope we will abolish the office.

Amendment (Mr. Taylor) negatived: yeas, 32; nays, 50.

Mr. FOSTER. I move that the resolution be reduced by $1,000.

Mr. SPROULE. It does seem to me that some hon. gentlemen in this House who have been so very active in the past in condemning the Deputy Speakership as needless, are guilty of inconsistency in voting as they did on the last motion. I am surprised at those hon. gentlemen, above all others, who belong to the organization known as the Patrons, because they have invariably condemned this as one of the needless expenditures in the House. I can understand why many members of this House believe that we require a Deputy Speaker; I, for one, believe that we require a Deputy Speaker; but while believing that, I also believe that for the sake of the position that he occupies, and for the sake of his own reputation, he ought to be here discharging his duties while the House is in session. Now, some hon. gentlemen in the course of the debate, endeavoured to argue that the late Deputy Speaker did the same; but I failed to hear any one of them say that the late Deputy Speaker took part in a Dominion or provincial election while a session of Parliament was going on. Outside of this, I am of opinion that there can not be the slightest objection in the world to the Deputy Speaker taking part in either election, according to his political proclivities; but I do think that while the House is in session he ought to be here attending to his duties.

Amendment (Mr. Foster) negatived: yeas, 36; nays, 51.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). Before the resolution is carried, by way of commentary upon the proceedings we have just seen, let me remind hon. gentlemen opposite that once upon a time, on the floor of this House, a vote of censure was moved against the late Mr. Gorman, editor of the Ottawa "Free Press,' for having written an article blaming the late Speaker, Mr. White—who I must say was a very good Speaker—for having left his seat during the session of the House to go and take part in a political campaign.

House of Commons—Salaries..... $71,025

Mr. SPROULE. What is the explanation concerning the reduction in salaries?

Mr. SPEAKER. The decrease is caused by the difference of $800 in the salary of the late Assistant Clerk and the present Assistant Clerk, the salary of the new appointee commencing at the minimum of $2,000, and the difference of $300 between the salary of the late Mr. Demers, assistant French translator, and the new appointee who commences at the minimum salary of a second class clerk. That makes a reduction of $1,100. The additions were as follows:—$100 caused by the promotion of second class clerk, and $12.50 required to give the French journals clerk the increment to his salary. The total reduction is $1,100 and the increase $120.50.

Mr. HUGHES. I cannot allow the remark made by the Prime Minister to pass unchallenged, that the late Speaker of this House had been charged by Mr. Gorman with having taken part in elections. The charge was not that Mr. Speaker White during the session took part in elections, but that he attended a convention during the recess; and there was not one word of truth even in that charge.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the Prime Minister should make an apology to the House. He owes some duty to truth as well as a common member, and if he made a statement of that kind and there was not one

word of truth in it, the Prime Minister should at least make the amende.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The item has been disposed of.

Mr. TAYLOR. I notice in the details of salaries there is a decrease of $800 in the office of Assistant Clerk. What became of the Assistant Clerk who was here during last session? Has he been superannuated? If so, what amount does he receive, and why was it necessary to superannuate him?

Mr. SPEAKER. I may say that the late Assistant Clerk resigned his position by letter sent to me, and his office has been filled by a gentleman, as I have explained, who commences at a salary of $2,000, there being a saving of $800 effected in that particular. The gentleman resigned because he knew very well that the efficiency of the service of this House might probably be increased by his resignation. So far as regards superannuation, the Committee of Internal Economy has recommended the Government that he be granted superannuation allowance according to his term of service, with about three months added to make the round term of fifteen years.

Expenses of Commons, sessional and extra clerks, &c..... $14,200

Mr. FOSTER. The committee would like to have a statement from the Speaker as to the extra clerks.

Mr. SPEAKER. The details are all on page 33.

Mr. FOSTER. Have there been any more changes than those detailed last year?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, there have been. I will give the names of the sessional clerks. C. W. C. Tabor resigned and was replaced by F. L. Fairweather. J. S. Masson resigned and was replaced by A. D. Weeks. W. W. Kenny resigned and was replaced by E. F. Neville. R. F. Bain resigned and has not been replaced, because I think the list is complete.

Contingencies, including $300 for clerical assistance for the leader of the Opposition $17,400

Mr. SPROULE. There is a reduction here of $10,000.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman will look at page 34 he will see that the reduction is entirely on stationery. For a number of years past the annual appropriation for stationery was $12,000, which included distribution of small trunks of stationery to members, the last distribution being in August, the expenditure coming out of the vote of last year. As the House decided last session that no distribution of small trunks should be made this session, the Clerk and I decided that $6,000, in addition to the regular appropriation, would carry us through this financial year, covering the two sessions. Consequently the amount appropriated for the current financial year is $8,000.

Mr. FOSTER. The amount of $8,000 is an abnormal sum?

Mr. SPEAKER. That is a saving for 1897-98 of $4,000, the usual annual sum being $12,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What stationery is now distributed to members?

Mr. SPEAKER. Hon. members get the stationery they require and a few trifling articles that can be obtained out of the reduced appropriation.

Mr. HUGHES. I believe in economy, but not in a cheeseparing policy. A member who attends to his duties during the session is entitled to all he gets in the stationery trunk, for he will use the stationery and more. Now this year each member has received a bundle tied up with a string. It is beneath the dignity of this House to send out such a parcel for the sake of saving a few hundred dollars—it looks like a country grocer's parcel. I believe in economy, but not in this small cheese-paring sort; it is equal to the attacks made on napkins and other trifling expenditures at Rideau Hall—it is that kind of politics.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Will the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) calculate the saving in bushels of wheat?

Mr. HUGHES. I understand there is a saving of $4,000; the usual sum is $12,000 and the amount now asked is $8,000. I think members should not only have the stationery they require for use during the session and during the recess, but that it should be done up in a proper parcel, for it will be used in the service of their constituents. I also think they should have the franking privilege for any work they do for their constituents during the recess.

Mr. CRAIG. I wish to say a word about this very matter. One night when I went to my room I found a bundle of stationery tied up with paper and twine, and I was wondering what I would do with it. I do not know how I am going to get it home. If the Government give us stationery tied up in this way, the least they might do would be to pay the express charges, as it will take more to send it home than it is worth. I think it is rather a poor way to send around stationery to members of this House. However, I rose to speak of something which concerns the dignity of this House and that is, that the stationery supplied to the members of the Senate is better than the stationery supplied to the members of this House. I was going to say that that was an outrage, but I do not know whether you would call it that or not. I see no reason why a Senator should get bet-

ter stationery than a member of the House of Commons. I think a member of the House of Commons is just as good as a Senator, and in fact sometimes it is a little harder to get into the House of Commons than into the Senate. If there is to be any difference at all made, we ought to get better stationery than the Senators do. I hope that those who have charge of the matter will bear this in mind, and afford a remedy next session. Perhaps it might be done in order to make people anxious to get into the Senate, but I presume there are a good many anxious enough to get there now without offering them this further inducement. Speaking seriously, I do believe there should be no distinction made at all. I think the stationery supplied to the House of Commons might be improved a little, and that it might be made equally as good as that supplied to the Senate.

Publishing Debates..... $40,000

Mr. SPROULE. I intended to say a few words in reference to the reporting of the debates, but as this is for "publishing debates" perhaps it would not be exactly apropos. I have noticed at different times this year, that the reporting is very bad, and I do not understand why it should be so, because we have usually had very good reporting in the past. I am not aware that there are any changes in the staff of reporters, but I must say, that, sometimes, it is a good deal more trouble correcting a speech than it is making it. I think it would save us a great deal of work if we had closer reporting. It may be as some of the reporters complain, that we occasionally speak very fast, but I do not know that we are any worse in that regard now than we have been in the past, and yet, in my opinion, the reporting is very much worse this year than heretofore.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). It is about as good as the speeches.

Mr. CRAIG. It is only fair to say of the reporters, that any speeches of mine are well reported. I have not had to make any complaint.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I should say that my experience has been entirely different from that of my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) behind me. I have been on recent occasions, as on previous occasions, surprised at the wonderful accuracy of the reports of the debates of this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Considering the difficulty that often presents itself, through a little ebulition on one side of the House or the other; how the reporters get the debates reported with such marvellous accuracy, has always been a surprise to me. I feel, that in justice to these gentlemen, I ought to say that my experience is different from that of my hon. friend.

Contingencies in connection with printing of Voters' Lists..... $2,500

Mr. SPROULE. If it is intended to do away with the franchise law, what do you require this for in the year 1898. There must be something wrong. You cannot be sincere when you say you desire to do away with the franchise law.

Salaries, officers of the Library..... $16,650

Mr. FOSTER. There is a decrease here. How has that been effected?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). There appears to be an increase of $387 for third class clerks and a saving of $1,275 in second class clerks, leaving a general decrease of $912. I think it arises out of Mr. Thayne's superannuation, because of illness.

Mr. SPROULE. Are there the same number of third class clerks as before.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, there is a third class appointed in the place of a second class clerk and that makes the reduction.

Mr. FOSTER. Who has been appointed?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The gentleman appointed to fill the vacancy caused by Mr. Thayne's superannuation is a son of the Hon. Wm. McDougall, of Ottawa. I think his appointment will meet with general approval.

Books—Library of American History..... $1,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is done with this money?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The sum has been voted for several years to buy books on American history.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a tremendous sum for American history. It would buy almost one volume.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It would buy more than that.

Archives..... $8,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of the increase?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). For several years past Mr. Brymner who has been in charge of this work, has been asking for an increase. It is evident, from my examination of the affairs of the branch, that the work of historical research in this country, in London, and in Paris, in connection with our archives, has been considerably hampered for lack of funds. Hon. gentlemen will, I am sure, appreciate the work which Mr. Brymner has done. His report is sought for

by all those who take the slightest interest in the history of our country, and I am quite satisfied that the House will sympathise with my desire to extend that work. For a number of years back the vote has been just the same each year, with this exception, that for a time there was an assistant to Mr. Brymner appointed, a gentleman who worked in Paris at a salary which was voted by the House each year as a special salary. This official died about a year and a half or two years ago, and since that time the work in Paris has practically ceased. The archives of the early history of this country are largely in the public libraries in Paris; that is to say, for the period during which this country was occupied by the French, and for some time afterwards, when constant references were sent to Paris in regard to occurrences in this country by the original French inhabitants. This work is very important for the proper investigation of our early history, and I thought it was desirable that it should be recommended and continued on a larger scale than before. There are also a number of things in this country which Mr. Brymner has not been able to investigate owing to the lack of funds; and I felt satisfied that it was a work which the reading people of the country would desire to see carried forward more actively than it has been. Under these circumstances, I feel justified in asking for this slight increase in the grant.

Mr. SPROULE. Has Mr. Brymner got any assistant, or how many are engaged at the work?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is no other salaried official connected with that branch except a clerk, Mr. Duff, who appears in the civil list of the department, and who is also engaged in the work here in Ottawa. There is no official away from Ottawa who is on the civil list. All the other expenditures, for the transcription of documents and the carrying on of historical research are paid out of this grant. There is a staff of copyists in London, and a few in Paris; and in this country we have to make copies of documents which are scattered about in various places. For instance, at this moment Mr. Brymner is very anxious to copy some documents which are in charge of the Anglican Cathedral in the city of Quebec, documents of great historical importance, of which we have at present no copies in our national archives. All work of this kind is done out of this grant, and it has not heretofore been sufficient for properly carrying it on.

"Patent Record" $9,000

Mr. SPROULE. Is this for publishing the "Patent Record?"

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is for the printing and publishing of it. The work in connection with it is done in the department by the clerks of the patent branch. This is all paid to the printing department.

Collection and compilation of Criminal Statistics (Chap. 60, R.S.C.)..... $1,800

Mr. FOSTER. Are these any good at all?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I believe the legal fraternity of the country want them.

Statistical Year-Book..... $4,000

Mr. SPROULE. I think we ought to have some explanation of the reduction in this case. If it is intended to give us a smaller number, I think it is a very bad kind of economy, because this is one of the valuable books which is looked forward to with a good deal of interest when it comes out. In my part of the country school teachers want it, and commercial men want it, and we cannot supply the demand. Instead of reducing the number, I think the hon. Minister would be going in the right direction if he gave us a larger number.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman has got entirely on the wrong track. I am going to publish a great deal larger number than ever before; but by making a considerable reduction in the volume of the book, I am going to lessen its cost. Last year it reached near 1,000 pages. This year I am going to have it within 500 pages, by excising from it a number of opinions, by condensing the tables, and by bringing together tables which are duplicated in different form, and making one table serve for two or three. There were several things in the last volume which we have cut out altogether. A large portion of that volume was occupied with the results of the census. It is a practical compilation from the census of 1891.

Mr. SPROULE. They would not require to be in, of course, in the succeeding year.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It seems to me that at this period, some six or seven years after the census, it is quite time to drop the census and let us have some new statistics. Last year's book had become so bulky it was practically losing its utility, and I think it very important that it should be kept down in size. Having gone over the matter carefully, with Mr. Johnson, the Statistician, I am quite satisfied that the work now being prepared will contain all the necessary information and statistics in a much less bulky form. The Statistician, under my direction, has started out with the intention of bringing the book down to less than 500 pages whereas now it is nearly a thousand. I intend publishing this year 3,000 English and 1,000 French copies, I think.

General Statistics..... $3,200

Mr. SPROULE. What is the explanation of the reduction ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have dispensed with the services of a number of extra clerks. Speaking from memory, some five or six have been dispensed with, and this saving is the result.

Aid to Agricultural Societies..... $7,000

Mr. SPROULE. What societies are receiving aid ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The agricultural societies in the North-west Territories. I have not the list, but each year this sum is voted and distributed. A certain sum is given according to membership, and no society is allowed to receive more than $250. This and last year the number of societies asking for aid has become so large that the maximum has not been reached by any one society. About 20 or 25 societies in different parts of the North-west Territories participate in this vote.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know whether this is the proper place to speak of it, but would like to inquire whether the hon. Minister has made arrangements to pay the debts incurred in connection with the exhibition at Regina last year ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. While that has nothing to do with this vote I may inform the hon. gentleman that I am investigating the claims in connection with this exhibition which was gotten up under the patronage and auspices of the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories. I am investigating the claims against that gentleman or that association, which have not been paid, in order to see whether they are just and proper and whether this House should be asked to pay them.

Mr. SPROULE. There will be an item for them ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That will depend on the result of my investigation.

Experimental Farms..... $75,000

Mr. McMILLAN. In looking over the report I find six teamsters are employed during the whole year and four stablemen. That is a large number of gentlemen employed upon a farm of that description. I run a farm as large myself, and I think there should be some explanation in this. I do not think it necessary to have six teamsters on that farm during the whole year. It may be necessary during the summer, but I should like to know what they do during the winter.

Mr. DAVIN. Something like the Deputy Speaker.

Mr. McMILLAN. The hon. gentleman is rather late in finding that out. I discovered it years ago. His conversion is very late.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I believe the teamsters are engaged the whole winter. I confess I have not the full details of the farm work this evening, because I did not expect these items to come up, but I can tell the hon. gentleman this, that up to the present time I have not undertaken to make any changes in the management or organization of the Experimental Farm. I came into the department some months ago, and found my attention very much occupied by various outside matters, quarantine matters, cold storage, which required the greatest care and thought to work out, a problem which I felt was extremely urgent in the interests of our people, some matters in connection with cattle quarantine and human quarantine, and the reorganization of the service in my own department and especially the Patent Branch. Feeling that I could not undertake everything at once, I simply left the Experimental Farm until such time as I might be able to spend a few months practically on the field with the men and see what was being done. I trust to being able to do that this spring and the early part of the summer, and hope to be able to reorganize where I find it necessary. I am not prepared at this stage to say what I think necessary and what not, as I have not sufficient knowledge of the details to lay a scheme before the House. Under the circumstances, I thought it best to let the farms work along as they have been doing until I could take up the reorganization. I do not desire to criticise the management of these farms, as that may be all right. There may be nothing to reorganize. I cannot say until I have investigated more completely than I have had time to do yet what may be required to be done. Therefore, I feel compelled to ask the House to vote the same sums as have been voted in past years, and if I find I can make reductions I will do so, notwithstanding the fact that the vote is the same amount as formerly. On the other hand, if I find, at the end of the year, that I can see my way to spend more money on the farm profitably, if I find that it is in the interests of the country to do so, I shall not hesitate in asking this House for a larger vote and have no doubt the House will grant it. If any hon. gentleman wishes to put questions in detail, I shall try to answer as well as I can, but have not at my hand to-night the memorandum which Professor Saunders had prepared for me.

Mr. McMILLAN. I have tried year after year to press upon the Government the idea that the farm proper and the experimental work should be kept apart, so that we might know in reality what the farm proper, that is as compared with a general farm, costs us. We all know that the experimental part could never pay, and I, for my part,

believe, that the experimental work is the part we have been most benefited by. There is one grass seed that was shown to us by Professor Saunders in the Agricultural Committee, that, I believe, will prove of lasting benefit to the North-west country, one of the greatest benefits that have been conferred upon it. But I do want to see what money is spent on the farm proper and what on the experimental part. I notice that we have six teamsters employed on the farm during the whole year. I observe also that 505 loads of manure were brought to the farm and there is a charge of $201 for labour in connection with that manure. I do not understand why this charge should be made, with six teamsters on the farm all winter. Surely they should be able to handle all the manure on the farm without extra cost.

Mr. McGREGOR. That is probably the cost of buying the manure.

Mr. McMILLAN. No; this is for labour over and above the cost of the manure. While certain things connected with the experimental part of the work are of great benefit, I know that the amount spent on the farm requires careful looking after. The sum of $40,000 is set apart for the Central Farm. I know that the Minister is doing his best to expend that money to the greatest advantage, and I will not say any more. I merely give these hints in order that the hon. the Minister may have an opportunity to attend to the matters that I suggest.

Mr. HUGHES. I am glad to see the leader of the Government (Mr. Laurier) in his place. I would like to call his attention to what I am sure he will be glad to correct. A little time ago he made a statement in reference to the action taken in this House when Mr. Gorman was brought to the notice of the House for an article in which he had charged that the then Speaker had taken part in an electoral campaign. It transpired that the article did not refer to any contest going on while the House was in session. The charge was that the Speaker had attended a convention. The fact was that he did not attend the convention and the charge was entirely unfounded. I am sure that if the hon. the First Minister will look up the record of that time he will see that what I state is correct. I am speaking from authority.

The PRIME MINISTER. I would not contradict the hon. gentleman's statement, but my impression was that the Speaker had attended a convention not for a Dominion but for a provincial election.

Mr. HUGHES. He was charged with having attended the convention but he was not there.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I would like to say a word in reply to my hon. friend from South Huron

ply to my hon. friend from South Huron details here of the expenditure on the farm, which I did not think I had. The hon. member for South Huron has said what I quite sympathize with, and which, perhaps, deserves a word or two of explanation, if the patience of the committee will allow it. In the Central Experimental Farm but a small proportion of this amount, $40,000. is spent on what may be called the farm work proper. At this Central Farm are the scientific officials who have to deal with all the experimental stations. The director of the Central Farm is director of all the farms, and, though his salary is charged to the Central Experimental Farm, his work extends over all the farms. We have besides the director, Professor Fletcher, the entomologist; Professor Shutt, the chemist, and Professor Craig, the horticulturist, whose work extends practically over the whole country, though their salaries and expenditures are charged to the Centeral Experimental Farm. We have, besides, at the Experimental Farm, the whole distribution of the seeds and plants and trees, which consumes a great deal of time and costs a great deal of money. Hon. members are well aware of the fact that the Central Experimental Farm sends out every year large quantities of seed grain, and various other seeds for experimental use throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion. That is done by the desire of hon. members, and the seeds are sent to those whose names are furnished by the members. This business is entirely apart from the work of the farm as a farm. At the same time, it is a work that demands the labour of seven or eight men for between two and three months every winter, and also involves a considerable amount of cartage. When hon. members are informed that this year over 50,000 samples of seed grain have been sent out from the Experimental Farm to every part of the country they can understand the amount of labour that is involved in this part of the work. These seeds must be carefully selected, put up in proper packets, labelled and posted, and the posting of itself means a great deal of labour. In addition to that a careful record has to be kept of every such sample sent out, and a form must be sent instructing the individual to whom the seed is directed how he can best utilize it for experimental purposes, and asking him to fill out a report showing the results of the experiments. I regret to say that the percentage of instances in which these reports are sent back to the Central Experimental Farm is comparatively small, and the results are not properly commensurate with the expenditure and the trouble involved. At the same time, there are some results and there is some satisfaction, and I doubt if the members of this House or the people from the country will be willing to do away with this feature of the Experimental Farm work—and I do not

propose to do away with it, for the present, at all events. But I want to draw attention to the fact that all this expenditure is charged to the Experimental Farm, though it has nothing to do with the running of the farm as a farm. Besides that we have a great many visitors to the Experimental Farm. All through the summer season there is a constant succession of individual visitors, and, during several months of the year, a large number of excursion parties come to the farm and have to be attended to. These visitors require a great deal of attention. A large portion of the staff have to stop their work and go about and show the visitors what there is to be seen and explain everything to them, and, generally, to treat them as visitors might properly expect to be treated when they come to the Government institution. This work is a serious interruption of the ordinary farm work, even the ordinary labourers, having, in many instances, to stop their work to attend to visitors. I am not making complaints, because I think these visits are one of the best means of familiarizing the people with the experimental work going on at the farm which is of such value to the people of the country at large. It is of inestimable value to the people to become acquainted with the work going on and the results which may follow. Still the fact that these excursion parties and a large number of visitors come all through the year, and especially during summer when the work is most driving, does interfere with the economical management of the work which my hon. friend from South Huron desires, as I desire, to see carried on. The hon. gentleman speaks about teaming and manure. I may say that the farm is a large farm, that it is a hungry farm, and one which does not have so much stock in proportion to the area as, perhaps, would be to the advantage of the farm as a farm pure and simple, and for the maintenance of the fertility of its soil. The result is that up to the present time, at all events, the teams during the winter have been to a considerable extent employed in drawing manure from the city to the farm. There is an item in this key to my estimate of $700 for manure and fertilizers, a portion of which I believe is spent in buying stable manure, and a large portion of it is spent in buying artificial fertilizers, for two reasons: In the first place, to help the fertility of the soil; and, in the second place, to try experiments with fertilizers and with different crops. There are on the farm a large range of experimental plots, where different fertilizers are experimented with, where mixtures of fertilizers and special and general fertilizers are tried side by side, so that we can see the result of the different foods given to the soil, and be enabled thereby to give advice to the farmers throughout the country as to the best use of these artificial fertilizers. This all requires some money, and I am sorry to say that in this country these artificial fertilizers are a little higher in price than would be to our advantage. The Experimental Farm buys a considerable quantity of them every year, and utilizes them chiefly for this purpose. In addition to this, I want to point out that upon the Central Experimental Farm is a seed testing department, where any farmer throughout the country can send seeds which he has either raised or bought, and find out whether they would stand the test, and whether they are sufficiently good to enable him to expect confidently that they will return what he might fairly hope from sowing them. There is another part of work which is of considerable advantage, and which perhaps occasions as much interest as any thing that goes on on the Experimental Farm, although it is not essentially what you may call farming. I refer to work in connection with the arboretum, and with the forestry investigations, not only at the Central Experimental Farm, but especially in Manitoba and at Indian Head in the North-west Territories, where experiments are carried on in regard to the forestry propagation of trees and plantations. This work is one that I think is of the utmost value, and has already resulted in considerable benefit to our people in the North-west Territories and on the plains. I trust that in the near future still greater advantage will be reaped from the work that is being done. I would like to draw the attention of the House and the country especially to the splendid results which have been chiefly accomplished at the Indian Head Farm in the way of forestry plantations, and in the way of experiments made to ascertain how forest trees can subsist and thrive in the comparatively dry portions of our North-west Territories. We are sending out large numbers of small trees which have been tested and found successful, and are asking the people throughout those Territories to try planting them. We are sure from the results already attained that by means of these experiments, and if people will only adopt the information and advice which have been given them, and are being given them, by the officials of the Experimental Farms, we will be able in the present treeless and arid plains of the North-west to bring about a much more satisfactory climatic condition, and to bring about the successful raising of crops there which heretofore have been of very doubtful success. These things are of the utmost importance from an economic point of view, and I think that the House and the people of the country at large, the more they understand this work which is being carried on, the better they will be satisfied with the application of the money of this country and the valuable results which are likely to accrue from it. There is another branch of work which, while not per-

haps equally valuable, is still of value, I think, to the people of our country, and that is the orchard work and the propagation of the experiment of ornamental trees and plants. One of the greatest difficulties which we experience is the fact that our country homes are comparatively cheerless and unattractive, and I feel that it is a very practical business to find out those trees and shrubs which will be hardy everywhere throughout our country, which will be easy to manage, require but little care in their treatment, but which will, if planted around our country homesteads, make them attractive, make them ornamental, and make them desirable residences, so that the people will be better contented to remain in them instead of leaving them for foreign lands, or going to our own cities. This work is being done very successfully. There is to-day established a large arboretum which you may observe on one side of the high road going to the farm. On the left hand side as you approach the farm, there is a tract of land which has been of comparatively little use for agricultural operations heretofore, but which has now been laid out, and is being laid out all the time as an arboretum. Besides being of this practical utility in obtaining information for the improvement of our country homesteads all through the country, it is becoming a source of great interest to botanical students and people who desire to know about the different trees and plants of our country, and also about those foreign trees and plants which are desirable in our country, and which there have been successfully planted and tried. This is a matter which requires a considerable outlay, it is a matter which requires a great deal of attention and care, because such an arboretum, if not neatly and trimly kept, would not attract much interest. But to keep such a large area of land in proper condition, and make it interesting and attractive to visitors to the farm requires considerable outlay. But I must say that I consider, farmer as I am, and practical man as I think I am, that this is practical work which it would be deplorable if we did not continue to keep up and enlarge. Therefore, I consider that the experiment is one which is valuable in the interests of the farmers themselves throughout the country, as well as to those who may be more particularly interested in the purely ornamental side of the Experimental Farms. If there are any other details or question which the hon. gentleman would like to ask, I should be glad to answer them.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not rise to find fault with what is being done, because this is a very valuable work, no doubt, and no doubt it is well done, for the hon. gentleman tells us that he has not made any changes from what existed heretofore. Nor do I wish to subject the hon. gentleman to the painful task of talking much, because I notice from his voice that he is suffering considerably from the ardous work to which he has been giving himself lately in the provincial campaign.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I get my reward to-day.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman says that the large number of visitors going to the farm require a good deal of attention from the farm hands. I think that is all right, and it is what should be done, it is one of the ways that the work is advertised, and one of the ways in which the people are educated. But I notice from year to year going to that farm that there is no shelter, comparatively speaking, for the crowds who go there; and if it happens that the weather turns out showery or unpleasant, there is no place where these people can sit down for lunch unless they go into the stables or some of the outbuildings, which would be very uncomfortable for them. I think there should be provided for them something like the summer house we have here, and there should either be a well dug or a water supply secured in some other way for the convenience of those visiting the farm. I am sure that the visiting public would appreciate these conveniences very highly, and I hope the hon. gentleman will bear this in mind, and that it will be one of the things that he will attend to. Now, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman how many head of stock they have on the farm at the present time.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot tell off-hand, but I think it is the same number as we had last summer. Some steers were bought last fall, I think, between sixteen and twenty. During the winter these were put under experiment and were sold a short time ago, the experiment having been concluded. Aside from that, the barn was full. But I cannot tell the hon. gentleman how many cows or how many animals there are at the present moment on the farm.

Mr. SPROULE. On what principle is the distribution of seed grain conducted? How many samples are sent to one person?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. As a general rule only one sample is sent to an applicant. In some instances, when we know the farmer and he has made a satisfactory report and thereby shown an interest in the matter, we send him more than one sample. As a general rule members of this House are asked by circular to send in the names of any persons to whom they wish grain samples to be sent. In addition Mr. Saunders has at the farm a mailing list, containing a large number of names of farmers, all over the country to whom bulletins and farm reports and samples of grains are sent. I do not think

it is usual to send more than one sample to each individual.

Mr. SPROULE. In connection with the distribution of the report, I may mention that on looking over the list kept at the farm I found it contained a good many names of men who had moved from the addresses given and had gone elsewhere. The list should be revised from time to time. From what percentage of those to whom samples have been sent have reports been received ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I asked Mr. Saunders that question one day, but he was not able to tell me. He has made no returns. I remember asking him if the number would be about 40 per cent, and he said it would be more than that; but after discussing the matter a little longer, he said he was doubtful. I think probably 20 or 25 per cent would be nearer the mark than 40 or 50 per cent.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. Minister has intimated that a great many samples of seed grain are tested with respect to their vitality. Could the hon. gentleman tell the committee what proportion comes from the farmers in the country and what proportion from the experimental farms ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Nearly all the samples received for testing purposes come from the farmers; occasionally some are received from gardeners. When the testing was first established seedsmen sent in samples, but there are very few received now. I cannot tell how many samples have been received, nor what the results of the tests have been, except in a general way. The officer in charge told me that the samples were remarkably good and the percentage very high.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. Minister has told the committee that about 50,000 grain samples were distributed this year. Is it usual to test the vitality of the different kinds of grains sent out ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The grain sent out is grown on the experimental farm and is very carefully selected. No grain is sent out except in appearance it is thoroughly good. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman whether each field or crop is tested; I do not think that is the general rule.

Mr. CRAIG. I was very much gratified, as no doubt all the members on this side of the House must have been, to hear the remarks of the Minister of Agriculture with respect to the experimental farms. These have been subjected in the past to much adverse criticism by hon. gentlemen opposite, and I was very much delighted—for I do not know anything about farming—to hear that this Central Experimental Farm, and I suppose the other farms generally, have been conducted properly and in a manner advantageous to the country and in the interest of the farmers at large, and also to hear the opinion expressed by the Minister that the experimental farms are of very great advantage to the farmers of this country. I agree with him in this respect—and I repeat I am not a farmer—because I observe that in the progress of time and the changes going on, farming in order to succeed must be conducted more and more on scientific principles, and I think it only proper that a large sum of money should be devoted to these experiments in order to instruct the farmers as to the best way to proceed in order to secure the best results. I never gave my vote for any appropriations with more pleasure than for appropriations that are for the benefit of the farmers, because they labour under a great many hardships at times, and we must admit after all that the farmers form the basis of most of the prosperity of the country. I was very glad to hear that the Minister is disposed to do all he can in this direction; and if he requires more money that he will ask Parliament for it, and I can assure him that so far as I am concerned I will always be willing to give my vote for generous appropriations that will benefit the farmers and the country.

Printing and distribution of reports and bulletins of farms..... $4,000

Mr. SPROULE. Is this item for the publication of the reports of the farm, sent out for distribution by the different members ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This vote is for the distribution of the farm reports and of bulletins. This item was asked for the first time last year. The farm report has become a pretty bulky volume, and for general distribution I do not think it is quite so useful as smaller and shorter bulletins, which the average farmer can read more easily and carry in his mind more effectively. Another difficulty with respect to the farm report is that it can only be got out at a somewhat late period of the year. During the winter and early spring there is often information of what has occurred during the last season which it is very important the farmers should know before spring operations, and for this purpose this winter I caused the issue of one or two bulletins for the purpose of giving information before the farmers commenced their spring work. I hope in the future that this will be done to an even greater extent than in the past, because I feel it is very important that the result of experiments should be placed before the farmers as quickly as possible and in as handy a form as possible. I propose to largely increase the issue of small bulletins from the farm, the cost of which will be taken out of this vote.

Dairying Service..... $30,000

Mr. SPROULE. What is this vote used for ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is out of this vote that all the work done by Prof. Robertson, in his capacity as Dairy Commissioner, is paid.

Mr. SPROULE. How many assistants has Prof. Robertson now ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He has a second class clerk in the department whose salary is not taken out of this vote, but out of the ordinary vote of the department. He has two instructors in Prince Edward Island. We having withdrawn from the management of the cheese factories in the island, it will be their business to act as instructors and inspectors in the manner that the instructors in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec act, visiting the factories and aiding by advice and instruction the makers, and testing where required. Those two men are engaged for the season, and are paid salaries and travelling expenses also. That is the only expenditure which is to be made this year in the province of Prince Edward Island. Hitherto, we have run a number of cheese factories there, but the time seemed to have arrived when these factories ought run on their own basis without assistance from the Government. The work in Prince Edward Island was understood to be of a temporary character, and only until such time as the business which was new should be established on a firm basis. A little over a year ago the Government gave notice to the people in Prince Edward Island, that they would to a certain extent withdraw from this work last year, and that this year they would withdraw altogether. I have carried out that arrangement and have this spring withdrawn from the work in Prince Edward Island, with the exception of these two officers as inspectors and instructors.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this the only locality where that kind of work is carried on ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In Nova Scotia we have a dairy factory connected with the Nappan farm. That is run under Professor Robertson out of this vote, and a gentleman is engaged there as instructor and manager, and spends his time looking after that particular creamery, travelling through Nova Scotia, speaking at various agricultural meetings, giving instructions wherever he is asked to, going to factories not under the Government, and advising where difficulties have arisen ; and during the winter, attending meetings and carrying on a dairying school in the province of New Brunswick for two or three months. Besides that, last year and again this year, we have a gentleman in British Columbia whose business it is to travel about the province giving instructions, and encouraging the people to enter into dairying work. Last year, out of this vote there was also a certain amount of work done in the North-west Territories. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) will see when we come to the vote a little later on, I am going to extend that work largely this season, but still, a portion of this vote will have to be devoted to that, because the creameries which we expect to run in the North-west Territories—a certain number of them at all events—will not pay their running expenses, and the deficit will have to be taken out of this vote. In addition to that, out of this vote, there is a grant made to the dairy school in the province of Quebec. For some years Professor Robertson managed that dairy school. Last year it was still under his charge, although it was really managed by the Assistant Commissioner, Mr. Chapais. This year I am withdrawing Professor Robertson's management of that school, but for the purpose of keeping it on, I give them a grant out of this vote to help them in their work.

Mr. SPROULE. How much does the Quebec school get ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It gets $3,000 out of that vote. I think I have now mentioned all the officials outside, whom Professor Robertson has under him this year.

Mr. SPOULE. Have you any employed in the North-west Territories and in Manitoba ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have two instructors who are going to look after the establishment and the maintenance of the creameries in the North-west Territories. They will be engaged all summer, and their salaries will have to come out of this vote.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. As this is an extremely interesting subject and the House is very thin, and the hour is late, and a great deal of work has been done, I would suggest that we should stop at this point in order that hon. gentlemen may have an opportunity of considering these questions later.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am agreeable.

Resolution to be reported.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.55.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 12th May, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

W. B. MOORE, FUEL INSPECTOR, INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. BELL (Pictou) asked:

1. Are there any reports on file in the Department of Railways from W. B. Moore, lately fuel inspector on the Intercolonial Railway?
2. Do these demonstrate any economy as resulting from the service of the said inspector?
3. What was the bill for coal on the Intercolonial Railway in 1887, 1891 and 1897?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. Yes, there are reports on file in the Department of Railways and Canals from W. B. Moore, lately fuel inspector on the Intercolonial Railway. 2. These reports refer to the quality and weight of the coal. I believe that Mr. Moore, when the office was abolished, sent correspondence to the general manager at Moncton, showing the savings which he alleged he had made in the cost of fuel, under his management. The general manager is of opinion that the statement is exaggerated. 3. During the year ended 30th June, 1887, there was paid for soft coal, $293,484.84; during the year ended 30th June, 1891, there was paid for soft coal, $511,395.70; during the nine months ended 31st March, 1897, there was paid for soft coal, $344,292.98. The amount of bills paid in each year do not either show or correspond with the actual consumption for the year.

JAMES McLEAN, OF ANTIGONISH.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (for Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) asked:

1. Have the services of James McLean, of Antigonish, as foreman carpenter on the Intercolonial Railway on the division extending from Stellarton to Strait of Canso, been dispensed with?
2. If so, when, and for what reason were they dispensed with?
3. How long was Mr. McLean in the service of the Government, and what was his record?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. The services of James McLean, of Antigonish, were dispensed with at the instance of Mr. McIsaac, M.P., on his representing that to his own knowledge Mr. McLean had taken an active and offensive part in the late Dominion elections. James McLean was in the service of the Government for thirteen years.

DISMISSALS ON THE WELLAND CANAL.

Mr. McCLEARY asked:

1. Why were F. Donohue and H. Kearns dismissed from their positions as lockmasters on Lock 24, Welland Canal?
2. Why were J. Smerdon and T. Bonewell dismissed from their positions as lockmasters on Lock 23, Welland Canal?
3. Why were R. Camp and Wm. Boyle dismissed from their positions as lockmasters on Lock 22, Welland Canal?
4. Why were F. C. Berryman and J. Winton dismissed from their positions as lockmasters on Lock 21, Welland Canal?
5. Why were J. Renter and J. McMurray dismissed from their positions as lockmasters on Lock 20, Welland Canal?
6. Why were A. K. Brennan and J. Hill dismissed from their positions as lockmasters on Lock 19, Welland Canal?
7. Why were G. Newton and J. Cook dismissed from their positions as lockmasters on Lock 18, Welland Canal?
8. Why was W. Galbraith dismissed from his position as lockmaster on Lock 17, Welland Canal?
9. Why were T. Burley, R. Laughlin and J. Holland dismissed from their positions as lockmasters on Lock 16, Welland Canal?
10. Why were R. Wright and G. Detlor dismissed from their positions as lockmasters on Lock 25, Welland Canal?
11. Why were A. Upper and Joseph Cook dismissed from their positions as lockmasters on the Guard Lock, Welland Canal?
12. Why was George Misener dismissed from his position as bridge tender at the Quaker Bridge, Welland Canal?
13. Why was R. Grisdale dismissed from his position as lockmaster on the Port Robinson Lock, Welland Canal?
14. Why was George Upper dismissed from his position as bridge tender on the Allanburgh Bridge, Welland Canal?
15. Why was W. Upper dismissed from his position as bridge tender on Marlatt's Bridge, Welland Canal?
16. Why were S. Bradley, S. Pettigrew, E. Smith, W. Cave, A. Martin, H. Aikens, W. Clark, J. Hulty and J. Coyle dismissed from their positions as Government employees in the gate-yard, Lock 21, Welland Canal?
17. Why were E. Fraser, T. Wilson, W. Neil, J. McMullen, H. Dell and Robert Hoover dismissed from their positions as Government employees on the repairs, Welland Canal?
18. Why were H. Vanderburgh, Wm. Jones, S. Ratcliffe and J. Hudson dismissed from their positions as carpenters on the Welland Canal?
19. If charges were made against any, was an investigation held as to the truthfulness of the same?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). None of the persons named in the question were dismissed from the employ on the canal. At the close of navigation, in the fall of last year, the employees were notified that their services were not further required, but they were given to understand that they would be informed, before the opening of navigation this spring, if they were to be taken on the work again. Very few of the persons employed on the

canal have been regarded in the department as permanent employees. It may be true that on one or more of the canals a practice had grown up of buying and selling the places of lockmasters and bridge tenders, and many persons having bought these places from those who had influence with the late Government, or with members of Parliament, might have come to consider that they had thereby acquired a permanent title to employment; but inasmuch as no portion of the purchase price passed into the Dominion treasury, such a transaction could not be regarded as conferring any such right upon the employee. Before selecting the staff for the current year, I gave explicit instructions to the Superintendent of the Canal, Mr. Thompson (as I did to other superintendents) that he was to take up the list of the employees of last year and give to persons on that list the preference who had given satisfaction in the past, and who had not made themselves obnoxious by active partisansnip or participation in the last general elections. Mr. Thompson was further informed by me that I would not countenance the putting off of good men, who had not interfered in politics, simply to make vacancies. Mr. Thompson prepared the list, and I see no reason to doubt that the instructions I gave him have been followed, and that the men taken on the canal for the current year were chosen in strict conformity with such instructions. Neither do I see that the number of changes in the employees, as enumerated in the question just asked, are considerable, in view of the fact that out of a total of 170 persons employed on this canal there appear to be only 45 persons whose services were dispensed with.

SADOWA POST OFFICE.

Mr. HUGHES asked:

1. Who is postmaster at Sadowa, in North Victoria?
2. How long has he held this office?
3. Why was Mr. Thomas Hart relieved of the office?
4. When was he notified that he was to be relieved?
5. When was he relieved?
6. Was there an investigation?
7. Who is mail carrier for Sadowa office?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). William Reid is postmaster. He has held the office since the 1st of January, 1897. The change in the postmaster was made in consequence of certain representations which were made to the department as set forth in a petition signed by Thomas Morton, and others, testifying to the inconvenient locality of the then post office. The petition contains the following statement:—

That the post office at Sadowa may be taken from the place where it is at present, lot 26, concession 9, township of Dalton, and that it be placed on lot 25, concession 8, Dalton, the latter place being where it was first established and kept by Mr. John Vanvlack for at least nine or ten years. Mr. Thomas Hart, of lot 26, concession 9, Dalton, then rented lot 25, concession 8, Dalton, from Mr. Vanvlack for three years; and, in transferring the office from Mr. Vanvlack to Mr. Hart, Major Sam Hughes changed the location from lot 25, concession 8, to lot 26, concession 9, Sam Hughes being on a visit at Hart's at the time, Hart being a strong adherent of Sam's, and Mr. Hart kept the office on lot 25, concession 8, for three years, when Mr. Vanvlack sold lot 25 to William Reid, and Mr. Hart moved to his own place, lot 26, concession 9, and has kept the post office there for about two years, to the great inconvenience of the majority of the residents of this locality, as some of the patrons of the office who live to the west of the office would have to go at least five miles by the public road for their mail, and a number of the residents to the south do not go to the office, as it is so much farther than it was when on lot 25, concession 8, but have their mail addressed to Seabright.

The petition goes on to recommend very strongly that William Reid be appointed postmaster. The correctness of this petition was certified to by a letter, dated November 13, 1896, from Mr. R. J. McLaughlin, of Lindsay, who states:

I inclose you a petition which has been forwarded to me by the chief residents of the township of Dalton who get their mail at Sadowa post office, asking to have the post office restored to its original position on lot 25, concession 8. I know, from being in the neighbourhood, that the present situation of the office is very inconvenient, and I would recommend that the prayer of the petitioners be granted. Mr. William Reid, the present owner of lot 25, in the 8th concession, would make an excellent postmaster, and I would recommend that in order to carry out the change he would be appointed.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (for Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) asked:

1. Has the hon. the Minister of Justice ever given a formal opinion as to the proper construction of Section 11, Chapter 18, Revised Statutes of Canada?
2. If so, when?
3. Is the present Minister of Justice of the opinion that under this clause a civil servant entitled to superannuation may be retired without adding, for the purpose of computing the superannuation allowance, ten years to his actual term of service?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). 1. Yes, he has. 2. On the 26th of August, 1896, to the Treasury Board. 3. Yes, that is his opinion.

JUDGES OF COUNTY COURTS.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (for Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) asked:

1. How many judges of county courts in Canada, if any, hold commissions without special legislation of the Canadian Parliament, indepenently of the Supply Act, authorizing their appointment or fixing their salaries?

2. What are the names of such judges and in what districts do they act?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to introduce legislation respecting the appointment or salaries of these judges?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). 1. One. 2. J. E. P. Prendergast, Eastern Judicial District of the province of Manitoba. 3. Yes, but not necessarily this session.

APPOINTMENT ON STR. "NEWFIELD."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (for Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) asked:

1. Is the following statement appearing in the press correct?

"Halifax, May 6.—Judge Johnston to-day convicted John Batfield and Charles Brennan for robbery on the highway. Both are late appointees by the Ottawa Government to the steamer 'Newfield.' They stole gold and money from the mines from Cariboo about a month ago. Batfield was sentenced to Dorchester for two years and three months, and Brennan two years with hard labour. They will be taken to Dorchester Saturday morning."

2. If not, what are the facts?

3. If Batfield and Brennan were appointed to the "Newfield," upon whose recommendation were they appointed?

4. If they were put in the places of men dismissed, what was the record of the men whose places they took?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The department has no information whatever with regard to the statements made in the newspaper clipping. The names mentioned do not appear on the last pay-list received by the department, and no appointment of the men mentioned was made by the department or with its knowledge.

APPOINTMENT OF G. McDONALD, SUB-COLLECTOR, P. E. I.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (for Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) asked:

1. Having reference to a return to Parliament, 1896, "Further correspondence (7d) respecting certain proposed appointments and Orders in Council, did His Excellency at any time approve of the appointment of G. McDonald, sub-collector, Prince Edward Island?

2. Under which head, if any, of the classification in the memorandum of His Excellency's Secretary, dated July 8th, 1896, (included in said return) does the Government consider the recommendation of Mr. McDonald's appointment came?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). 1. His Excellency did not at any time approve of the recommendation of Mr. McDonald. 2. The recommendation, as afterwards appeared, came within the class to which His Excellency's objections did not apply. One of the officials in making a classification of the numerous recommendations made by the late Government, placed Mr. McDonald's name on the wrong list. The vacancy in the office continued and subsequently another gentleman was appointed to fill it.

GASPE LIGHT-SHIP KEEPER.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (for Mr. Foster) asked:

Has the light-ship keeper at Gaspé been dismissed? If so, what was the reason for his dismissal? Was any charge preferred against him or investigation held? Who has been appointed in his place and at what salary?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say, the light-ship keeper at Gaspé, John Ascah, was not a regularly appointed official of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. He had a contract with the department during the year 1896 for maintaining a light-ship on the Peninsula Bank, Gaspé Basin, and to keep a crew of two men on board at $400 for the season. The department furnished illuminating apparatus and oils. Tenders were invited by letter for the season of 1897. Two tenders were received, the lowest being $400 per annum which was accepted, therefore no dismissal took place. The contract was simply awarded to the lowest tenderer. No charges were preferred against Mr. Ascah and no investigation was held. The last question is answered by the above answers. The present contractor maintains the light-ship for $400 per annum, which means the season of navigation.

MAIL CARRIER AT STRATFORD.

Mr. LANDERKIN (for Mr. Cameron) asked:

1. Who is the mail carrier employed to carry letters from the letter-boxes to the post office, Stratford?

2. When was he first so employed? Has he been continuously so employed since?

3. Were tenders called for, for that service?

4. What salary or allowance does he receive?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say: 1. Thomas Stoney is the contractor for the Street Letter Box service in Stratford. 2. Mr. Stoney has been contractor for this service continuously since the 1st October, 1887, the date on which he entered upon the service. 3. Tenders were not called for the service, the present contract being a renewal of its predecessor on the same terms and conditions from the 1st October, 1895. The service is now being put up to tender. 4. The rate is $441.25 per annum.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to rise to a question of privilege. Yesterday, while you, Sir,

were out of the Chair, and the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Bain) was in your place, in the absence of the Deputy Speaker, and after I had made a motion to which I had spoken, the hon. member for Wentworth just read the question and is said to have declared it "lost," which I have no doubt he did. But the mover of the motion, who happens to have the honour now of addressing you, Sir, got up and with him rose some twelve or fourteen others, and demanded the yeas and nays. The hon. member for Wentworth hesitated a little, but the hon. leader of the House, I think, nodded to him and said "lost," and thereupon the hon. member for Wentworth left the Chair. Now, I do not know whether my version will coincide with that which may be given by anybody else in this House, but I feel bound to rise, not for any personal motive, but in the interest of the freedom of debate. Nor do I rise to complain of my hon. friend the member for Wentworth whom I have known and long respected, and who, it would be hard for me to believe, would do anything that would be unworthy an honourable man. I rise solely in the interests of the freedom of this Parliament and the freedom of debate, and I desire, Sir, to call attention to what is laid down in the text-books as the duty of the Speaker when putting the question:

When the debate on a question is closed and the House is ready to decide thereon, the Speaker proceeds to "put" the question. The proceedings in taking the sense of the House on a question are similar in the Senate and Commons. Members for and against a question are distinguished in the Senate as "Contents" and "Non-Contents"; in the Commons as "Yeas" and "Nays." The House generally expresses its desire for a decision on a question by demanding at the close of the debate that the members be called in; and in that case, the Speaker does not read the question until the Sergeant-at-Arms has reported that the members have been called in. In many cases, however, the question is put without calling in the members. The Speaker rises in his place and asks: "Is the House ready for the question?" If it is evident that no member claims the right of speaking, the Speaker proceeds to put the question by reading the main motion, and then the amendment or amendments in their order, as the case may be. Having read the question on which the decision of the House is to be first given,——

I suggested at the instance of my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) that, with the consent of my seconder, I would slightly amend the question, and I understood the Speaker for the time being (Mr. Bain), to put the amendment, which, of course, makes the case much stronger in my opinion. We rose to canvass the opinion of the House on the amendment whether I should be permitted to amend the question or not.

—Having read the question on which the decision of the House is to be first given, he takes the sense of members by saying: "Those who are in favour of the question (or amendment) will say 'Content' (or 'Yea'); those who are of the contrary opinion will say 'Non-content' (or 'Nay')." When the supporters and opponents of the question have given their voices for and against the same, the Speaker will say: "I think the Contents (or Yeas) have it;" or "I think the Non-contents (or Nays) have it;" or "I cannot decide." If the House does not acquiesce in this decision, the Yeas and Nays may be called for.

In the Commons upon a division the Yeas and Nays shall not be entered on the minutes unless demanded by five members.

The yeas and nays were demanded. Twelve or fourteen got up.

In the case of important questions, the members are called in when it is proposed to close the debate and decide the matter under consideration. The moment the Speaker orders that the members be called in, no further debate will be permitted.

My hon. friend, who was presiding in your absence, Mr. Speaker, did none of these things. He did hardly any of them at any rate. I believe he read the question but did not put it formally in that way, and when we demanded the yeas and nays he, mistakingly and no doubt meaning to do right, left the Chair and consequently deprived the people of Canada——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, Mr. Speaker, deprived the people of Canada of knowing how the members of this House would vote on the question then placed before them.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Did you intend to vote for your own motion?

Mr. DAVIN. That seems to strike hon. gentlemen opposite as intensely humorous, and no doubt recent events have given them an enviable facility for cachinnation. But this is not a matter for joking; it is as important to that side as to this that the rules of debate and the rules governing divisions should be observed, and above all it is important to this side, when we are confronted with a majority flushed with cumulative victories, and who may be tempted, therefore, in the intoxication of power, to perpetrate acts that, in sober second thought and consideration, they themselves would deeply regret. I may call your attention to what May says:

When debate on a question is closed, the question must be put, which is done in the following manner. The Speaker, rising from the Chair, states or reads the question to the House, beginning with "The question is, that." This form of putting the question is always observed, and precedes (or is supposed to precede) every vote of the House, except in cases where a vote is a formal direction, in virtue of previous orders.

In the Lords, when the question has been put, the Speaker says: "As many as are of that opinion, say 'Content'"; and "As many as are of a contrary opinion, say 'Not content'": and the respective parties exclaim "Content" or "Not content," according to their opinions. In the Commons, the Speaker takes the sense of the House by desiring that "As many as are of that

opinion, say 'Aye'"; and "As many as are of the contrary opinion, say 'No.'"

Now, I did not hear my hon. friend who was then in your place take any such course.

On account of these forms, the two parties are distinguished in the Lords as "Contents" and "Not Contents," and in the Commons as the "Ayes" and "Noes." When each party have exclaimed, according to their opinion, the Speaker endeavours to judge, from the loudness and general character of the opposing exclamations, which party have the majority. As his judgment——

I call your particular attention to this, Mr. Speaker:

As his judgment is not final, he expresses his opinion thus: "I think the 'Contents' (or 'Ayes') have it," or "I think the 'Non Contents' (or 'Noes') have it."

Not "I have given my decision," not "lost," which would make the Speaker for the time being the tyrant of the Chamber, but "I think the 'ayes' have it."

If the House acquiesce in this decision, the question is said to be "resolved in the affirmative" or "negative," according to the supposed majority on either side: but if the party thus declared to be the minority, dispute the fact, they say: "The 'Contents' (or 'Not Contents'), the 'Ayes' (or 'Noes') have it," as the case may be; in which case the Speaker puts the question a second time, in order that the numbers may be counted, by the process which is termed "division."

This does not apply to us here.

The Speaker, directly the debate is closed, puts the question, and when the voices are taken, gives the order that "strangers must withdraw." One of the Clerks at the Table then turns a two-minute sand-glass, pursuant to Standing Order No. 28, and, while the sand is running, the door-keepers set in motion the "division bells" in every part of the building, to give notice that a division is at hand. When the sand has run out, the Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order No. 29, so soon as he shall think proper to direct that the doors be closed, cries: "Order, order," and immediately the Sergeant, and the door-keepers and messengers under his orders, close and lock all the doors leading into the House and the adjoining lobbies, simultaneously. Those members who arrive after the doors are shut, cannot gain admittance, and those who are within, cannot leave the House, until after the division is concluded.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is quite evident from May and from Bourinot that the putting of a question in this House is a deliberate and solemn act, and not a thing to be done so furtively but that any member who can muster four supporters has the right to have the "ayes" and "noes" counted. Having given an account of what occurred, and having, with great deference, called the attention of the House to the law of Parliament on the subject, I will respectfully ask your ruling.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). My hon. friend from Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has, if he will permit me to say so, given himself undue trouble in quoting authorities in support of positions which nobody denied. There is no question as to the law of Parliament which governs the divisions of this House; they are well known, and no one needs to be reminded of them. But I differ from my hon. friend as to the facts upon which he wishes to apply these rules. My hon. friend (Mr. Davin) made a motion, and it was put from the Chair. My hon. friend behind me from Brant (Mr. Somerville) puts the question to the hon. member for West Assiniboia whether he intended to vote in favour of his own motion. There is some pertinence in his remarks, because he will remember, after the motion was made, he wanted to correct it or amend it. I objected to the words proposed being included in the motion. Therefore, the question was put as stated by my hon. friend from West Assiniboia. Ample time was given to ask for the "yeas and nays," if he had intended to do so. But the sense of the House was evidently against my hon. friend—not only on this side, but on both sides of the House. The Speaker for the moment in the Chair—my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. Bain)—finding that there was a great prevalence of opinion against that motion, declared it lost. Then came the main motion whether he should leave the Chair or not, and, after ample time had been given, he declared it carried. Then my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) tried to get friends about him to the number of five to call for the "yeas and nays." But he was altogether too late; the main motion had been carried. The one thing to which I attach importance, and the one thing I submit to the judgment of the House—and this is the only ground on which he can raise the question—is that ample time was given him to have the vote recorded if he had demanded it at the proper time. But he demanded a division only after both motions had been declared lost and the other carried. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) knows more. He knows that, according to the rules of the House he has more than one opportunity to test the feeling of the House upon the question which he had yesterday before us. It will be open for him on many future occasions if he wishes to avail himself of them to-day or to-morrow or any other day to test the feeling of the House upon the question.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yesterday afternoon, having occasion to leave the Chamber for a short time, I called upon one of the most fair-minded and experienced members of this House, the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Bain) to take the Chair. When I came back, I found the House in Committee of the Whole. On looking at the record of yesterday's proceedings, I find:

Mr. Fielding moved, That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair.

Mr. Davin moved in amendment thereto, That all the words after the word "That" be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof :——

etc., etc.

And the question being put on the amendment; it was negatived.

And the question being put on the main motion ; it was agreed to.

I think that the only thing I can look to is this record of the proceedings ; and the propriety of that ruling, I think, will be evident to the House, hon. members having already heard in the arguments addressed to me that there is an absolute difference of opinion as to the question of facts. My only guide must be the record of the proceedings of the House.

Mr. DAVIN. I will not go into that question——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DAVIN. Have the hon. gentlemen heard me yet ? The suggestion made to me by the Prime Minister (Mr. Laurier) I accept.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have nothing to do with that. That is a matter of future arrangement. There is nothing before the House and——

Mr. DAVIN. I am not going to speak on this matter ; the thing is done with your utterance, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. MEMBER. Sit down.

Mr. DAVIN. Has not the Speaker called the Orders of the Day ? Mr. Speaker, you having called the Orders of the Day——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. DAVIN. I understand the Speaker has called the Orders of the Day.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). That does not give the right to speak, does it ?

Mr. SPEAKER. The Orders of the Day have not been called.

SUPPLY—DUTY ON FARM IMPLEMENTS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. DAVIN I now rise, Sir, to move that :

Good faith with the western farmers on the part of the Government demands that agricultural implements and lumber be placed on the free list.

Yesterday I made an argument as to the necessity from the point of view of policy, and the duty from the point of view of good faith, of placing implements on the free list. I attach more importance, if possible, to the Government keeping faith with their pledges, than even to the policy of placing implements on the free list. I consider it of the utmost moment to the welfare of this country, that when men climb into these great positions, whatever promises they have placed before the country, they should fulfil. I am not alone in thinking that. A paper connected with which is one of the greatest minds in the Empire dealing with that very matter, refers to the case of Sir Robert Peel, and comparing what Sir Robert Peel did with what is being done by the leader of the present Government. This great publicist declares there was this difference : That Sir Robert Peel was perfectly consistent, whereas in the present case the leader of the Government has failed to carry out his promises and his pledges, and the recriminations that are made against him by gentlemen on this side of the House are perfectly just. This writer says :

In another column, Mr. Mallory analyses the new measure, and points out, citing chapter and verse, that it is a misnomer to call it a Bill for the relief of the farmer. Notice has been given in the House of a resolution, demanding that, at any rate, farm implements and the workmen's tools shall be free.

That is the resolution of the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas), and my hon. friend has a question on the paper at the present time which shows what they are expecting in the constituency of Eastern Assiniboia, represented as it is by a gentleman who was elected as a Patron, but who now, I believe, is a declared Liberal.

That motion seems to us quite inadequate to meet the case. It does not go to the root of things. The proposed duties on iron and steel are higher, taking them all round, than the proposed duty on the finished implement ; that is to say, under the new, as under the old, tariff protection is to be extended, not to the Canadian maker, but to his foreign competitor, who obtains iron and steel at first cost. It would be unjust, therefore, to call for free implements without prefacing that with a demand for the repeal of the iron and steel taxes, or for such a reduction as shall leave them no more than 20 per cent. It is desirable, however, if the views of independent men throughout the country are to be expressed at all, that a resolution of wider scope should be submitted. Here is an apt one, taken bodily from the Liberal platform : "That we denounce the principle of protection as radically unsound and unjust to the masses of the people, and declare our conviction that any tariff changes based on that principle must fail to afford any substantial relief from the burdens under which the country labours." Amid the general humiliation over the Liberal apostasy, it is only right that the party should be compelled to spend a bad quarter of an hour in publicly swallowing its old creed.

What this distinguished writer suggests is that a plank from the platform laid down here in Ottawa in 1893 should be placed before this House, and that the hon. gentlemen should be challenged whether they can vote for it now or not. More recently than that time, the Prime Minister spoke in this

very House, and this is what he said, in April, 1894:

> The produce of the farmer has been driven to the lowest point, but what he has to buy is sold to him at an increased price, as compared with the price in England. What is the lesson to be deduced from this state of things? It is this—and this is the proposition we rely upon on this side of the House—As the price of agricultural products has been reduced to the lowest point, it should be the aim of the tariff to reduce the prices of manufactured goods to the lowest point. The farmer is bound by his circumstances to sell in the freest and cheapest market; so, also, ought he to be privileged to buy in the cheapest market, consistent only with the imposition of such duties as are necessary for raising the revenue of the country. That is the proposition on which we stand, and it is a proposition perfectly fair, perfectly just, perfectly equitable—so fair, so just, so reasonable, and so equitable, that the Government dare not attack it openly. And yet they cannot adopt it. Why? Because they are chained and yoked to a system which is the reverse of just, and fair, and equitable.

And yet the hon. gentleman is self-chained and self-yoked to the detestable system that he then denounced. Yesterday I quoted from a colleague of his, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, words just as strong; and here is the language used in a still more recent year by the gentleman who sits at the present moment on the right of the Premier (Mr. Davies), and what does he say:

> Protection always generates extravagance, I do not care where it be applied.

And again, speaking of the National Policy, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries said in this House, in 1895:

> We condemn it, in the first place, because it is a system which wrings from the people millions of dollars for Treasury purposes more than the old tariff.

And yet they have given you a tariff so near the old tariff that the highest difference is 3¾ per cent, and it goes down to 1¼ per cent. I have put lumber into this motion, and I will tell you why. My hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), who lives in Winnipeg, and who I am glad now to see in the House, knows that we have in the North-west a lumber combine: and he knows well that over the vast prairie where we have no trees, the farmers have to build houses from bought lumber, and when you have a high duty on lumber, suppose you have 20 per cent, every house the farmer builds, the cost of every plank of lumber that he puts into it, and that he has to buy—the cost of that may be divided by five, and the quotient is what is exacted from the farmer who builds a house. Therefore in my opinion, lumber should also be placed upon the free list. Now, Sir, having laid this question before the House yesterday at considerable length, I will not dwell on this at any length to-day. I consider that the House is possessed of my argument in regard to implements, and at an earlier period I made the argument in regard to lumber, when I also quoted a distinguished man on the other side of the House in favour of placing lumber on the free list, I quoted from the "Hansard" what the Minister of Trade and Commerce said; I quoted also his important supporter, the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards), who said that lumber should be on the free list, thus supporting my contention. I move:

> Good faith with the western farmers on the part of the Government demands that agricultural implements and lumber be placed on the free list.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to say a word or two on the subject covered by the amendment. As representing an agricultural constituency I want to state to the House that we have a proposal before the Government, by which we are not asking for free implements but for such concessions as would be equally advantageous as those suggested in the amendment. In consequence of this fact we are not disposed to support the amendment before the House. We have no desire to ask the Government to grant special concessions and advantages to any particular class. It has been my position to declare that I did not desire to represent any people who clamour for special class legislation, or to ask that implements or anything else they may need should be placed specially on the free list. I believe everything should bear its share of the public taxation. We do not want class legislation even though it be to the farmers' advantage. I do not desire to be tied down to that principle, but to be free to administer justice to all classes and to all interests. So we are not in a position to vote for this amendment, but we desire to call attention to the proposition already before the House which we believe will meet the case.

Mr. ROGERS. A few of the members met together when the tariff was brought down and talked it over. We were not quite satisfied with it, although we felt that it would afford some relief, but we desire further relief especially in regard to agricultural implements and other articles affecting the farmers. A motion to make a corresponding reduction on agricultural implements with the reduction of duties made on iron, which forms the raw material, now stands on the Order paper, and I seconded it and will stand by it. Also, we wish to be reasonable and withdraw the principles of protection gradually from our industries. Again, I say we are not satisfied, but we feel that the Government will make further efforts to lighten our burdens. Under those circumstances, I cannot support the amendment.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I am thoroughly in accord with the hon. members from the west in regard to the position of the farmers.

As a farmers' representative I hope we may have the burdens of taxation lightened on them so soon as the Government can do so. We should not, however, expect too much at once. We promised our farmer friends that we would in time remedy the evils existing, and this is being gradually done. We should not expect further reductions to be made until the finances of the country will permit, but when there is an adjustment between expenditures and receipts the Government will, I am satisfied, not forget the farmers, but will do something in the direction indicated by my hon. friend (Mr. Rogers). I do not think the farmers desire to embarrass the Government, but they view the tariff introduced as a step in the right direction. The Government perhaps have not met the wishes of the Opposition by making wholesale slaughter, and thus allowed them to say that the Government have killed the country, but the Government have shown the people that they are willing to consider all interests alike; at the same time, it must be remembered that men must look to their homes and factories, for the time must come when each industry must stand on its own bottom. The handwriting is on the wall against combines. Combines must disappear, and legitimate labour and legitimate industry considered; and later on, not this session, but when the income equals the expenditure, which I believe it will do under the proposed tariff, then we will be able to turn to our farmer friends and do something to assist them further than we have done up to the present. I might have said something the other day from the standpoint of my own people in regard to coal oil, but I bore in mind the fact that the people in the west have interests as we have, and that a reduction of one cent per gallon on oil and other concessions, namely 1½ reduction from tank vessels, making 2½ cents per gallon reduction in all, is an earnest of the good intentions of the Government and that our interests are being looked after. I do not wish to take up the time of the House longer.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DOMVILLE. If I were on my feet every five minutes as are some hon. gentlemen opposite, they might perhaps say "hear, hear." Some hon. members bore the House on every occasion; they show the House that they have the cacoethes loquendi. The other night I was on the point of suggesting that some hon. members might prepare their speeches at home, dispense with their reading, and hand them in, as they do at Washington, to be printed in "Hansard." This would save the time of the House, it would spare our feelings and reduce the cost of Government, because every speech made by hon. gentlemen under circumstances show they are unnecessary, is so much time and money wasted and is thereby adding to the burdens of the farmers.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DOMVILLE. If hon. gentlemen on the other side, instead of saying, "hear, hear," would curtail what they call their sharp criticism, it would be better for the country. I saw my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) smile just now, but he has nothing to smile at. East and West the people have told him and his friends that they are sick and tired of them. They told them that in King's, they told them that in Nova Scotia, and they told them that again yesterday in Quebec. They have been turned down by the people, and they will be turned down for a very long time to come. I have not troubled the House much this session, but I should not be interrupted when I speak for the farmers, those noble farmers of King's County who knew their duty and did it. King's County is an agricultural county, and it knows what is right, and it showed its wisdom. The people of that county show their appreciation of their representative when they send a man here who is willing to say a good word for them, and who does not waste their money by offering factious opposition as gentlemen opposite are in the habit of doing. My county is perfectly satisfied with the course the Government is taking, and they have every confidence that the Government will do what is right.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, before alluding to the point of order to which I shall call your attention, I have one sentence to interject. The daily recurrence of the hon. gentleman who has moved this motion, seems to justify a statement made to me today by a gentleman on his own side of the House, who said: It seems there are only two parties in this House, the Government and Mr. Davin.

The point of order is, that this motion is substantially the same as the one which was negatived yesterday. Allow me to quote from Bourinot, beginning on page 401:

> But when a question has once been negatived, it is not allowable to propose it again, even if the form and words of the motion are different from those of the previous motion. Sir Erskine May says on this point, which is one involved in much difficulty: "The only means by which a negative vote can be revoked is, by proposing another question, similar in its general purport to that which had been rejected, but with sufficient variance to constitute a new question;——

I submit that in this case there is not sufficient variance to constitute a new question.

> ——and the House would determine whether it were substantially the same question or not." * * * * If an amendment has been negatived, a similar amendment cannot be proposed on a future day. It has been decided, however, in the Canadian Commons that an amendment is in order when it comprises only a part, and not the

whole, of a resolution previously voted on by the House.

Well, Sir, I think this motion comprises the whole of the motion rejected yesterday, with an addition, but I submit that the addition is not sufficient to constitute it substantially a new motion. We have refused to declare that agricultural implements shall be admitted free, and we are now asked to declare that both agricultural implements and lumber should be admitted free. I think, Sir, as far as agricultural implements are concerned, the motion is out of order and cannot be put to the House in its present form. I submit the whole question, Mr. Speaker, to your ruling.

Mr. DAVIN. May I be allowed to say one word, Mr. Speaker. When gentlemen elected here as Patrons declare, as I understood them to-day, that they do want——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) has spoken, and he can only speak again to the point of order.

Mr. DAVIN. I am going to do that, Sir. What I want to say is this: That if hon. gentlemen object to this motion because of a point of order, I wish to give the reason for the course I take—

Mr. SPEAKER. That is not the point of order.

Mr. DAVIN. After the declaration of these gentlemen——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. In my judgment—of course it is subject to the decision of the House, and the House may disagree with me—the amendment has been sufficiently changed to bring it within the competence of this House to deal with. Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. DAVIN. Lost on division.

Mr. CHARLTON. Don't you want to see if the motion will be carried?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Have I not the right to speak, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER. Certainly, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) has a right to speak on the motion.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not wish to allow this motion to pass without stating my position in reference to this question, for if I did so, my silence might be misinterpreted. I stated my position very clearly when I spoke in the Budget debate. I then said I was disappointed, and that I believed that many people in the west were disappointed, because there had not been a larger reduction in the duty on agricultural implements. I entertain the same view at the present time. I also pointed out then, that there was some encouragement in the fact that the duty on coal oil and certain classes of implements had been reduced. I entertain the same opinion at the present time. I also pointed out, Sir, that there had been very considerable reductions generally, and that free binder twine and barbed wire had been conceded as a benefit to the farmers. As the prow of the vessel was pointed in the right direction, and as we had assurances that it was only an instalment we had received, I could not see my way clear to vote against the Government on the question, believing that it would not be in the interests of the Dominion as a whole, and certainly not in the interests of the province of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, that this Government, which has done a great deal in the direction of reducing the duties, should be hurled from power, and that the high priests of protection should be returned, to restore high duties on these articles.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) had put his motion in a different way, I might see my way clear to support it, but in its present form it practically amounts to a vote of want of confidence in this Government. I am not prepared to vote want of confidence in the Government at the present time. I am prepared to say that I am disappointed that the duties on these articles have not been reduced as we had reason to expect they would, and if the hon. member (Mr. Davin) had put his motion in such a way as to state that it would be in the interests of the farmers of the Dominion of Canada that the duty should be reduced on these articles, I certainly should be prepared to vote with him. I pointed out last session, that I thought a motion of this kind came with peculiarly bad grace from the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), for he it was of all others, who rose in this House and denounced these duties, and then when the vote came—I think I am speaking within bounds when I say—he took to the woods.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) is saying what is not correct. It is not a fact what he stated. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman means to say what is false, but what he says is not true.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Then, perhaps I might qualify that by saying that if he did not take to the woods, he probably crawled under the barn.

Mr. DAVIN. I will ask the hon. gentleman to point out to what he refers. The hon. gentleman cannot say that in any way I shirked the support of my motion. If he says that I did in any way, either directly or indirectly, he is saying what is not true.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I certainly would not like to be put in the position before this

House of stating anything that is not absolutely true. I am sure the House understands these expressions sufficiently well to apply them. I know that the hon. member for Western Assiniboia has had the habit, in the last twelve or fifteen years, of taking to the woods or crawling under the barn on all possible occasions.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. member for Western Assiniboia says that he did not crawl under the barn, I think the hon. member for Lisgar should withdraw the statement.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I am prepared to say, that if the hon. gentleman rises in his place and says that he never took to the woods or crawled under the barn, I will apologize for the statement and withdraw it.

Mr. McLENNAN. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. RICHARDSON. However, I just wish to say——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I sat down for the purpose of giving the hon. member for Western Assiniboia the opportunity of saying whether he had or had not; but inasmuch as he has not seen fit either to affirm or deny the soft impeachment, I may perhaps be allowed to conclude my remarks by saying——

Mr. DAVIN. I understand that the hon. gentleman wanted me to say something. Well, what I have to say is this, that the utterance of the hon. gentleman—you seem to understand it, Mr. Speaker; I don't—if it means that I at any time in this House did not support the resolutions I proposed, he is uttering what is an objective falsehood.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am sorry the hon. gentleman has put himself out of order by saying that the hon. member for Lisgar has uttered a falsehood.

Mr. DAVIN. I said an objective falsehood.

Mr. SPEAKER. Whether objective or subjective, falsehood is not a word that is in order in this House. The hon. gentleman can very easily, as well as any other hon. member of this House, make a contradiction to a statement without using language which puts him out of order.

Mr. DAVIN. I was using the language of Schlegel, who is a pretty high authority on language. However, I withdraw it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think the hon. gentleman treats the Chair with the respect that promotes the dignity of this House, when on this occasion—I am not referring to any other—the hon. gentleman quotes an authority outside of this House, Schlegel, instead of accepting the authority of the Chair. I do not think that is respectful to the Chair. Whether the Chair is right or wrong, its ruling should be accepted.

Mr. DAVIN. I bow to the ruling of the Chair; but, with great respect, I submit to you that when the hon. gentleman makes a statement which I characterize as incorrect, it is your duty to ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. LISTER. What was the statement?

Mr. DAVIN. The statement was made in the vulgar style that belongs to the hon. gentleman.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. member for Western Assiniboia cannot learn to respect the Chair, I shall have to take means to make him do so. I shall have no more discussion whatever on this question.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. When an hon. member makes a statement regarding another, and that hon. gentleman in reply emphatically denies the statement, is it not right for the hon. member to withdraw the statement or accept the denial, without trying to say the same thing in another way?

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the question which the hon. member has just propounded is a most fair one. When an hon. member makes a statement charging improper conduct against another hon. member, and the hon. member who is charged denies it in proper language, that declaration should be accepted unhesitatingly and without equivocation. The unfortunate trouble in this case is that a slang expression is used, which the hon. member for Western Assiniboia says he does not understand himself; and the hon. member for Lisgar said that if the hon. member denied the truth of that expression, he would accept the denial. I think it is a pity that the time of the House should be further wasted in that respect. If the hon. member for Lisgar charges the hon. member for Assiniboia with improper conduct as a member, and the hon. member for Western Assiniboia makes a distinct denial of the charge, the hon. member for Lisgar should at once accept that. I desire most earnestly to keep up the dignity of this House, and to keep members on both sides of the House from using language across the floor which could in any way be considered objectionable in any other assemblage of gentlemen.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I shall probably be allowed now to continue my remarks.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Oh, keep quiet, gentlemen on the other side. I have the floor, and I am going to say what I have to say if it takes all day. I may say that since I have been sitting here an hon. member has come to me and mentioned that the hon. member for Western Assiniboia voted against free binder twine in 1891. I would ask him to state to this House whether he did so or not.

Mr. DAVIN. I do it with the greatest possible pleasure. In 1891 I had never heard from my constituents one murmur on that subject; but in the following year, after I had gone back and had spoken to them and found what their opinions were, I came here and advocated a reduction of the duty on binder twine, and here I see it accomplished. It is my motion of last year which has led to the reduction of the duty on binder twine and on barbed wire fencing, and the Minister of Agriculture is carrying out my policy with regard to creameries and cold storage.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I wish to conclude by saying that I do not see that any good object is to be attained by voting against the Government on this occasion. Ever since the recent reduction of the tariff was announced, the members from the west have been urging the Government to make certain concessions in reference both to coal oil and agricultural implements, and I have the strongest reasons for believing that when these concessions are obtained, it will be found that a most important reduction in the duties has been conceded both on agricultural implements and on coal oil. If I wished to make a demagogue of myself, I could act as certain hon. members might do. But the members from the west have been patiently working, and are patiently working to secure their ends, and they are doing it in an earnest and hopeful, and I think I am safe in saying a successful manner; and they will attain these ends. Viewing the matter in this way, it is my intention to vote against the motion of the hon. member.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to draw the attention of the House to the statement made by my hon. friend who has just sat down in his concluding sentences; it is a statement of some gravity. Members on both sides have rights as representatives of the people in Parliament. My hon. friend who sits at my side, in the exercise of his right, criticised the Government for the line of policy they have adopted with reference to agricultural implements, and he brings before this House a motion to disapprove of the policy of the Government in the tariff they have brought down, with reference to agricultural implements. He naturally expects that all those who favoured the reduction on agricultural implements or free agricultural implements will support him on this ground of public policy, but the very moment that he brings this matter to the vote, an hon. gentleman on the other side arises and says in fact—no English language could make it more apparent—that the North-west members have been closeted with the Government and the Government has made them promises which justify them in opposing this motion. In that the Government were simply carrying out the policy of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), who, before he would take the country and this Parliament into his confidence, made a little bargain with the faithful as to what he would do with the duty on coal. Thus the thing goes on and private members on the Government side are told what the Government is going to do with reference to tariff changes, while the rest of the House is kept in ignorance. I call the attention of the House and the country to this. It is the continuation of the same unjust, the same uncandid, the same tortuous policy which these gentlemen have carried on from the first. In my opinion, we ought all to be treated on the same footing, and no single member of this Parliament should be in a position to rise and state, when a debate is taking place on the tariff or on any part of it, that he is not going to oppose the Government because he has been taken into its confidence and knows that the Government intends to reduce the tariff or make some other arrangement that will be satisfactory to him.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Speaking for myself, I would be prepared to make the statement which the hon. member for Lisgar did (Mr. Richardson) here or elsewhere on any occasion, and I would feel warranted in making it on this very just ground, without having had any communication whatever with the Government, namely, that the Liberal party having agreed to a policy, when the Government take one step in carrying out that policy, they are bound, so long as it remains the policy of the Governemnt, to take the next step. It does not follow, because my hon. friend may have made such a statement, that there has been any particular communication between him and the Government on the subject. Surely when a policy is agreed upon, any hon. member has the right to say that he expects the Government, who have already accomplishd a portion of their policy, will, as soon as possible, move in the direction of completely carrying it out. For my part, I accept the instalments that have been given, and speaking as a member not having the confidence of the Government more than any other member that supports it, I desire to say that there has been no such arrangement arrived at as that mentioned by the hon. the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), either with the Government as a whole or the Finance Minister in particular. I, for one, supporting the Goverament am confident that it is the de-

sire of the Government to undo as fast as they possibly can, the mischief perpetrated by hon. gentlemen opposite. Aye, more. Sir, the country understands that, and the country fully appreciates the difficulties under which the Government labour. The country accepts at the hands of the Government the relief which has so far been given, and have faith in the purpose of the Government to go further in the same direction as soon as they can possibly do so. The country has confidence in the adherence of the Liberal party to principle and in the purpose of the Government to act in accordance with the principles in which they believe and which they have publicly stated. In this respect, we have at least a standing which hon. gentlemen opposite have not. They have never promulgated a policy, but have always just taken hold of any makeshift that they thought would serve the moment and tide them over an election. They have not put on record in any convention any definite policy as we have done. I think it exceedingly unfair that the ex-Finance Minister should have insinuated that the Government have been holding private seances with their supporters and saying to them: Take this just now and we will give you more later on. Surely he understands that no great party, if it respected itself—and certainly the history of the Liberal party is not such as would justify the contrary supposition—could fail to move in the direction it has always moved in and carry out the principles it has always advocated.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) said a few moments ago, that in 1891 he did vote against this binder twine resolution because he had not then consulted his constituents in the North-west and did not know their views, but that after he had met them he changed his views and adopted theirs. Well, the hon. gentleman's memory must be at fault, because I find that, in 1893, the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) introduced a resolution in favour of admitting binder twine free into this country, and I find that the hon. member for Assiniboia spoke in favour of that resolution but voted against it.

Mr. DAVIN. I want to show the hon. gentleman that my memory was not at fault. And the very reason given by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) to-day was my reason. He spoke in favour of my motion, but says he is going to vote against it, because it is a motion of want of confidence.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. member for Lisgar occupies a somewhat different position than that of the hon. member for Assiniboia. The hon. member for Assiniboia now poses, and has pretended for some time to pose, as an independent party in the House. As the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) has said, it appears that there are in this House only two parties, the Liberal party governing the country, and Mr. Davin, the member for West Assiniboia. Let us look at the position in which the hon. gentleman finds himself. At present he is very zealous in behalf of these poor farmers in the North-west, notwithstanding the fact that the Government have reduced to a large extent the taxation which bore so heavily on them.

Mr. DAVIN. They have not.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman now rises and poses as the friend of the farmers. Why? Because he knows that within a short six weeks or two months he will be called on to face the electorate of West Assiniboia, and he wants to make out that he, and he only, is the friend of the farmer in the North-west. Sir, the men who supporting the Government from the North-west to-day have done infinitely more for the farmers of that country than the hon. gentleman has done in all the ten years he has been in this House. What has the hon. gentleman done? He tells us that in 1891 he voted against binder twine, because, forsooth, he did not know what his constituents desired: but when called on to explain his course in 1893, he says: It is true I spoke for and voted against it in 1893, but then I was supporting the Conservative Government, and, therefore, I swallowed my principles for the sake of supporting that Government. What should such an hon. gentleman expect to be able to obtain in this House for the farming population of the North-west? In another six weeks he will have to face the electorate again, and it will not take the vote of the returning officer to defeat him. If I may be permitted to predict the result of the election, he will be defeated by hundreds.

An hon. MEMBER. He will take to the woods.

Mr. LISTER. I do not say that, because, like my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), I do not know exactly what that means. Let us look at the matter further. In 1893 he spoke in favour of taking the duty off binder twine but voted against it. In 1892, and again in 1894, when the same resolution was introduced into this House, he spoke in favour of it, but when it came to the vote, he was outside. As an hon. member says, he crawled under the barn. How is it, if the hon. gentleman is so zealous in the interests of the people of that country, that he could not take time to record his vote in favour of the motion he pretended to support? How the hon. gentleman should blush, when he goes before the electors of that country, to be obliged to admit, that he spoke in favour of a motion which was a boon to the

people of the country, and voted against it. How he will have to blush when he is confronted with the records which show that on two other occasions he spoke in favour of a motion which was in the interests of the people of that country, and had not the courage to stay in the House and vote for it. Sir, I have only looked partially into the record. The research is an interesting one. I wish to tell the hon. gentleman that if time permits, I intend to search out his record since he came into the House, and I venture to say that such contradictions as I have shown will be found to be almost innumerable.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Before I am called upon to record my vote upon this resolution, I wish to express my opinion in regard to the reduction of duties on agricultural implements. As I represent a rural constituency, I suppose I shall have to express my opinion lest a false interpretation be placed upon my vote. The farmers, in my constituency, are reasonably satisfied with the reductions that have been made, and believe that as soon as the Government has sufficient money to meet the requirements of the public service, they will seek to reduce the duties on some of these articles considerably. Therefore, I feel that at the present juncture I would be doing an evil both to the Government and to the country in supporting a motion made by a person who has brought it before this House for the purpose of compromising the position of the Government. Now, I understand——

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) has called the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), a "person."

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Mr. Speaker, I was just about to remark——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order. Take it back.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) is surely not serious.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I am serious, because I assume that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) used that term, as he evidently did, in a sarcastic and slighting way.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). You are very imaginative. You should write a novel.

Mr. BENNETT. It was said in a most slighting way.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I was about to remark that in 1891 when a resolution was put to place binder twine upon the free list, my hon. friend from West Assiniboia stated that after consultation with the farmers of the west he found that they were perfectly satisfied, that they were getting binder twine and other articles as cheap as were the people in any other part of the country, and not only of that country but of Dakota and other states of the union. Therefore, when he says to-day that he gave a vote not knowing the sentiment of the people at that time——

Mr. DAVIN. I did not say that. I said I had not heard a murmur against it.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Very well. Is it not strange that a gentleman representing the farmers of West Assiniboia for years, have attended the meetings week after week where this most important question was discussed, should not know the sentiments of the farmers; and when they met in Regina in 1891, as stated in the speech made by my hon. friend in that year, for the purpose of discussing prices. According to that statement, a number of farmers were there from Dakota and compared the prices that they paid in Dakota with those paid by the farmers in Manitoba. Is it not strange that the hon. gentleman should say: I never heard a single murmur from any of the farmers with respect to the increased price of binder twine by reason of the duty.

Mr. DAVIN. In 1891?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). That is in 1891.

Mr. DAVIN. No, before that.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Very well. In July, or thereabouts, the farmers would have purchased binder twine for the year, and the question would naturally not come before them before the next year. But, in March of the following year, my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) came back from the west with an entirely different opinion upon the subject of binder twine. That leads me to suppose that this change in the opinion of the west had not taken place between one harvest and the March of the following year without my hon. friend knowing it. This is what he said in 1891 when he discussed the importance of putting binder twine upon the free list:

> We have the sons and brothers of these farmers in the North-west. Is it to be supposed, for one moment, if they were paying more, as compared with the prices in Dakota, for binder twine, that I would not have heard a complaint?

Now, it is certain they were paying more during that very season than in the United States, and here was a gentleman supposed to represent the interests of the farmers of the west, and he says he never heard a complaint. Further on, he says:

> I have never heard, in my constituency, one word of complaint as to the price of binder twine.

He was speaking in July, it will be remembered. He went on:

> We have had, within a few weeks, in Regina, a large number of farmers from Dakota, who were interviewed as to prices of things in Dakota and Regina, and they declared, with regard to

all things farmers use on their farms and in their business, down to the clothes they wear and the food they eat, the prices in our North-west compared advantageously with those in Dakota.

Now, there was an admission that the duty did not increase the price of these articles one farthing. If, in 1891, the duties did not increase the price of these articles, how is it that the hon. gentleman is so anxious in 1897 to reduce the duties so as to reduce the prices on these same articles? Now, my hon. friend went home after that. He was anxious to come back here again. He went before the farmers and the farmers said: Mr. Representative, if you wish to go back and teach such doctrine as you did last session in Parliament, you need not expect to go back at all. The result was that he came back in 1892 with a different policy, and different views.

Mr. DAVIN. I rise to a point of order. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that anybody in my constituency said that to me?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I suppose they did.

Mr. DAVIN. I beg to say nobody said it to me.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). In 1892 the hon. gentleman came back, and a similar resolution to the previous one was brought before this House by some member of the Liberal party, and now, instead of saying that he never heard a complaint, the hon. gentleman spoke in this wise:

In the North-west, in the constituency from whence I come, and in other agricultural constituencies, a great interest is taken in this question, and at one of the last meetings held in my constituency before I came away, before a very large and crowded meeting, I was asked what I thought of the duty on twine, and I had no difficulty whatever in complying with their unanimous request that in Parliament I would express the opinion that I expressed to them there.

Now, you must remember that in 1891, as he says, he voted against the free admission of binder twine. In 1892 he moved that binder twine be placed upon the free list. In 1893 this is what he said:

I wish to enforce, with whatever little weight remarks of mine may have, the contention of the hon. gentleman who has put this motion on the paper, that the tax on binder twine should disappear.

Now, if he was consistent in 1891, and if he was in touch with the people then and knew their feelings, how was it that he had a different opinion in 1891 from that he held in 1892 and 1893? Now, his opinion has changed also upon other matters. In 1894 he was not in favour of free coal, he was not in favour of free barbed wire, he was not in favour of free agricultural implements; but he was in favour of free binder twine, and now in his attempt to compromise the position of the Government, he has again changed his policy. Let me draw his attention to a resolution he moved himself on the 13th of February, 1893:

That the duty be reduced upon barbed wire, agricultural implements, coal oil and cottons, and that binder twine be placed on the free list.

Now, I would ask my hon. friend how is it that when he has held those different views during those three consecutive years, he comes here to-day with an entirely different policy. I will say, in concluding my remarks, that I am still of the opinion that I have always held, that so long as we have an incidental protection or a direct protection, no matter which, that incidental or direct protection should be extended to all the industries of the country in an equal and in an equitable manner. I do not think it is fair to place the products of one industry free upon the market, while giving protection to others side by side with it. Therefore, I believe that as far as the Government go at this time, they have reduced the duty upon agricultural implements to a reasonable extent, at least; and if we take it as a first instalment, we look forward to the time when they will be in a better position than they are to-day to give us more advantage in that direction.

Mr. TAYLOR. I did not intend to occupy the time of the House, as I was of the opinion that the Government were anxious to get into Supply. But as nearly two hours have been taken up by their supporters, I think it is but fair that a few words should be said from this side of the House. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) stated that he could not support the motion moved in amendment by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) because it was a vote of censure on the Government. Well, I could support it if it only went that far, if the motion was to censure the Government for not having carried out the promises that they made to the farmers of the west when they promised that they would place agricultural implements, coal oil, coal and iron on the free list. I think they are entitled to the censure of every honourable man in this House, no matter which side he may sit on, from the fact that they did make those promises, and they have not carried them out. But the motion goes further; it says that agricultural implements should be placed upon the free list. I would vote against the motion because it goes that far. I am a protectionist, I believe in protecting the industries of this country, I believe in protecting the labour of this country. My hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Rogers), whose constituency adjoins mine, would oppose the amendment moved by the hon. member for Assiniboia, and holds out to the farmers of this country that the present Government have been doing a great deal for them. Well, now, I have gone carefully through the tariff that the Government have brought down. The

Government have said that they would abolish specific duties; they have come down practically with the same tariff that they found prepared for them by the preceding Government. In the old tariff there were 198 specific duties; to-day in the tariff as brought down by the Finance Minister there are 135 specific duties left in, only sixty-three in number less than they found in the old tariff. Now, reading the old tariff and the new, reading the new tariff from the papers that reported it, line after line, item after item, there is no change, it is practically the old tariff. But they have hit it in a few places, to the great injury of the workingmen of this country and of the farmers of this country. Now, I will tell the hon. member for Frontenac that the farmers of his constituency feel as the farmers in my constituency do with regard to what this Government have done for them. I represent, perhaps, as large an agricultural constituency as there is in the province of Ontario, and at the same time I reside in a town having a population of about 4,000, where there is more manufacturing done, according to the number of the population, than in any other town in Ontario, or perhaps in Canada. I think that the tariff now proposed by this Government injures the farmers and the manufacturers and the workingmen, more than any proposition that could be made. Now, let us see how it will affect the farmers. I have gone through the various items in which the farmers are chiefly interested, to see what this Government has done for them, and here is how I work out the advantage that the farmers will receive. Taking an average farmer, living on 100 acres of land, growing perhaps a thousand bushels of grain per year, having a family of five or six persons, he will be benefited to this extent by the changes proposed by this Government: They have reduced coal oil 1 cent per gallon. The average farmer will use twelve gallons of coal oil per year, and therefore will effect a saving on his coal oil per year of 12 cents. The average farmer will use 200 pounds of sugar in his family per year. They give him the benefit of a reduction of 14 cents per hundred pounds. But the price of sugar will not be reduced any, because they charge the same price on the raw sugar that the old Government did, but they give a little less protection, $1 in place of $1.14 per hundred on the sugar manufactured outside of the country. However, I will give the farmer the benefit of the 14 cents reduction on the 100 pounds of sugar, and if he uses 200 pounds, he will effect a saving of 28 cents. Then on the small hand tools and agricultural implements the old tariff of 35 per cent is reduced to 25 on tools such as hoes, rakes, scythes and forks. The average farmer, in five years, will use up one axe, two hoes, five rakes, two scythes and two forks, which, at the market value, would amount to $3.95. A reduction of 10 per cent from 35 to 25, will give the farmer a benefit of 39 cents in five years on those articles. On barbed wire the average farmer will save in duty about $1, and upon binder twine about 50 cents. Now, these various savings amount to $2.29 per year, which is all the benefit the farmer will receive from all the reductions in the tariff. Now, we will take the debit side to see how much the farmer loses by the changes in the tariff.

Mr. MACDONALD. What about nails, hardware and a hundred and one other things?

Mr. TAYLOR. The share of the taxes the farmer has to pay on the bounty given to the iron manufacturers will more than counterbalance all he will save on the few nails and other hardware he uses on his farm; the farmer is the man who will pay the big proportion of the bounty that is given to these iron manufacturers, and it will more than counterbalance all that he saves on his hardware. The average farmer will pay 25 cents a year more duty on the rice that he consumes in his family.

Mr. MACDONALD. He pays no more.

Mr. TAYLOR. He does pay more. The duties are raised on the uncleaned rice, which change has shut up all the rice factories in our country and driven the men working in them out upon the street.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). If my hon. friend will look into the matter, he will find that the duty on rice is not raised.

Mr. TAYLOR. The price will be raised 25 cents, and that has already closed our factories. The Government have raised the duties on cottons 2½ per cent. The average farmer will use $40 worth a year, which would be equivalent to an increased outlay of $1. The average farmer will produce on his 100 acres of land 1,000 bushels of coarse grains, peas, oats and barley, and the Government by placing corn on the free list will thereby reduce the price 5 cents per bushel on the 1,000 bushels of coarse grains, causing a loss to the farmer of $50. In support of that contention, I should like to read extracts from a letter written by C. B. Watts, published on the back of the "Flour and Grain Trade Bulletin," issued a few days ago. He says:

> The free importation of corn will have the effect of further reducing the value of our bran and shorts, and will also have a very injurious effect upon the prosperity of the farming community, as it will bring down the price of all their coarse grains to price of feeding corn now that American corn can be brought in free of duty at the low freights which can be obtained at American points. The seriousness of this is evident, when we consider the enormous quantities raised by the farmers of Ontario, which last year was as follows:—Oats, 83,000,000 bushels;

peas, 17,000,000 bushels ; barley, 12,000,000 bushels ; corn (shelled), 18,000,000.

As American corn is being used in some parts of the States for fuel, or left to rot in the fields, for want of a profitable market to ship to ; the free admission of corn into Canada will be a great benefit to the American farmers, and it is easily seen that it will enter into active competition with all the food products our farmers raise. The less we get for our bran, shorts and flour, the less will we be able to pay the farmers for their wheat.

Mr. ROGERS. You do not believe it is so.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes ; the farmers of my county and the farmers of Frontenac believe it. I conversed with many of them on Saturday, and they were all satisfied that owing to free corn, their coarse grains would depreciate in value 5 cents per bushel. From the farmers' standpoint, therefore, I protest against the contention that the tariff now introduced will prove beneficial to the farmers, because in my opinion it will be very injurious and to the average farmer it will mean a loss of $50 per year. Now, as to the workingman—how will it affect him ? What benefit will he receive from the reductions in the tariff? The tariff plank in the platform of the present Government when in Opposition was that they would admit the necessaries of life free and place the taxes on luxuries. Have they done so ? In what position are the necessaries of life ? Are they not all charged with those so-called obnoxious specific duties ? Have hon. gentlemen opposite lowered the duties on meats—they did so a little on flour, but on all agricultural products that are necessaries of life to workingmen they have not done so. I should like to know in what way they have lowered the duties on the necessaries of life, and on what luxuries increased duties have been charged.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Did you not say a moment ago that the Government had lowered the duty on wheat ?

Mr. TAYLOR. They have lowered the duty on flour only 15 cents a barrel, and that will not have much effect as regards the workingman—it will not affect him probably more than 5 cents. I have worked out these calculations. The Government have increased the duty on tobacco ; that may perhaps be considered a luxury. An hon. friend behind me says that it is the poor man's luxury. They have also increased the duty on the poor man's grog, whisky. But what have they done with respect to the Cabinet Ministers' wines and champagnes ? They have not advanced the duties on them, but they have increased the duties on whisky which is used as a medicine and is the poor man's drink, if he drinks at all.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Are you opposed to the increase of duty on whisky ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, I am, for this reason, that I believe it will bring about a worse state of affairs than at present exists, and that it will increase smuggling to a very large extent. The present duties are quite high enough. If the Government want to raise more revenue, let them impose increased duty on Cabinet Ministers' and the rich man's wines and champagnes. Here, then, are all the benefits the workingman receives from the changes in the tariff : he gets 12 cents reduction on 12 gallons of coal oil which his family will use during the year ; he will obtain a saving of 28 cents on sugar, making a total of 40 cents. He will pay 25 cents more for rice, $1 more for cotton, and he will suffer a reduction of $50 equal to 10 per cent at least on his wages.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I wish to ask the hon. gentleman a question.

Mr. TAYLOR. I claim the right to conclude my speech, then I will allow the hon. gentleman to proceed.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I wish to ask——

Mr. SPEAKER. Any interruption is allowed only as a matter of courtesy.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will extend the courtesy when I get through. The average workingman makes $500 a year, but he will have to suffer 10 per cent reduction in his wages in order to meet the competition of foreign manufacturers if our manufacturers are to live in this country. Some of the factories in my own town have already inaugurated a 10 per cent reduction, while one factory closed on Saturday for good. Those losses will amount to $51.25, which the average workingman will have to submit to owing to this tariff, and the benefit he will receive from the reductions in the necessaries of life will be 40 cents a year, leaving the workingman $50.85 worse off than if the tariff had remained as it was before the present Government came into power. I desire to draw the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to a few statistics I have taken from a very valuable report he has just issued, as I desire to call the attention of the farmers and workingmen to these figures, because the farmers are as much interested in having labour employed in this country as are the labourers themselves in obtaining work here. The labouring man is the farmer's best customer. The report to which I refer, which was issued a few days ago, shows this state of affairs. We imported from the United States in the years 1894 and in 1896, as follows :—

	Value. 1894.	Value. 1896.
Binding attachments	$ 1,475	$ 3,766
Cultivators	.....	21,483
Drills	4,207	40,243
Forks	1,373	6,408
Harrows	4,729	18,729
Harvesters and binders	75,573	130,780
Hoes	276	1,052
Horse rakes	.....	12,903
Lawn mowers	.....	977
Mowing machines	36,159	73,578
Ploughs	11,198	51,679
Reapers	421	2,330
Scythes	17,379	22,430
Spades and shovels	14,005	23,596
Threshers	3,558	23,805
Carriages	253,044	1,224,352
Total	$423,397	$1,658,111
		423,397
Increase of imports		$1,234,714

This gives the total imports from the United States in 1894 at $423,397, and in 1896 at $1,658,111, or an increase last year over 1894 of $1,234,714. Now, what does that mean? It means that one million and a quarter dollars were sent from Canada to the United States, to employ foreign labourers in that country. The farmers of Canada are not allowed to send their produce to the United States to feed these workingmen, and so this million and a quarter dollars goes to benefit the people of the United States, and our nation is that much the worse off.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). How much do they buy from us?

Mr. TAYLOR. Not one dollar's worth of these articles, nor any other articles that we manufacture here.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). They bought $3,000,000 worth from us.

Mr. TAYLOR. Of what articles, my friend? not any articles that required a day's labour. They bought the raw material and that is all. The farmers of this country and the workingmen of this country want, that instead of the tariff being lowered it shall be made defensive enough, so that the products of any foreign country, whether the United States, or England, or Germany, or Belgium, or anywhere else, shall be kept out and the labour employed at home in Canada. We are told in the Liberal newspapers, and we are told by gentlemen on the opposite side of the House that we now have a Cabinet of business men who know how to run the country on business lines. I have been looking over the complexion of this model Cabinet to see the number of business men in it, and what do I find? I find that the Prime Minister is a lawyer, as well as nine of his colleagues, in the persons of Mr. Sifton, Mr. Davies, the Minister of Trade and Commerce——

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I am not a lawyer.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. the Solicitor General, the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals, the hon. the Postmaster General, the Controller of Inland Revenue, the Hon. Mr. Geoffrion, and, in the Senate, the Hon. Sir Oliver Mowat and the Hon. Mr. Scott. Ten lawyers compose this Cabinet of business men. The Controller of Customs is practically the only business man in the Government, but he is not allowed to have a voice in the Council where his business ability would be of some service to the country. They shut the business man out, but they have a couple of practical newspaper men in the persons of the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. Minister of Public Works. They happen to have a doctor, but he is away sick, or he might give them a little medicine to cure them from making such a tariff as they are now administering to the farmers and workingmen of this country. They are not the Cabinet that the people outside of this House expected.

An hon. MEMBER. They have a farmer.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, I forgot the farmer. They have one gentleman farmer whom they are holding up to the farmers of this country as a model practical farmer. I do not know that the hon. gentleman has ever done much practical farming, but so far as I can see, he is administering his department on the good lines that he found laid down for him by his predecessors, both in respect to creameries and model farms. He has adopted the policy of cold storage and he is practically carrying out the policy laid down for him by the practical Government which was in office until last June. He is sensible enough, as a sensible farmer ought to be, to follow in the footsteps of his predecessor. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have not yet received the full policy of the Government on the coal question. There is something held back, and therefore I will not discuss the question until the Government make known their policy in that respect. I presume, if they carry out the promise that was hinted at, we shall have the poor man's fuel taxed in the near future. The Government and their supporters talked about clerical errors in the last tariff, but I will be more than surprised if there are not a number of clerical errors to correct before this tariff is completed. When the Ministers get through receiving the deputations that have arrived in Ottawa from one end of the country to the other, I have no doubt that there will be a number of clerical errors to explain away before their tariff is finally adjusted. I rather think that my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) will have to apologize, because he informed the House at the beginning of this session, that the Government were delaying bringing down the tariff so that when they did bring it down it would be perfect, and there would be no clerical errors in it. He will no doubt have to take back his announcement, and turn round and back up the Government in ex-

plaining a number of clerical errors which they have made in the tariff as proposed to this House. If they do not do so, the explanation of a Liberal in Gananoque made to me when I was home on Saturday will fall to the ground. The gentleman said: That this Government went round the country, spent thousands of dollars in consulting the farmers, the manufacturers, and the workingmen, and they were advised by nine out of ten of these people to make no changes. He further said: They went back to Ottawa, never looked at the evidence, and they brought down a tariff that a dozen school boys could bring down a better one; they went into making changes for change sake, and they bungled the whole business. If these clerical errors are not corrected, then, in my opinion, the workingmen of Canada will have to stand a reduction of from 10 to 25 per cent in their wages, or else they will have to leave the Dominion and work in a foreign country, where our farmers cannot send their produce after them to feed them. The farmers of this country do not want the duties removed so as to injure the manufacturing industries, and consequently destroy their home market. They know that to-day there is competition enough among our manufacturers to bring goods down to the lowest price they can be produced for. There is not an article manufactured in Canada to-day, which is not being sold practically at cost, owing to the close competition. The labouring men are getting a fair day's wage, and the farmers are getting a fair price for their produce, and so between the farmers and the labouring men there is a fair interchange of products, and both industries are moving along side by side, and producing wealth in Canada which will not be produced if manufactured goods have to be imported, as they will have to be, from foreign countries as they will be if this tariff goes into force. Notwithstanding that the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) may have to admit that a number of clerical errors have been made, I hope that before the Government finally announce the completion of the tariff, they will admit these clerical errors, and endeavour to adjust some of their blunders so that our manufacturers can make a living, and employ the workingmen of Canada at home.

Mr. STENSON. I did not intend to take any part in this debate until I heard the speech delivered by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), belittling so much the benefit that would accrue to the farmers from the tariff that has been brought down by this Government. The hon. gentleman computes the number of gallons of coal oil used by each farmer at twelve gallons a year, and the reduction in the cost at one cent a gallon. I think that is scarcely fair, because the reduction in cost will certainly be greater, as a result of the privilege of having coal oil carried in tank vessels, which is supposed to reduce the cost one cent and a half per gallon more. But taking the hon. gentleman's own figures as the amount of the reduction in the cost of coal oil, sugar, axes, scythes, barbed wire and binder twine, the hon. gentleman admits that each farmer will benefit to the extent of $2.31, which, according to him, is not worth considering. It might not be if only one or two farmers in his constituency were benefited by this. But, taking my own constituency as an example, mostly a farming community, numbering over 5,000, on that basis we arrive at the nice little sum of $11,550, which will be saved in that county alone by the new tariff. This is something worth considering, leaving out of the question all that will be saved by bringing in coal oil in tank vessels.

My hon. friend pretends that the farming community are suffering a loss from the placing of corn on the free list. Well, I do not think that doctrine would do very well in my county, for the people there are not only pleased with this change, but they have been asking for years that corn be allowed to come in free so that they could use their milk to better advantage in fattening hogs, the coarse grains they could get in our own country not being just what is required in dairying communities. I would put the benefit to my constituency alone from the placing of corn on the free list, as equal at the very least, and I think very much higher than the benefit afforded by all the other articles mentioned by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), that is to say, $11,550. I think it would not be an exaggeration to say that the benefit obtained by my constituency from the introduction of free corn will be double that.

With regard to the increase in the duties on cottons, I would just remark that when the preferential tariff is taken advantage of by the British manufacturers, instead of losing anything by this increase in the duty on cottons, we in our part of the country will be benefited by it. The cottons will be cheaper than they were before, under the late duty. So that the farming community have nothing to lose, but everything to gain by these changes in the tariff.

I must take exception to the hon. gentleman's remarks with regard to the present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher). In my part of the country his remarks would not be taken seriously, because there the hon. Minister is known as a gentleman farmer, it is true—because he is a gentleman in every sense of the word; and he is not only a gentleman farmer, but a practical farmer as well, and able to give instructions to farmers who have not had the opportunities he has had of becoming educated as a scientific farmer. I know that his instructions have been beneficial to the farmers of my district, even more so than the advantages they will reap from this new tariff for many years. If we make a comparison between the present Minister of Agri-

culture and his predecessors in office, I think it will be wholly to the advantage of the present Minister of Agriculture. Even if he were not a practical farmer, he is a gentleman farmer, whereas his predecessors were not farmers in any sense of the word. I do not know whether they were lawyers or doctors, but I believe they were not farmers. That was the opinion among us when we saw the results of their operations in the Department of Agriculture. But we shall have the benefit of the experience and knowledge of the present Minister of Agriculture, in connection with the means he has provided for having our butter and cheese placed on the English market in a proper state, and in a state to command the highest price. This will be of greater advantage to the farmers of this country even than the benefits which we reap from the tariff.

I will just say one word in conclusion with regard to the remark made with reference to an absent Minister. I will only say that I regret that the hon. member should have got up in this House and taken advantage of the sad accident that has occurred to one of our Ministers to refer to it in a sarcastic manner instead of sympathizing with a fellow-member so seriously hurt.

Mr. ROCHE. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to engage the attention of the House for more than two or three minutes, and I will not depart from the subject under discussion, namely, the duty on agricultural implements. I have already delivered my speech on the Budget, and therefore, unlike some other gentlemen, I have no speech to make on the Budget to-day. I have always noticed that when the Government have a particularly bad case to defend, there is no one on that side of the House so ready to jump up and defend it as the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister); and the worse the case the readier he is and the louder is his voice in defence of the same. He engaged the attention of the House for five or ten minutes on a subject entirely foreign to the one before us, charging an hon. member on this side with voting one way and speaking another. The hon. gentleman need not come to this side of the House to get an example of that; he has only to look at the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) to find a brilliant example, for that hon. gentleman has spoken in one way and he is going to vote in another way on this occasion. That hon. gentleman is going to perform the act of which he accuses an hon. member on this side, in his own elegant language, of getting under the barn. No one is better acquainted with the profuse promises held out to the farmers of Manitoba that agricultural implements would be placed on the free list than the hon. member for Lisgar. He is the editor of a paper which has been crying out for years past for free agricultural implements; and now, when he is asked to back up his principles, if they are principles, by his vote, you find him swallowing those principles for fear of embarrassing the Government. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) takes the same position, and has congratulated the Patrons on coming to the support of the Government on the ground that they will not embarrass the Government by voting against them. When a similar motion was brought up last session by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), the hon. member for Lisgar gave as an excuse why he would not support him, that he had every confidence that when the time came the Government would do every justice to the farmers of the North-west, and place agricultural implements on the free list. He declared that the reason why he did not vote in favour of that motion was because it might have the effect of assisting the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) in the election which he thought that hon. gentleman would soon have to face. That election may not, and I hope it will not take place. Very likely it will not, but if it should, I am confident that my hon. friend from West Assiniboia will derive very great support from the farmers of his riding for having brought up this motion and standing by it like a man. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) himself will have to undergo another election, and no doubt will find that the farmers of his constituency will resent the attitude he has taken in this House to-day. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald) has declared that the farmers in his constituency are perfectly satisfied with the reductions that have been made on agricultural implements. I would like to know to what reductions the hon. gentleman refers. To my mind, there has been no reduction at all except in the duty on the raw material which enters into the composition of the machines and of which the manufacturers derive the benefit. But the protection to the manufacturers of agricultural implements is the same to-day as it was under the late Government, 20 per cent, so that, as a matter of fact, the manufacturers receive greater protection to-day, because besides the reduction in duty on the raw material, they enjoy the same protection on the manufactured article that they did before. The farmers of the hon. gentleman's constituency must be very easily satisfied if he voices their sentiments.

Now, this motion calls for the condemnation of the Government for not having kept faith with the farmers of Manitoba. I know that the Government have broken faith with the people of that country. While I am not pledged to my constituency to vote in favour of free agricultural implements, my opponent made this proposition a drawing card in his election and every Liberal member in Manitoba did the same. Quota-

tions were printed, and freely circulated from the speeches of the leaders of the Liberal party, promising that if returned to power agricultural implements would be placed on the free list. We now call on those hon. gentlemen to keep faith with the farmers of the North-west. I intend voting in favour of the motion of the hon. member for West Assiniboia, and I am sure that in doing so, I am voicing the sentiments of the farmers of my constituency, who are in favour of the free admission of agricultural implements, the greater portion of the duty on which is paid by the farmers of our western country, as has been pointed out by my hon. friend from West Assiniboia. And I am confident that those hon. gentlemen from Manitoba who vote against this motion will, in doing so, certainly not represent the sentiments of their electors, and I am equally confident that their punishment will come when they have to go back to their constituents for re-election.

Mr. CRAIG. I do not intend to occupy the time of the House very long, but think it only due to myself to explain the vote I give on this question. Before doing so, however, I may be permitted to refer to one or two matters. I think it is only right for me to say that so far as my knowledge goes, the hon. member for West Assiniboia has always in this House lifted up his voice in favour of the farmers in the west. I am sure that even hon. gentlemen opposite must admit that no man has drawn more attention to the needs of the farmers of the great North-west and Manitoba than my hon. friend from West Assiniboia. It has seemed to me at times that the western members on the other side were rather jealous of my hon. friend, and imagined that their efforts were somewhat thrown into the shade when compared with his. I was rather amused at the statement made by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) reflecting on the conduct of the hon. member for Assiniboia in not voting in favour of free agricultural implements and free binder twine when the late Government held office. Now, the hon. member for West Assiniboia explained that he did not vote in that way because the motion was one of want of confidence in the Government. Yet, singular to relate, while the hon. member for Lisgar rises to condemn my hon. friend from Assiniboia for having taken that course, the hon. gentleman proposes to follow exactly the same course himself to-day. In attempting to depict the conduct of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) he makes use of some elegant similes. For instance, he describes the hon. member for Assiniboia as climbing a tree and crawling under a barn, apparently quite regardless of the fact that these similes apply just as effectively to himself.

There was one statement, however, made by the hon. members from the west supporting the Government, especially the hon. member for Lisgar, and that is that they accept the tariff, as it stands to-day, because it is only an instalment; and whether they have had the assurance of the Government or not to this effect, they led the public to believe that they have had assurances from the Government that the present tariff is only an instalment and that they are justified perhaps in looking for great reductions in the future. Well, that may be satisfactory to hon. gentlemen opposite, but the House should require something more, and the country looks for something more definite. In itself, that is a very important statement, but I think it is the duty of the Government to take the House into its confidence and inform us whether these hon members who have spoken have any right to make such statements to the House and country. The hon. First Minister should let this House and the country know whether it is a fact that the present tariff is not, even for a few years, to remain unchanged, or whether it is only an instalment, and that in a very short time the farmers in the west and all over the country will have further reductions. There is one point concerning the western farmers and agricultural implements, which should not be forgotten, and that is that the Conservative Government did not lose sight of the claims of the farmers in the west, and I am satisfied that they were to a considerable extent induced to take this course by my hon. friend from Assiniboia. They took into consideration the situation of the farmers in the west and what did they do? They reduced the duty on agricultural implements from 35 to 20 per cent. That was done by a Conservative Government, and it seems to me that the farmers in the west ought to recognize this fact. It seems to me that they ought to recognize the fact that the great reduction that was made, was made, not by hon. gentlemen opposite, but by the late Government. The late Government also reduced the duty on binder twine from 25 to 12½ per cent. I cannot of course refer to any previous debate, but the other day I see by the papers—I was not in the House at the time—the hon. first Minister, in answer to a question concerning the sale of Kingston penitentiary binder twine to Mr. Hobbs at London, said that no stipulation was made as to price, because it was not considered necessary, the reduction in the tariff having caused such a keen competition that there was no complaint on that score. If that be the case, I do not see what need there was for any necessity to reduce the duties still further to 10 per cent. This, however, is another question which I shall discuss when we are in committee on binder twine. The amendment says that good faith to the western farmer demands that agricultural implements and lumber should be made free. While I am not going to stand up here and defend the consistency

of the Government, because that point I will let them settle with their own supporters. I feel bound to explain the vote I intend to give on this question and I wish to say that, whether hon. gentlemen opposite be consistent or not, wherever they maintain protection I will not condemn them. Why? Because I am now, and have been ever since I entered the House, a protectionist, a moderate protectionist. I am not a political protectionist—not a protectionist from politics, but, as a Canadian, looking at the question as a business man, in the interests of this country, looking at our situation, lying, as we do, alongside the United States, and having to compete with cheap labour from Germany and the countries of the old world, I believe that moderate protection is to this country an absolute necessity. And so, I say that I am not going to condemn the Government when they have maintained protection. Under these circumstances it would be impossible for me to support the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Davin). And why? Because if I support this motion, in a short time I may be called upon to vote for an amendment declaring that good faith on the part of the Government with the farmers or workingmen of Ontario and Quebec demands the abolition of all protective duties. I do not want to vote for that, and, for the same reason, I do not want to vote for this resolution. I do not intend to vote for any resolution which would place me in the position of seeming to be in favour of free trade for this country or of doing away with moderate protection to the manufacturers of this country. The Liberal party, in so far as they have maintained the protective principle have really endorsed the policy of the Conservative party. Sir, I find no fault with them for doing that. It is true that in doing this they have not been consistent, for they denounced this policy unsparingly throughout the country. I know that in my own constituency one of the speakers against me, a prominent member of the Liberal party, advocated free trade, and, no doubt, in that way gained a good many votes. But, I am willing to overlook their inconsistency, so far as this resolution is concerned. I repeat that, so far as the Liberal party have maintained protection they have endorsed the policy of the Conservative party, and I do not intend to condemn them for that. Whatever I may say of their consistency and of their good faith with the farmers of the west, I am not going to vote that I wish to have them adopt free trade. I shall be obliged to vote against the motion of my hon. friend. How the members from the west shall settle any questions arising between them and their constituents is their own concern, and not mine. But, for myself, I intend to vote as I have always voted—in favour of moderate protection for the workingmen and farmers of this country.

Mr. OLIVER. On this motion, I desire to say—if the House will forgive me for taking the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) seriously—that I consider the motion a very proper one; and, as a western man, feeling a certain amount of dissatisfaction with the tariff brought down by the Government, I shall be most happy to support the motion—provided the hon. gentleman can show me that when his motion is carried and the Government have been turned out, the new Government that will come in will give effect to the motion. But, until he can show that, until he can show that the people of the western country and the agriculturists of Canada would be benefited by turning out the present Government and bringing in their opponents, he can certainly not expect me or any western man or any agriculturist or representative of an agricultural constituency to vote for his motion of want of confidence in the present Government. The difference between the position as it is to-day on the motion of the hon. gentleman and the position as it was on the motion that has been alluded to during this debate, as proposed, I believe, by the present Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) in favour of free binding twine—and the hon. gentleman from Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) spoke in favour of that motion and voted against it—is this: Had the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) voted as he spoke on that motion and succeeded in turning out the Government on that proposition and in bringing in their opponents, the new Government would have given effect to the motion, whereas to-day, if we carried this motion and the present Government is turned out and the Opposition comes in, the motion will not be given effect to, and we shall be in a worse position than we are to-day ten times over. That is the difference and that is the reason why there is no inconsistency in any hon. member representing an agricultural constituency, even though he is not perfectly satisfied with the present tariff, voting confidence in the present Administration as compared with their opponents, who have declared themselves on every point and on every occasion as strong protectionists; that the manufacturers of Canada were their first interest and the farmers of Canada did not enter into their consideration. If there was anything to be gathered from the address of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) who is the whip of the Opposition, or from the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Craig) who has just sat down, it was that wherever else the farmers of Canada may look for help they need not look for it from the present Opposition. It may suit hon. gentlemen on the Opposition benches to propose votes of want of confidence, to propose catch motions. There are many gen-

tlemen on this side of the House who represent strictly agricultural constituencies, but it should not be supposed that for that reason they are simply cabbage heads, and are going to vote against the interests of their constituencies on a motion put forward even by the very astute member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin).

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

After Recess.

CALGARY AND EDMONTON RAILWAY COMPANY.

On the Order,

House in committee on Bill (No. 33) respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Mr. Osler.)

Mr. GILLIES. I am requested by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) who is promoting this Bill, to ask that it be allowed to stand.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I would like to know why the hon. gentleman wishes this Bill to stand.

Mr. GILLIES. Mr. Osler is unavoidably absent this evening, and asked me to make this request to the committee. What reason he has for asking it to stand, I do not know, but I think he is entitled to have his request granted.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Let it stand, then.

LANGENBURG AND SOUTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

The House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 51) respecting the Langenburg and Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Richardson.)

(In the Committee.)

On the preamble,

Mr. RICHARDSON. I will make a few explanations in regard to the object of the Bill, and leave the Minister of Railways and Canals to explain the amendment which he proposes to introduce to this Bill, as well as to other Bills which will come before the House. The object of this Bill is to enable the Langenburg and Southern Railway Company to connect with the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company. That is a road that has been constructed west of Gladstone, a point some twenty or twenty-five miles north-west of Portage la Prairie. The Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company has been constructed from Gladstone, 100 miles north-westerly into what is known as the Dauphin country, and it is proposed to further extend that railway this year, I think, some twenty-five miles. As explained in the Railway Committee the other day, this Dauphin Railway is in reality the Hudson Bay Railway, or, to put it perhaps more correctly, the subsidy of $80,000 per year which was granted some years ago by the Dominion Government to enable the construction of that road to proceed from Winnipeg, or a point near there, to the Saskatchewan River—that aid of $80,000 per year has been transferred to this Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company, and under that aid, one-half the mileage has already been constructed. Therefore, this company, I presume, has secured from the late Dominion Government this aid of $40,000 per year for this Dauphin Railway Company. Doubtless the intention is to obtain the balance of the $40,000 to enable the construction of this road to proceed to the Saskatchewan. Now, the importance of that work will doubtless be conceded by all hon. members, for if it is decided that the Hudson Bay Railway is a feasible undertaking, if it is decided that these Straits are navigable and that we will have navigation for a sufficient period to secure the success of a commercial route from Hudson Bay to Great Britain, then there will be constructed this important link between Portage la Prairie, or Gladstone, up to the south shore of the Saskatchewan River, almost half the distance. Now, this Bill which is before the committee asks the extension of the charter, I think, for two years. The charter was obtained some two years ago, and they now seek an extension for an additional two years. They have power under their charter to connect with the Canadian Pacific Railway. I may say that the length of the road is some seventy miles, extending from the town of Langenburg, in eastern Assiniboia, down to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and they now want permission to connect with this Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company as well as with the Canadian Pacific Railway. I think this is all the Bill proposes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I wish to make just one remark with reference to this Bill, and what I am about to say with reference to this Bill will apply to some of the other Bills which are upon the Order paper for reference to committee this evening. During the discussion before the Railway Committee of this and the other Bills to which I refer, I intimated that I thought it would be desirable that a clause or a new section should be added to each of these Bills which, on the face of it, would contain a recognition of the power of Parliament to enact any legislation which might be regulative of the manner in which, and the extent to which, these companies should issue bonds, and also give running rights which might be desired by other companies over the lines of railways incorporated by the particular Bill; and I said that I had not been able to direct as much attention

to the subject as I desired, but that I would at a very early moment, prepare a clause which I would have moved when the Bill came before the House. I am aware it would not be in order for me to propose an additional clause to the Bill in committee, but I wish to give notice that I shall have a clause moved on the third reading which will cover the ground I have now particularly mentioned, and which I think it was understood by the members of the committee generally I would move later, and which it would be desirable to have added to the several Bills.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I should like to suggest to the Minister of Railways that the amendment, so far as I can understand it from the remarks he has made, will be evidently one of very great importance and will affect railway schemes very materially. I should like to suggest to him that as it is of such importance, it ought to take the form of an amendment to the General Railway Act. I think it would be very unfair that a company which had received incorporation should be placed in a different position from other companies, and I should like him to take into consideration whether he does not think that the amendment he proposes is of sufficient importance to become part of the general Act. Of course, without seeing the amendment it is difficult to judge its effect, but I must suggest to the hon. gentleman and the committee that it would hardly be dealing with the company fairly when it had been incorporated, had built a considerable portion of the line, and had invested considerable money, to insert in its Act a provision which would affect its financial position very materially, such provision being different from any contained in the Acts of other companies. I should like the Minister to consider that point, and I think he will see it is desirable, if the House agrees to the amendment, that it should be made a part of the General Railway Act, and be not applied to one company and not to other companies.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman does not carry in his mind fully the purport of the discussion which took place before the Railway Committee. I intimated there that it was not impossible that the Government might conclude to adopt a somewhat drastic policy with respect to all these questions, and it might conclude to propose to Parliament the creation of a commission, which would have very large powers in respect to the control and supervision of railways generally. I could not speak definitely at all on that subject, because it had not been possible for the Government as a Government to consider and come to a conclusion upon the matter, and of necessity, therefore, whatever might be the decision at which the Government might arrive, it would be impossible to give effect to any such intention by proposing legislation at the present session of Parliament. It would be a very large subject, it would require to be very carefully studied, thought out and prepared in the form of a measure, and the best we could do was to hope to introduce such a measure at the next session of Parliament. But in the meantime, I thought it desirable that we should not incorporate any more railway corporations without, at all events, inserting in their charters a clause to which they would be subject hereafter, that if Parliament should adopt later a general law those companies which were previously incorporated would be subject to its provisions. It was mainly to prevent the possibility of it being hereafter said that the companies now being incorporated could fairly claim exemption from the operation and effect of any such law, if any such law were hereafter passed, that I thought such action would be proper, and in that decision I think the committee generally agreed with me, the idea being such as I have now mentioned. It would be no advantage to add any such clause now to the General Railway Act. When I referred to inserting an additional provision it was simply intended as a declaration that companies, in the event of such legislation, if any, being passed by Parliament, should be regulated as regards the particulars I have mentioned.

Bill reported.

IN COMMITTEE.

Bill (No. 52) respecting the James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Lount.)

Bill (No. 56) respecting the Medicine Hat Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Lount.)

RESTIGOUCHE RAILWAY AND BRIDGE COMPANY.

On the order,

Second reading Bill (No. 104) to incorporate the Restigouche Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Domville.)

Mr. McALISTER. This is not printed in both English and French.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not see that it is printed in French.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Could we take up Bill 103, respecting the Canadian Fire Insurance Company?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not see that it is printed in English or French; and, as we have passed this order, and it has not been read by the Clerk, I do not think it would be in order to have the Bill read the second time now.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I beg to move that Bill 104, an Act to incorporate the Restigouche Railway and Bridge Company, be read the second time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The Bill has not been printed in French, and the objection has been taken to the second reading.

Mr. DOMVILLE. It is not customary to object when a Bill is printed in English.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair.

SUPPLY—THE DUTY ON FARM IMPLEMENTS.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, the amendment of the hon. member for Assiniboia West (Mr. Davin) is perhaps regarded by some members of this House as intended to advantage the hon. gentleman, and possibly to disadvantage some of the other gentlemen who represent the west. At the same time, it seems to me that the introduction of this resolution at this time is not altogether unfortunate, because it gives us an opportunity to discuss the attitude of the Government now that it is in power as compared with the attitude of the gentlemen who compose it when speaking in the country without the responsibility of office before and during the elections. The hon. member for Assiniboia West, in maintaining that the Government has not kept good faith with the western part of Canada, has enunciated a proposition that ought to secure the assent of every one who remembers distinctly what statements were made by those hon. gentlemen in support of their policy during the years they were in Opposition. It seems to me that there was a certain amount of animosity, even of bitterness, shown in the manner in which the hon. member for Assiniboia West was attacked in the House. When it was announced by hon. gentlemen opposite that he stood practically a lone man in this House, in taking the position he did, it might have been expected that the great party sitting opposite would have treated him with some generosity and kindness. But both the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) and the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) showed anything but tenderness or generosity in dealing with the hon. gentleman. They did not seem to think that the lonely position to which they assigned him required them to treat him with any kindness. In fact, the whole of that side of the House seemed to join without any hesitation in endeavouring to crush our friend from Assiniboia West. I am sure that those who know that hon. gentleman and have watched his career, those who have listened to and read his speeches in this House, know that it is quite unnecessary for any one here to speak in his defence. Since he has been in this House he has developed a knowledge of the rules of the House and a readiness in debate which renders him equal to any encounter that may be thrust upon him. At the same time, it seems to me that he was perfectly within his right in the motion he was introducing; and even if it could be argued that his intention in introducing it was to better his position in his own constituency, it seems to me that those who oppose him most vigorously could be charged with doing the same thing. The hon. member for Lisgar accused him, not directly, but in the manner of language he used, of shirking a vote, of being ready in the interest of his party to abandon his position, and even after speaking in favour of a motion, to avoid a vote upon it. Now, the hon. member for Lisgar is not in a good position to attack the hon. member for Assiniboia West in that respect. Even if he can allege that the hon. member for Assiniboia West is willing to sink his own convictions to avoid embarrassing his party, the hon. member for Lisgar has given proof of his desire to avoid embarrassing his party, not only this session, but last session as well. Last session, when the hon. member for Assiniboia West moved a precisely similar amendment, the hon. member for Lisgar spoke in favour of it, saying that it voiced his sentiments and opinions, and after all he voted against it. At this session, when almost an identical resolution is introduced, the hon. member for Lisgar again announces himself in favour of the amendment, and again gives us to understand that he is going to vote against it. Why does he do this? Simply to serve his own interests. And why does he condemn the hon. member for Assiniboia West so strongly, and endeavour to hold him up to ridicule, for following a line of conduct which he is closely imitating at this moment? The hon. member for Lisgar has taken a line that will leave him free to vote in any way he pleases in this legislature. Last year, the point was taken that it was improper to vote on the resolution of the hon. member for Assiniboia West, because as the Premier said, it was asking for an affirmation on this subject six months before the tariff would be introduced. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) on that occasion voted with the Government and against his own convictions because it was too soon, and now he has gone to the opposite extreme, and is prepared to vote with the Government and against his own convictions because it is too late. So that within those two extremes, he has practically given himself latitude to do anything at all that is in the interests of the Government, and his own also, we must assume.

As I have said, I do not think it necessary at all that I or anybody else should champion the cause of my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), but as that hon. gentleman is precluded by the rules of debate from replying in his own behalf, I shall take this opportunity to show that the sweeping assertion made by the hon. member for Lisgar and other hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to the conduct of my hon. friend is not borne out by the facts. In 1891 my hon. friend introduced a resolution,

which I find in the "Hansard," with reference to second homesteads, and pressed that to a vote, even after being asked by the Hon. Mr. Langevin, who was then leading the House, not to press it to a division. My hon. friend persisted, despite that request, in pressing his motion, and in the vote obtained he largely reduced the majority of the Government which he was supporting. So that the sweeping assertion made to-day by hon. gentlemen opposite that the hon. member for Assiniboia lacked the steadfastness and the courage to stand by his own doctrines in the House is not consistent with the facts. I am sure that any one who knows my hon. friend and admires him, any one who knows how great an ornament he is to the Parliament of Canada, does not require to have such an assertion put to the test, and is pleased to learn, when it is put to the test, that it cannot be substantiated.

The ground upon which I maintain that such a resolution as this should be introduced at present is because it enables the Parliament of Canada to consider what has been the course of the Government with reference to that most important question, the decision of which has been placed in their hands. It may be argued that the Government of Canada is not bound to fulfil its pre-election pledges; it may be argued that utterances of gentlemen in their constituencies before election cannot be held to bind the Government which they support. I hold, however, that it is not in the interests of the country, that such a doctrine should be announced and such a precedent established by this House. It is not in the interests of any country, in which we have the Government and the Opposition appealing to the electorate upon certain issues, and in which each party has deliberately decided in favour of a certain policy, and to present it to the country, that the party elected should fail to carry out the policy upon which it appealed to the people. I maintain that if there is any sound principle upon which the Government and the Opposition can go to the country and appeal to the people as to a jury, it is that when a party attains power on certain avowed principles and programme, it is bound to give them effect. But when that party, after its return to power and after Parliament meets, laughs at all its promises, appears intensely amused when they are recited, looks upon them as a huge joke, in which not only the Ministers of the Crown but their supporters join, and ridicules the idea that doctrines publicly stated by public men are not to be laughed at and repudiated the moment the party is put in a position to carry them out, that party and Government should be shown up to the country in their proper light. Why, it makes a perfect mockery of an appeal to the people, if we are to substitute for the decision given at the general elections, which ought to be and, we suppose, does embody the judgments and opinions of the country, something entirely different. It would mean that the success of the party is to be attained by any means whatever, and afterwards to be used solely for the advancement of personal interests and to suit the convenience of the members who compose the Government. Such a position as that, I need scarcely say, it is not to be supposed for a moment the people of any country, more particularly the intelligent people of a country like this, are going to condone or pardon, and it strikes me that if it be true that the party in power has pledged itself to certain views and opinions and is now deliberately failing to carry them out, it will follow that the country will soundly condemn them, on the first opportunity, for that neglect of duty and failure to fulfil their promises. Therefore, it seems to me that it is most important in the interests of the country that this attitude of the Government should be held up to the view of the country on every possible occasion. Is it to be held for a moment as doubtful whether or not the Government has been pledged to the doing of the very things recited in the resolution of the hon. member for West Assiniboia? I think there can be no question whatever that by the utterances of the First Minister and his supporters, by resolutions adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite, by the specific promises referred to by the hon. member for West Assiniboia, this Government were pledged on these things and secured the support of the people of Canada on these pledges. The Government has not fulfilled them. And why? Because this Government is not disposed to stand by the position it took during the election, but is presenting to this country, instead of a revenue policy tariff or free trade tariff, a tariff which is the product of opportunism produced for the purpose of satisfying, in a measure, everybody and if possible displeasing nobody, a policy which leaves it in the power of the Government, in the course of such time as they choose to take for the purpose—at the end of the session or at the next meeting of Parliament, or some other time—to reduce the tariff or go back to protection or go a little further in the direction of revenue tariff, just as they please. But it is no fulfilment of the pledges and promises made to the people and no such fulfilment can be found in the tariff. The hon. member for Lisgar considers it safer and better for his constituency to trust this Government than hon. gentlemen on this side, but in so doing he is violating the pledges upon which he was elected and upon which the Government were returned to office. Some very extraordinary propositions have been laid down here to-day. For instance, the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) regards the tariff as a step towards the fulfilment of the promises made by the party now in power, when in Oppo-

sition, to give us a revenue tariff. He regards the measure in which the Government have fulfilled their promises in reference to these questions, of binder twine, barbed wire, coal oil and the other items mentioned, as a step towards a revenue tariff. There is this to be said about the tariff we now have, you may call it what you please. The speech in which the hon. Minister of Finance introduced it was one from which, as he proceeded, it was impossible to tell what was going to be the result. He might have given you anything he pleased at the conclusion, and you could not have said that it was not, in a measure, foreshadowed in the speech. The tariff the Government have submitted to us is not a revenue tariff. Why, the very items upon which some members asked the confidence of the country on the ground that the Government have fulfilled their pledges are not at all in the direction of a revenue tariff or free trade, but are positively and decidedly protectionist in their nature. For instance, take one article that has been dwelt upon by some hon. members—free corn. Is that a step in the direction of a revenue tariff ? Is it not rather decidedly a protectionist measure ? If corn is to be made free and if, as hon. gentlemen say, it is to the advantage of the farmers that it should be made free, is not that a violation of the first principle that ought to be held by a man in favour of free trade or of a revenue tariff ? Is not this building up and assisting one portion of the producers of the country at the expense of the rest ? Is it not diverting money from one class of producers to assist another ? It is an attempt, and an attempt carried out to the full, to give protection to the feeders. It is as much a measure of protection as the giving of bounties to the producers of iron. It is a violation of all free trade principles and free-trade policy.

Mr. McGREGOR. Free corn, a violation of free-trade principles ?

Mr. BELL (Pictou). It is a violation of the doctrines of the free trader.

Mr. McGREGOR. How ?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). We are not free traders.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I have already explained, but I have no objection to repeat what I said. I notice one gentleman tells us that they are not free traders. I made that discovery during the election, when we were waging our contest against them. I found then and in the contest in the country the same state of affairs that exists to-day in this House and in this Government. I found that they were free traders in one place and protectionists in another, that they were free traders when they addressed themselves to one class of the community and protectionists so far as they addressed themselves to another. There was not, so far as I could distinguish, one genuine free trader to be found in their ranks. And, if you judge by their conduct, and by their conduct as crystallized into legislation, do you find any genuine free trade principle in the Government or in the ranks of those who support them ? The hon. gentleman (Mr. McGregor) asks how I maintain that free corn is contrary to the doctrines of free trade. If corn is made free, it can only be justified, on free trade grounds, if other goods are made free and if every person is put on the same footing as those who use corn. The fundamental doctrine of the free trader is to remove restrictions, to do away with duties and to allow trade to flow easily in natural channels, and to raise a revenue to provide for the public needs of the country by taxing fairly and equally the people of the country generally. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that he holds that giving the agriculturists, those who have cattle, or whose particular private or sectional, or local interests demand and require such a favour, free corn, is a measure in the direction of free trade ?

Mr. McGREGOR. Certainly.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Is that in the direction of a revenue tariff, the object of which is to remove adventitious advantages that are possessed by some and distribute them equally to the others ? If the hon. gentleman cannot understand a proposition such as that I lay before him, I do not wonder at his supporting a Government like the present ; he is in the densest ignorance as to what is required to fulfil the promises of a free trade party. I say that we found during the election contest this same state of affairs. In the county I had the honour to contest, and which I have now the honour to represent, we are generally interested in protection, we pin our faith to protection and avow ourselves protectionists. We were in favour of protection to coal. And what did we find ? We found that those who opposed us in the county were not only not opposed to protection to coal, but were prepared to go further in that direction than the Government had gone.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. That would suit you.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). No ; no dishonest argument of that kind suits me. I am perfectly willing to take my stand in a manly way upon the public platform and maintain the propositions I believe in. But I do not want a man who is opposed to me to sneak around under a false pretense of believing in something to which his whole party is opposed, in order that he may have a chance to stab me in the back. I want an honest, open, up-and-down opponent, who believes something, who is prepared to lay down his proposition and fight it out for that proposition, and who seeks by argument to secure the support of the electors to whom we are both appealing. I do not want to fight a

many-headed, a many-hued party, one man talking free trade, another revenue tariff, another free trade as it is in England, and still another protection. Such a party it is inconvenient to have to fight ; such a party it is not creditable to have to fight. We like straightforward declarations on the part of our opponents. We are prepared to pledge ourselves to certain views; and when we come into power, as I believe we shall at an early day.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). If the Government continue the course upon which they have entered of trying to sit upon two stools, of trying to ride two horses, they must inevitably come to the ground before long. Clever as may be the leader of the Liberal party, there is no reason in the facts, nor is there anything in their past record to make us believe that they can long maintain such a position.

Mr. McGREGOR. The people of Nova Scotia and Quebec said they were all right.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). The people of Nova Scotia did not say they were all right. The very ground upon which the so-called Liberals appealed to the people of Nova Scotia was that of protection to coal—the party that for eighteen years has denounced protection, and for eighteen years had tried to foment dissentions between different sections of the people by telling the people in the maritime provinces that their flour was taxed for the benefit of Ontario, and by telling the people of Ontario that they were being injured by the taxation on coal. The party which has a policy which can only be developed piecemeal in hole and corner fashion, cannot hope to maintain its position in the face of a party which has one policy from one end of Canada to the other. Our policy is protection, upon that ground we are prepared to stand.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Were you not a Grit at one time ?

Mr. BELL (Pictou). The hon. gentleman is very curious. Perhaps I shall be able to satisfy him before the session closes. I hope he is not so dull of comprehension that the hon. gentleman will fail to learn whether I am a Grit or not. I must admit that he will probably have difficulty in judging me from a straightforward declaration of policy, because the gentlemen with whom he associates are not to be judged in that fashion. They say one thing to-day and another to-morrow, they say one thing here and another there. But the hon. gentleman will not find it so upon this side of the House. He will have no difficulty in understanding my position and the position of any man who stands beside me on this side of the House.

Mr. McGREGOR. I think you are tired of that position.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I can assure him we are not.

Mr. McGREGOR. The country is tired of it.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I can assure him it is not. I can tell him something more, since he is so anxious for information. I can tell him that the Government he supports is tired of the policy they have been advocating. If not, why is it that this Government is trying to perpetuate its existence by giving us what, upon its face, is practically a protectionist measure ? The Conservative party was never more alive than it is to-day. Its policy has so permeated Canada, it is so acceptable to the people of Canada, that the Liberal-Conservative party, instead of being dead and buried, is very much alive, or if it is dead and buried, its spirit is very much alive to-day, and it is so much so that the present Government, in propounding their tariff, has had to adopt the policy of the Conservative party. If not, why is it that they bring down to us what, upon its face, is a protectionist measure ? I would like the hon. gentleman who is so inquisitive, to tell me if he has been able to ascertain, in his researches into this tariff, what the result has been ? Is the tariff a free trade measure, or is it a revenue measure ?

Mr. LISTER. We want to know something about Quebec.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). My hon. friend is very silent when he is asked any questions that are pertinent to this discussion, he is not ready to answer them. I can assure him that while I have had much experience in this House that all these interruptions will be perfectly futile if he thinks they will divert me from the course of my argument. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) wants to know what about Quebec. Well, Quebec has gone Grit, it has gone strongly in that direction, and I suppose hon. gentlemen are very much pleased about it. I suppose they are glad to know that their friends of former days are again with their noses in the trough. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, they would not be at all unwilling to know that at the next great election contest in Canada they would have just the very same class of friends in the public offices, and as ready as they were in days of old to furnish to the Liberal party that assistance which it is credibly supposed the Government of Mr. Mercier did furnish to his friend Mr. Laurier. One thing is sure, that whatever the popular verdict of Quebec has been, those men who know the difference between good and bad government know that the verdict given yesterday was not one which was given after a careful examination of the records of the last Liberal and the last Conservative Government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). What are hon. members laughing about ? Are they laughing

at the poor people of Quebec? Are they laughing at the poor innocents in Quebec who, after being reduced to a condition in which the credit of their province was destroyed by a Liberal regime, have seen it restored by a Conservative regime to a decent and respectable position in the ranks of the provinces of Canada? They laugh, and well they may. They laugh heartily since they got in here. No matter with what they are charged by this side of the House, they have only one all-sufficient answer: We are here and you are there. What do these gentlemen care for sincerity? What do they care for the opinion of the public? "We are here and you are there." Apparently the only thing by which these gentlemen are able to judge as to the good or bad character of a movement, as to the good or bad results of a movement, is whether or not it puts them in a position to control the treasury. Why, they openly laugh when reproached with things which in a private individual would be disgraceful. They laugh to scorn the idea that Canada has a right to expect from her leading public men, the great representatives of a great party, honesty of conviction, honesty of purpose, and an honest attempt to fulfil promises made. They laugh at these things, and still that hon. gentleman (Mr. Somerville) hiding his head like the ostrich, shuts his eyes to all the consequences that must come from a public sentiment aroused to a sense of the outrage which has been committed, and which it will not condone when committed by the great men, or those who are supposed to be the great men of the Liberal party, violating the fundamental principles of morality. Now, I say it is not an unfortunate thing at all that we have an opportunity to discuss these measures. It is most important that we should have these opportunities, it is most important that the hollowness of these gentlemen's professions should be made perfectly palpable to the people of Canada. Let these gentlemen indulge in all their happy dreams of a continuance in power for a long time. I have no doubt whatever if, as I believe, the people of Canada are still strongly in favour of that system of protection established by the Conservative Government, that these gentlemen can not long remain in power unless they go further than they have yet gone, and adopt absolutely the whole policy of the late Liberal-Conservative Government. Now, if they decide to do that, I am sure we will have every reason to flatter ourselves, when all these great leaders, these men who for eighteen years assailed the Conservative party and Government, now that they are in power are compelled to go back on every pledge that they have given, on every principle they have valued, and to adopt as they have done, almost to the full extent, the principles they condemned before they attained to power. What better vindication for the Conservative party and the Conservative policy can you find? It is much better in that sense than the result of the general election. No better vindication of the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party of Canada in favour of protection could be furnished than the fact that their opponents have been compelled to adopt it. Therefore, I maintain that it is not at all unfortunate that we have an opportunity, through the resolution that has been introduced by the member for Assiniboia to consider these questions, and at the earliest possible moment, to put ourselves on record as being strictly and straightly in favour of protection, and as being equally determined on every occasion to denounce, as we should denounce, in our character of representatives of the people, the course and conduct that hon. gentlemen opposite have followed in their efforts to keep control of the Government. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) maintained that the action of the present Government in going in a certain direction towards fulfilling their promises to the North-west, is to that extent a fulfilment of their promise to bring in a tariff for revenue. Does the hon. gentleman believe what he says? If he does, he does not understand what he says. Coal oil reduced one-sixth—is that a tariff for revenue? Corn made free, barbed wire to be made free in a short time; binder twine to be made free—does the hon. member for Guysborough consider that these measures form part of a tariff for revenue? Is it possible that his education has been so neglected in the great schools of free trade he has attended that he is not able to recognize the difference between such a policy as that and a policy of tariff for revenue? I cannot believe it, but still I am compelled to believe that the hon. gentleman, seeing the desperate position in which his party has placed themselves, a position that is perfectly indefensible, is compelled to set up such false pretentions as these, with the idea that they will pass unnoticed, and that they will be overlooked as temporary aberrations on his part.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Are you going to vote for Davin's motion?

Mr. BELL (Pictou). The hon. gentleman will find out if he will wait until the vote is taken. The resolution of the hon. member for Assiniboia is one that I am sure will commend itself to his constituents in the west. I am sure he has the very highest possible authority for it, he has the authority of the Premier of Canada. Now, that may be no good at present to the hon. gentlemen opposite, but it ought to be good enough to justify the member for Assiniboia in introducing his resolution, and I should think my hon. friend who is so full of interruptions, would be now in that position in which he would be compelled to vote for that reso-

lution. Did the hon. gentleman not support the Premier at a time when he was making the very promises which the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) is now asking him to fulfil ? I would not be surprised if I discovered that the hon. gentleman had on platforms and elsewhere in his own county advocated this very concession. I do not consider that a member is justified in any neglect of duty by what the hon. member for West Assiniboia may have done. It will be time enough when the hon. gentleman has shown himself to occupy the right position, to criticise the hon. member for West Assiniboia. I should not be surprised if the hon. gentleman even now voted for the amendment.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. No.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). The hon. gentleman would not be where he is, he would not be worthy of sitting where he is, if he was so honest as to take that step. The truth is that the issue is one of policy. This party stands for protection. That party stands for a mixed policy—a little protection, a little free trade, a little revenue tariff, a little reciprocity, a little of everything. In fact, it is not hard to catch almost anybody with that policy, for there is something in it to suit everybody. The party on this side of the House stands for protection to Canadian industries, and for sufficient protection to those industries. Furthermore, there is this difference between the two parties. This party is for sincerity, for straightforward declarations and an honest attempt to fulfil them. Hon. gentlemen opposite and those who fill the Government benches could not have been sincere in their pledges to the people, because they have not now made any attempt to fulfil them.

Mr. LOGAN. I do not intend to detain the House more than a few moments, but I cannot keep my seat and listen to the speech delivered by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) without making a short reply. The hon. gentleman stated that the Liberal party preached free trade in one place and protection in another, and he said that, so far as he was concerned, he did not do one thing at one place and another thing at another place. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a report of a lecture delivered by the hon. gentleman in New Glasgow, N.S., in 1891. Let me state before reading an extract from the report, that the hon. member for Pictou, for whom I have the very greatest personal regard, ran an election in 1887, and he could not find words strong enough to condemn his present colleague. However, in 1891 the hon. member for Pictou delivered this lecture in New Glasgow, and I will read his reference to free trade. They were as follows :—

I consider the argument of the free trader unanswerable. I believe at this moment that if Canada took a liberal step in the direction of free trade, it would go a long way to place her upon the road to the greatest prosperity. The reasons why I consider Canada should turn about and adopt a free trade policy are : (a) that we might free ourselves from the dominating influences of the United States ; (b) on account of the failure of the National Policy ; (b) because of the startling revelations of the census.

But in 1896 the genial gentleman, when he was notified of his candidature with the late Solicitor General, changed his opinion. Here is an extract from a report of his speech at the Tory convention delivered last year :

The great issue for this election is the trade and tariff question. I avow myself an admirer of the National Policy, and am prepared to support it in preference to any so-called free trade policy which could be put forth.

Mr. Speaker, we have the hon. member for West Assiniboia who takes up the time of the House to a considerable extent, but I now wish to hail the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) as the Davin of Nova Scotia. I do not think it necessary to make any comments on these speeches of the hon. gentleman, except to say that I trust he will remember the maxim "consistency, thou art a jewel," in all cases.

House divided :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Bergeron,	McDougall,
Cochrane,	Mills,
Davin,	Monk,
Gillies.	Powell, and
Macdonald (King's),	Roche.—10.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Bain,	Landerkin,
Bazinet,	Lang,
Beattie,	Laurier,
Beith,	Lavergne,
Belcourt,	Lewis,
Bell (Addington),	Lister,
Bell (Pictou),	Livingston,
Bethune,	Logan,
Blair,	Lount,
Bostock,	Macdonald (Huron),
Bourassa,	Macdonell (Selkirk),
Britton,	Mackie,
Brown,	MacLaren,
Calvert,	McAlister,
Cameron,	McClure,
Campbell,	McGregor,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McGugan,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	McHugh,
Casey,	McInnes,
Champagne,	McIsaac,
Christie,	McLennan (Inverness),
Clancy,	McMillan,
Copp,	McMullen,
Costigan,	Madore,
Cowan,	Maxwell,
Craig,	Meigs,
Davies,	Morin,
Davis,	Morrison,
Desmarais,	Mulock,
Dobell,	Oliver,

Domville,	Osler,
Douglas,	Paterson,
Dupré,	Penny,
Dyment,	Pettet,
Earle,	Prior,
Ellis,	Proulx,
Erb,	Quinn,
Featherston,	Ratz,
Ferguson,	Richardson,
Fielding,	Rinfret,
Fisher,	Robertson,
Fitzpatrick,	Rogers,
Flint,	Rosamond,
Fortin,	Russell,
Fraser (Guysborough),	Rutherford,
Fraser (Lambton),	Scriver,
Frost,	Semple,
Ganong,	Sifton,
Geoffrion,	Snetsinger,
Gibson,	Somerville,
Gilmour,	Stenson,
Graham,	Stubbs,
Guillet,	Sutherland,
Haley,	Taylor,
Henderson,	Tolmie,
Heyd,	Tucker,
Hurley,	Tyrwhitt,
Jameson,	Wallace,
Joly de Lotbinière (Sir Henri),	Wilson,
Kaulbach,	Wood (Brockville), and
	Yeo.—121.

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to, and the House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

To promote the establishment and maintenance of creameries in the North-west Territories $15,000

Mr. DAVIN. This vote was postponed last night in order that we should hear from the Minister. How many creameries are to be established in the Territories and where are they to be established ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). There will be, by this arrangement, sixteen creameries and sixteen skimming stations attached to various stations, making in all thirty-two places where milk will be collected for making into butter. Moosomin, White Wood, Grenfell, Wolseley, Qu'Appelle, Maple Creek, Witaskiwin are creameries newly established. Wolseley will have three separating stations subsidiary to it, namely, Moffatt, Lebret and Fort Qu'Appelle. Witaskiwin, McLean, Balgonie, Craven, Buffalo Creek are skimming stations, and the Prince Albert creamery will have Duck Lake as a subsidiary skimming station. In addition to these, there are the following stations restarted which have been in existence but were not operating, at any rate all of them were not operating, last season : Indian Head, Regina, Prince Albert, Moose Jaw, Calgary, with two or three subsidiary skimming stations. There will be Innisfail with four subsidiary skimming stations and Red Deer with two subsidiary skimming stations, namely, Lacombe and Leduc. There will also be Edmonton with two separating stations and Yorkton. That is a list of the creameries which will be running this season.

To promote dairying interests, by advances for milk and cream, and for making butter and cheese, to be recouped out of the proceeds of sales of such butter and cheese, to be placed to to the credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund..... $100,000

Mr. CLANCY. We should have some explanation from the Minister of Agriculture in regard to this vote. He is asking for a very considerable increase and this is practically a new experiment in the North-west Territories. I think the House should have some specific information on the matter.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) says that this is a very considerable increase on last year. For the information of the House I may say, that the vote last year was entirely for the purpose of carrying on the dairy work in Prince Edward Island. That work has ceased altogether this year, but in place of it we are running the creameries I have just mentioned in the North-west Territories. This is a much larger number of stations than we were dealing with last year, and we expect that the produce will be much greater. The estimate made by Prof. Robertson, the dairy commissioner who has this matter in charge, is, that about $5,000 of this vote will be required for the creamery which we are running at the Nappan Farm, Nova Scotia, and that $95,000 about, will be required for advances on the first ten weeks work in the North-west Territories. We hope to make about 10,000 pounds of butter a day, and in the course of ten weeks we expect to make so much butter, that we will be obliged to use up fully $90,000 or $95,000 in advances to the patrons of those creameries. After the ten weeks, we expect, that from the sales will accrue to a sufficient amount to enable us to supply the advances which will then be necessary for the rest of the season. We found that this large amount of money was needed because, we could not market the butter and get the returns for it from the North-west Territories, in less than, at the least ten weeks. The estimate which is made of the production of the North-west creameries during this coming season, indicates that about from $90,000 to $95,000 worth of butter will be produced and exported—or sold at all events whether exported or not—before we get the returns, and begin to utilize the money accruing from the sales, for the succeeding advances.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). I wish to refer to the case of Prince Edward Island. The Government has controlled several cheese and butter factories in that province for several years past, and it has continued for two or three years the subsidies to the weaker factories, the stronger ones being left to shift for themselves which I am glad to

say they have fairly succeeded in doing. I regret very much that the Minister has not seen his way to continue the subsidies to the weaker factories, until they would have grown a little stronger at least, and have a better chance of carrying out the work that was so well begun. I believe it is the intention of the Government to withdraw wholly from Prince Edward Island the subsidies heretofore granted. I regret that the Government has not seen its way clear to continue the work; in the case of the weaker factories, for at least another year or two.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I should like to point out to the hon. member (Mr. Macdonald) that before I came into office, the late Government distinctly announced in Prince Edward Island, that they were about to withdraw. They announced more than a year ago that they were going to withdraw from most of the cheese factories during last season; that some of the weaker ones they would continue to run during that season, but, that in the season now commencing they would withdraw entirely. During the visit which I paid to Prince Edward Island last fall, I found that the condition of the work there was such as to justify that withdrawal. There are no creameries running there in summer under the Government patronage, but there were two running last winter. The cheese factories which ran last season, without the Government control, were successful, and from what I saw, I am satisfied, that with possibly one exception—a cheese factory which was started in a neighbourhood which evidently had not yet arrived at that condition of dairy work to justify the establishment of that factory—with that one exception, I believe that the factories this season will be able to operate on their own account. The hon. gentleman has slightly misused the word "subsidy," because there was not a subsidy given to these cheese factories. The Government simply ran them, controlling them and managing the business, and to a certain extent supplying the deficit which accrued on the small factories. It was felt by the late Government, and I concurred in that view, that it was time that these factories should assume the responsibility of doing their own work, and I feel that in the case of Prince Edward Island the time has now arrived when this should be done. However, in view of the fact that some of the factories there are rather weak, or not in a sufficiently advanced state to do without a little assistance, I have decided to maintain in the island two inspectors or teachers, who will remain there this season and aid the weaker factories with advice and assistance in testing the milk and carrying on their work. I think that by this means the island will be well able to carry on that business, which has been well established, and which is certainly a source of great profit and advantage to the farmers there. When I visited the island last fall, I was glad to find it reported that the factories had attained a high standard of excellence, and that their cheese was commanding a price almost equal to the very highest on the English market. Under these circumstances I felt that it was our duty to withdraw from these factories and allow them to manage their own business, as I am satisfied they are well able to do.

Mr. CLANCY. There are two points in connection with this vote that ought to be made clear to the House. It was urged strongly last year by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) that the fact of the Government entering on a work of this kind had a tendency to discourage local enterprise. That hon. gentleman took strong ground on that occasion, but I fancy he ought to be glad now to find that he was wrong, since the hon. Minister of Agriculture is asking for a very large increase in the vote for this year. I do not know whether my hon. friend dissents from the amount; but, aside from that, it does seem to me that the House should have a very clear enunciation of the policy of the Government—whether it is proposed to continue this vote year after year, the Government doing the work, or whether the work is to be left to private enterprise. I do not wish to be understood as offering any opposition whatever; but it is a very large work, and if it is in the right direction, it will necessarily grow, and require a very large addition to the sum already voted. Therefore, I think the House should be informed whether the intention of the Government is to continue in a work of this kind from year to year. I think the House should also have some definite information as to the probable loss, if any, that will arise from the enterprise. The hon. Minister of Agriculture will remember that when the late Government entered upon this work, many hon. gentlemen on that side of the House took very strong ground against it. I hope that time has at last solved the difficulty for them, and that they have now become convinced that the experiment is worth the undertaking. I am sure the committee will be glad to receive from the Minister of Agriculture some definite information on these points.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is the intention of the Government to run the creameries, and they are entering into an agreement for that purpose, for three years. In the case of new creameries, the Government supply half the capital invested, and the people of the neighbourhood the other half. Where there are already established creameries which are in financial difficulty—and I regret to say that most of the creameries in the North-west

Territories were in financial difficulties—the Government have stepped in and made arrangements of a somewhat different character, according to the circumstances of each individual case, by which the Government take charge of the buildings and plant and equipment, and advance a sum of money to the owners somewhat in the same proportion as they advance to new creameries; that is to say, roughly speaking, about one-half the investment. Unfortunately, these creameries which have got into financial difficulties invested a larger sum than was necessary for a new enterprise, and the Government have not taken over these plants and buildings at the price they cost, but at a reasonable valuation of their present value. By this means the difficulty that existed when the individuals or associations themselves ran the creameries, disappears, because now the Government is responsible to the patrons who supply the milk, for the value of the milk supplied, and for the returns from the butter sold. When these associations or individuals got into financial difficulties, the patrons would not send their milk to them for fear the product of that milk might be seized to provide for the obligations of the creameries. The result was a deadlock. But we have avoided that difficulty by means of this arrangement, and have given the patrons confidence, so that they will be quite ready to send their milk, feeling assured that they will get from the Government the full returns from the product of their milk. There is one point that ought to be explained, and it is this, that in addition to the charge for making butter, we are charging one cent a pound on all the butter manufactured, which is placed to the credit of the patrons in proportion to the quantity of the milk they supply, and is used to pay off the obligation to the Government for the money the Government advances to establish the creamery. By this means we hope that after a short time, in most instances within the three years of our management, the patrons of these creameries will own in fee simple the proportion of the building, plant, &c. which the Government are now paying for, and the Government will be relieved of the charge, and the money we are advancing will come back into the treasury. At the same time, we will enable this industry to be established on a firm basis in the North-west Territories, to the enormous advantage of the agriculturists of that country. In a short time this industry will be so well established in the North-west that immigrants will find it on a firm basis there, will know it is adapted to the country, will thereby acquire a higher opinion of the country, and year by year their numbers will increase.

Mr. CLANCY. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that a sum was being retained each year from the patrons.

Mr. FISHER.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. One cent a pound on each pound manufactured is charged to the patrons, in addition to the 4 cents a pound charged for the manufacture. That sum of 1 cent is set aside as a sort of sinking fund. It is credited to the patrons in proportion to the milk they send to the factory. Each patron, as he sends in the milk, shall obtain so much credit, according to the amount of butter manufactured in the factory, and at the end of a few years he will step into the position of the Government.

Mr. CLANCY. How many years?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It depends on the number of patrons and the amount of milk supplied. One cent a pound will be retained for the purpose. If a large amount of butter is manufactured, it will only take two or three years, but if not it will take longer. The hon. gentleman spoke about the Government continuing this work. The arrangements we are making are made for three years, and I hope that, at the end of three years the business will be on such a good basis that the people themselves will be able to carry it on without Government assistance. Just as in Prince Edward Island, the Government for a few years carried on the work, and have now left it to the people to carry on themselves, which no doubt they will do successfully.

Mr. CLANCY. I think the work is very important, but I fear that the Government is entering upon a scheme that may end in a very tedious manner of recouping the treasury through the channel to which the hon. gentleman refers. He said that the intention of the Government was only to give aid for three years.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think the hon. gentleman has misunderstood me. We are giving a certan amount of capital sum out of this $15,000, which we were voting to certain individual creameries. In some instances, we are supplying the plant in a new building, the people of the neighbourhood supplying the building. In other instances, where the creameries are in difficulties, we are advancing certain sums to remove some of their difficulties, and are taking control of the plant. We are running the creameries in addition for three years, but the sinking fund for the redemption of the money does not necessarily depend upon our running the creameries. That sinking fund will have to be continued until the whole money which the Government has advanced is paid up, whether in two, three or five years. We have undertaken to run the creameries for three years, so as to insure confidence in the patrons that they will few years he will step into the position of the Government.

Mr. CLANCY. That leads exactly to what I was endeavouring to point out. The Gov-

ernment have adopted a scheme in the North-west Territories which may be used as an engineering scheme for political purposes. They may have that last for two or five or ten years, or perpetually, and I think the House should have some express declaration from the Government that they do not intend coming to the assistance even of the creameries in the North-west Territories on grounds of this kind. It seems to me there is a healthier and better ground upon which the encouragement of this industry might be promoted. While it is a desirable work, it is most undesirable for the Government to enter upon work of that kind, which would practically make them partners with the patrons or make the patrons the slaves of the Government. I wish to point out that no more vicious course could be pursued than for the Government to come to the aid of any concern in this country and become partners in it and be obliged to continue it for how long we cannot say. It depends wholly on how much milk will come in. What will happen ? The funds of the treasury will be invested in plants of that kind all over the North-west Territories. This House should have more definite information as to how long the Government intend to be partners in such schemes. While I am most friendly to the North-west Territories, it seems to me that this is a dangerous proposition which we should view with great alarm.

Mr. DAVIN. I confess that I cannot agree with my hon. friend behind me. I followed the Minister of Agriculture carefully, and from what little knowledge I have been able to gain about the practical work of these creameries, I think the House has a pretty good guarantee in the scheme proposed that the Government of Canada will not lose any money by it. I should like to learn from the hon. Minister what is the difference between the cremeries he describes at Maclean and the creamery at Balgonie ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Balgonie is a collecting station for cream, subsidiary to the Regina creamery. There is a creamery at Regina where the butter will be manufactured and at Balgonie there is a station where the cream will be collected and carried to the Regina factory.

Mr. DAVIN. I understood from the hon. gentleman that there was a creamery at Maclean.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is another collecting station.

Mr. DAVIN. Is that a collecting station for Qu'Appelle ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes. I mentioned the various collecting stations together, but did not know myself exactly the situation of each.

Mr. DAVIN. I would suggest to the hon. Minister whether he would not consider that Balgonie, which is the centre of a fine agricultural district, and is eighteen or nineteen miles from Regina, might not be made a station for a creamery. I know there is a strong desire to have a creamery there. I got the impression, when I was there, that they were able to guarantee a sufficient number of milking cows to warrant the establishment of a creamery there. At present, all that I would suggest to the Minister is that he should consider the matter.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not the detailed report of Prof. Robertson, who went to the North-west and met the people at these places, as to the conclusions he came to after carefully investigating the claims of the different localities. But his opinion was that it was better to establish a collecting station at Balgonie and not a full creamery. The House can understand, of course, that there was a great desire in almost every locality to have a full creamery. But we had to look over the whole ground and make a choice, as we could not establish full creameries in all these localities without a larger grant of money. But I think that by the arrangements made we shall learn more definitely what steps should be taken. If, in the near future, this collecting or skimming station shows a sufficiently large amount of milk, we may be able to establish a creamery.

Mr. TAYLOR. Where does the hon. Minister propose to expend this $100,000 for the promotion of the dairying interests ? As I understand, it is to be expended in the North-west.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No. $5,000 of it is provided for advances to the creamery at Nappan, where we run a creamery every summer, and where the same system is pursued—we manufacture the butter and send it to the market, making advances of the probable value to the people, so that they have not to wait for a return. When the butter is sold the Government is recouped for the advancement. This is only a sum to be used temporarily and returned. The consolidated fund is not poorer than at the beginning.

Mr. TAYLOR. But I wish to know which of the provinces this money is to be expended in ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In Nova Scotia and the North-west Territories.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think that item ought to be so amended as to make it applicable only in Nova Scotia and in the North-west Territories. According to this item it is voted "to promote dairying interests," and is applicable to the whole Dominion. The hon. Minister could spend it in Ontario or any province.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We are not running any creamery or cheese factory there.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, but you could establish one. If it is required only for Nova Scotia and the North-west Territories, it should be made applicable there alone. I may say that I am pleased to see that the hon. Minister is following in the footsteps of his predecessor, the Minister of Agriculture under the late Government. The late Government asked for a certain amount of money to promote the dairying interests in Prince Edward Island; and I know that on our cheese board in Brockville, I have heard the Government berated by the president of the association of that board, Mr. Evarts, for the course they were pursuing in that respect. This Government are following up the same principle and making it applicable to the North-west Territories and Nova Scotia. I think that is quite right, for I believe that the late Government pursued a right policy in setting aside a certain amount of money to promote dairying, both the production of cheese and the production of butter, in the new provinces that have not yet done as Ontario did—because Ontario leads both in the cheese and butter industry, and it came to that state without any help from any Government. But these outlying provinces, which have not had the advantages that Ontario has had, I think should receive, as they did receive from the late Government, a helping hand. I am glad to see the present Government continuing that policy. But I do hold that this item should define where the money is to be made applicable.

Mr. MARTIN. I have no objection to this vote, or to the fostering of the dairying industry in the North-west Territories and other outlying sections of the Dominion, for the outlying sections a more fostering care than the more central sections of Canada. I am glad the Minister of Agriculture has extended his fostering care to the North-west Territories. But I am a little sorry that he has withdrawn the patronage of the Government from Prince Edward Island. You know, Sir, that what was done by the late Government there has resulted very beneficially indeed to the province. I would not object so much to the withdrawal of this support from the factories that have been in operation for several years. But I think it is unjust to factories which have been established only one or two years. I know that the Minister of Agriculture has taken a great deal of care of his department, and is getting on very well. If he could give a little more consideration to Prince Edward Island and give these factories which are to be established the same protection as has been given to those already established it would be a good thing. The change that has been made in Prince Edward Island through the policy of Government aid and supervision has been very satisfactory; it has been one of the greatest boons that has ever been conferred on Prince Edward Island. I did not think that this Government would withdraw its support; I was almost sure that, if anything, they would add a little to what their predecessors had done. We have always been told that we should get a good deal more when that party got into power. We have had in Prince Edward Island a gentleman in the employ of the Government who, I think, has done more service to Prince Edward Island than anybody else except Prof. Robertson, and that is Mr. Dillon. I understand that his services are to be dispensed with in Prince Edward Island, and I am sure if that is the case the cheese industry will get a very bad setback in that province. I may say also that Prince Edward Island labours under some diadvantages in this respect. Almost every province in the Dominion has an experimental farm supported by the Dominion. Prince Edward Island is altogether an agricultural country, and, I think, of all provinces of the Dominion should claim one experimental farm. That was an additional element to be taken into consideration by the Minister of Agriculture before he withdrew this patronage which the Government formerly extended to Prince Edward Island. I am not aware that since the late Government adopted this policy in Prince Edward Island it has entailed very much expense to the country. I think it has been self-sustaining. And I can assure the committee that many of the factories are more than self-sustaining. The late Government did what was right—they took hold of the weaker factories and extended their aid to them. Those factories that were self-sustaining and more than self-sustaining were allowed to operate on their own responsibility. I must say that I have a good word for the Minister, and I must acknowledge that there is a little offset to this in the fact that the steamer is to call fortnightly there during the summer. But even with that Prince Edward Island is not in as good a position as other parts of the Dominion. This is only a fortnightly call, in place of a weekly or bi-weekly call, as in several parts of the Dominion. If the favour that was extended by the late Government is withdrawn, it will not be well received by the people of Prince Edward Island. I do not think the expense would be very much.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I want to remove a misapprehension from the mind of the hon. gentleman. The late Government decided to withdraw from Prince Edward Island, and sent out a circular to inform the people of Prince Edward Island that they intended to withdraw. I am merely carrying out the plan they laid down, a plan which I confess I approve of, because the people of that province are able

and willing to manage their own affairs and to deal with their dairy industry themselves. I grant there are some of these smaller factories there which may have a slight struggle for a short time; but at the same time I think the great bulk of them, with only one exception, will certainly go on and be able to manage their own business satisfactorily and well. The hon. gentleman speaks about Mr. Dillon, and his withdrawal some time ago. It was intended before I came to the office that Mr. Dillon's work should cease, and he understood that and was prepared for it. The hon. gentleman no doubt is forgetting these things when he tries to intimate that the policy of the new Government is in this respect less favourable to the people of Prince Edward Island than that of the preceding Government. I wish to have it distinctly understood that the hon. gentleman is mistaken in that idea.

Mr. MARTIN. I scarcely think the Minister of Agriculture can come before this House and say that his policy and that of the Government is to carry out the policy of their predecessors, but that is just what the hon. gentleman has told the House they are going to do. But in this respect I think they are going to follow the policy of their predecessors in a retrograde direction. They have led us to suppose that in following the policy of their predecessors they would do so in a progressive manner, but I am sorry to say that the contrary is the case.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) So far as this matter is concerned, if I remember rightly, I think that two or three years ago it was intimated by the then Government that they intended to withdraw their support from the factories in Prince Edward Island, but owing to the pressure that was brought to bear on the Government by the gentlemen representing Prince Edward Island at that time, they continued the supervision they had been extending to the cheese factories there for another season. At the end of that time it was suggested that they should withdraw, but again presure was brought to bear, and it was continued for another year in favour of the weaker ones. I did hope that the Minister of Agriculture, with the intelligent advice of the dairy commissioner, would have continued the supervision of the weaker factories for a year or two longer, and of those that were about being established. I think it would cost the country little or nothing, and it would be a great boon to those people who are struggling to make a living at the present time from agriculture. The factories that were only established in the past year, are rather weak, and have not reached that stage in which they are able, as the saying is, to paddle their own canoe. If the Government could only see its way clear to continue the position they have taken heretofore with these factories, I believe it would be the proper thing to do. Let the stronger ones, as they would no doubt, stand alone, but the weaker ones, I think, should be aided for a little while longer.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture what is the arrangement as to the quantity of milk to be furnished at those factories that have received assistance as well as those that have been taken over, if there is a minimum quantity stipulated in every case. The reason I ask the question is obvious. Upon the plan of repayment, the Government must have a certain quantity of milk delivered at each factory in order to have that repayment made within a reasonable time.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The dairy commissioner has exercised his judgment as to the number of cows and the number of patrons who are to be subsidiary to these factories, and we have established the factories where we believe there was sufficient milk to justify their establishment.

Mr. CLANCY. It is a most extraordinary ground on which to establish factories, that it is left entirely to the discretion of the dairy commissioner to say how much money shall be put in there, in view also of the uncertain chances of getting it out again. I think we should hesitate now more than ever in voting money upon principles of that kind. I think the hon. gentleman should be able to state that there was some fixed policy as to the quantity of milk to be furnished, otherwise there is not even a possibility in sight that the Government will ever get their money out of them again. Now, I want to ask the hon. gentleman another question which will perhaps make clear the position in which the Government are going. Is there any time fixed with regard to those factories that are being taken over, and those that are being aided, as to when this agreement should terminate? That is very important also, looking forward to putting an end at last to what may be called a partnership, and on the other hand, securing what is no doubt the object of giving these grants, that the creameries and the dairy interest may be in the near future become self-sustaining, and that the Government can withdraw their support as is being done in Prince Edward Island. I think I understood the hon. gentleman, that that is to be the policy of the Government. I am sure he will see how important it is that the people should look forward to a certain period when this will reasonably terminate.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I am sorry to see any measure of opposition being offered to this small vote for the North-west Territories in the matter of creameries. I am sure that if hon. gentlemen opposite knew the cir-

cumstances of the case they would see that the Minister of Agriculture is doing good work, not only in the interests of the North-west Territories, but of the country at large. It is very necessary in a new country like the North-west Territories that the people should get some assistance, because the people who come into that country as a general rule have not a large amount of money, and they cannot establish those creameries on their own account. It is almost impossible for them to do so, so it is necessary for the Government to assist them. The Government is not giving them this money, they are simply loaning it to them for the time being, and this money is going to be repaid in the way the Minister has explained to-night. We must take into consideration that when people come into a new country, and we do not always get the richest class of settlers, it takes a year and a half or two years before a settler can get a crop. In the meantime if there is a creamery near to the location where he takes up his land, he is enabled to take his cream to that creamery and to get money to live on. In this way a great many people are coming into the country who would not otherwise come in. I think that the $15,000 that was expended by the Minister of Agriculture in the North-west Territories last year, will do more towards promoting immigration into that country than $25,000 spent in immigration agents and in other ways, in trying to get people into that country. If you want to get immigrants into that country you have to make the settlers prosperous and contented who are there now, you have got to show people that are coming in, and that intend to come in, that there is some means of making a living in the country, and when you do that, you will get immigrants to come in. There is no doubt that one contented settler is worth ten immigration agents. People that settle in that country, if they are enabled to take their milk to a creamery, will write favourable letters to their friends, and be the means of bringing more people into the country. Something has been said about the number of cows necessary to run a creamery in that country. I understand the limit is 400 before any assistance will be granted, that settlers who may get up an association and apply for assistance have to give a guarantee that the milk of 400 cows will be taken to the creamery before they can receive the money. There is a provision in the ordinances of the North-west Territories to carry out the agreement. With respect to skimming stations, I think the Minister of Agriculture is perfectly right in that respect, because in operating a creamery it is just as cheap to use the milk of a thousand cows as three hundred or four hundred, and therefore it is in the interest of the people to run it on as large a scale as possible, and with this view to establish skimming stations. If a creamery can be run with a thousand cows, more money will be obtained by the patrons. The people are taking that view, and although there are some settlers there, as there are elsewhere, who are directly interested in their own backyards, and want a creamery established every fifteen or twenty miles; yet when the matter is fully explained there will be no difficulty in getting them to fall in with the view of the Minister of Agriculture, and creameries can be established at different points to which the milk can be sent. In the place of $15,000, the Minister, I think, should ask for $25,000. I hold that the security is perfectly good, and certainly the Government will be repaid. We do not consider this money as a gift, but as a loan. In regard to farmers having established creameries which are now in financial difficulties, it must be remembered that settlers coming into the country are not wealthy. This assistance, I repeat, is by way of loan. The property is not valued at its cost, but at what it is actually worth, and the security taken ensures that the money will be repaid because the Government has the whole matter in their own hands. They manufacture the butter and sell it and deduct one cent per pound, and no doubt in a year or two the amount will be paid. I am sorry the idea prevailed that there was any general opposition to this vote, and I thought it well to make this explanation for the benefit of gentlemen on the other side of the House.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. gentleman is evidently rather sensitive on the question. There is no disposition on the part of hon. members on this side of the House to oppose the vote, in fact every disposition has been shown to support the vote. Members from Ontario are generous indeed in being prepared to grant this large sum to the North-west Territories and Nova Scotia to establish creameries and promote the industry, while in the large provinces of Ontario and Quebec no similar allowance has been made. Certainly I am prepared to approve the vote as being in the right direction, and I hope in every way it will be successful and be productive of much good to the people in those sections of the country. But I would ask the Minister if it is not the intention of the Government, whilst they are granting this large sum for the use of the North-west Territories and Nova Scotia, to place in the Supplementary Estimates a small appropriation for the purpose of granting a bonus to promote the dairying interest in Ontario and other parts of the Dominion, a sum by which a bonus could be granted for first-class dairy or creamery butter no matter from what section of the country it might come. This matter has been discussed in the House already. I think it is a move in the right direction, and I hope the Government will be able to deal with the matter now in order

to encourage the industry throughout the country, by granting a bonus to encourage the industry elsewhere.

Mr. GANONG. I am sure I have no objection to this vote, but I rather favour it, while at the same time I hope, like the last speaker, that other provinces will have some consideration. I represent the county of Charlotte, where we have one of those weak creameries. Our farmers have not very great experience, and much difficulty has been experienced in keeping it going. The county is devoted very largely to lumbering as well as to farming, and while it is not especially adapted to general farming, so far as regards its pasturage and water supply we have a county equal to any in the maritime provinces. We are within easy reach of the port of St. John, to which are to run subsidized steamers provided with cold storage. There is ample room in the county for quite a number of creameries, and if the Government were to give assistance to the present creamery, the tendency would be to develop a large business in the line of creameries, and this would tend to keep our farmers more fully occupied than they have been for the past few years. I trust that while this estimate may not be sufficient to include a proportionate amount for my county, the Supplementary Estimates may cover the required sum.

Mr. OLIVER. I desire to remove any wrong impression that may have arisen in regard to myself, either from remarks made by hon. gentlemen opposite, or owing to the position I took last session in regard to a creamery grant. If there is one thing I would dislike more than another it would be to have the idea prevail that any position taken by me has been in opposition to the creamery industry in the North-west. It is only fair to the Minister who has this matter in charge to say that not only at that time I had no opposition, but that I have no opposition now to the project, and further that the system inaugurated by the Minister has given, so far as it has gone, the greatest satisfaction in the constituency which I represent. Of course we cannot tell until the experiment has been longer in progress what the results will be, but the people are well satisfied with the action taken and they hope for good results. The position I took was in respect to the attitude which I understood to be taken by certain other members of the House, which was that the Government should employ its funds solely for the purpose of starting new creamery enterprises. In the district which I represent there were in existence five or six creameries into which the people had put $30,000 of their own money. Those creameries, owing to certain circumstances, were not a financial success. They were ahead of the times, the country was not ready for them, and when they got into financial difficulties, it seemed a very great hardship that they should not receive a share of the aid the Government were evidently going to grant. It was from making a demand or request on the Government that those creameries should receive a share of the aid, that I was construed to be in opposition to the projects relating to creameries. Whatever might have been the intention of the Government at the beginning, I do not know; but I take the opportunity of saying that the Government has shown the utmost desire to aid those enterprises that were already started and had fallen into financial difficulties. They did not do so by coming forward and paying the debts that had been incurred. The people who put their money into those enterprises had to consent to accept the cutting off of the amount of capital put in not represented by the actual value at the time the Government took over the creameries. The people were willing that should be done in order to place them in the hands of the Government and put the business on a satisfactory footing. The conditions against those creameries being successful as private enterprises were these: In the first place, those people were not acquainted with the business. Another thing was, that the country had not advanced sufficiently in this line to support them satisfactorily, and again, they were started in the face of a falling market for butter. In regard to butter, just as in regard to other agricultural products, the price has been going down, so that an enterprise started on a certain basis of value having to face a fall in the market, felt the loss more greatly than if it had to face a rising market. These were the unfortunate conditions that met the creameries which were started by private enterprise in the North-west Territories. The Government has now put these enterprises on a basis which is fair to the country, and fair to the people at large. Throughout the country affected by these creameries, and in the district that I represent, the greatest hopefulness is expressed by the people as to the results that are to be derived from this policy of the Government. There is no reason to suppose for an instant, that the Government will lose a dollar on the transaction directly, while indirectly, both the Government and the country will gain many thousands of dollars. In the district to which I refer, there are five creameries running under Government control, four of which have already been in operation and only one newly established. There are ten or fifteen separating stations, and altogether there is a country 200 miles in length served and thoroughly served, by this enterprise. The share of Government expenditure which has been made in that part of the country, to accommodate 200 miles of territory, is certainly very small compared with the results that will be achieved, and the prosperity which will accrue to the settlers throughout such a

very large area. I echo what the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) has said: That, there is no part of the Government policy which has been received with such satisfaction in the North-west, or, that in my humble opinion, is likely to lead to such good results, as this policy, as far as it has gone, of giving aid to creameries.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). I wish to ask the Minister of Agriculture, how many creameries in the province of Nova Scotia he proposes to assist out of this vote?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The Government has only one creamery in Nova Scotia. That is at the Nappan Farm.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). Is it situated on the Government farm there?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Well, adjacent to it.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). I may say that the practice of giving assistance out of public money to localities where it was not needed, has been carried out by the previous Government on too extensive a scale to satisfy the public. In the western counties of Nova Scotia where this Government Experimental Farm is maintained, agriculture is well advanced in consequence, whereas in the eastern portion of the province, notably in the Island of Cape Breton, one of the counties of which I have the honour to represent, it has never received the slightest consideration at the hands of the late Government. I hope, Sir, that the present Government will inaugurate a better order of things with regard to Cape Breton in this regard. The Federal Government maintains an experimental farm in the most advanced agricultural portion of Nova Scotia; the local Government of the province, maintains a model farm in the neighbourhood of the Nappan Farm; it maintains a school of horticulture not far from the same locality, and a school of agriculture in the town of Truro also in the neighbouring district. I would suggest to the Minister of Agriculture who is now starting out upon his career as a Minister in a Liberal Government, that he should in a measure at least, change the existing order of things, which has hitherto been so very unsatisfactory to the eastern portion of the province, and particularly so to the island whence I come. I make these observations to call the hon. gentleman's attention to this particular point, as a condition of things, which has hitherto caused considerable dissatisfaction. I regard with approval the remarks of gentlemen on both sides of the House, as to the non-necessity of helping localities that are well advanced in agriculture; whereas in many instances urgent necessity exists for assisting along struggling communities, which are not so fortunate, and which have not been hitherto so pampered in the matter of assistance from the treasury. I trust that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) who is now at the head of this very important department, will see to it, that the order of things that I have described shall be changed or modified, so as to advance the general interests of Nova Scotia, and not one particular locality which has been favoured not only by nature, but by Government as well.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I may point out to the hon. gentleman, that the creamery was established at Nappan in consequence of the experimental farm being there, and that is the only creamery in Nova Scotia, aided out of this vote. The gentleman who has charge of that creamery is well up in dairy matters, and during a great portion of the year it is his duty to go round the province of Nova Scotia and aid the creameries by his advice and instruction. I shall take into careful consideration what the hon. gentleman (Mr. McLennan) has said, and see what can be done to encourage dairying in Cape Breton. I shall be only too glad if possible to meet the views of the hon. gentleman in that respect.

Mr. SPROULE. It is the first time I have heard from any one coming from that province any objection made to an expenditure in Nova Scotia in this line, and it is somewhat surprising after the number of eulogies we have heard with regard to what was being done in that line heretofore in that province. It is generally conceded by most members who come from that province, that there was a most valuable work done, and that the result of the experiment was entirely satisfactory. However, Mr. Speaker, I rose more particularly to draw attention to the position of the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver). It seems to me, that it is very seldom we have had such an exhibition in this House, of the ability of an hon. member to swallow himself and his convictions in the short space of about nine months. If I understood him correctly—and I think most of the members of the House understood him as I did—at the last session of Parliament he was distinctly opposed to the system of the Government assisting those creameries holding that the Government were coming into direct competition with the farmers of the country who had already established their factories, and did not require Government assistance. To-night he is perfectly satisfied with it. I am glad that he has in the meantime made such inquiries as to satisfy himself that it is a good work, because I believe it is. I do not think it is any discredit to a man to change his views, or when he sees he is wrong to admit it.

Mr. OLIVER. Did the hon. gentleman hear what I said a while ago?

Mr. SPROULE. I think so. I understood that the hon. gentleman commenced by making an apology or some kind of explanation for fear the House would think that his present position was inconsistent with the position he took last year; but he tried to argue that there was no inconsistency in his two positions, that he was in favour of the system before. If so, he was very unfortunate in not making himself clearly understood, because the impression on this side of the House last year was that he was very much against the system, whereas now he is in favour of it. I am glad he is, because I think it is a good work, and I do not think any member on this side of the House has been disposed to criticise it severely or to do otherwise than commend it. I think the Ontario members are generous enough to allow the Minister of Agriculture to assist dairying in the North-west or in any other distant part of the country. I was not in during the early part of this discussion, and I would like to ask the Minister how many associations have taken advantage of this offer last year, and how many he expects to take advantage of it this year.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman was not in when I gave the information. There are sixteen creameries running, and sixteen skimming stations, adjacent to the creameries this season.

Mr. SPROULE. How many cows for each ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Four hundred cows for each is the lowest number. In some cases there are six hundred or seven hundred.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. gentleman say where these are distributed ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I read the list, and the hon. gentleman will find it in "Hansard."

Mr. WILSON. How many months in the year will these factories run, winter and summer ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That will depend on the nature of the season and on the district. In some cases they will run fully six months, and in some cases not more than four or four and a half months; but I hope in most cases six months, and no doubt as the business proceeds the time will be extended, as it has been in other provinces.

Mr. WILSON. Is that in the summer season ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I am glad the Minister says he will take into account Cape Breton; and I hope he will also take into account New Brunswick, because we have a fine county in King's county, and when he brings down further provisions I hope he will not forget that county.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I may say to my hon. friend that last winter I carried on a dairy school in King's county which I hope will have good results.

Mr. McMILLAN. I have been in the North-west, and we are all anxious to see that country settled, believing that the future of Canada depends largely on its rapid settlement. I am convinced that unless something of this kind is gone into, a great many of the people of that country will not remain, because last summer they were getting only 7 or 8 cents a pound for very good butter, and I think even less than that. The time has come when something must be done, and I do not think that a better system can be adopted than that of establishing creameries, and I am glad to find that there are to be skimming stations near the creameries, for in Ontario those succeeded best which have skimming stations. If this result in obtaining for the people 12 or 13 cents instead of 7 cents a pound for their butter, it will be of great benefit to them. It is a good thing to have the creameries near the lines of railway; some of the creaming stations are at present back from the railways. I hold that there is no better system of settling up that country or assisting immigration into it, than the system of establishing these creameries and giving the help the Minister is now giving to this object, especially when we know that as early a date as possible the money will be returned to the treasury.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not care to prolong this debate, but I cannot allow hon. gentlement to assume a position that is perfectly farcial. Nobody has said that this is not a good policy or should not be continued. Speaking for myself, I am prepared to vote even for a larger grant for this object; but we find hon. gentlemen opposite, notably the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, speaking as if some opposition had been given to this proposal, as a blow to immigration. I would like to know if any hon. member has hinted at anything of that kind. I wish it to be understood that I have been simply making inquiry into a system which we want to see properly carried out. The Minister of Agriculture has not given quite as clear an explanation as the House ought to have. One hon. member says the minimum is 400 cows, while the Minister says it is a discretionary matter with the dairy commissioner. These statements are at variance. I will not do more than ask this question of the hon. gentleman, whether there are cases where the creameries have been taken over which are partly private enterprises or wholly so, or whether in every case the buildings and plant belong to the patrons who are furnishing the milk.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think that in every instance these creameries belong to associations or companies. I do not think there is one owned wholly by a private individual. In some instances they belong to the patrons, the people who are supplying the milk being the shareholders. I think that in all cases some of the patrons are shareholders, and in many instances, the people of the neighbourhood or locality are also shareholders. In regard to the first question the hon. gentleman put, I thought I endorsed what the hon. gentleman behind me said. There are no creameries to be established where there are not at least four hundred cows. There may be some cases where possibly four hundred cows are provided, on paper at any rate, but where we have not been able to meet the demand. So I say it is in the discretion of the dairy commissioner to decide whether the circumstances in any case will justify the Government in undertaking this work.

Mr. SPROULE. When this scheme was first outlined, I think it was said that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company generously offered to give some assistance in the way of carrying cream to the creameries at low rates of freight, and perhaps providing storage. Has anything been done in that direction ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Professor Robertson is making arrangements with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for certain rates for the carriage of cream or milk ? There is no other assistance given by the railway company, but they are very liberal in the arrangements they are willing to make.

Mr. SPROULE. What are the rates ? I understood they were likely to be very much below the ordinary freight rates.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot tell exactly. The matter is under negotiation now between Prof. Robertson and the railway, but the railway is meeting Prof. Robertson's views very generously.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has not made it quite clear how, in cases where creameries are held in part by persons living in the town and who furnish no milk, the repayment of one cent a pound is to be collected.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have tried to make it clear to the hon. gentleman, but do not seem to be able to make him understand. The one cent per pound on each pound of butter is placed to the credit of the individual patron who has supplied the milk, in proportion to the amount of milk he supplies, and he will then get a share in the building and plant according to the amount of money credited to him ; and when the Government advance is altogether paid up, he and his associates will own the whole building. The patrons who supply the milk will, under this arrangement, eventually become the owners of the building.

Mr. DAVIN. Some hon. members are under the impression that the patrons to whom the hon. Minister refers are the Patrons of Industry. I understand him to mean those persons who patronize the creamery.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certainly.

Mr. CLANCY. Suppose one-half the capital is invested by townspeople who furnish no milk and the other half is furnished by those who have cows and deliver milk. The Government then comes in and relieves these people by taking say one-half of the factory. The one cent a pound will be collected from those who deliver milk, but what about those who have not delivered any milk, and from whom nothing will be collected ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They will receive the money from the others and give up their proportion of the building as they receive the money.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I would ask the hon. leader of the House whether it would not be better not to press the next item to-night, as it is one which will likely provoke a long discussion.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). My hon. friend (Mr. Fisher), I am sure, will be most desirous to give the fullest explanation of cold storage, and as that item is likely to lead to a debate, perhaps it would be better to let it stand. There are, however, a few other items which we might pass, as there is not likely to be any discussion concerning them.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). Before you go to the other items, I would like to ask the hon. Minister what the Government propose to do in the matter of branding and registering cheese, concerning which I had a Bill before this House last session. I have had this Bill before the House several sessions, and have submitted to the House opinions from all parts of the country interested in the matter. Ninety-five per cent of the people most interested, including the presidents, secretaries and treasurers of the different organizations interested in the manufacture of this article, have sent me letters resolutions and memorials asking that the Bill which I submitted to the House should be carried out. It received its second reading last session, and with the consent of the hon. Minister it could have been passed in a very few moments, but he asked me not to press the measure, and promised me that the Government would introduce a Bill of this kind, drawn up on the lines of the one submitted by me. I should like to know now what the intention of the Government

is in this respect, as the matter is one of very great interest to the country. I find that the Americans are making great efforts to place their butter and cheese on the markets of Great Britain and other countries are also making every effort to compete against us, so that this matter is one of very serious moment and should be attended to in time. I certainly expected to have seen the promise of the hon. Minister, which he made last session, carried out this session, and I hope yet to see it carried out before the House rises. If I thought the Government would not redeem their promise, I would again bring my Bill before the House this session and take the sense of the House upon it, and find out whether they are prepared to extend that measure of justice to the agricultural community. It seems almost dangerous for an hon. member to rise to speak on any subject which is in the interests of the farmers. My hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) brought up a question in their interests and was censured from all sections of the Government side of the House for having done so, and I was very much surprised indeed to find the Patrons declaring themselves against a measure which is in the interests of the farmers, and one which they made one of their planks on every platform.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must remind the hon. gentleman that the item on which the discussion is now entering into might have been made, has been carried and that he is now referring to a past debate or to a vote of the House, which is not in order.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). I asked if the House would allow me to speak, and you, Sir, in your place, allowed me to go on, and I am dealing now with the very subject with which I opened my remarks. If you say I am not to be allowed to speak, I repeat that it is almost dangerous for a man to get up and speak here in the interests of the farmers. The very moment he rises, he is stopped by some hon. member opposite; he is censured, and even on some occasions he is bullied in the attempt to stifle discussion. It seems to me that I have the right, as every hon. member in this House has, to speak in defence of what he considers is in the interests of his constituents or of the country generally. I do not think it is proper that I should be called to order when I am simply asking for explanations on a matter in which I feel very great interest and in which, judging by the evidence that was produced by me in this House, the country at large is deeply interested. We on this side desire to receive from our opponents the same treatment which, I am happy to say, we extended to them when they were in Opposition, but which we have not received at their hands since they have come into power. The policy of the Government as to this dairy question is as much an issue as anything else. When this matter was brought up they made free trade speeches, but they settled down to a protective policy. They have criticised the policy of the Conservative party, but I have not yet been able to find out what their own policy is. I would like it if some of their leaders would tell us what their policy is. So many policies have been advocated that I do not know what to call this one.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McLennan, Glengarry) is going a little too far. When he began to speak I thought it was to put a question concerning an item that has been carried, but it is apparent——

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). As you refuse to allow me to go on, I will take my seat.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The reason I allowed the hon. gentleman to go on was because I thought he desired to ask a question. But I see now the hon. gentleman is trying to raise a discussion upon other issues that have been threshed out during the day, and I think that is going a little too far. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he desires to ask a question, to ask it.

Mr. WALLACE. There was a distinct agreement made across the floor of the House between the leaders, that if consent was given to the House going into Committee of Supply, there was to be the utmost latitude of discussion, and hon. members were to be allowed, if they chose, to make in committee speeches they had intended making when the Speaker was in the Chair. In conformity with that agreement I contend that the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) was quite within his rights and the understanding reached by the leaders.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would remind the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) that the item on which the hon. member (Mr. McLennan) is speaking has been declared carried, and that we are now about to take up the item of quarantine.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McLennan) was not speaking so much on the particular question of the item as on the general question. There is no question now before the committee.

Salaries and contingencies of organized districts, and public health in other districts $50,000

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). This is a question under the Department of Agriculture. I would like to ask the question that I rose before to ask—and I may explain that I should not have taken so much time before had I not been interrupted. I wish to ask the hon. Minister if he intends to carry out the promise made by him to bring before the House a measure based upon the

Bill I had before the House last session and the session before? Up to this time the Government has not introduced such a Bill. It is due to himself that he should bring in the Bill which has been promised, and I hope that when it comes it will not be found a mere makeshift. If it is such it will not be a complete carrying out of the promise made to this House. I have no reason to doubt that the hon. Minister will bring in the Bill referred to. I do not intend to make a speech on the matter. I have not spoke very often in this House, and I can say that in the six years that I have been here I have never interrupted any one in this House. I think it is due to every gentleman to allow fair discussion and I have always been willing to extend that right to every hon. member of the House. I would simply like to ask the Minister if it is his intention to bring in the Bill promised.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The Bill I am to introduce is about ready, and I hope in a few days to lay it on the Table, when hon. members can ascertain its character.

Mr. SPROULE. There is a reduction of $8,416 in this quarantine item. How does the hon. Minister make that saving? This item speaks of organized districts "and other districts." Will the hon. Minister state to what districts it applies?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This item covers all human quarantine of the Dominion. The saving is made at different ports, sometimes greater and sometimes less. I have been able to dispense with a certain number of officials connected with the department and to reduce the item expenditure in various institutions. The larger proportion of this saving is at Grosse Isle, the quarantine station of the port of Quebec. For the last year or two the department has hired a steamer, a very large one with a very large crew, and the hire of steamer and crew involved a heavy expenditure. I have engaged a bare steamer, and, with the addition of two cheap hands, the staff already at Grosse Isle are able to run the two steamers there, instead of hiring an extra crew as well as an extra steamer. Besides I have made considerable reductions in other respects in the staff, the greater part of saving being at Grosse Isle. I have been able to dispense also with a number of minor officials, one or two at Halifax, one at St. John's, and one, a physician, at Sydney.

Mr. SPROULE. Some important repairs were going on last year and the year before. Are these completed?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No; they have not been entered upon. They were on paper only. I found I was not called upon to go into such extensive repairs. Such repairs as are being made are carried on under the Public Works Department and are not to be paid for from this vote.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. Minister has mentioned some reductions which he thinks he can safely make without interfering with the efficiency of the service. I would ask if he will tell us what these reductions are?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. When I came into office I found there were at Grosse Isle four policemen at $1.50 per day. They were engaged some four years ago temporarily, because of a considerable number of people being detained through a number of cases of small-pox, I think, and they have been continued ever since, though the need for them had passed away within a month or six weeks of the time they were first engaged. They were paid high wages because they were supposed to be temporarily employed, but they have been continued during all this time. I was also able to dispense with the services of a man who was called a gardener, whom the superintendent of the staff there, Dr. Montizambert, said was not necessary, and that he could get along perfectly well with some of the other people doing a little of the work that he did. I superannuated the chief constable who had become an old man, and could really work no longer, and I put in his place another, a young man, active and energetic, who had been working in a subordinate capacity, giving him the duties of a chief constable and some other work which he can do without any assistance. Formerly there were the two. I have made the chief reduction in the steamer. One steamer called the "Challenger" is required there for boarding vessels which come into the harbour. Besides that, there was another vessel engaged by the season, called the "Miramichi," which was fitted up with disinfecting plant, so that when vessels arrived which had disease on board and the vessels themselves required to be disinfected, the steamer "Miramichi" went alongside of them and this apparatus was employed to disinfect and cleanse the vessels. This vessel was a large steamer requiring no less than fourteen or fifteen hands, and consequently the department was obliged to pay a large sum amounting to some $6,300 a season for her use. I engaged the new vessel at $2,200 a year, and by the addition of two hands to the crew of the "Challenger," I expect to be able to run the two vessels. Dr. Montizambert made a report to me that he could do this and effect this saving, and I believe it can be accomplished. When I say I had to add two hands to the crew of the "Challenger" and accomplished this by reason of dispensing with the services of this policeman and this gardener, I think I have mentioned all. I have not really added to the staff otherwise, but on the contrary the staff, independent altogether

of the crew of the "Miramichi," is a less staff, and I am relieved from the large payment which I had to make to engage this vessel fully equipped and manned.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Does that explain the whole decrease?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not the whole of it, because I have besides dispensed with one of the quarantine officers at the port of Sidney in Cape Breton, who was getting $1,000 a year; and I have dispensed with the services of a matron who was living on the island which is the quarantine station of the port of St. John, practically doing nothing and whose services were not required. I have dispensed with the services of two men at Halifax on board the vessel where, so far as I could make out, they practically did nothing. But if any extra assistance is required at that station, the physician in charge is to employ it by the day, but for years he has not had to have the assistance of these people, and they were practically drawing salaries and doing nothing for them.

Mr. MORRISON. May I ask the Minister with regard to dispensing with the services of the quarantine officer at North Sidney, as to whether there were any charges laid against him, or whether the removal was made for reasons of economy?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No charges whatever were made against him. The chief officer reported to me, after a visit to that port, that the one doctor could perfectly well perform the whole services, and he is willing to do so.

Mr. MORRISON. Am I right in understanding that the senior incumbent was selected?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certainly.

Mr. PRIOR. I would like to ask the Minister whether any changes have been made in the staff of the Williams' Head quarantine hospital, and whether he has made any decrease in the salaries of the staff there.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. When I came to the office I found that there was a caretaker at Williams' Head and another at Albert Head, and as the Albert Head station has been abandoned, that is to say, the buildings have been destroyed, and it is no longer used, I dispensed with the services of the caretaker there. Within the last few days I have received the resignation of one McGregor, who was the caretaker at Williams' Head, and he has been replaced by another at the same salary. The chief officer in charge of the Williams' Head quarantine station has been changed, otherwise I do not think there has been any change in salaries at Williams' Head. There has been necessarily a considerable outlay in the way of building and improvements to the plant and machinery there, but that does not come out of this vote, it is done by the Public Works Department, and will appear in the Public Works vote.

Mr. PRIOR. I wish to impress upon the Minister the necessity of putting that station in the very best condition. I suppose he knows the great danger there is of infectious diseases being brought across in vessels. It may surprise the hon. gentleman to know that during the last year Victoria had the biggest sea-going tonnage of any port in the Dominion of Canada. Now, with these steamers running regularly to China and Japan and bringing in Chinese and Japanese, the danger of infection is considerable. If infection is brought in, it is always from that source, and I would ask the Minister to take particular care of that station and see that infection is kept out. There has also been complaint in the past of inadequate accommodation to cabin passengers. The hon. gentleman has had a report up to the present time, I think, and I wish to call his attention to it and ask him to see that there are more comforts provided for cabin passengers when they are in quarantine.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In consequence of the state of affairs which the hon. gentleman has mentioned I took upon myself this winter to send the chief quarantine officer, Dr. Montizambert, to Victoria to make a special report upon the requirements of that station. He supplied me with a report which dealt with a large number of improvements, the majority of which I have authorized, and I may tell the hon. gentleman that the Public Works Department will, during the next few months, expend probably between $6,000 and $7,000 in improvements at that quarantine station. I ought to say, perhaps, that while making deductions in some expenditures in various ports, I have established a quarantine physician at the port of Vancouver, where I found an increasing number of vessels coming which had not touched or did not pass Victoria, and it was necessary to appoint a permanent physician there. Heretofore that port has been served by a physician who charged a fee to the vessels for examination. That was not consistent with the practice in other ports of the Dominion, and I did not think that the shipping of Vancouver should be charged when the shipping of other ports were not, and therefore I put another official there at a salary of $400 a year, which is about in proportion to the salaries and work of other officers in the other smaller ports. That is an additional charge, and comes within the grant that I have here asked for.

Mr. SPROULE. In connection with these cases that occurred on the vessel which

came into Victoria some time since, and were referred to once before in the House, I had put into my hand a paper containing a report from the medical men on board that vessel, and I will read it so that the Minister may make such explanations as may be necessary in order to disabuse the public mind of the idea of anything being wrong in that service:

We, the undersigned medical men, passengers on board the steamship "Empress of China," wish to submit the following statement of opinion regarding the unprecedented quarantine restrictions which have been imposed upon her passengers. The facts of the case are these: On the 20th of April, ten days ago, two cases of discrete small-pox occurred amongst the steerage passengers. The utmost precautions were at once taken, in accordance with the quarantine regulations, to isolate them. They were placed in a hospital, which was shut off from the rest of the ship and ventilated from the upper deck, two men were isolated, as nurses, with them, and absolutely no communication has been held with the rest of the passengers, all food and other necessaries being passed in to them. Further, these two cases were exceptional, seeing that they came from the same house and were cousins. Every person on board was promptly vaccinated, and everything done that was possible, with the result that no further cases have occurred. On arrival, the quarantine officer ordered sixteen days' strict quarantine on shore, all passengers to be landed, ship and baggage to be disinfected. We wish, further, to call attention to the fact that the quarantine officer never went to see the patients on arrival, and never, indeed, went to see them at all until requested to do so; neither the infected cases nor the steerage passengers were removed until the second day of the arrival at the quarantine station. We wish to give it as our opinion, being, all of us, medical men of some experience, that the medical officer of this station has imposed a quarantine restriction which, under the circumstances of the case, is unprecedented in severity and unjustifiable. A quarantine of five days, making fourteen in all from the first appearance of the disease, would be ample. Further, having, all of us, personally inspected the accommodation on shore, we state as our opinion, that it is absolutely insufficient for the number of persons to be provided for, and that to place on shore for over a fortnight, under such conditions as here exist, a number of persons, many of whom have come straight from the tropics, is a step liable to be attended with the very gravest results.

Quarantine Station, April 28, 1897.

It is said to be signed by seven doctors who were on the vessel. I do not read this for the purpose of complaining as to what has been done, but only to allow the Minister to make such explanations as he thinks are necessary to justify what has been done, or to say why that was done.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I need not go into the whole details of the case, which are already before the public. The "Empress of China" arrived at Victoria, with two small-pox cases on board. Naturally and properly the quarantine officer detained the vessel. He took the precautions indicated by the case, and immediately telegraphed to the department here. We telegraphed to Dr. Montizambert a full statement as to how Dr. Watt proposed to deal with the matter. I may say incidentally that this was a Canadian Pacific Railway steamer. A great effort was made by the company to have the vessel relieved, especially in view of the fact that there was a large number of passengers on board, some of whom were very prominent, and who were very anxious to proceed immediately on their journey. The matter, I repeat, was referred to Dr. Montizambert for an opinion, and he fully endorsed and sustained Dr. Watt's action, stating that what he had decided to do was usual and covered the proper precautions to take. The statement has been made that this was an unusual course to take, a course much more severe than was followed by the United States authorities at adjoining ports. But Dr. Montizambert quoted to me an instance at Port Townsend in the adjoining state of Washington where the United States authorities were much more strict and severe in their quarantine regulations, that a protest was sent to Washington in consequence of the strictness exercised, and that the chief quarantine officer telegraphed back endorsing the local officer and stating that what he had done was correct. Dr. Watt examined the individuals on board that vessel. Finding that certain of them appeared to have been vaccinated properly and showing no sign of disease and that the period of incubation had practically passed, he allowed them to proceed, having thoroughly disinfected the vessel and cleansed it. There were other passengers, however, whom he did not consider showed that vaccination had been properly performed or had taken, and, therefore, he looked upon them as suspicious, and kept them in quarantine at Williams' Head.

Mr. PRIOR. For the full period of incubation.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That his course was fully justified is abundantly proved by the fact that four days ago two of the passengers broke out with small-pox, and two days ago two more of the passengers, thus showing that Dr. Watt had taken the proper course.

Mr. PRIOR. Have any cases occurred among those let out?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No report of cases having occurred among those allowed to proceed has been received, and I do not expect any such report, because Dr. Watt took all the proper precautions, and although great pressure was brought to bear by passengers and others that he would relax the full quarantine regulations, he carried them out so far as was necessary, and the results justify his action and show that he protected the health of the people

of the country, and at the same time allowed certain passengers to proceed.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman has not given an explanation as to why Dr. Watt did not visit the patients to ascertain what was the matter with them. It is strange that where passengers were alleged to be suffering from small-pox or any contagious or infectious disease, the quarantine officer never satisfied himself as to whether that disease prevailed among the passengers or not, which could only be ascertained by visiting them. These seven medical men state that he never looked at the passengers until asked to do so. I am rather surprised at this, because I knew Dr. Watt for some years, though not since he commenced the practice of his profession, and I do not think he is a man who would be lax in the performance of his duty.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Dr. Watt reported to me that he personally examined every person on the ship, and I am satisfied that any statement to the contrary is incorrect.

Mr. SPROULE. That might have been so, but it is said he did not come on the vessel until he was asked to do so.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Dr. Watt reports that he was on the vessel and examined every individual.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not deny that, but the statement is here made :

> On arrival, the quarantine officer ordered sixteen days' strict quarantine on shore, all passengers to be landed, ship and baggage to be disinfected. We wish, further, to call attention to the fact that the quarantine officer never went to see the patients on arrival, and never, indeed, went to see them at all until requested to do so.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot understand that statement. All I know is that the doctor took the necessary precautions, that he examined the vessel and reported to me that he had individually and personally examined every one of the passengers. I have no explanation to make of the newspaper article.

Mr. MORRISON. On a careful perusal of the letter the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) has read, it will be readily seen that there is no categorical statement that Dr. Watt was remiss in any respect in the performance of his duty. The fact is that the steamer came into the Royal Roads flying at the mast head the yellow flag, indicating that small-pox or other infectious disease was on board. Dr. Watt did not proceed with precipitation, not knowing what was wrong, until the usual preliminary steps had been taken. Those people who wrote the letter, and it must be observed that no name is attached to it, were aggrieved at being detained, because they were prevented from connecting with the train at Vancouver and put to a little extra expense, and in their indignation they went to the newspapers. I have read all those letters that have appeared in the Victoria papers, and every one of them is written anonymously, and present in the most vague and fallacious way the state of affairs. So I think that not the slightest credence should be given to correspondence of that kind, and I was very much surprised that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) should have read a letter of that kind, not signed by any body, but simply alleged to have been signed by so many medical men. They may or may not be medical men ; or if they are medical men, they may be medical men of repute or of no repute. So a letter of that kind should not weigh in any respect against the official information before the department, and if I am correct in recollecting the information before the department, it was that Dr. Watt immediately telegraphed for instructions. The hon. gentleman did not proceed headlong in the matter. Why should he ? The vessel was lying in the roads ; he did not allow the passengers to land, and as regards the people on shore, it was quite immaterial whether Dr. Watt was one hour, one day or even one week in visiting the ship so long as communication was cut off from the shore. So there is nothing in the letter to indicate delay or recklessness on the part of Dr. Watt. The letter states that he did no go until he was asked. But there is nothing to show that Dr. Watt was not signalled at once to go on board. I think the Government and Dr. Watt are to be commended on the efficient way the matter has been handled. Apropos of this matter, I must say that I have been reading during the last two or three days San Francisco papers, referring to the stringency and care with which the quarantine regulations are being observed and carried out in Canada, and instituting a comparison between their methods in California and our methods in this country. They deplore the fact, that notwithstanding they have very strict quarantine laws, they were not carried out owing to the conflict between the federal and the state authorities. The paper gave a number of instances of ships which had arrived from Honolulu and the Hawaiian Islands, where actually two days after the ship arrived and the passengers had gone ashore the officers were instructed from Washington to prevent the spread of contagious disease which existed on board. In one case, actually a week had elapsed between the arrival of the ships and the dispersing of the passengers, before instructions had been sent from Washington, superceding those which had been given by the local authorities. The argument was, that so long as the local authorities had concurrent jurisdiction with the federal authorities in matters of that kind, this deplorable state of things would continue. The article in the newspaper put up quite an argument in favour of the Canadian system, and referred in complimentary terms to the

very stringent way in which the quarantine regulations of the Dominion of Canada had been carried out. In a case of this kind, if there was any mistake made, if I should call it a mistake, if there was any error, I am satisfied that Dr. Watt erred on the right side. He could not take too great precaution in this matter. Doctors cannot come in here and try to impress us who are not physicians, with such a statement, as, that there was such and such a partition, or such a space between the steerage, and the cabin, or intermediate passengers. That would be all right if small-pox were only transmitted by contact, but if I am rightly informed, the disease is transmitted in other ways. Therefore it would not suffice to say, that there were such facilities on board that ship, that in the opinion of these people would prevent the spread of this disease if it had been in the steerage. Both the Government and Dr. Watt should be strongly commended for the very efficient manner in which they have handled this case. I do not think we need assume, or that the hon. Minister need assume, that the hon. member for Victoria, B.C., are at all adverse criticising what has been done in this case. I think they are simply actuated by a desire to have these arrangements carried out, perhaps with greater stringency, if that were possible. I think I am safe in assuming, that both the senior member (Mr. Earle) and the junior member (Mr. Prior) for Victoria, are quite in accord with what has been done. I cannot construe any questions they have asked as in any way adverse to the policy adopted by the Government.

Apart from this question, I would ask the Minister, whether he deems it necessary to have a quarantine officer stationed on the Fraser River. That river has settled at its mouth during the greater part of the year, a large colony of fishermen. The town of Steveston during the fishing season, the hot season, contains some five or six thousand inhabitants of all nationalities engaged in and about the fishing industry. There are a great many people at Steveston from the United States, and also a great many foreigners, Japanese, Chinamen, Turks, Arabians, in fact every nationality under the sun is represented in that town in the summer. I am supported by the opinion of the people of the locality, that some extraordinary precautionary measure should be adopted to prevent the spread of contagious disease there. It is even a more important point than Vancouver, because ships with contagious disease going to Vancouver, would first have to run the gauntlet at the Royal Roads, Victoria. I think I am not wrong in saying, that no ship can get into Vancouver except by way of the Fraser River passing Steveston, without first being subject to the supervision of the quarantine officer at Victoria. These are the only two routes by which ships can enter Vancouver. What I submit is, that next after Victoria, the important point at which a quarantine officer should be stationed, is at the mouth of the Fraser River. I would respectfully call the attention of the Minister to that matter, and I trust, that if steps may not be convenient to be taken this season, that next session the matter will receive the most careful consideration of the Minister, as I have no doubt it will, and that if possible a quarantine officer be stationed at that point.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member (Mr. Morrison) expresses his wonder that any member of this House would read such a communication. I do not know why it should be a matter of wonder, nor do I see how it could be out of place for a member to draw the attention of the House to any communication in a respectable paper, with reference to the defects of this or any other quarantine station, when this subject was under discussion. The hon. gentleman is very specific in stating that this criticism was not made by medical men. Well, the communication states: "We are all medical men of more or less experience," and that ought to be definite enough for him. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Morrison) proceeds to ask what do we know about partitions, that could separate those affected with disease from others, and he says that small-pox is communicated in other ways than by actual contact. The less the hon. member says about medicine the better for his reputation. He shows how little he knows of it when he speaks of it. He jumps to the conclusion that Dr. Watt did his duty in every particular. I would like to know, what would be thought of a medical health officer in this country, if when called to see a patient in a house where there was said to be small-pox, he would placard that house without going in to see the patient to know whether there was or was not small-pox in the house.

Mr. MORRISON. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) is in error as to my statement. The officers of this vessel reported to Dr. Watt that there was small-pox on board. Dr. Watt did not require to examine the patients at once, because he was informed by the officers that there was small-pox on board.

Mr. SPROULE. That is where the short-sightedness comes in. It is the duty of every medical health officer to make an examination as to what the disease is, which is reported to him. We know that very often it is reported that a patient has diphtheria, and that when a medical man makes an examination, he finds it is only sore throat.

Mr. MORRISON. The hon. gentleman is misrepresenting what I intended to say. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) evidently does not know that this steamer, in common with every well-regulated steamer, car-

ries a medical man on board. That yellow flag would not have been flying at the mast-head of that steamer, with the medical man on board, unless there was some contagious disease on board. So that whether it was small-pox or cholera or any other contagious disease, Dr. Watt knew that some medical man had discovered disease there, and it was entirely a matter of detail when he should board the ship, so long as it was not near the wharf, and there was no danger of the disease spreading.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman must know that I am not quite so green, after practicing thirty years, as not to know a medical man accompanies such vessels, and what his duties are in case of contagious or infectious disease. That has nothing to do with the duty of the quarantine officer, he as the medical man was not carrying out the regulations without ascertaining of his own knowledge the nature of the disease. The statement here is specific, that the medical man did not go on board this steamer to examine the patients—in fact, did not go on the vessel at all to see them until he was invited to go. Now, I do not want it to be understood that I am criticising severely or wishing to find fault with the Minister of Agriculture. I have read this for the purpose of enabling him to give such explanations as will set the matter right in the public mind if there has been a misapprehension, and I think I was amply justified in reading the letter. But I say the matter does require some explanation, and it would take a good deal more than either the ability or the energy of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Morrision) to convince the public that any medical man had done his duty if he allowed the ship to go in and remain any length of time without ascertaining for himself whether the alleged disease existed or not.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to know from the Minister of Agriculture what has become of that high Chinaman who refused to be examined when the vessel arrived at the port?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He has gone through to New York.

Mr. BERGERON. Was he examined? Did he go through the regulation?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. PRIOR. In regard to the letter which has just been read by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), signed by seven doctors, stating that Dr. Watt had never been to see the patients——

Mr. SPROULE. The letter did not say that he had never seen them, but that he had not visited the vessel when it landed, nor afterwards, until invited to do so.

Mr. PRIOR. I think the Minister should know that before I left Victoria, a very serious complaint was lodged with me against Dr. Watt. It was that when a former ship came into port with a suspected Chinaman on board, he was put into the hospital, and another Chinaman set to watch him; that he was kept there a day and a night, and died during the night, without the doctor ever going near him; that the man who was with him could only make known the Chinaman's death by knocking frantically at the window to the people who passed; that the body was taken away and buried, and that the doctor had never seen the patient from the beginning to the end. That was told to me by a man who must have known the facts. I asked him if he was prepared to swear to that, and he said he was at any time. I told him that it was his duty to send the information to the Minister of Agriculture, but he said he did not want to be drawn into it, because there was some political feeling about the change. I thought it right to mention this to the Minister.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is the first opportunity I have had of hearing anything against Dr. Watt. I shall give him an opportunity of refuting the charge, which I have no doubt he will be able to do.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. As I understand there are some gentlemen who wish to speak on this item, I would ask the hon. leader of the House if he does not think it is time to adjourn.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). If my hon. friend opposite thinks there is going to be a debate on the subject, I certainly cannot refuse his request, as he is usually very reasonable in these matters. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Resolutions to be reported.

REPORT.

Annual Report of the Department of the Interior for the year ending June 30, 1896.—The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton).

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.20 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 13th May, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, a certificate of the election and return of Stanislaus F. Perry, Esq., member for the electoral district of Prince West, P.E.I.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Stanislaus F. Perry, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Prince West, P.E.I., introduced by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) and Mr. Yeo.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 105) to amend the Act respecting the protection of navigable waters.—(Mr. Davies.)

SEED GRAIN DISTRIBUTED IN NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES AND MANITOBA.

Mr. DAVIN asked :

1. What number of farmers in Manitoba and the North-west owe for seed grain sent them by the Government for use on their farms?
2. What number owe for seed grain as bondsmen for other farmers?
3. How much is owed the Government in the former case?
4. How much in the second?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say : 1. 5,384 individuals owe the Government for seed grain. 2. 4,643 individuals are liable as bondsmen for others, 3,439 of these are liable also as principals, and are, therefore, also included in the number who owe for seed grain. 3. $153,602.67. 4. $103,042.94. This amount is, of course, included in the $153,602.67 owed the Government, as the principals owe it, while the bondsmen are only liable for it.

I may add by way of explanation that the majority of those owing for seed grain participated in two or more of the seven distributions which were made. The greater number of the parties liable as bondsmen are liable on more than one bond.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

DUTY ON FARM IMPLEMENTS—COAL OIL IN TANKS.

Mr. DOUGLAS asked :

What will in future be the basis for the imposition of customs duty on farm implements coming from the United States : the retail or the wholesale price ? In the transportation of coal oil, will tank vessels be allowed to all ports and tank cars to all railway points? When will this privilege be accorded to the people?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The two matters referred to in the question of the hon. gentleman are now engaging the attention of the Government. With regard to the question regarding farm implements, representations were made by the hon. gentleman himself and a number of others as to the operation of the present system and the Government are inquiring into the matter brought to their notice.

With regard to the question concerning the carriage of coal oil in tanks, that matter can only be dealt with by an amendment to the Petroleum Act, which will shortly be introduced.

HARBOUR MASTER AT MURRAY HARBOUR, P.E.I.

Mr. MARTIN asked :

1. Who is the harbour master at Murray Harbour, in Prince Edward Island, and what is the date of his appointment?
2. What amount of salary does he receive, and is his salary a fixed one, or is he paid by a percentage on collections as heretofore?
3. If fixed by a percentage or commission on collections, what is the rate?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say : 1. Wm. Miller was appointed 17th June, 1874 under the provisions of the Harbour Master's Act. 2. Mr. Miller is authorized under the terms of the Order in Council appointing him, to receive a salary of $200 from the fees received by him from vessels entering the port during the calendar year, but if no fees are collected by him, the salary will be merely nominal. No fees appear to have been collected by him during the year 1895, and no return has been received for 1896. 3. The Harbour Master's Act provides that harbour masters shall be remunerated solely by fees, and these fees are defined in the 11th section of the Act, and range according to the tonnage of the vessel, from 50 cents to $5. Fees are payable twice in each calendar year, at the first and second ports at which a vessel arrives.

MR. ALF. JURY.

Mr. McMULLEN asked :

Is Alf. Jury, at present taking an active part in the fight for Sunday cars in Toronto, the Alf.

Jury recently appointed emigration agent and supposed to be attending to his duties? Is it with the Government's consent and approval that he is actively engaged in the conflict?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say that I have no knowledge, except what may be gleaned from the Toronto papers, as to any part that is being taken by Mr. Jury in the contest in question. Mr. Jury was given a short leave of absence to return to Toronto for the purpose of preparing his family to leave for Europe, and I have no knowledge of anything that has taken place there in regard to the matter in question except what is reported in the papers. I may say that I have instructed the Deputy Minister to write to Mr. Jury and make inquiries with regard to the alleged fact. It is not with the Government's consent or approval that any officer should neglect his duties for the purpose of taking part in a contest of that kind. In making that statement, I do not wish to be understood as assuming that the Government have any right to interfere with Mr. Jury's opinions or the opinions of any other official. I am only saying that the Government would not approve of Mr. Jury or any other official neglecting his duties for the purpose of taking part in a contest of that kind.

OCEAN SHIPMENT OF CATTLE.

Mr. SPROULE asked:

Has the Government made regulations for the ocean shipment of cattle which provide that a space of not less than 2 feet 8 inches by 8 feet shall be allowed for each head of Canadian cattle and 2 feet 6 inches by 8 feet for each head of United States cattle shipped through a Canadian port? If so, are they aware that such regulations are operating to the disadvantage of Canadian shippers, by the premium offered vessel owners to carry United States cattle instead of Canadian, seeing a larger number can be put in the same space thereby increasing the carrying powers of each vessel when carrying United States cattle?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that the last part of his question is merely an argument. I do not want to take any advantage of that now, but I do not think it is advisable that questions should be put in this form. In reply to his question, so far as it is not an argument, I beg to say: The regulations from the first required Caanadian cattle to have a space of 2 feet 8 inches clear by 8 feet long, no change has been made in these regulations. United States cattle on the upper or spar deck may be carried in spaces of 2 feet 6 inches, but if shipped between decks must be allowed a space of 2 feet 8 inches in width by 8 feet long, except in the case of regular cattle ships with satisfactory ventilation when the space may be 2 feet 6 inches in width. This change was made to enable the Canadian steamship companies to compete with the American steamship companies for the transportation of American cattle. The United States spaces are 2 feet 6 inches on spar deck and 2 feet 8 inches between deck or 2 feet 6 inches where the ventilation is sufficient, and American shippers will not have any other spaces. Hence it was necessary to adopt these spaces for American cattle to give Canadian steamship owners a chance to compete with American lines and divert a share of the transportation of American cattle to Canadian ports.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—DEPUTY SPEAKER AND ELECTIONS.

Mr. BERGERON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to speak a word of personal explanation with regard to something which took place the other day. I see by the newspapers that on Tuesday there was a discussion in the House with regard to the Deputy Speaker's behaviour, and my name was mentioned. The complaint was made that the Deputy Speaker was electioneering during the session, and my hon. friend from Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac) declared that I had gone into his county to take part in an election during the time I was Deputy Speaker. The hon. senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) said that I had not left the House when it was in session. I desire to emphasize that fact and to explain further. I was appointed Deputy Speaker in 1891. There was an election in my own county in 1892, about the beginning of the session of this legislature. The local Conservative member for Beauharnois, who had been elected in March died about one week after the election. An election to fill the vacancy was held in June. I did not leave my duties here, but remained here, and the Liberal member was elected by nearly 900 majority—that is about 700 more than the same Liberal member was elected by the other day.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). It is just as well you did not go.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not know about that; we might have discussed that at the time. I mention the fact to show that I did not leave my duties here during the session to take part in elections. My hon. friend the Premier (Mr. Laurier) said something to which I wish to refer for a moment. Speaking of my having taken part in elections, he said: "It might have been in better taste not to have done it." I was appointed under Sir John A. Macdonald, and when I was appointed I made it a special point that I should be free to go out electioneering as much as I pleased; and I believe that I would not have accepted the position if I had not been left free in that respect. I may say that Sir John Macdonald, and Sir John Thompson also, told me that not only had I the privilege to take part

in elections out of session. but it was my duty to do so, as it was the duty of every politician to work for the success of the representatives of his party. So far as my hon. friend the Premier is concerned, I wish to remind the House that I have his certificate that during my term of office as Deputy Speaker, I always acted with the greatest impartiality.

The PRIME MINISTER. The only remark I have to make in answer to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) is that when we suggested that the present Deputy Speaker should be appointed to that office, we made no bargain at all with him.

THE TARIFF—ADMISSION OF MINING MACHINERY.

Mr. PRIOR. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to elicit some information from the Government with regard to an item of the tariff—item 535, covering the free entry of mining machinery. There seems to me to be a very great deal of misconception in regard to the interpretation of this clause, and I think it is only right that this matter should be laid at rest as soon as possible, as the mining industry, not only in British Columbia, but all over Canada, is showing a great deal of enterprise, and the men who have machinery to be brought want to know at the earliest possible moment what they can bring in free and what they have to pay duty upon. The item reads :

> Machinery of a class exclusively used and required for mining, smelting or refining purposes, and also all materials for the construction of such machinery in Canada, to be free for that purpose—the whole to be subject to regulations to be made by the Controller of Customs.

The other day I spoke to the hon. the Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson) with regard to this matter, and the conclusion I arrived at from his conversation was that there is hardly anything you can bring in free under this clause.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). If my hon. friend (Mr. Prior) would pardon me—I understand that he wants to discuss an item of the tariff. He would be more in order if he waited until the motion was made to go into Supply.

SUPPLY—MINING MACHINERY AND THE TARIFF.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. PRIOR. Having put myself in order, I go on to say that from a conversation I had with the hon. the Controller of Customs, it seems to me there is hardly any machinery used in mining that would come in free because there is comparatively little of it that cannot be used for something else than mining. Take, for instance, the hoisting machinery which represents a large amount in a great mine—that might be used for something else, and therefore would have to pay a duty. Take air compressors, which all these deep mines have to have for running their drills and for ventilation. I was informed by the Controller that he could not say on the spur of the moment, but he thought they would have to pay the duty. Ore cars can be used not only in mining, but in railway work. The Ingersoll drills used in mines can be used for excavations for railways and other purposes. Rock crushers also can be used in connection with railway work. And so with many other things. If the hon. the Controller's ruling is that anything that can be used for any other purpose than mining is not to be introduced free, I do not see how this tariff is going to be of any benefit to the mining industry. The same is true of smelting and refining machinery. I know of one smelting plant which it is contemplated to erect in British Columbia for which there is over 500 tons of machinery ready to be brought in. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) if it is the intention to make the company pay the duty on all that machinery. I am a strong protectionist, I believe in protecting the industries of Canada, and I do not see why the manufacturers of mining machinery should not be protected as well as others. But so long as the machinery is not made in Canada, I do not see why it should not be allowed in free, if the Government believe in that way of bonusing and protecting the mining industry. At any rate, it says in this item that "the whole is to be subject to regulations to be made by the Controller of Customs." I contend that when the tariff was brought down the hon. Controller of Customs should have had these regulations ready, so that as soon as the tariff came into force the mine owners might know exactly what the ruling would be. I would ask him, if he has not got these regulations prepared already, to do so as speedily as possible, so that we may know exactly what class of machinery is to pay duty and what is to be free.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) and I had some little conversation with regard to this matter. The hon. gentleman knows that when the resolutions are laid upon the Table, they go into effect, but that these items are not finally completed until the Tariff Bill is passed. Until that is done, I do not feel that I can make the desired regulations. If questions were coming up for ruling, we would endeavour to give such rulings as we thought would fairly interpret the law. But I have not made any formal regulations.

Mr. PRIOR. How is it with machinery brought in now? Who says what is to be free and what not to be free?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. In case of any doubt, I suppose the case would be referred to Ottawa. I do not know of any references having been made to us so far. It cannot be long before it will be definitely known how this item will read, and then it will be my duty to prepare the regulations, and probably might be able to specify in some way what machinery should be admitted free. It might be in this case, as often occurs in the Customs Department, that special rulings might be asked during the course of years as events transpire. I think there has been no difficulty, so far as I am aware, up to the present time. I think the hon. gentleman will not have to wait long before the tariff receives the final sanction of the House and becomes law, when I will endeavour to frame resolutions as alluded to just now. The hon. gentleman asked if I had made regulations yet; I have not, for the reason I have mentioned.

Mr. TAYLOR. Might I inquire from the Minister of Finance when he proposes proceeding with the tariff resolutions. The manufacturers, as well as the merchants, are in the same state of uncertainty as before as to what the tariff is to be, and business is practically at a standstill. I think that in place of dealing with the Estimates that we had before us yesterday, and are to have again to-day, the Government should settle the uncertainty that is existing in the minds of manufacturers and business men as to what the tariff is finally to be. I think the Minister should say whether he proposes to go on to-day or to-morrow, or some day soon, so that we may get the matter disposed of, and the people may know what their fate is going to be.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Answering the hon. gentleman's last remark first, I may say that we have no anticipation of being able to proceed to-day or to-morrow; but I quite appreciate that it is desirable that we should at a very early day have the resolutions before the House in such a form that we can proceed with them. I hope the hon. gentleman will agree with me when I say that there has been no unusual delay in this matter. The time which has elapsed since the moving of the resolutions and the present moment is not an unusual time. If I may add another word on that point, it is this: That if there is any delay, and any further delays are to be given, it is because the business men, whom we are always pleased to meet, are exceedingly anxious, not that we should proceed, but that we should permit them to be heard, and possibly we err in hearing too many. However, we desire as far as possible to meet all the gentlemen who have views to present, and any delay that may have occurred up to the present time, and any further delay, if there should be any, will arise almost entirely from that fact. Now, permit me to say a word with regard to the point that was raised by my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Prior) in relation to mining machinery, in addition to what has been said by the Controller of Customs. In the old tariff the item read that mining machinery of a class not made in Canada might be admitted free. I believe there was considerable difficulty in applying that rule, owing to the uncertainty at times as to what was properly regarded as mining machinery not made in Canada; and I am advised that the customs authorities had some difficulty, and that the mining people had some reason to complain, or at all events, they did complain, of the indefiniteness of that item. We hoped to improve it, whether we succeeded or not, by adopting a different form of words. I have to admit, however, that since then we have been informed by gentlemen interested in mining enterprises, that there is still some vagueness and indefiniteness about the item which is proposed, and they are very anxious that we should agree, if possible, upon a specified list of articles, saying exactly, so far as possible, what machinery should be admitted free, and what machinery should be dutiable. We are having interviews with gentlemen interested with regard to that point, and it may be that we shall be able to make such a specified list as to remove the uncertainty which to some extent has existed in the past, and which, I have to admit, exists in the item as it now reads in the tariff resolutions.

Mr. FOSTER. The point raised by my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Prior) is an important one, and I do not think my friend the Controller of Customs met it in a very business-like way, if he will allow me to say that by way of criticism. My hon. friend introduced here three weeks or more ago a tariff, and from the very moment that he introduced that tariff it was law. It was law and has been acted upon, presumably, certainly under the customs proceedings and proceeding of Parliament from confederation up, acted upon the very moment that it left the lips of the Finance Minister and was declared before this House. Now, my hon. friend had, as one clause of that tariff, that mining machinery was to be free, whatever was used exclusively in the mines, or it was worded in something like that way. Yet three weeks afterwards my hon. friend stands up in the House and states in his place that he has not issued any directions to his officers; states in the next place, that he does not know whether any difficulties are taking place or not, that is, that he does not know how his officers are acting with reference to that item in the tariff; and, in the third place, he pleads for delay on the ground that it has not yet

been passed upon officially, and is therefore not an Act of Parliament, and he is not called upon to issue his instructions or to make his regulations, which amounts to the same thing. I think the House will see in a moment that it is not a business stand to take, nor is it the legal stand to take. Mining machinery is coming into this country. If it is not coming into this country free of duty, at least mining men, corporations and individuals are arranging for the purchase of mining machinery, they are considering as to whether they should purchase it in the United States or purchase it in Canada. If any of it is coming in, it is brought to the different custom-houses along the line, and the customs officer is allowing it in under some interpretation. What is the interpretation? My hon. friend who is at the head of that department sits here at his seat in Ottawa and does not know, three weeks after that became law, whether there is any trouble or not, and has not issued any instructions at all to his officers. When he is asked for definite instructions, he says: Well, I don't think I ought to make definite instructions until this becomes law; it is not law yet. Why, the preference clause, the duties with reference to Great Britain, became law the very moment they were enunciated in this House; so did all the other clauses, and so did this. Does not my hon. friend know that the very moment he introduced that mining clause, he demoralized the business of Canadian foundries and makers of mining machinery utterly, so far as mining machinery for Canada was concerned? I venture to state to my hon. friend that not one single concern has been able to conclude any important piece of business with reference to mining machinery from the moment that was promulgated up to the present time. Why? Because those who operate mines in British Columbia, especially, know that if their mining machinery comes in free, they will get it from the United States, and will not pay the heavy freights from the east to that part of the country. He knows that; and I think every member of the House has possibly received representations from mining machinery manufacturers, drawing their attention to the injustice of the clause, and stating that it is impossible for them, under that clause, to engage in competition with machinery from the United States. After my hon. friend's proclamation three weeks ago, the ground was taken all through British Columbia that mining machinery is to be free, and many were the jubilations of mining men there under the impression that mining machinery was to be free. Under that proclamation, I say, he has paralyzed the business of mining machinery manufacturers all through Canada, and yet he has not issued instructions. Evidently somebody has asked him a question, and the Finance Minister has found out at last that there is to be trouble under that wording, and that there seems to be indefiniteness, and now they are reconsidering, after they have made the tariff. These gentlemen, a Cabinet of business men, were not going around the country to find out what ought to be done, they knew what ought to be done, but afterwards thought it would be better, at least for form's sake, to go about the country a little and listen to the people, and then when they came back there would be no more deputations, they had investigated, they were making up their minds, they had made up their minds that was the end of it, no clerical mistakes, no emendations of the tariff; business men had decided it, and it was decided. Three weeks afterwards, on so simple a clause as mining machinery, the Finance Minister gets up and naively says, oh, so naively, that he finds there are a few difficulties yet, and that probably they will have to go to work and specify every single article of machinery. They will have a pretty long specification, as hon. gentlemen know who have dealt with the Customs Department in the past, and as hon. gentlemen will know who are dealing with it now. Is it not strange that a Cabinet of business men should have framed a tariff and yet have allowed three weeks to elapse without pressing one item to a conclusion; and all the time they have been investigating, showing their utter distrust of themselves and this House, and asking for representations to be made and deputations and delegations to wait upon them, declaring that they were not overwise and that they were willing to be taught. Yes, they learn wisdom when the actualities of office fall upon them. It often occurs that a man is far more wise before he attains office than when he is in office. Hon. gentlemen brought down the tariff three weeks ago, and yet they are not ready to press it at this date. The position of the country is just as uncertain to-day as it was before the tariff was brought down, in almost all important particulars. Hon. gentlemen have admitted that they have found claims that should be considered and that a great many changes may be necessary, and that the business men are talking matters over with them; and it is high time for the business men to talk with them. That is very wise; it would have been better if hon. gentlemen had talked more with the business men before they brought the tariff. No Government will bring down a tariff or pass a tariff without having had such interviews before or after or both, because the opinions of the business men are highly important and the tariff is made for the business men. So hon. gentlemen are not infallible, but they are worse, for they thought they were infallible when they brought down the tariff, and yet they complain that they are pestered to death with recommendations. They know there are faults, and glaring faults, in the tariff

brought down, but although it was submitted three weeks ago the Government has not placed one item before the House to have it definitely settled and enacted into a clause of the Tariff Bill. When is this going to end; when are hon. gentlemen opposite going to get up courage enough to issue the regulations, to let up on the great mining and manufacturing industries and tell them the conditions under which they will have to work? Will it be necessary to wait another three weeks? I beg hon. gentlemen opposite to come to a conclusion, and not to sit there lazily and helplessly, and acknowledge that three weeks after they brought in the tariff they do not know what it means and dare not submit to the House any of its provisions.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman somewhat contradicted himself when in one breath he described the Government as being lifeless, and in another breath, as being pestered to death.

Mr. FOSTER. Many a lazy man is pestered.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I think the hon. gentleman has been giving the House a leaf out of his own past history. I am reminded that I have already spoken, but I may be pardoned if I make a remark. The general instructions have gone out to the custom-house officers who are bound under the instructions always given in relation to the tariff, namely, that all entries made in the meantime are taken subject to amendments of duties. The hon. gentleman knows that it is the invariable rule, that it must be followed. Those instructions have gone out, and no difficulty has arisen, nor can I believe when the hon. gentleman pictures business as at a standstill, he has any ground for saying so, and at all events, I have not yet discovered it.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) has called attention to the fact that three weeks have elapsed since the tariff was introduced, and that up to the present time the Finance Minister has not made known to the House the extent of the changes that may possibly have to be made.

Mr. BERGERON. It is a clerical error.

Mr. McMULLEN. Allow me to remind the ex-Finance Minister that in 1894 he introduced his tariff on March 27th, and it continued under consideration up to July 12th. Yet the hon. gentleman rises and charges the Government with delay, although up to the present time only three weeks have elapsed, while the hon. gentleman himself took twelve or fourteen weeks to complete his tariff. The ex-Finance Minister evidently thinks that the people have made a very great mistake in removing him from the distinguished position of Finance Minister of this country, and placing my hon. friend in the position he now occupies. When the hon. member for York rises to address the House he is evidently under the impression that when his hat is on the best financial brains in this House is covered. He has criticised the Government at a time when they are labouring honestly and earnestly to bring about a revision of the tariff, and to undo what the hon. gentleman and his friends took eighteen years to do, they built up a system of protection that strikes at the resources of the people, and gives to certain classes advantages, which they are trying at the present time to retain. If the ex-Finance Minister will cultivate a little patience there will be a nice, neat and satisfactory tariff adopted, and this will be done in a shorter period than that occupied with the consideration of the tariff in 1894.

Motion agreed, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Salaries and contingencies of organized districts, and Public Health in other districts $50,000

Mr. PRIOR. Before this item passes I wish to say a few words in regard to the quarantine station in British Columbia. Last night I made some remarks, and I think I gave the Minister of Agriculture a little information he had not received before. I told him of a case that had been reported to me before I left Victoria, of a Chinaman who had been afflicted with small-pox, put in the hospital and died there. The hon. gentleman clearly showed that he doubted very much the authenticity of my information, and in so many words he declared it was scarcely possible, because there had been no report of the same made to him. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman received a report or not, but I do know as a positive fact that he received a bill for a coffin, which is pretty good evidence of it. The fact is that the man was afflicted with small-pox, was taken to the hospital and died there. The charge was made to me,—I do not know whether it is true or not—but the man who gave me the information said he was willing to take affidavit as to the fact, that the doctor never saw the man from the time the ship went into quarantine. I do not want to make any charge against Dr. Watt, who may be a very good man; but if he never went near that individual when he was afflicted with that dreadful sickness and never reported the case to his department, it shows that he is not a fit officer for the position.

He may be a very good man, but anyhow, the results of his superintendence of that quarantine station have not proved at all satisfactory. Since Dr. Watt took charge, three ships, I believe, have come in flying the yellow flag, with small-pox on board. One was the ship "Victoria" from which

this man was taken off and died. He was the only one afflicted with the disease on board, but all the crew and passengers were taken off and put in quarantine. After the ship was fumigated, a new crew of longshoremen was engaged in Victoria, and the ship proceeded to Tacoma. In a short time after that numerous cases of small-pox appeared in Tacoma, Fort Townshend and Victoria. The spread of the disease was traced to some of these men who have been engaged to act as a temporary crew, and who had come across the Sound and spread small-pox. Now, whether that ship was properly fumigated or not remains to be proved, but anyhow the result was, that small-pox was brought into these towns. I may say, that at the time, no newspapers on either side of politics, and no business men said a word about it, because experience in years gone by had taught us, that when small-pox was known to exist in a town, that town was isolated and business suffered.

Last night the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) read a letter stating that seven doctors had made charges against Dr. Watt, as to his not seeing patients who were supposed to be inflicted with small-pox on board ship. What I have stated to the hon. Minister (Mr. Fisher) rather bears out that letter, and there may be some truth in what these doctors have said. One would be led to believe from what we hear, that Dr. Watt seems to be afraid to do his duty; he seems to be afraid to go near these patients. I cannot see any other reason why he does not attend to them, if it is not that he is afraid.

Whilst I am on this subject I wish to say a few words in regard to the reasons why Dr. Watt was placed in that position. His predecessor was Dr. George Duncan, and any one who has met that gentleman must say, that he was a first-class man for the position. I do not believe, that the Minister of Agriculture can show that Dr. Duncan ever did anything wrong as superintendent of the quarantine station, but that on the contrary, he always carried out his duties in a proper manner, to the satisfaction of the department and to the satisfaction of Dr. Montizambert who was his chief. I may say, that whilst the Conservative party was in power, both the Minister of Agriculture (Dr. Montague) and the Deputy Minister were very much pleased indeed with the manner in which he carried out his duties. But, Sir, to make place for Dr. Watt, Dr. Duncan was dismissed. Why was he dismissed? What was the cause? Was it because he did not attend to his duties properly as quarantine officer? I say, Sir, it was nothing of the sort. I telegraphed to the Minister of Agriculture asking why Dr. Duncan had been dismissed, and this is the letter I received in reply:

Dear Sir,—In reply to your telegram of yesterday, the Order in Council dismissing Dr. George Duncan recites the facts in connection with his allowing a suspect to leave the isolation hospital in Victoria,——

Not the quarantine hospital at Williams' Head, bear in mind.

—and goes on to say, that the Minister is accordingly of opinion that, in the public interest, Dr. Duncan should no longer retain the position, and therefore, recommends that his services should be dispensed with.

Yours truly,

SYDNEY FISHER.

Now, Sir, Dr. Duncan while acting as superintendent of the quarantine station at Williams' Head for the Dominion Government, was also health officer for the city of Victoria, and it seems that on the 20th June a medical man of that city came to Dr. Duncan as health officer, and reported to him that he had a suspicious case like small-pox in charge. Dr. Duncan went to see the man, and told Dr. Hall that he believed it was chicken-pox and not small-pox, but not knowing where this man had been to get the infection, he said he would take him to the isolation hospital and detain him during the proper period for the incubation of the disease. Dr. Duncan did so, and not only did he take this particular patient, but he also took three suspects who had been in contact with him, and put them all into the isolation hospital. He put this patient into a clean room, gave him lots of pure air, disinfected the three suspects thoroughly by fumigation and baths, and gave them clean clothes. On the 23rd June, that being election day, one of these suspects asked Dr. Duncan to allow him to go down and vote, and Dr. Duncan having disinfected him thoroughly and given him clean clothes, which had not been in contact with anybody, allowed him to go out of the hospital. He also allowed the caretaker, Mr. Heathorn, to go down to vote, and as the other two suspected persons did not wish to vote they therefore did not go. Presumably, Dr. Duncan was dismissed from this position because he allowed two men out of the hospital who voted for my worthy colleague (Mr. Earle) and myself. Well, Sir, here are the affidavits from these two men. The first one is:

I, Arthur Heathorn, of the city of Victoria, in the province of British Columbia, do solemnly declare:

1. That I was employed as outside caretaker at the Isolation Hospital, in the city of Victoria, on the 23rd day of June, 1896;

2. That I begged for, and received, permission from Dr. Geo. Duncan, medical health officer, to go and record my vote at the late election and remain as scrutineer, on condition that I found a competent and reliable substitute;

3. That such substitute I found, and I paid him out of my own funds;

4. That I had not been exposed to infection at all during the period of my employment at the said Isolation Hospital;

5. That I voted for Messrs. Earle and Prior.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath, and by virtue of "The Canada Evidence Act, 1893."

(Sgd.) ARTHUR HEATHORN.

Declared before me, at Victoria, this 28th day of September, 1896.

(Sgd.) F. MACRAE,
Police Magistrate, city of Victoria.

The next affidavit is from Frank E. Murton, and is as follows :—

I, Frank E. Murton, of the city of Victoria, in the province of British Columbia, letter carrier, do solemnly declare :

1. That I was detained as a suspect in a doubtful case of what I believe was chicken-pox, at the Isolation Hospital, in the city of Victoria, during the month of June last ;

2. That, on entering the hospital grounds, my clothing and person were thoroughly fumigated and disinfected, and that I did not thereafter at all come in contact with any infected person ;

3. That I obtained permission from the medical health officer to go out and record my vote at the election on the 23rd day of the said month of June ;

4. That I voted for Dr. Milne and Mr. Templeman.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath, and by virtue of "The Canada Evidence Act, 1893."

(Sgd.) FRANK E. MURTON.

Declared before me, at Victoria, B.C., this 28th day of September, A.D. 1896.

(Sgd.) F. MACRAE,
Police Magistrate, city of Victoria.

Now, Sir, I call particular attention of the House to the fact, that it afterwards turned out that the case was one of chicken-pox and not small-pox at all. I also call attention to the fact that Mr. Frank E. Murton voted for Dr. Milne and Mr. Templeman who were the opponents of myself and my colleague in that election. These are copies, and the original affidavits are in the Agricultural Department, I believe, in possession of the hon. Minister. Now, Sir, there is another telegram which bears on this case and which I will read to the House. It is as follows :—

Victoria, B.C., Sept. 26, 1896.

To Hon. Sydney Fisher, Ottawa.

No authenticated case of small-pox has occurred in Victoria or vicinity during the month of June, 1896.

That telegram is signed by Dr. J. C. Davie, a well-known doctor in Victoria. As I have said, the case was chicken-pox and nothing else, and Dr. Duncan was quite within his rights as health officer of the city of Victoria to allow these men to go out and vote. I appeal to any medical man in this House or out of it, as to whether there was any liability of contagion from these two men going out of the hospital under the circumstances.

Not only that, but I contend that the matter was altogether outside of the jurisdiction of the Minister of Agriculture. Dr. Duncan was acting as health officer in Victoria, and that alone, and if the civic authorities had thought he was to blame, I would not have a word to say ; but what are the facts of the case ? The matter was brought up before the council, and after an investigation Dr. Duncan was cleared ; and not only that, but the mayors of the town for the two preceding years stated that in their opinion Dr. Duncan had not exceeded his authority, and had done nothing against the safety of the town. Now, when we had a good man like Dr. Duncan, it seems to me that it was almost an outrage for the Minister of Agriculture to dismiss him on such a flimsy excuse. We have seen hundreds of dismissals since the 25th of June, for any conceivable excuse ; but here was a man who gave the greatest satisfaction to every one brought in contact with him. The steamships on the one hand and the civic authorities on the other hand were perfectly satisfied with him, and I challenge the hon. gentleman to show me in what respect he did not do his duty.

Mr. McINNES. The hon. gentleman says the civic authorities were perfectly satisfied with the conduct of Dr. Duncan as health officer of the city. I would like to ask him if it is not a fact that he applied to be reinstated in that position, and that the civic authorities did not entertain his application ?

Mr. PRIOR. The hon. gentleman asks me if they were not satisfied ? They had an investigation, and the majority of the council, with the mayor, acquitted him——

Mr. McINNES. Did they not refuse to accept his application ?

Some hon. MEMERS. Order.

Mr. PRIOR. To show the esteem in which Dr. Duncan was held, he has been appointed to the position of secretary of the provincial board of health, to look after the health of the whole province. I said that the steamship companies were satisfied with him. Here is a copy of a telegram which was sent to the hon. Minister of Agriculture at Ottawa :

During the time Dr. G. H. Duncan has been superintendent of quarantine, the duties have been satisfactorily discharged, and no delay or other inconvenience has occurred to the steamers of our respective lines. We, therefore, have every confidence in him and respectfully recommend him as in every way competent to discharge the duties of the office, and hope the Government will continue him in the position permanently.

This is signed by the agents of the Pacific Coast Steamship Company, the Oregon Asiatic Steamship Company, the Northern Pacific Steamship Company, and the Northern Pacific Railway Company. I have very

little more to say about this matter. I do think that in all fairness Dr. Duncan might have been allowed a chance to vindicate himself. Instead of that, he was never asked to show any reason for what he had done. He was simply notified by the Department of Agriculture on a certain day that his services would be dispensed with, and that he was to hand over the quarantine service to his successor. If the hon. Minister had known as much about the case as he knows now, I do not believe he would have consented to the dismissal.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). In reply to the remarks of the hon. member, I think an explanation is due. In the first place, the facts as recited by the hon. gentleman are about correct. The facts are these, in short: Dr. Duncan was at that time the city health officer as well as the quarantine officer at Williams' Head. The doctor attending this case declared in an affidavit that it was a case of small-pox, and appealed to Dr. Duncan, as city health officer; and Dr. Duncan, by virtue of his position as such, had the patient, along with two suspects, put in the isolation hospital, because he believed it to be dangerous to the health of the city to allow them to be at large.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not quite understand the hon. Minister. I understand that the facts have been correctly stated by my hon. friend, and he states that the case was one of chicken-pox, but supposed to be small-pox, whereas the hon. Minister is treating it as a case of small-pox.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It was a case of small-pox by the sworn affidavit of the physician who attended it before and after this occurred.

Mr. PRIOR. The hon. Minister knows perfectly well that it did not turn out to be a case of small-pox. I know, as a matter of fact, that the man was vaccinated, and he had a typical arm, which showed that it was not a case of small-pox.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. At the time the suspects were put into the hospital it was considered a case of small-pox, and nobody at that time pretended that it was not.

Mr. PRIOR. Dr. Duncan did.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Then why did he put them into the hospital and keep them there? Because he considered that it was necessary to the public health of the city that they should be put in. When polling day came he was appealed to, to allow this suspect out, and he gave him permission to go out. The hon. gentleman said that he was disinfected or fumigated the day he was let out.

Mr. PRIOR. The suspect swears he was.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He does not. He says that when he came into the hospital he was, but not just before he went out, and there is no proof that he was. The caretaker of the hospital swears that so far as he knows he was not disinfected on that day. The hon. gentleman is confusing two dates. When the suspect came into the hospital he was disinfected and was given new clothes; but before he went out on the day of voting he was not, and he does not say he was, and the caretaker of the hospital distinctly states that to his knowledge he was not. The man had been in the isolation hospital for some time. He was attended upon by the same man who attended upon the small-pox patients; and yet this man was allowed to go out for the purpose of voting, and then came back to the hospital and continued to be isolated. If it was safe for him to go out to vote, what reason or justification had Dr. Duncan for continuing him in the hospital afterwards? It was very evident that Dr. Duncan believed that it was necessary for him to stay in isolation, that the period of danger had not passed, and that this was an exceptional privilege allowed to the man, to go out on voting day for the purpose of recording his vote. I did not care how he voted, or for what particular reason he went out. The question of politics did not enter into the matter at all. As a matter of fact, until the statements of these men came to me, that one had voted on one side, and the other on the other side, I did not know or care which way they voted. But Dr. Duncan, as an officer of my department, occupying the responsible position of city health officer, had placed this man in isolation because he considered it necessary to the public health of the city, had allowed him to go out for a certain purpose on a certain day for a few hours without disinfection, and had then put him back to continue his isolation afterwards. If it was safe to the public health to allow the man to go out, he ought to have been allowed to continue out. Dr. Duncan had no excuse whatever for keeping him there: he ought to have given him a free exit from the hospital without requiring him to return at all.

Mr. PRIOR. I may say that I know as a fact that Dr. Duncan would have let him remain out altogether, but that the mayor asked him kindly to keep him in until the full period of incubation had passed.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Then, according to the hon. gentleman, Dr. Duncan, the physician in charge, who was responsible, allowed the mayor to run things. I do not want such an officer as that in charge of the health of the Dominion. My reason for the dismissal of Dr. Duncan was simply this, and I think the hon. gentleman's statement now completely justifies his dismissal, that judging by his conduct in this case, I would not feel safe in continuing him

in charge of the British Columbia quarantine station. If on voting day he permitted a man whose exit, by his own act, he believed to be dangerous to the public health, to go out and mix freely among the people in a public place such as a polling booth, there could be no confidence in his administration. He might equally be influenced by other reasons, by reasons of personal friendship, by particular regard for a friend who was in port, by particular regard for the feelings of individuals, or for the convenience of large corporations who might ask that their employees should not be detained in quarantine, as often happens when the ships of great steamship lines come to our ports, to relax the quarantine regulations. There could be no safety in leaving such a gentleman in charge, there could be no guarantee that a gentleman who would act as Dr. Duncan did on that occasion would not be equally yielding on other occasions and endanger the public health. Under the circumstances, I considered Dr. Duncan not a safe man to trust with the health of the whole Pacific coast. I may say that the position he occupied is that of the health officer in charge of the Pacific station. The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) has spoken about what has occurred since the dismissal of Dr. Duncan. He says that several vessels arrived there, that a good deal of care was required, that Dr. Watt had exercised firmness and done his best for the health of the neighbourhood.

Mr. PRIOR. With very poor results.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That remains to be seen. So far the hon. gentleman has shown no evidence that the administration of Dr. Watt has resulted in bringing any disease into the country. Under the circumstances, I think I was perfectly justified in removing Dr. Duncan, who had been guilty of the remissness and lack of judgment I have described, out of consideration for certain interests or from whatever other motive may have actuated him.

I wish to say a word or two with regard to the hon. gentleman's remarks about Dr. Watt. He said that three vessels floating the yellow flag had arrived at Victoria since Dr. Watt's appointment. I may say that I have no report in the department that there has been any case of small-pox traced to any individual whom Dr. Watt permitted to pass the quarantine. The hon. gentleman has stated that a certain vessel was disinfected and a new crew engaged, and that since the engagement of the new crew, small-pox has broken out in two or three cities in the province of British Columbia and has been traced to that crew. There is no report or complaint of anything of the kind in the department. When there is, I will have the matter investigated. The hon. gentleman has no doubt spoken from some knowledge given him by others, hearsay knowledge or newspaper reports; but I am not prepared to accept such reports as an accusation against the department of which I have charge. If any information be given to the department of any such remissness or anything that might indicate remissness, I shall only be too glad to have it carefully investigated and reported upon. The hon. gentleman spoke also of the death of a certain Chinaman from small-pox. In the department there is no record of such a death, although, as the hon. gentleman rightly says, there is a charge for a coffin. But the officer in charge has not made his official report with regard to any of those steamers yet. The hon. gentleman spoke last night of a case which occurred quite recently on board the "Empress of China." I have telegraphed Dr. Watt to give me the full details of that case, and I shall ask him to give full details and report of the other cases to which the hon. gentleman has alluded, and I shall be very glad when I get that report—which I trust will be by return mail—to give him full information. I cannot accept any statements, which are not made on the hon. gentleman's personal knowledge, as an accusation against my department. Of course, if he states, of his own personal knowledge, that anything of this kind has occurred, I shall accept his statement and have an investigation, but as to hearsay statements and newspaper reports, I cannot accept them as evidence. But I may say that while a number of people told me, at the time of Dr. Duncan's dismissal, that they considered him perfectly competent for the position, I have yet to receive any information which would lead me to believe that Dr. Watt is not perfectly competent. On the contrary, he was strongly recommended to me, not only by people in British Columbia but by people in Eastern Canada, who had known him in his college days and in the earlier part of his practice; and I may say that Dr. Montizambert, the chief quarantine officer of the Dominion, who went to Victoria, at my request, since Dr. Watt's installation, came back with a very favourable report of his capacity. He said he had full confidence in Dr. Watt's ability to carry on the work of the station there, responsible and difficult as it is, owing to the constant communication between that port and China and Japan, from which countries there is probably more danger of disease than from European countries.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I cannot help thinking that the hon. Minister of Agriculture has, in this matter, made a very grave and unfortunate blunder. I do not say that the hon. gentleman did not act according to the light he had or according to what he believed to be right, but I am quite certain that there is no medical man in this House or out of it who will say that the ground he has alleged for the dismissal of an able and painstaking officer,

as he admits Dr. Duncan was, from the position of quarantine officer of the port. was justified. Every medical man knows that there is a certain stage at which a doubt arises as to whether the disease is going to be small-pox or chicken-pox. Every medical man is quite aware that there is a certain period when it is very difficult to say whether a case will in twenty-four hours prove to be small-pox or simply chicken-pox, which is a comparatively harmless disease. It appears that Dr. Duncan, in the exercise of that great caution which a quarantine officer is bound to exercise, where there is a possible doubt as to what the result may be, put the parties subject to this doubt in quarantine. Having done so, and the disease not having developed, several days after, when it had become quite evident to Dr. Duncan that there was no danger whatever of small-pox, so much so that he was prepared to release the whole of the party, he allowed two of these persons, all of whom had been disinfected and fumigated when they went into the hospital, to go out for a short time on polling day. Dr. Duncan's observations in the matter warranted him in arriving at the conclusion that the disease was not small-pox. He had arrived at that conclusion from his own observation and experience, he considered that there was no danger whatever, and he allowed these parties to go out. The hon. Minister, finding he has not a leg to stand upon, finding no justification whatever for the dismissal of a competent officer who discharged his duties efficiently and against whom no charge whatever was made, suddenly seized on a ground he had never heard of before as a sufficient cause for dismissal. The mayor of the city was not willing that these parties should be discharged without spending a few days more in quarantine, and, as he yielded to the authority of the chief officer of the city, the hon. Minister says that that is quite sufficient reason for his dismissal. He finds that the ground upon which he dismissed Dr. Duncan slips from under his feet, that it affords no reason whatever to justify the course he has taken in striking at a professional man occupying, and deservedly occupying, a high place in his profession, and with an experience which proves his fitness to discharge the duties of the position he occupied under the Government, and he takes another ground that is equally untenable. The hon. Minister must not forget that the ground upon which he dismissed this gentleman related to a matter with which he had nothing whatever to do. It was as health officer of the city of Victoria that this matter came in charge of Dr. Duncan. This gentleman, as I understand, occupied the position of quarantine officer, and as such was amenable to the Minister of Agriculture; but the hon. Minister of Agriculture has nothing to do with the manner in which Dr. Duncan discharged his duties as health officer of the city of Victoria. He discharged his duty as quarantine officer with great ability, with great, with extra, caution. But his dismissal is justified now on the ground that he respected the authority of the head of the city of Victoria under whom he served as health officer. Why, Sir, I think the position the hon. Minister takes, he himself must regard as one he could hardly offer to this House as any justification for the course he has taken.

But the consequence of the hon. Minister's action seem to have been deplorable. This is another case in which the haste to provide places for supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite ends in disaster to the people of the country. Yesterday we had a lamentable case of the destruction of public property through putting incompetent persons in place of officers who were reliable and careful. To-day we have an infinitely worse case. We have a charge brought against this new officer, this gentleman who is thrust into a position made vacant by depriving a professional man of high character and standing, who had faithfully and ably discharged the duties of his office. Can a more horrible thing be presented for the consideration of this House than the allegation that that quarantine officer took a man who was suffering from small-pox, locked him up and left him without medical attendance. My hon. friend (Mr. Landerkin) is a member of the profession. I ask him what he would say of a medical man who would take a man suffering from small-pox and have him locked up in a room and refuse to see him or to afford relief for his sufferings. The hon. Minister of Agriculture says that the case comes to him as a surprise, that he has not had the evidence, that the only proof he has of the death of this unfortunate man, locked up with small-pox and denied aid and medical relief by the man appointed and paid by this country to fulfil that duty, is that the department has had to pay for a coffin for this individual. I trust that that will be sufficient evidence to him that a death has occurred. And, after the statement made by my hon. friend from Victoria that so dreadful a thing has occurred in this civilized country through the conduct of one of the hon. Minister's officials, holding a high and important position, I trust that the hon. Minister will feel it his duty to investigate the case to the bottom. I say more—I say that if the facts as stated to the House by my hon. friend from Victoria are sustained, it will be the duty of the hon. Minister of Agriculture not only to discharge Dr. Watt from the position he has shown himself so utterly incompetent to fill, but to call the attention of the legal authorities in British Columbia to the question of how a medical man should be dealt with who allows a man to die under these circumstances without of-

fering him that relief he is bound as a professional man and as an officer of the Department of Agriculture to offer.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the Minister of Agriculture laid down a novel rule in this case, the rule that although a man, when appointed to one position is discharging his duties in that position faithfully and well to the satisfaction of those to whom he is responsible and to all concerned, because he happens to do what others think is not right in some other office, that is a reason why he should be dismissed from the office whose duties he discharges satisfactorily. I do not think that that rule would be admitted in any other department of life. If a man is engaged or appointed to do work his performance of that work is the criterion by which he should be judged, and if he does his work satisfactorily and well, he ought to be retained in the position. I can see some strong grounds for Dr. Duncan acting as he did in the capacity of health officer of the city of Victoria. He is called in perhaps to take charge of patients who have been under another medical man's care. That other medical man has given the opinion that the case is one of small-pox. Dr Duncan does not agree with this opinion, but, as the medical counsel for the city, he feels bound to exercise very great care. For that reason, although, in his own opinion, it is not necessary, he isolates these men for the time during which incubation is taking place, when it will become plain to medical men whether it is a case of chicken-pox or a case of small-pox. On further examination, he is satisfied that it is not a case of small-pox, and therefore he allows these men to go out for a time. He does this feeling satisfied that there is no risk to the public health. And because he has done so in his capacity as city health officer, and under these circumstances, that is held to be sufficient cause why he should be considered unfit to perform the duties he was appointed to do in connection with his other office. I do not think that rule is sound, and I am quite sure that the hon. Minister, on further consideration, will agree with that himself.

Mr. McINNES. I agree thoroughly with what the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) has said with regard to the high character of Dr. Duncan. I regard him as a friend, and all those who have the pleasure of his acquaintance will heartily agree that personally and professionally he is a gentleman of very high standing. It was for this reason that I was very sorry to hear, after the election, that he had taken the extreme part he did in that election; and it is for this reason also that I am sorry that the hon. member for Victoria, though posing as a friend of Dr. Duncan has seen fit to give greater notoriety to a part of the doctor's career which, I am sure, the doctor himself would heartily wish that he could blot out. Now, the facts have been very clearly stated by the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher). There is no necessity to deal with this matter from a political standpoint. There are acts known to the public that altogether warrant the hon. Minister in acting as he did, without entering into a consideration of the offensive partisan act which Dr. Duncan undoubtedly committed. There is no question that there were two suspects in the isolation station at Victoria, and that Dr. Duncan at the time that he was quarantine officer of that district, allowed these two suspects out. It may be that they had undergone some fumigation and disinfection; but he let them out to mingle among other men, and to go into crowded parts of the city to the polls, unguarded by any guardian, but with distinct instructions to return to the isolation hospital again. Now, the point which occurs to the popular mind is, why in the world was it necessary for Dr. Duncan to give such explicit instructions for these two suspects to return to the station. If they were free from danger after they had undergone fumigation, then they were free from the liabilities of giving the disease, and they might as well have stayed out. But Dr. Duncan himself knew that there was danger in letting these men out, and it was for that reason that he was most specific in his orders to these men to go to the polls and to hurry back again to the station.

But if this matter is to be dealt with from a political standpoint, then there are some questions in connection with the doctor's conduct on that very day which I think would amply warrant the Minister of Agriculture in dismissing him. One case is quite notorious in British Columbia, it is a matter of common notoriety, and it is this: The sanitary officer of the city of Victoria, who was under the directions of Dr. Duncan when he was acting as health officer, was sent out by the doctor at two o'clock in the morning, to a place called Souke, some thirty miles away from the city, presumably to look after a leper case which had been supposed to have been discovered there. His orders were most peremptory, they were most sudden. This man was ordered out at two o'clock in the morning to go thirty miles out of the city, to look after that leper. Now, as a matter of fact there was no leper, there never was a leper there, the whole thing was a cock-and-bull story, and when this man went out to Souke, as you might suppose, all sort of fun was made about it. There are no Chinamen there at all, and Chinamen are the only lepers that we have in that province. But the man came back, I do not know whether he had an opportunity of recording his vote or not; but the point is, that this sanitary officer, Mr. Chipchase, is a very strong Liberal, well known throughout the district as a Liberal,

and there can be no doubt at all about the fact that Dr. Duncan, abusing the authority which he had over that man in his capacity as health officer, wished to get that man out of the city on the day of the election.

Now, hon. gentlemen opposite have discussed this matter without a knowledge of the facts, and it reminds me of the discussion which occurred in this House a few days ago with regard to the dismissal of Mrs. McManus, when we saw the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Quinn) rushing down to defend her on the supposition that she was a strong Irish Catholic, calling upon the Solicitor General to defend those of that creed and of that race. But he found out afterwards——

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think the hon. gentleman has a right to refer to a previous debate.

Mr. QUINN. I beg to call the hon. gentleman to order, in the first place, for referring to a matter which was a subject of another debate; and secondly, as making a misrepresentation of what was stated by me at that time. I never said that the widow McManus was a Roman Catholic, I never took that position, never dreamed of inquiring whether she was a Roman Catholic or a Protestant. But I simply took the position I did as a matter of justice, and in vindication of what I considered was the rights of a woman who had been very much wronged.

Mr. McINNES. Mr. Chairman, I well remember, and I can never forget, how the hon. gentleman from Montreal rushed down into the front seat from the back seat where he usually sits and called out to the Solicitor General to come forward and defend an Irish Catholic, when, as a matter of fact, he said afterwards he had found out that this man was an Orangeman.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have reminded the hon. gentleman that he has no right to refer to a previous debate. Now that he has answered the hon. member for Montreal, we must consider the incident closed.

Mr. QUINN. I wish again to state——

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. I do not think it would be well now to discuss that matter. I have given the hon. gentleman an occasion to deny the statement of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. McInnes).

Mr. QUINN. But the hon. gentleman has not accepted the explanation that I made; on the contrary, he has persisted in making a wrong statement of what I said, and I ask to have the point of order sustained.

Mr. McINNES. I am not surprised, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. gentleman does not want this subject discussed after the extraordinary exhibition that he made of himself on that occasion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has made a statement which has been denied by the hon. member for Montreal, and I suppose he will accept the denial which has been made.

Mr. McINNES. If he denies it, of course I accept his denial. However, Sir, to take up the thread of the argument again, I contend that hon. gentlemen opposite have discussed this matter without any knowledge of the facts, as indeed they have discussed many other matters in the past. For instance, they have made a great deal out of the supposed fact that this man was suffering from chicken-pox and not small-pox. Now, as a matter of fact one month after the case was concluded, Dr. Hall, an eminent physician in the city of Victoria, made a sworn affidavit and sent it to the Minister of Agriculture, that that man did suffer from small-pox and not chicken-pox. Now, the hon. member for Victoria knows that there is no sworn statement to the contrary.

Mr. PRIOR. I appeal to the evidence of Dr. J. C. Davey, who is as good an authority as there is in Canada.

Mr. McINNES. Is that statement before the Minister of Agriculture?

Mr. PRIOR. Yes.

Mr. McINNES. One month after that man had recovered, Dr. Hall made a sworn statement and sent it in to the Minister of Agriculture, that it was a case of small-pox and not a case of chicken-pox. Now, the hon. member for Victoria has gone out of his way to discredit the conduct of Dr. Watt since he took office. He made a most disparaging and damaging statement, that during that period a Chinese small-pox patient at the quarantine station had been completely neglected by the doctor in charge. Now, that statement is very similar to some other statements which he has made here, being a matter of hearsay altogether. He did not give any authority for his statement to this House, although he said that the party who told him was prepared to make an affidavit to that effect.

Mr. PRIOR. Yes.

Mr. McINNES. Well, Sir, affidavits from some people are of very little value. I think I am familiar with the people of Victoria, and if the hon. gentleman will do this House the justice, and do Dr. Watt the justice, to give the name of his informant, then I might be able to give an estimate of its value, and what he states might have some weight in the eyes of the House or it might not. If he does not do so, we can only come to the conclusion that

the party from whom he gets his information is not a party who would lend a great deal of weight to the statement which he recklessly makes. I have only this to say in conclusion, that all reports I have heard with regard to Dr. Watt's conduct in the serious and trying cases which have come before him of late, have shown him to be an efficient officer of the highest merit; and whatever may have been thought at the time of his appointment as to his ability to fill that position by his opponents and traducers, one thing is certain, that since he has been brought into contact with his duties, he has performed them uniformly in a manner that is in the highest degree satisfactory to the people of British Columbia.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman asked us that we should deal with the facts, and now let us see what the facts are. It is a fact, so far as the records show, that an order was given for a coffin to bury somebody. It is supposed there must have been a corpse, and it was at the quarantine station. But there is no record in the department to show that a death had taken place. A death must have taken place there, or they would not have wanted to bury a corpse, and the department would not have been called on to pay the expense. The next fact must be apparent or assumed: Either the quarantine health officer was there or not; at all events, he never reported the death, but gave an order for a coffin. What explanation has the hon. gentleman to make as to these facts? Who is to blame for this when he allows that to go on? This is the fourth month that has elapsed, and yet there is no information in the department except an order for a coffin in which to bury some one.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The quarantine officers do not make monthly reports of what occurs at their stations. They make reports at the end of the year. No doubt when the report of this station comes down the deaths, if there have been any, will be recorded. I have asked Dr. Watt to give me a report of these cases, because there has been so much talk in regard to them. But I think it very unfair to an officer in Dr. Watt's position that an hon. member should speak from pure hearsay in regard to his conduct, without any proof being adduced and without assuming any responsibility. In justice to any official, I think it is unfair that an hon. gentleman should make the statement that has been made, and not be prepared to state his authority and take the responsibility.

Mr. PRIOR. I am prepared to take the responsibility.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Then I suppose the hon. gentleman has personal knowledge that Dr. Watt placed a small-pox patient in a room in the hospital and did not visit him until that patient's death.

Mr. PRIOR. That is absurd. A member cannot have personal knowledge of everything brought before him, but when the information is given him by responsible and credible persons that should be sufficient.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). The hon. gentleman will see that if he makes a charge of this kind, and he states that his information is obtained from a responsible party, he should in justice give my hon. friend the Minister the name of the party. That is reasonable and fair in a case like this. This, of course, could not be insisted on in all cases; but this is a very grave matter, and when such a charge is brought forward the authority should be stated.

Mr. PRIOR. I am willing to give the name to the hon. Minister privately, but not until I hear from the gentleman, will I be prepared to give his name publicly. I acknowledge that this is a serious charge, and I brought it up so that the Minister might have it investigated, not from any personal feeling but for the safety of the public in general.

Mr. DAVIN. Have the papers ordered by this House in regard to changes in the quarantine regulations and also in the personnel, been brought down?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think they are ready in the department. I will lay them on the Table at once.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is it not a fact that the hon. Minister has dispensed with the services of one of the quarantine officers for the harbour of Sydney, Cape Breton? I so understood from the remarks made by the hon. gentleman last night, when I was out of the House. If I understand the position it is this. Dr. Johnston, who was physician at North Sydney, and whose duty it was to board vessels coming into the port of Sydney, has been removed, and Dr. McLeod, who lives at Sydney and whose duty was mainly to attend at the quarantine hospital, which is located two or three miles from the residence of Dr. McLeod, has been transferred from Sydney to North Sydney. I should like to know from the Minister why this change has been made. Sydney is a very important port, and anything that would render the quarantine service of less security to the public health would be a great mistake, and I hope that before the Minister made the change, which I understand has been made, he instituted full inquiries into the necessity of that service being properly maintained for the port of Sydney. Dr. McLeod, residing in the town of Sydney and within two or three miles of the quarantine hospital, was not located in a convenient place to meet the requirements of the boarding of vessels when they came

to the port, and in consequence of that and of the necessity of having the physician who attended the hospital reside near the hospital, an officer was appointed for North Sydney, which is fifteen miles by land from Sydney and from the quarantine hospital. An officer located at a place convenient for the boarding of vessels when they were prepared to enter the port, would not be suitably located to attend to patients in the quarantine hospital. That is the reason why the previous Government appointed two officers and found it necessary to retain them. I should like to know from the Minister the grounds on which he dispensed with one of those officers under those circumstances. I may say that by water the distance between Sydney and the quarantine hospital is only two or three miles, while by land it is between twelve and fifteen miles. In the same way the distance by water from Sydney, where Dr. McLeod resided, to the quarantine hospital is about two miles, while the distance by land is about four miles. The distance between the residence of the doctor at Sydney and the point at which vessels were required to stop until they were examined by a medical officer, is between seven and eight miles from Sydney, or between five and six miles from the quarantine hospital. Under these circumstances it was considered necessary that the two officers should be appointed and retained. It was also considered that the expense was not large in view of the importance of Sydney. I may say to the Minister for his information that Sydney is one of the principal ports of Canada as regards shipping. Upwards of three-quarters of a million tons of shipping, largely foreign, enter the port yearly, and it is threrefore of the greatest importance that the quarantine service should be kept intact. I do not think the action of the Minister in dispensing with the services of this officer is a wise move, keeping in view all the facts.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I shall have to repeat the explanation I gave last night when the item was up and this question arose. There were two medical officers, one at Sydney and the other at North Sydney. North Sydney is really nearer the anchorage ground where the vessels come in, than is Sydney. Dr. McLeod is the senior officer, and he resided at Sydney, and Dr. Johnston was the junior officer, and he resided at North Sydney. Last fall I sent Dr. Montizambert, the chief quarantine officer to that port, where he had never been before, to examine into the situation, because I was rather surprised to find two officers at that port, when there was no other port in the whole Dominion that required two officers, except the important station at Grosse Isle. Dr. Montizambert reported to me, that Dr. McLeod was quite ready to do the whole work, to remove to North Sydney which was more convenient than was Sydney, and that the services of Dr. Johnston could be perfectly well dispensed with, without any injury to the service or to the management of the work there. Under these circumstances, I felt that in the interests of public economy it was my duty to dispense with the services of Dr. Johnston. I did so a little while ago, giving him leave of absence, and allowing his salary to go on until the end of the fiscal year for which it was provided, but not providing for his salary for the year beginning the 1st of July next. As far as the quarantine hospital is concerned, the hon. member (Mr. McDougall) knows well, that it is on a point in the harbour, between Sydney and North Sydney, and that both these places are about equally distant by water from it. The quarantine hospital is only used when vessels come in and when the physician in charge orders the patients or the crews to be taken to it. It is quite easily accessible by boat from North Sydney, and I do not anticipate the slightest difficulty, and I am sure there will be no difficulty in regard to the patients from a vessel reaching the hospital, quite as easily from North Sydney, as from Sydney, although by the land route it is further around

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is it not a fact, Mr. Chairman, that the point at which the vessels come to anchor until they are boarded by the physician, is some two miles further out of the port than North Sydney, the nearest point on that side of the harbour to where the quarantine hospital is, making the distance between five and six miles to the quarantine hospital from the point at which the vessel comes to anchor ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. And it is seven or eight miles from Sydney, where Dr. McLeod used to live. The place where the doctor is now going to live, is near the anchorage ground, and nearer the hospital, and therefore more convenient for the work.

Mr. McDOUGALL. But it is not as near to the point where these vessels come to anchor as where Dr. Johnston resided.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Dr. McLeod is going to reside where Dr. Johnston resided.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Oh, no !

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Excuse me, Dr. McLeod will remove to North Sydney.

Mr. McDOUGALL. But Dr. Johnston is not residing at North Sydney. He is residing at Sydney Mines, just at a point right opposite where these vessels come to anchor, and he has only a few steps from his office to the shore, where he can take the boat to board the vessels. In the case of a very heavy storm he might take a steamer from North Sydney to go on board the vessels, but

in a great many cases it was more convenient for him to take a boat right from his own door. It would therefore not delay the vessel at all. As it is now, Dr. McLeod is to reside in the town of North Sydney, and has to go two miles to board a vessel, so that the doctor at North Sydney town is not in as convenient a place for the shipping as where Dr. Johnston has resided.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). I would ask whether it was not at North Sydney that the quarantine doctor before Dr. Johnston resided ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. Yes, the late Dr. Macpherson resided at North Sydney.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). That is where Dr. McLeod now is.

Mr. DAVIN. Does not the quarantine officer make a report to the department of the disposition of the cases ? Suppose there are any deaths, will not he report to the department what is done ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will answer that question in a moment.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I wish to ask the Minister, whether or not, there has been any change during the last year in the officer at the quarantine station at the port of Halifax ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The officer in charge is still the same. There was a caretaker and an assistant whose services were dispensed with. The caretaker was replaced but the assistant was not. Dr. Wickwire, who was in charge there, is authorized to employed assistants if he finds it necessary, and to pay them by the day. I dispensed with the man who was employed the year round.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have had no communication with the officer, but I have seen some reference to the matter in the public press. For what reason was the caretaker dismissed, and a new caretaker appointed in his place ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I received information that the caretaker had taken an active part in the elections, was offensive to the Liberal party there, and on that ground I dismissed him.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the hon. Minister inform me, in what respect the part which the caretaker took in the election was offensive ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The affidavits which were sent me were to the effect, speaking from memory, that he had frequented a certain house on the shore opposite the island where the committee work of the hon. gentleman's party was being carried on ; that he had used offensive language to certain Liberals who had been at the polls, and that he had shown himself a partisan in an offensive manner. I cannot remember the exact details of the affidavit, but that is about the effect.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course it would be impossible to expect that the hon. Minister would remember all the details, but I would like to ask further, whether any opportunity was given to the caretaker to show cause against these charges.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) supplied me the information, and told me he had investigated the charge, and that he was convinced of the truth of it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have to ask another question, whether the hon. Minister is prepared to state that my hon. colleague from Halifax (Mr. Russell) afforded the caretaker an opportunity of answering the charges ? If the duties of the hon. Minister are to be performed by my colleague from Halifax, I presume that he (Mr. Russell) would do what the Minister, it seems to me, should have done ; that is, to give to this caretaker an opportunity of showing whether the charges were true or false, of defending himself against them, and of making any answer he might have to make. That is no more than the worst criminal in our courts is permitted to do by the law of the land.

Mr. RUSSELL. I could not very well hear all that my learned colleague (Mr. Borden) said, but I fancy he was making a reference to the dismissal of the caretaker at Lawlor's Island. This caretaker did not have any more opportunity, I believe, of having his case heard than in the case of the dismissals that were made by the Conservative Government. My own impression is that a man ought to have an opportunity of having the charges against him heard, but the evidence that was given to me in his case seemed to be so absolutely conclusive that I did not think it was requisite to go through the formality of an investigation. I sent to the Minister of Agriculture the affidavit which was placed in my hands by persons who gave their personal assurance that the party who made the affidavit was a perfectly reliable person, and that he was not seeking office for himself or for any of his friends ; and they themselves pledged their own personal belief in and knowledge of the charges made against the keeper of the quarantine station. The time this was done was a time when the practice of the departments with regard to dismissals from office was not thoroughly understood. Some were acting on the assumption that a statement made by a representative was quite sufficient in such cases. I myself thought that was the proper position. Others were acting in more deliberate ways—ways that were certainly not known before in this country, and that were not pursued by the late Government for eighteen years. If the hon.

gentleman wants to go into the general question of dismissals from office. I can give him a great deal of information; but I do not suppose this is the proper time to enter into a general discussion of that question. I can only say that I was perfectly convinced that I was justified in sending the papers to the department. I told Mr. Devlin, who came to see me shortly afterwards, that if any mistake had been made in his case, I would assist him in getting any inquiry he wanted, or an opportunity of placing his case before the department. He was very well satisfied with what I had done in respect to the matter, and I see no particular reason for not adhering to what I suggested at that time. If any mistake has been made in this case, I am quite satisfied that he should have an inquiry and be reinstated if injustice has been done to him. Of course, very ridiculous stories have been circulated in the papers in regard to his manner of exit from the quarantine station. I know that Mr. Devlin was dealt with in a far more considerate way than those officials of the Mackenzie Government who were dismissed after the Conservative Government came into power in 1878. I do not for a single moment say that I recommend these precedents as proper precedents to be acted upon. For my part, I would prefer that they should not be. There are so many of them that it would weary the House if I gave them to hon. gentlemen opposite, and I will not do so unless it may be necessary.

Mr. BORDEN. So far as further information is concerned, I am not aware that I would shrink from asking for information on this question because of any information my hon. friend may have. I had no communication at all with this caretaker who was dismissed; but I did see a statement in the papers about his dismissal, and I believe there was a somewhat harsh construction put on the action of the department. It appears now that this man had no opportunity of saying anything until after judgment had been pronounced against him, when he was offered the opportunity of opening up the judgment. It seems to me, notwithstanding what my hon. friend has stated, that it would be only fair that before he was dismissed he should have been called upon to show cause against the charges made against him. So far as the record of the Conservative Government is concerned, I may say that in a great many instances, to my personal knowledge—I do not intend to speak exhaustively about it—men who were Liberals by profession and by active practice were not dismissed from office at all during the Conservative regime; and, in making that statement, so far as I am concerned, I refer to only two counties in the province of Nova Scotia of which I have some personal knowledge. One of these is the county of King's, my native county, and the other is the county of Halifax, of which I have the honour of being one of the members. I know that in these counties, a great many Liberals who held office did take an active part in politics, and I know they were not disturbed. If a new principle is laid down by this Government, well and good. They have the power to lay it down, and it must be submitted to. But I would venture to think that what was suggested by the hon. leader of the Government last session as the proper course ought to be carried out in all cases. I think there should be some investigation by the department or by some commissioner appointed for the purpose. If that is not done, the members who recommend a dismissal should either have personal knowledge of the facts themselves, or should make that investigation on behalf of the department; and even when that is done, I think the officer against whom the charge is laid has only the barest justice done him. That course does not seem to have been followed in this case, and I regret that it has not. It may be that this man is guilty of the charge that has been made against him. All I have to say is that if he is guilty, he has not had the opportunity which every man has in the courts of this country of answering to the charge.

Mr. DAVIN. I have not had an answer to the question I asked as to what disposal is made of the cases dealt with at a quarantine station.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have had no reports yet of any such cases. My deputy informs me that it has been unusual to make a report.

Mr. DAVIN. What time after the quarantine has been closed has it been usual to make the report?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I really cannot tell the hon. gentleman. I will try to find out and give him the information.

Mr. PRIOR. Can the hon. Minister say whether there have been any further cases of small-pox developed at Williams' Head?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. A report has come from Dr. Watt that among the steerage passengers from China two cases had broken out, and two days afterwards two more had occurred.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I regret that I was not in the House when the question of the removal of the quarantine officer at Sydney Mines was under consideration. While I was in office a vacancy occurred, owing to the lamented death of the gentleman who held the position of quarantine officer of the port, and also physician to the quarantine hospital; and, in conjunction with my colleague, I recommended the appointment of Dr. McLeod to the office of physician to the quarantine hospital, and

Dr. Johnston to the position of quarantine officer to the shipping, for the purpose of examining vessels arriving at the port. I need not tell the committee that the port of Sydney is one where there is a very large tonnage, and where a great number of vessels arrive. We thought it very desirable that while the physician to the quarantine hospital should be near the hospital at North Sydney, the officer who was charged with the duty of performing quarantine service at the port should be as near as possible to the point where these vessels arrived. Consequently we appointed Dr. McLeod physician of the quarantine hospital, and Dr. Johnson, a very able physician of high standing and large experience, to look after the quarantine service at a point very near where the vessels arrive. Dr. Johnson is not only an eminent member of the profession, but a grandson of one of the most distinguished men that ever adorned Nova Scotia, the late Hon. Judge Johnson, at one time the Premier of that province. I do not mention that as any additional reason why he should be retained in office, but I think that even the hon. gentlemen who now administer the affairs of the country ought not to consider that any reason for the unnecessary removal from office of a gentleman of very high standing in his profession and so situated as to be able to perform the duties more promptly and efficiently than they could be performed by anybody else differently situated. I might mention, at the same time, that Dr. Johnson is the son-in-law of a gentleman to whom the Liberal party are deeply indebted, a gentleman who has long been the manager of the Sydney Mines, and has for a long period given very strong support to hon. gentlemen opposite. I therefore regret very much that the hon. gentleman should have seen fit to dismiss a worthy officer, and one whose position was such as to enable him to discharge the duties of the office much more promptly and efficiently than could be done by an officer at North Sydney. I do not suppose this matter is likely to be reconsidered, but I would have been very glad if I had had the opportunity of presenting to the hon. Minister my views why this gentleman should not have been discharged.

We have had so many statements made in this House by hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches as to the grounds for dismissal that I was rather astonished a few moments ago to hear the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) claim that this Government were entitled to great consideration because they had decided to oppose the removal from office of any person, without preliminary investigations into all the facts and circumstances. I think that hon. gentleman could hardly have been in his place yesterday when a member of the Government announced the fact that he thought the Opposition ought to be very gratified because the Government had only dismissed 45 out of 170 officials in one district. And I think that hon. gentleman could scarcely have been in the House when an hon. member of this House informed us that the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) had handed him the list of a large number of employees in his own district and had given him a carte-blanche to dismiss these and appoint his friends in their places without any question of investigation or charge whatever. The House will learn with some surprise that the hon. member for Halifax should be under the impression that this Government made any pretense now of having any investigation or inquiry, or in fact giving the slightest attention to the grounds on which people are dismissed from office. An hon. Minister of the Crown stated on the floor of Parliament yesterday that he had instructed his officials to remove from office promptly any persons who had been guilty of active partisanship or participation in an election. Therefore, any official who, in the most quiet and peaceable manner went to the polls and recorded his vote is, under the principle laid down by a Minister of the Crown yesterday, liable to dismissal, because that Minister has instructed his subordinates to dismiss all such people from office.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). The hon. gentleman must be in error.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not at all. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals yesterday read, in reply to a question, his reply to the House, in which he stated that he had instructed Mr. Thompson that it was sufficient cause for removal if parties had been shown to have been guilty of active partisanship or participation in elections.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am quite sure that my hon. friend could not clearly have apprehended what the Minister of Railways and Canals said. He referred to active participation.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, he said active partisanship or participation.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I was present on the occasion and I must remind the hon. gentleman that my hon. colleague called attention to the fact that there had been a traffic in offices at the time, and that instances were brought to his notice of transactions in which offices had been bought and sold, and it was in that connection that he used the words "active partisanship" and, I believe, "active participation," but certainly he did not refer to the mere act of voting.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have the answer here. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals read this statement from a typewritten copy to the House.

Before selecting the staff for the current year, I gave explicit instructions to the superintendent of the canal, Mr. Thompson (as I did to other superintendents) that he was to take up the list of the employees of last year and give to persons on that list the preference who had given satisfaction in the past, and who had not made themselves obnoxious by active partisanship or participation in the last general election.

So that he meant either active partisanship or—separated by a disjunctive conjunction—participation. The words will admit no other construction. The hon. gentleman laid down the grounds for dismissal, one of which is active partisanship and another is participation of any kind.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. So that construed by the plainest principles of construction, every man, however quietly he discharged what he conceived to be his duty of polling his vote, is under the ban of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and the hon. Minister's subordinates are instructed to discharge them from the service. The hon. Minister gave authority to his superintendent, not to investigate the case, but wherever they, in their wisdom, think a person is open to charge of participation at all, they are to dismiss him from the public service.

But let me call the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to a far stronger case. A member of this House, in the hearing of the hon. gentleman, if, as I presume, he was in his place, made the declaration that this same Minister, the Minister of Railways and Canals, handed him a list of 20 employees in his district and gave him carte-blanche to dismiss the whole of them and put his own friends in their places, without any rhyme or reason whatever. The statement was made by the hon. member for Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Frost), and I will read it to the House. That hon. gentleman on the 6th of May, said :

I know that on the Rideau Canal, where there were over twenty-two officials suspended last fall, when the Minister himself gave me a list, and I could put any official in that I liked——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FROST. Certainly I could ; I had that privilege.

The hon. gentleman took credit before the House for the fact that although he was given carte-blanche to dismiss twenty officials and put his own friends in their places, he had not dismissed one of them. The power of dismissal is enjoyed not only by members of the present Government without investigation of any kind whatever, but they instruct their officials simply to discharge men for participation in the late election and not allow them to remain in the public service. And now the hon. gentleman says that he had carte-blanche to cut off twenty of these officers and put his friends in their places.

Mr. LISTER. Ever since the House met in March last, hon. gentlemen on the other side have been constantly finding fault with the Government for what they are pleased to term universal dismissal of public officials. I say, that so far as the Government is concerned, they have nothing to answer for in this matter to the Opposition. Out of thousands of officials in the employ of the Government from one end of the country to the other, very few have been dismissed. Hon. gentlemen opposite pose as the friends of the employees of the Government, pretend to be their champions in this House and out of it. I can only say that if the Government had acted as many men would act, and as hon. gentlemen opposite themselves did act when they attained office in 1878, a much larger proportion of the officials would have been dismissed than have been dismissed. Why, what does the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) raise such a fuss about ? Why does he fume over these so-called dismissals of the canal employees ? He knows perfectly well that these men are not permanent officials ; he knows perfectly well that they are employed for the season only, and that when the season closes their engagements closes——

Mr. McGREGOR. The same as a sailor.

Mr. LISTER. The same as a sailor, as my hon. friend (Mr. McGregor) remarks. It is perfectly competent for the Government to dismiss these men, because they have no tenure. The letters my hon. friend refers to were letters written recommending certain appointments which the head of the Government had a right to regard and pay attention to. When it comes to employing men who have no fixed tenure, surely the Government have the right to say : We will have our friends rather than our enemies upon these works. That is but natural. Why should the Government be called upon to repel attacks made upon them day after day by hon. gentlemen opposite upon these grounds ? Look at the record of that party, look at the record of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) himself. Did he hesitate, when he took office in 1878, flushed with victory, to discharge officials by the hundred from one end of the country to the other ? The slightest excuse was sufficient for the decapitation of those engaged in the service of the country.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The very reverse.

Mr. LISTER. Sir, that these hon. gentlemen have educated the officials of this country to the belief that it was a part of their duty, the duty for which they were paid, to take an active part in politics. And

when we say that if they do this they must take the consequences of their acts, hon. gentlemen opposite rise and try to excite public feeling in the country by saying that we are introducing the spoils system into Canada. There is not one man on this side of the House who would for a single moment think of adopting the spoils system. We stand up for purifying the public service of the country, we hold that the public servants of Canada must be taught that now and for all time, no matter whether hon. gentlemen opposite may be in power or not, public officials must discharge their duties to the public and leave politics alone, or lose their positions. I believe that the lesson which has been taught by the acts of the Government will have a salutary effect, and that in the future we shall not have the spectacle of officials of this Government being the principal committee men of the parties to which they belong. The hon. gentleman tries to make the country believe that we are revolutionary in what we are doing. Why, Sir, he is no friend of the officials of this country, for, if we had not such a Government as we have, if we had not men in power with the strong sense of justice possessed by the members of the present Government, not only a few, but many of the civil servants of this country would have been dismissed on account of the appeals made by the leader of the Opposition and his friends behind him. Let us consider the grounds of that attack. During the past years, in order to promote their friends' interest, they have not hesitated to superannuate civil servants who were well able to discharge their duties. William Henry Griffin was an old well-tried servant of this country, having served in different capacities for fifty years. What did hon. gentlemen opposite do?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. How old was he?

Mr. LISTER. He is alive to-day and as active as the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition—aye, and more so. They went to Mr. Griffin and proposed to him that if he would consent to retirement he should have six months' leave of absence, he should have his superannuation allowance and the Government would pay him $5,000 in cash. There is no question about the accuracy of the statement I make as to that, for there is an Order in Council showing that it was adopted by the Government. And the sum of $5,000 was proposed in the Estimates, to carry out the bargain made with Mr. Griffin. Sir, they withdrew the item of $5,000, and they did not give him his six months' leave of absence. They did not carry out their part of the contract made with this man, but they retired him in order that a friend of their own might be promoted to his place. Then, take the case of Mr. Vankoughnet, a man in the prime of life. What did they do in his case? They superannuated Mr. Vankoughnet against his will—a capable efficient officer against whom nothing could be said—for the purpose of putting a friend of their own in the office he had filled, saddling the country with the superannuation allowance in addition to the cost of the salary of the new Deputy Minister. Then we have the case of Mr. Zachariah Wilson, who was collector of customs here. They superannuated Mr. Wilson to make a place for their friend Mr. Batson. Mr. Wilson is alive and active to-day, and Mr. Batson is dead. Mr. Wilson was as well qualified to fill the place as Mr. Batson because they were of the same age. And so I might go on and show almost innumerable cases in which hon. gentlemen opposite did not hesitate to dismiss men in the civil service who were quite able to perform their duties, in order that they might put into their places friends of their own. And, Sir, it is well known throughout the length and breadth of the country, that if an official stood in their way, if it was necessary, in their judgment that he should be removed, they removed him in order that they might put a friend in his place. It comes with bad grace from hon. gentlemen opposite to be constantly prating about the spoils system and about the dismissal of this man or that. The hon. gentleman works himself up into a fury about these poor men on the canal. He knows these men are only hired for the season, he knows that it is perfectly competent for the Minister at the head of that department to employ other men if he thinks proper. These men have no claim, they have done the work, and they have been paid, and it becomes the duty of the head of the department, at the opening of navigation next year, to hire a certain number of men again. I am told by my hon. friend beside me that none of the men in either of the ridings adjoining this city, have been changed, but if they have been changed, the Government would be perfectly justified in doing so. I can only repeat what I said once before, that the Government throughout this whole matter have acted with remarkable moderation. Sir, if hon. gentlemen opposite were in our places, after having been in opposition for eighteen years, and after we had filled the offices up with our friends, what a slaughter of innocents would have taken place. Sir, I think it is about time that hon. gentlemen should stop this——

Mr. LANDERKIN. Crying.

Mr. LISTER. "Crying," as my hon. friend says, in this Chamber. The Government have done their duty, they can defend every act of theirs, their followers can defend it, and the only fault we have to find with the Government is that they have not made more dismissals.

Mr. McCLEARY. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat would make

this House believe that the officials referred to by the leader of the Opposition were men who were only hired by the month or by the day, that they had no claim upon the Government, and consequently they are not permanent officers of the civil service. The hon. gentleman knows, if he knows anything at all about the employees referred to, that they had been working for the Government for fifteen or eighteen years, and their positions were never put in question. These men have built up for themselves little homes, expecting that so long as they behaved themselves and did their work properly, they would be retained in their positions.

Mr. LISTER. So they would.

Mr. McCLEARY. Well, they have behaved themselves. But notwithstanding that the hon. gentleman would put up this bluff upon us to-day, and tell us we are crying too much about it, I want to give him notice that later on we will talk a little more about officials being dismissed, but it is nearly six o'clock now.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman feels a deep sympathy for these men that have been dismissed. He probably feels as deep a sympathy as he does for himself. He has been engaged, I understand, for ten or fifteen years supplying lumber to the Government at his own figures, without tender.

Mr. McCLEARY. I fling back into the teeth of the hon. gentleman the insinuation he makes. I say he is stating what is absolutely an untruth.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. McCLEARY. If that is unparliamentary, I will say that he is stating what is contrary to the facts, and in his usual way of braggadocio he wants to try to scare a new member of Parliament, but he will not succeed. I do not propose to be sat upon in that way.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I rise to the question of order. I say that the hon. member for Lambton has flung across the floor of this House a charge which, if true, is insulting to the hon. member. The hon. member has declared that that statement is untrue, and I say the hon. gentleman opposite is bound by the rules of the House to take back that statement.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. A statement has been made by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) which has been denied by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. McCleary). I suppose the hon. member for Lambton has no objection to accept the denial.

Mr. LISTER. In obedience to the rules of the House.

Mr. McCLEARY.

It being Six o'clock, the Committee rose for recess.

After Recess.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether the officer that visited Cape Breton in connection with quarantine matters, put himself in communication with the two officers that were in charge of the quarantine station there, and if so, after conferring with those officers, did he make a report to the Minister recommending the doing away of that one office?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Dr. Montizambert, the chief quarantine officer, certainly did put himself in communication with the doctor in charge of the said quarantine. Whether he saw Dr. Johnson, I could not say. He made me a report recommending what I have done.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Would the Minister be good enough to lay the report on the Table of the House.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The report was a verbal report.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) who spoke just before six o'clock, when a criticism was going on based entirely upon what was germane to the Minister's Estimates, raised the whole question as to the relative dismissals of civil servants under the two regimes, and is therefore responsible for any extended remarks that may have to be made with reference to that question. The hon. member for Lambton is as well able as any one on that side to take up the whole field of that kind of literature, and make the most that can be made out of it for his party. That has been one of his forts for a long time past, and in that kind of warfare he played a very prominent, if not a very distinguished, part during the last four or five years. It is quite fair to believe, therefore, that when he took up the argument as he did this afternoon, and made a statement as to the dismissals under the preceding Government, he exhausted all the cases which he had at hand, and which could be brought up. His argument was chiefly strong in assertion, but in the actual cases he produced there were only, I think, some three or four or five which he gave as examples of the practice which he alleged was almost universal under the late Government, of dismissing officials who were Liberal in their tendencies. Well, he was not very fortunate in those he brought up. I think every one of the gentlemen whose cases he instanced, with, perhaps, one exception, were cases where Liberals were not superannuated at all, but where gentlemen who were friends of the Administration, and who were of the same line of thought with the Administration, were superannuated and

for cause. The instance which he brought up of Mr. Griffin, the late Deputy Postmaster General, was that of a friend of the Administration, at an advanced age, who, on account of his advanced age, and to make way for a younger man, and one who was better up in what may be called the modern requirements of the post office service. It was not a political or a partisan superannuation, it was not a superannuation which was not warranted by age, but it was for the purpose of bringing into administrative capacity in the post office a younger man, a man who, of course, was a friend of the Administration, and of the same political belief, but a man who could put more energy and more modern work into the department. The statement was made that something was added to Mr. Griffin's term of years, but an arrangement was contemplated by which he was to have an allowance besides. That arrangement was contemplated because Mr. Griffin was the organizer of the Post Office Department, and his services were certainly very signal, and it was in contemplation to give an extra mark of his services in that way. That, however, was not pressed to a conclusion, so that the end of it was that Mr. Griffin was superannuated at an advanced age, and a younger man and more vigorous man put in his place. With reference to Mr. Vankoughnet, I think members on both sides of the House understood why he was superannuated. He also was a friend of the Government. It was not a superannuation based upon partisan motives, but was for the good of the service, and for the purpose of getting a younger man, and perhaps a more energetic method into the department over which he presided. These are the two chief instances that were cited by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister); but if he had wished or asked the advice of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), he would have found in the history of the short Liberal Administration from 1874 to 1878 instances which were much more to the point, instances where men were superannuated who are living to this day and enjoy good health and are able to do active and energetic work. I think the Administration has on one of the commissions at present at work in Canada—the Penitentiaries Commission, I think—a gentleman who was superannuated by that party between 1874 and 1878, a gentleman who has been drawing tens of thousands of superannuation money, and who is yet considered to be sufficiently active to be placed on the commission by his friends and who is at work on that commission to-day. The senior member for the city and county of St. John (Mr. Ellis) might have given a case in point, where a gentleman was superannuated in order to give him the post office in the city of St. John. That gentleman is still walking about the streets of that city in fair health and strength, while different changes have come to the gentleman who was made postmaster—the representation of the county in this Parliament, his defeat and subsequent return, and through all that long series of years this gentleman who was superannuated and who has been drawing a heavy superannuation allowance, has been in the enjoyment of good health and a fair amount of strength, and he is so to-day.

But coming down from those two or three special instances to the general affirmation made that it was the general policy of the late Government to dismiss Liberal appointees or officers, we have few concrete instances brought to our attention. On this side we distinctly state that such was not the policy of the late Government; that the Liberals who were found in office when that Government came into power in 1878, who were known to be Liberals, who were not asked and did not recant their opinions and who have worked and voted for their party ever since, were not up to the time this Government went out in 1896 disturbed in their enjoyment of their offices. That was the general rule. No rule in a broad country like this can be operated without having its exceptions, and there have no doubt been exceptions in the long course of eighteen years, in which gentlemen have been for one reason or another turned out of office, dismissed or superannuated; but the instances are comparatively very few in number, and it was never made a policy; on the contrary, the distinct line of Liberal-Conservative policy was that competent officers who did their work should be kept in office, and this was done whether they were Liberals or Conservatives. But the very moment this Government came into power, forced by the back benches, forced by that cry which was very well interpreted and voiced by the hon. member for Lambton to-day, the Ministers, I am bound to believe, against the better thought and better judgment of most of them, have given way to that clamour, and everybody knows that the spoils system has been introduced in the civil service and employment of this country, introduced at first under cover of promises made by the Prime Minister and some few other Ministers that only in cases of offensive partisanship and after full investigation would any Government officer or employee be discharged—gathering force and volume from day to day and month to month, it has clean swept over those good intentions of some of the Ministers, until to-day the spoils system in its nakedness and with its characteristics is the system which is put in vogue and carried out by a Liberal Administration in the Dominion of Canada. There is no doubt about that. No one case probably was a grosser instance than that which I gave the other day with respect to the Minister of Public Works—the suave and excitable Minister, suave

when not excitable and excitable when not suave.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). He is all right.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. And Quebec is all right, too.

Mr. FOSTER. And I quite understand the other position which the hon. gentleman takes. What did Mr. Cloran say the night before last? He said Quebec has defeated the Tory Government and with a sweep has placed the Liberals in power. And, elevating his standard, metaphorically, he declared: Now Mercier is avenged. The "Free Press," the organ of the Prime Minister in this city, came out with a jubilant heading that at last Mercier has been avenged. It is a Liberal victory, it is a victory for the avenging of Mercier. Is it? If any hon. member wants to take that position, let him be jubilant.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We take it as it is.

Mr. FOSTER. The Prime Minister is no doubt very much pleased to see Mercier avenged. The Prime Minister stated in this House, if not in this House, in the country, that Mercier was the greatest living French Canadian.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. But he is dead now.

Mr. FOSTER. I am quite aware of that. The Minister of Public Works no doubt possesses a great deal of knowledge, but when an event takes place like Mercier's death, the hon. gentleman should understand that others may also know the facts.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Let him rest in peace.

Mr. FOSTER. I would, if the hon. Minister would let him rest in peace. When ther campaign takes that colour in the province of Quebec, when the shades of Mercier are invoked in order to bring them support, who is it that may properly be taunted for not letting him rest in peace? The Prime Minister is glad he is avenged. The Prime Minister had a good friend when Mercier was in power. He had an intimate friend in Pacaud when Mercier was in power, and the Supreme Court, delivering judgment, declared that Pacaud stole $100,000 out of the Quebec treasury, and ordered Pacaud to put it back. Why did not Pacaud put it back? He pleaded a non possumus. Where did that come in? He had spent the money for his dear leader's party, he had spent the money for his dear leader's campaign, and it had gone into the party's treasury and helped to elect the party supporters and helped to keep them in power, and so he could not pay it back.

The hon. Minister of Public Works diverted my attention from the River Du Lièvre, to which I was then referring, and took me away down to Quebec to talk about Mercier and the Liberals, about the patron saint and the party which made him their patron saint. I was saying, that there was never a more glaring instance of the spoils system than that perpetrated by the Minister of Public Works, by the suave but excitable Minister; and when the facts were brought to his attention and the Minister was asked to say what was done why was it done, I am sorry to say that the answer of the hon. gentleman was not an entirely satisfactory answer. The Minister of Public Works, without any report, without any investigation, without going to the trouble of an investigation or getting a report, on the mere hearsay, on a letter written to him, he dismissed two officers, Mr. McCallum and Mr. Raymond. He dismissed Mr. McCallum for a mistake of his own department, on a representation which I believe has not a word of truth in it, and in regard to which I am certain the Minister had not under his hand one single particle of evidence to support. A member of this House wrote a letter which at once made a charge and demanded an execution, and the charge made and the execution followed simultaneously. There was no evidence under the hand of the Minister to justify him under the charge which was made against the officer on the La Lièvre. That is the spoils system pure and simple. My hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) exerted it there. There are other instances, but, Sir, the spoils system has been openly averred by the Minister of Railways, who is now in his place. He missed an elucidation of his policy this afternoon, and for fear he may not read the "Hansard," I will have to call it to his mind again. Yesterday in answering a question, the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) is understood to have read the answer, and consequently it was well thought out and was deliberate. The Minister of Railways declared in effect that to participate—and to vote as quietly and as decently as a man could in an election, is to participate in an election—that any officer who participates in an election would do it under pain of dismissal. That was the statement of the Minister of Railways who knows what the English language means, and who, when he uses it ought to know what he is expressing, and who has no excuse for not expressing what he means when he goes to the trouble of having it written out and reading it here to the House. It was in reference to the same Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) that the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Frost) made the statement in this House that he had been presented with a list of twenty officials on the Rideau Canal, I think, and he had been given the option of replacing all these with his own men; but, magnanimous and honourable, he de-

cided to make no re-appointments and to continue the old men. Under this same Minister of Railways, you have a practical exemplification of the spoils system, and you have had yesterday an exact definition of what he meant to do, and which is certainly no more nor less than carrying out the spoils system. But there was another case exposed this afternoon by the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Russell). He (Mr. Russell) is a man of learning, of gentle method, a man of deep thinking and plain living, who it would be supposed would be above taking the heads off lower and common people—so to speak in one sense—officials; taking them off almost for the very pleasure of the thing. He has consideration for his friend the Minister of Agriculture, and some affidavits were put into his hands. He did not ask the person against whom these affidavits were made to show any cause; he did not give him information that his office was to be sworn away from him; he did not inquire from him as to whether he had any answer to the charges or not; but this member of Parliament, a professor of law, who ought to, of course, be well grounded in the elementary principles of justice; this member, on the basis of information handed to him, without giving the accused even notice that these charges were made against him, although he lived in the same city with him, sent the ex parte statement up to the Minister of Agriculture, and the Minister of Agriculture promptly decapitates the unfortunate office-holder.

Now, Sir, I think any man who has the most elementary idea of the principles of justice will scarcely uphold that method of trial and execution. Without even giving the caretaker of the quarantine station the least notice, on an ex parte statement, this hon. member decapitates the accused without allowing him to say a word in his own behalf, and the Minister of Agriculture adopts his recommendation. Sir, these are a few instances that are coming up from day to day. Why, a telegram was read the other day by the leader of the Opposition which purported to state that in the county of Beauharnois, during this present Quebec election, methods of terrorization were put in force by the Government, no doubt under the command of the Minister of Public Works, who about that time was a little excited and consequently was not so gentle and suave in his manner as usual. If I mistake not, the gravamen of that charge was not only that one man had been dismissed and a new man put in his place, and that loss had come to the public on account of it; but that certain persons in authority were telling the office-holders in the county that it would be better for them not to vote in the election unless they voted right, or that they would lose the offices which they held. That is an eventuality which springs directly out of the spoils system which has been inaugurated by my hon. friends opposite, and which has been openly avowed by them through the Minister of Railways, and which has been practically carried out by almost every Minister in the Government.

Sir, I am led to make these remarks because the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) opened up the general question as to dismissals from office under the spoils system. He brought no proof at all to show that it was a system countenanced in the least degree by the Liberal-Conservative Government. The opposite is exactly the truth of the case. That it is countenanced by the party opposite, and that it is being put into execution by the Government, is attested in case after case that comes up day after day, and is also attested by the statements of Ministers themselves. I think it right to place upon record these views in reference to the matter as an answer, and I think a conclusive answer, to the statement that was made by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), and which opened up the general question of the policy of both parties with reference to officials under their care, and in the employ of the Government.

Tracadie Lazaretto..... $4,600

Mr. SPROULE. It was stated a few years ago that the number of lepers was very few, and that they were getting less all the time. How many are in this institution now?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). There are fifteen or sixteen there just now.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture if the statement which we saw in the press was authentic, in regard to some cases of leprosy having been discovered in Manitoba, to which I believe attention was given.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The health authorities at Winnipeg asked me to take charge of some lepers who had come to the hospital there. Without assuming any kind of responsibility of doing that kind of work, I authorized Dr. Smith, the officer in charge of the Tracadie Lazaretto, to go up to Winnipeg and see if he could induce those people to go there willingly. He succeeded in doing so, and took three of them down there quite recently.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Where are they from?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They are Icelanders from the province of Manitoba, whom he found to be real lepers. They went with him quite voluntarily, and they are now in the Tracadie lazaretto.

Mr. FOSTER. Were they old or new settlers?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They were not very old settlers. Two of them were not very advanced cases; the other had been leprous for some years.

Mr. FOSTER. Were they in the Icelandic settlement?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think they came from three different sections of the province.

Winnipeg and St. Boniface Hospitals..... $4,000

Mr. SPROULE. Are these connected with quarantine stations, or how does this item come to be here?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is an old item, under an arrangement that was made by former Governments, and that has been going on for years, to aid the Catholic and the Protestant hospitals at Winnipeg.

Mr. SPROULE. I noticed that some time ago an application was made to the department here to recoup the city of Winnipeg for expenses incurred through the breaking out of small-pox in a company of immigrants who were brought there from Halifax, I believe. Was any settlement arrived at, or was the claim accepted or acknowledged, or is it the intention of the department to settle it?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The claim is under consideration. It has not yet been arranged.

Cattle Quarantines $30,000

Mr. McCLEARY. Under the new quarantine regulations affecting animals, particularly that clause with reference to the inspection of horses entering the United States from Canada or entering Canada from the United States, provision is made for their inspection; but this provision is supplemented with the clause that such inspection shall not take place unless it is ordered by the Minister of Agriculture. I understand that these quarantine regulations are intended to be reciprocal between the United States and Canada. Now, there is means of communication between the United States and Canada at Fort Erie and Niagara Falls, and while the United States officers inspect all horses going from Canada to the United States, horses coming from the United States to Canada are not inspected regularly at all. This is unfair and prejudicial to our Canadian horses, so much so that a leading horseman asked me in Buffalo if there were infectious diseases among Canadian horses. I would just call the Minister's attention to this, because I am sure he will see the unfairness of this regulation, if it is carried out elsewhere as it is there, and will have it rectified.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman is quite right. Under the arrangement which I made with the United States authorities, it is as competent for us to inspect horses as it is for them, and any moment I think it necessary, I have the authority to order the carrying of it out; and if any evidence is given to me that that is necessary, I am quite willing to do it. Up to the present time I have not thought it necessary to carry out this inspection all along the line. The United States authorities have so ordered it, as they have a right to do, but I do not think it is necessary as yet.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it was the intention of the Minister a year ago, to organize that branch of his department relating to the health of animals, under Dr. McEachren. Has he effected any organization yet or made any appointment?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have been making a good many changes in a minor way, but I have not yet by any means completed an organization for the whole country. In consequence of the new arrangement I made with the Washington authorities, I was able to do away with a good deal of work in connection with the veterinary department. I shall be obliged to appoint officials in different parts of the country, who will be authorized to give the certificates required for stock going to the United States. I am doing that gradually, as I can find men whom I am willing to appoint, but I did not wish to make indiscriminate appointments until I learned about the individuals and the requirements of the trade.

Mr. SPROULE. I know that certain representations have been made from our district, where cattle are being constantly shipped to the United States, and it is sometimes difficult to get the inspection made. Some veterinary surgeons from that part of the country have applied for the position, but I have not heard that any have been authorized to act in that capacity.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Some have been authorized to act in most of the counties of Ontario, but not so many as there will be.

Mr. SPROULE. There are several stations from which cattle are being shipped every week, such as Shelburne, Dundalk, Flesherton, Markdale, Chatsworth, and Owen Sound; and Thornbury and Meaford on the Northern Railway. From these stations a great many cattle are shipped right through the year, and it is important that there should be an officer at each of these stations who would make the inspection.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have taken a note of the stations the hon. gentleman names, and I will try to see that there is somebody there to attend to shippers.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the hon. gentleman attempting under this vote to stamp out cer-

tain diseases of animals, such as tuberculosis ? I see the next item is for compensation for the slaughter of hogs and sheep and other animals. I understood that Dr. McEachren was contemplating some amendment which would enable him to stamp out tuberculosis. I understood him to say that something of that kind could be done for about $50,000 a year, so that it is quite evident from the smallness of this vote that it is not intended for that purpose. What other disease is it intended to combat with this vote, apart from the portion that will be used for quarantine ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Almost the whole of this item is used for quarantine. There are a few fees which we have to pay for tests or inspections here and there, and we have had to pay certain fees to inspectors who have been attempting to stamp out the hog cholera in the western part of Ontario, which has, during the last season, been very bad, which may break out again this spring, and to deal with which I have to provide some means.

The question of tuberculosis is one which has occupied my attention a good deal. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the report of Dr. Echlin McEachren, he will find in it a statement by Dr. McEachren on the subject. The question is surrounded with great difficulty, and is undoubtedly a very important one, both in the interests of the health of the animals and the health of our people, because no doubt tuberculosis is communicable through the animal, especially through its milk, to the human. Therefore I consider it of the utmost consequence that some attention should be paid to the disease. It was partly in consequence of that disease, that when I made new arrangements with the United States authorities, I agreed that all dairy animals imported from that country into Canada or exported from Canada into the United States, should be tested with the tuberculin test, which is now acknowledged to be a sufficiently accurate test to be used anywhere, the number of mistakes in it being so small as to be inappreciable. There are, however, difficulties in the way, because a good many people do not wish to have their animals tested, and I am very anxious that public opinion should be educated on this point and our farmers induced to have their animals tested as much as possible so as to do away with this source of danger to animal and human life. I have not yet taken any particular steps towards stamping out the disease. That is going to be very difficult. It is so difficult that other countries have so far shrunk from attempting it, with the exception of some of the American states, which have attempted it but have failed to accomplish it, and have even shrunk, in some instances, from putting into practice their own laws. I do not believe that tuberculosis is as prevalent in Canada as it is in some other countries. I do not believe it is as prevalent in this country as some wild statements in the press and elsewhere would lead us to believe, but still there is sufficient of this disease among our cattle to make it greatly in the interests of our cattle owners and people who use stock to turn their attention to it. I hope by having this question discussed in the institutes to bring it to the attention of stock owners throughout the country and make them alive to its importance and thus induce them to have their animals tested and those infected destroyed. At present I am not prepared to go further, but shall be glad if, in the near future, public opinion becomes so aroused that some more speedy measures might be taken to accomplish the desired end.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice that the provincial legislature of Ontario passed a law recently making it compulsory on dairymen to have their herds tested, and very strong objections were taken to the law. The question is whether the jurisdiction lies with our department here to do the same thing.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There are two divisions in this question. One is the health of the animals generally, which appears to be in the purview of this Parliament, and in the control of the Minister of Agriculture. The other is the question of public health which is in the control of the local authorities. As a general rule, the action referred to by the hon. gentleman in the province of Ontario has been attempted by the local health boards, which, of course, have nothing to do with my department. In certain cities and towns of Ontario, and I believe elsewhere, the attempt has been made to force the city milkmen and the dairies which supply milk, to submit their animals to the test, but the attempt has not been successful. So much opposition has been raised, amounting almost to a rebellion among the milkmen, that the local health boards have not found it possible to put a wholesale testing of this kind into practice. No doubt public opinion will have to be educated up to that point, and I trust in the near future it will be, and when it is, it will not be found that the number of cattle, after all, affected is so very great, although I think it is sufficient to justify very great care and surveillance and the strongest efforts to stamp out the disease.

Mr. SPROULE. Notwithstanding the objections raised to it, medical men are strongly of the opinion that this test is one of the most desirable things in the interests of the health of the community. Are the same regulations in force which were adopted about two years ago with reference to the examination of cattle and other animals going from the port of Montreal to the old country ? Do we still weed out those which are diseased in any way ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there any change in the regulations with regard to the examination of sheep coming from the United States, either to be exported via Montreal or to remain in the country ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. All animals, whether sheep or cattle, exported from the port of Montreal, are examined before shipment. Those coming into the country for slaughter are allowed in without examination. Sheep for breeding purposes are required to have a certificate the same as cattle. The sheep brought in for export again are allowed to pass through in bond without examination. Sheep for crossing purposes are required to have a certificate that there was no disease in the district from which they came.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it the same in the case of animals brought in for breeding purposes ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. QUINN. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to a report concerning one of the quarantine stations—the station at the first port of entry, which is Halifax, I think. A very valuable herd of cattle was brought into this country for breeding purposes and kept at that station some three months, according to regulation, and the importer complains that the cattle were placed in a large shed where they were almost completely unprotected, during very severe weather, in consequence of which many of them contracted colds and one subsequently died. The cattle were released in the early part of this month. The experience of this gentleman was such that it has deterred a number of others, among whom are some members of this House interested in the breeding of cattle, from embarking in the venture of importing cattle for that purpose. Now, I think this could be altogether obviated by improving the condition of the cattle sheds and the quarantine station and putting them in such a condition that the cattle might be kept there without injury, which, I understand, is not possible at the present time.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) say it was at the port of Halifax ?

Mr. QUINN. I think it is Halifax ; at any rate it is the first port of entry.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Unless the hon. gentleman can tell me where it was, I cannot reply to his statements specifically. My report is that the sheds at the different quarantine stations are in good order so that cattle can be taken good care of in them.

Mr. QUINN. From my information now, it must have been at the port at Halifax.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will inquire about the matter.

Mr. DAVIN. Could not the hon. gentleman allow this item to stand until the return comes down ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. What return ?

Mr. DAVIN. The return I asked for a fortnight ago and which the hon. gentleman promised to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Is that about Dr. Duncan's dismissal ?

Mr. DAVIN. Dear me, no. I refer to the return of all correspondence made to the department with respect to the new quarantine regulations.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will have it down shortly.

Mr. OLIVER. I would ask the hon. Minister if he has received representations from the district of Alberta as to the changes with respect to the quarantine on sheep ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Speaking from memory, I do not know of any such representations. It may be that some letters were received on the subject.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. Minister of Agriculture was not present when this question was discussed on another motion. But I may tell him that objections are raised by the sheep ranchers in the district of Alberta to the changes of regulations with regard to the quarantine on sheep. I wish to ask him if it is absolutely necessary that the same class of regulations that prevail with regard to cattle quarantine must be applied in the case of sheep. For there is a difference between the conditions with regard to sheep and those with regard to cattle, inasmuch as south of the line the herds of cattle are comparatively free from disease, whereas the flocks of sheep are not so free from disease. In one case there is no great danger of the importation of disease, whereas in the other case there is danger of the importation of "scab."

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) will find, on examination of the regulations with regard to the passage of sheep across the frontier, that the sheep must have a certificate that there is no disease in the district from which they come. Under these circumstances, I think there is no danger in the importation of sheep from the south. The old regulations were very onerous upon the people of Canada who wished to export sheep to the United States, and these modifications were a great benefit, as they facilitated the trade in sheep across the fron-

tier, while, at the same time, they safeguarded our flocks.

Mr. OLIVER. I wish to repeat what I said on a previous occasion, that the ranchmen do not generally consider that the American certificate is a sufficient guarantee that there is an absence of disease in the district from which the animals come. Furthermore in regard to inspection at the boundary, it is not a sufficient safeguard against "scab" for the reason that the disease can be carried for some time without appearing in the animal.

Mr. PRIOR. I am sorry that I was not in the House when this item came up, so the hon. Minister will pardon me if he has already given the information I wish to ask for. I would like to know whether he intends to make any alterations in British Columbia in regard to the cattle quarantine. I was informed, when I applied to the department some time ago, that the hon. Minister had a new scheme under consideration. I would ask him if he is going to make a change in the appointments in British Columbia, and whether he is going to pay the officers by fees or by salaries?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not settled that matter. I am in search now of a veterinary officer to take charge of the frontier on the mainland. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) knows that there is a veterinary officer in Victoria, whose duties, in consequence of the new regulations, are much less than before. His payment heretofore was by fees. It was not intended under the new arrangement that we should charge fees, but since communications have taken place with Washington we have decided to charge fees. For the work that the veterinary officer is doing for which he does not charge fees, we shall pay him.

Mr. PRIOR. This officer is a most estimable man, thoroughly competent, and has attended to his duties in the best manner possible.

Mr. DAVIN. I should be very glad if the hon. Minister would let this item stand until we see this return, because there is a great division of opinion in the North-west Territories in regard to these regulations, some approving and others disapproving. I would like to have these papers before we pass this item.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Pass the item, and, if the hon. gentleman wishes to bring up any matter on concurrence, that can be done. In the meantime, the return will have been brought down.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the hon. Minister (Mr. Fisher) Supplementary Estimates with regard to quarantine to bring down?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think so.

Mr. McMILLAN. I would like to say a single word about the quarantine of cattle coming from the old country. I think this point was brought up in the House some time ago. I think it would be well if the quarantine regulations were such that cattle for breeding purposes could be imported more easily from the old country. There should be an examination and certificate before they leave the old country that not only the cattle exported but the herd from which they come were free from disease; another examination should take place when they land here; and if they are free from disease they should be allowed to be taken by the importer, and, if necessary, quarantined on his own place. I am aware that many farmers would bring out cattle if it were not for the present regulation. I was talking some time ago with a gentleman in Montreal who had brought out a herd of Ayrshire cattle, and lost one in the quarantine station at Halifax, I think. He will never try the experiment again unless there is a change in the regulations. If some modification could be made of the kind I have suggested, it would be a great benefit to the cattle breeders, both of Ontario and the North-west.

Special Quarantine Vote—compensation for slaughter of hogs and sheep, and all other expenses connected therewith..... $5,000

Mr. SPROULE. Can the hon. Minister tell us the extent of the trouble in Kent and——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SPROULE. Hon. gentlemen might as well understand first as last, that any question that it is desired to ask will be asked, whether it meets with their approval or not. These questions are reasonable and appropriate questions, and we have a right to expect an answer.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certainly. I understand that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) asks me the extent of the hog cholera and of the slaughter of hogs in the western part of Ontario. During the last season there has been a considerable amount of this disease. We have had a great deal of trouble and have spent a large amount of money, not only for compensation for slaughtered animals, but because we have had to have a great number of inspectors to go about, examining the herds, disinfecting the buildings, &c. I made a great effort last fall to put a stop to this, and I trust to a certain extent, at all events, I have succeeded. During the early part of the winter we were obliged to slaughter some hogs, and it was impossible properly to carry out the disinfecting process during the frozen period. The result has been this spring again, as the warm weather came on, I have been obliged to send some inspectors to these places

to thoroughly disinfect where they have found the disease, and in some instances we find that outbreaks have again occurred. I am, however, taking the utmost precaution to stamp this out, and perhaps even have gone further than some of the farmers were quite pleased with, because they do not like interference with their liberty, and were not quite satisfied with what was necessary under the regulations, and which I believe was necessary for the health of animals throughout the country. But I believe it was more important to try to stamp the disease out promptly than to let it continue through the season, as it did during last season. Under these circumstances I trust that in a short time we will not find any further cases, or only a few sporadic ones. But just at present there are a number of inspectors going about each in his own county, or neighbourhood, endeavouring to make sure that the disease is thoroughly stamped out. I may say that in round figures this matter has cost me last season about $15,000; but I ask in this vote for only $5,000 for the coming season, believing that that will be sufficient to overcome the difficulties under what I consider to be a system producing better results. I may say in connection with the hog cholera that some sheep scab has been discovered in certain parts of Ontario. It was a surprise to me last fall when that came to my notice. We have been boasting that our sheep in Canada were entirely free from scab, but I had unfortunately brought to my notice certain instances in Ontario where I believe it was my duty to take precautions to isolate the sheep, and in some instances to have them slaughtered. The consequence is that in the wording of this item I put sheep scab along with hog cholera, but I trust that with the sheep scab, as with the hog cholera, I have been able to bring it within a very circumscribed area, where there are only a few instances, so that I trust this season there will be very little of it, if any.

Mr. SPROULE. I noticed lately in one of the western papers that there has been a little difficulty between the Government inspector and some farmers, where he ordered the animals to be slaughtered and they refused. What was done in those cases?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I suppose the hon. gentleman refers to a case in Kingsville, in the district of South Essex.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. A portion of them were slaughtered, and the others were isolated and quarantined in order to see whether they were really affected or not. The reason that sometimes the inspector prefers to slaughter them is this: Animals that have been exposed to contagion are dangerous to the public health, although they are not necessarily affected with the disease. If they are slaughtered before they are affected, they are fit for human food; that is to say, they are fattened to be used, and the inspector, after slaughter, in many instances finds that they were perfectly fit for human food. But if these animals are allowed to remain in pens, or on the farm where, in consequence of the unsanitary condition of these pens, and the contagion to which they have been exposed, they may show signs of disease in a week or ten days, then they are not fit for human food, and are not allowed to be sold. The consequence is that in many instances the owners are willing to have them slaughtered, although they are not diseased, so that they may be able to sell them if, after slaughter a post mortem examination shows that they are fit for human food. In the case the hon. gentleman refers to there was a certain number which were diseased, and a large number which had been exposed to contagion. The inspector intended to slaughter the whole of them. Those that were only exposed to the contagion and which, after the post mortem, were found to be good, would have been sold, but the proprietor did not wish to do it, and hence the difficulty. That was obviated by the rest of them being held in quarantine until the period of the incubation of the disease was passed, after which they may either be sold, or moved, or kept, or slaughtered, as the case may be.

Mr. SPROULE. If in the case of slaughtering a number where they have only been exposed to contagion by being brought close to diseased animals, what rule does the department follow in granting compensation to the owners of those animals, where they are fit for human food after being slaughtered?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We grant a compensation, and offset against that the money which the owners get.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the amount of compensation you give? The same that it was in the Act for some years past?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Just the same as it has been. I think it is two-thirds where they are not affected with the disease, and one-third where they are.

Mr. CLANCY. Referring to the question of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) in calling the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the duties of inspectors as to diseased animals, I may say that there is a possibility of conflict between the local authorities in the municipalities and the inspector, were he permitted to allow any of these diseased animals to be

slaughtered and afterwards sold. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if there is any uniform instructions given to the inspectors. This is a very important question, and I think the Government upon the whole have taken very prompt measures to stamp out the disease. I know of cases where the animal was slaughtered under the circumstances which the Minister of Agriculture has pointed out, and the local authorities took action against the parties selling what was said to be diseased meat. It is very dangerous, I may say, to permit meat to be sold if the animals have any taint of disease about them. It endangers the health of persons who may innocently consume the food coming from that quarter. While it is a great hardship for the farmers to lose any portion of their herds, it is absolutely necessary that most stringent measures should be taken to ensure that no encouragement should be given to placing such meat upon the market.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. A circular is sent out to all my inspectors giving them specific instructions in regard to that, and every precaution is taken to see that no diseased meat goes upon the market. At the same time the question of diseased meats on the market is entirely in the hands of the local health boards.

Mr. CLANCY. The conflict, as the hon. gentleman will see, will arise between the local authorities and the inspectors under the control of this Government.

Mr. McGREGOR. In case of cholera in a district, the hogs are quarantined. As hon. members know, hogs are not allowed to be killed without inspection. The inspector examines each hog before it is sent to the market, and his certificate is sufficient, so that there is no difficulty in that way at all. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) will remember that any animal who dies of that disease will show evidence of the disease after death.

Mr. DAVIN. I want to call the Minister's attention to a question raised by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) regarding sheep being brought in here under regulations. I will not take up the time of the House by reading the debate, but I will refer the Minister to the "Hansard" of April 12th, where the case is stated by myself and the member for Alberta. In my constituency, and all over the North-west, there is a divided opinion as to the effect of the hon. gentleman's regulations regarding cattle. Some condemn, some approve, but so far as I know, the opinion is unanimous that the hon. gentleman has been a little precipitate as regards sheep. But I wish to direct his attention to that debate. It was adjourned on the motion of the Prime Minister because the hon. gentleman was not here. If the hon. Minister will bring down those papers within a short time, we can discuss the matter on concurrence.

Cold storage..... $80,000

Mr. SPROULE. What has been done in that direction; how far has the hon. gentleman perfected the scheme, and will it be available to the needs of the country during the present season.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am very glad indeed to answer my hon. friend. I feel this vote is one of the most important perhaps that will come up in the Estimates this session. The attention of the public generally throughout Canada has been very largely turned to the necessity of providing some cold storage arrangement by which our perishable food products can be carried to the old country in the excellent condition in which they leave our own farms. For the purpose of accomplishing this, I have been giving very considerable attention during the last six or seven months to the question, and I am glad to be able to say that I have made such arrangements as I think will meet the case entirely. In the first place, by reason of Prof. Robertson's work, we were able last year to make arrangements with certain of the railway companies by which refrigerator cars were run on the main lines which carry these products to our ports, and by that means our butter and cheese and some other products were carried in cold storage to the port of Montreal, and there put on board ship in good order. Last year we had an arrangement with one line of steamers sailing from Montreal to Avonmouth, the port of Bristol in England, for what is commonly called insulated cold storage, with ice. This on the whole worked very well, but still not sufficiently well to justify the continuance of it. Therefore I set to work to make arrangements with various steamship lines to furnish mechanical cold storage on their vessels sailing from Montreal and other ports to the old country. Going back for a moment to the railway companies, I desire to say that following the lines of last year we have been able to make much more extensive arrangements with the railways to carry our perishable food products over almost all the lines of the country to the ports. I have here a list of the lines of railway on which this will be done. I do not think it would be worth while to read it to the House, as it would occupy some time, but it practically covers the railway system of our country. By this means the farmers in every section of the Dominion will be within comfortable reach of a railway station at which their products may be placed in refrigerator cars and carried to the great centres or to the ports. This will be done at a comparatively small expense. The Government guarantee that a certain amount of freight will pay its way in those cars, and thereby induce

the companies to take this freight at the usual rates, notwithstanding that cold storage is supplied. Last year our loss on this guarantee was trifling. I have no doubt the loss this season will be greater because we have had to arrange for more lines, on some of which the amount of freight will probably be not so great and therefore the cars will not be full enough to cover the full freight we guarantee. Still I have made provision in this vote for that deficiency. These railway lines practically centre in Montreal, the port of shipment for the western provinces, and in Halifax and St. John, the ports of shipment for the maritime provinces. At the same time we are doing this in Prince Edward Island on the Government railway there, so that perishable food products on the Island can be brought to Charlottetown for shipment. I have endeavoured to provide cold storage warehouses at the points of transhipment. In Montreal there is already abundant cold storage warehouse accommodation. There are two large warehouses, containing perhaps 1,200,000 or 1,300,000 cubic feet, quite sufficient for the needs of the trade for several years I think. At Halifax a company is now engaged in erecting a warehouse for this purpose. Negotiations are now going on with some gentlemen in Charlottetown, by which I hope that a warehouse will be established there for the trade of the island. I regret to say that negotiations which I had opened up with some gentlemen in St. John, have fallen through, those gentlemen not seeing their way clear to carry them out. But Prof. Robertson, the officer who has this matter in charge, is preparing to make some temporary arrangements for this season, so that the trade which may centre at St. John may be accommodated. In addition to these arrangements at different ports, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have undertaken to put up a warehouse in Winnipeg, chiefly for their own purposes, although it is perhaps essential to the perfect carrying out of this scheme. This is for the purpose of keeping perishable food products which may come from the west on their way east until there is a sufficient quantity there to make up a carload. These perishable products will come down from the North-west Territories and different points in Manitoba in small lots, they will be collected at Winnipeg and held until there is a sufficient quantity to make a carload or more, and this warehouse is to be used as a collecting warehouse. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company in their own interest and in the interest of the public have agreed to put up the building, and I believe are already doing so.

Mr. FOSTER. Without any Government aid.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes. In addition I found it was likely this summer that a large portion of the product of the Government creameries in the North-west Territories would find a good market in British Columbia; and after a careful investigation I considered that Revelstoke on the Canadian Pacific Railway was the most convenient centre from which this product could be distributed. I therefore made arrangements there for a small cold storage warehouse for the purpose of what may be called distribution of our products in the province of British Columbia. This is also necessary in case we may wish to collect the products of British Columbia or of the North-west Territories for export over the Pacific, which is quite possible and may be attempted this summer. Speaking of warehouses, I want to inform the hon. gentleman that the fruit dealers and fruit growers of this country are very anxious indeed to make some experimental shipments of fruit to the old country. This has already been done with very partial success, if any, in cold storage, but those who are best informed in regard to this trade, believe that, with proper appliances for cold storage, a good many fruits which now are not exported to the old country, can be successfully sent there. After having several conversations with the fruit men of the country, I came to an arrangement with the fruit raisers in the Niagara district, the oldest, and probably the best equipped, fruit district of the Dominion, by which they are going to send forward a car-load a week of certain kinds of fruit to England during the fruit season, in cold storage. To accomplish this it was necessary that there should be some collecting point, and I made arrangements with a group of gentlemen at Grimsby that they should prepare this car-load of fruit. I put up a small warehouse there, in which it is to be collected until a car-load is ready to be shipped in connection with the sailing of a vessel from Montreal.

Mr. FOSTER. These would not be small fruits?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No; peaches, grapes, pears, and early apples are the fruits that it is expected will be sent in this way. I may say in this connection, that I had a good deal of conference with the fruit growers in the Annapolis Valley, N.S., and that they believed it was quite practicable to utilize the cold storage warehouse in Halifax for their purpose. They did not require the establishment of a cold storage warehouse in their own immediate neighbourhood. I have had, also, a conference with the fruit growers within the area surrounding Montreal, and they have suggested to me that they would send forward their shipments to be collected in the cold storage warehouses in Montreal. For the purpose of the project, therefore, it was only required that I should prepare some facilities in the Niagara district, which

I have done in the manner indicated. I made an offer to some gentlemen in the city of St. John, and a similar offer to some gentlemen in the city of Toronto, which is the collecting centre for the province of Ontario, with a view of having small lots collected in that city and sent down by carloads for shipment at Montreal.

Mr. SPROULE. Has that offer been accepted by any company ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. A company undertook to accept it, but so far they have not succeeded in doing anything, and I cannot longer keep the offer open, because the season is advancing, and if anybody else will undertake it I shall give the offer to them. I may say that I have had communications quite recently from other gentlemen saying that they will do so. There are cold storage warehouses at the ports of Halifax, Charlottetown and Quebec. I have made arrangements with the latter to store the goods which come from the province of Quebec below the city of Montreal, and which naturally would not want to come to Montreal to be re-shipped. The arrangement which I have made with those various companies or individuals, to provide the cold storage is practically this : I have offered them a guarantee of 5 per cent for three years on such portion of their capital stock as I have agreed to. Those who are establishing the cold storage warehouses have in many instances undertaken a larger investment, and are putting up larger buildings than I consider to be necessary for my purposes. Under these circumstances, I have allowed them to make such arrangements as they choose in that respect, but I am only guaranteeing the interest on that amount of stock which I considered was necessary to provide the necessities that my scheme required, and no more.

Mr. SPROULE. Your assistance is in the way of a guarantee of interest on their stock ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. A limited guarantee of 5 per cent for three years. I give no money to any of these.

Mr. FOSTER. Explain one arrangement you have made, and concretely we will get the idea much better.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, we will take the arrangement at Halifax. The company there are starting an establishment with a capital stock of $100,000. I have agreed to give them a guarantee of 5 per cent for three years on $40,000.

Mr. FOSTER. On what principle ; why not guarantee on $30,000 or $50,000 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Because I felt that it would require $40,000 to put up such a warehouse as would provide the facilities for the extra trade which I hope within a year or so would be required.

Mr. FOSTER. Are they going to put the whole $100,000 into their establishment ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is what they intend to do.

Mr. FOSTER. The whole of the $100,000 stock to go into the building ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Into the building and plant ; that is their intention.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you insure so many cubic feet of space for the use of the public in the building ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Of course the through traffic will have assurance of accommodation in the building. They have formed a company of $100,000 capital, and I guarantee them 5 per cent interest for three years on $40,000 of that stock. As a matter of fact, in Halifax the local government has guaranteed them 5 per cent for three years on another $40,000, so that the company has a guarantee of 5 per cent on $80,000. As a condition of giving them that, I require that the rates shall be such as have been charged during the last few years for cold storage in Montreal, and which rates were considered reasonable. I require also, that they shall submit their books and accounts to show their disbursements and the management of their business, so that I may see that they are not extravagant, and that they are not spending more money than would be justified in the work they are doing. I give the guarantee as a guarantee of interest, which will not be called upon if their own business gives them a profit over and above their working expenses.

Mr. FOSTER. Any profit ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No. The guarantee is only to be called upon when they do not show 5 per cent profit.

Mr. FOSTER. On the $80,000.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, on the $40,000.

Mr. FOSTER. If they put $100,000 in, how is the hon. gentleman going to divide it according to the proportion of the stock? If they put $100,000 in and show 5 per cent interest ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If they put $100,000 in and show 5 per cent interest, on the whole, no guarantee will be called upon from me or from the local government. If they show 3 per cent interest on the whole, then I would have to give them 2 per cent on $40,000 and the local government would be called upon to give them 2 per cent more on another $40,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose they said they would put $200,000 in, they would rather get ahead of you in that respect if you do not limit the amount of stock ? They could call

on you so long as they did not make 5 per cent on their whole stock.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have made an agreement with them that their stock shall be limited to $100,000. That is their charter.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the Government exercise any supervision over the mode of constructing the building ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes ; their building is to be according to the plain and the principles laid down by the Government.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the mode of refrigeration ? Is it mechanical, or both mechanical and ice ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mechanical wholly, both in the warehouses and on the steamers. On the railway trains it is ice. There is no means that we know of yet for having mechanical refrigeration for cars.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that the cold storage at present is entirely for dairy products and fruits, not for meats.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, for anything. The cold storage accommodation all through is intended to be utilized by anybody who desires to utilize cold storage for any purpose—for meats, eggs, poultry meat, dairy products or fruit. It is at the disposal of the country at large.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the hon. gentleman provided a schedule of rates for storage in these cold storage warehouses ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, not higher than the rates which have been charged in Montreal for the last two years.

Mr. SPROULE. What are the freight rates on railways—for instance, on butter and cheese ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The ordinary less than car-load rate.

Mr. SPROULE. What would be the rate per hundred pounds, say from Toronto to Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot give that information, as I have not the schedule of rates at my hand. The arrangement is that the railways shall charge the same rates in these cold storage refrigerator cars as they charge for ordinary freight, in consequence of the Government guaranteeing to them two-thirds of the freight on each car.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman has provided for cold storage warehouses at Quebec, Halifax, St. John, Charlottetown, Montreal, Winnipeg and Revelstoke, but not at Toronto. Has any provision been made for London, Windsor, Stratford and other large cities ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, I do not provide any except for the export trade. I have not entered into local cold storage at all.

Mr. DAVIN. Has the Minister thought well to have a cold storage warehouse between Winnipeg and Revelstoke ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The creamery which the Government are going to run at Calgary this year has a cold storage chamber, which will be utilized for that purpose, in case it is needed for anything but butter.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. gentleman tell us the number of lines he has arranged with to provide cold storage, the number of vessels for each line, the ports from which they go, and the ports at which they land in Europe ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. From Montreal to Avonmouth, the Elder Dempster line, five steamships ; from Montreal to London, six steamships—three on the Thomson line and three on the Allan line. The Elder-Dempster line to Avonmouth will leave every week. The line to London will leave every week, requiring six steamships. Four vessels will leave Montreal for Liverpool, two of the Allan line and two of the Dominion line : two vessels going from Montreal to Glasgow. The Liverpool line will be once a week, and the Glasgow line will be once in about two and a half weeks. In the maritime provinces, three vessels will perform a fortnightly service from St. John and Halifax, and I am now trying to make an arrangement by which one vessel will make a round trip from Prince Edward Island to Liverpool.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I suppose that would practically be a weekly service from St. John and Halifax, the vessels running alternately

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, the vessel will leave St. John once a fortnight, calling at Halifax. I tried to arrange for a weekly service, but the company were not prepared to put on enough vessels.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What line has the hon. gentleman arranged for from Halifax ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think it is the Furniss line.

Mr. SPROULE. What are the freight rates on these vessels ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The ordinary ocean freight rates, besides an extra charge of ten shillings a ton of seventy cubic feet. I would like to explain that a ton of butter in ordinary tinettes or

tubs was taken as the unit, and it was found that a ton of butter occupied about seventy cubic feet. We thought it fair that all freight going into these cold storage chambers should pay the same amount according to its occupation of space, so that there would be no inducement to steamers to prefer one kind of freight to another, but that all freight going into them would be on the same basis and equal in the eyes of the shipowners. I took as a basis one ton of butter at seventy cubic feet, and all freight of whatever kind which goes into these cold storage chambers will pay ten shillings a ton of seventy cubic feet, whether butter, cheese, eggs or other produce.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you guarantee any certain amount of freight?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. SPROULE. In the event of their not getting freight enough to make it pay, what arrangement have you made?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. None; that is their lookout. I would like to explain a few other things in this connection. I am asking $80,000, but that is a printer's error. It should be $100,000 for that was the amount I sent to the printer, and I shall ask for $20,000 more in the supplementary Estimates. When I undertook last year to spend what I thought was necessary, I said I was afraid I would require $125,000 a year, but I found I could make better arrangements than I anticipated. There were some things I found I could dispense with which I then thought necessary, and the result is I brought the expense down to $100,000. In consequence of this contract with the steamship company, and in consequence of the contract with the warehouses, I shall have to ask the House to pass a resolution later on, endorsing, in the ordinary way, the arrangements I have made. The arrangement with the steamship companies is this: They put in the plant and provide the accommodation, and we undertake to pay them three annual instalments of one-sixth each of the cost of the plant and the fitting up, so that in the course of three years we shall have paid them one-half of the expenditure of fitting up the steamships. At first I thought this unnecessarily large, but I was surprised to find how the contract works against the steamship company. The insulation of these compartments occupies very considerable freight space in the steamer, so much so that by calculation we found that for every 100 feet taken up by the compartment and its walls, there is only about 80 cubic feet capacity inside the compartment. This means a loss to the steamer of one-fifth the compartment, and when you calculate very closely, as the steamship owners do, the space accommodation in their vessels, which is worth so much every voyage, you find that they make this loss of 20 per cent of the whole space occupied by the compartment, and this loss they must suffer as long as they keep the walls and machinery there. It was therefore only fair that we should make some generous arrangement with the companies rather than act otherwise. I made this arrangement, first of all, with the Elder-Dempster Company, with which Professor Robertson had dealings last year. I afterwards came to make arrangements with the other steamship companies, but at first they thought the proposition so unfavourable that they would not agree to it, and it was only after very careful consideration and and after I told them I could not possibly make more favourable arrangements with them than I had made with the Elder-Dempster firm that they agreed to accept these terms. I consider that in getting accommodation on the terms I have mentioned, we are accomplishing a great deal in the interests of our export trade in these perishable products. I think I am safe in saying that no less bonus or subsidy or whatever you choose to call it to these companies would have accomplished the arrangement and enabled us to carry out this scheme.

In making up the amount of $100,000, there are some other items included. The guarantee at Halifax, if altogether called upon, would amount to $2,000. A similar guarantee which I expected to be called upon at St. John would amount to $2,000. In consequence of the people there not putting it through, I think it is very likely I may have to spend a portion this year for temporary accommodation, and therefore will still ask that amount. In Charlottetown I may have to provide a guarantee, in case it is called for, of $1,000. At Quebec, as at Halifax and St. John, I have to provide a guarantee of $2,000. At Toronto I have provided for a guarantee of $2,500, which may still be called upon, although the company that originally had the offer has apparently not been able to do the work. The arrangement at Calgary calls for about $500, and at Revelstoke the building and the necessary attention to it, having a man there, will require about $2,000. This means a total of $12,000 for this work.

I am asking besides for an amount to send two men to England to assist our people in placing their perishable food product on the English market. I consider this one of the most important portions of the scheme. At present there are certain parts of our export trade to England well established, which have perfect commercial connections, but we are hoping, by reason of this arrangement, that a very considerable addition will be made to our export trade and that a number of things will be sent to England which have not heretofore been shipped there to any large extent. Our people who wish to introduce this trade are not familiar with the English market, they are not in touch with the English importers and deal-

ers, and there is no doubt a very great risk attendant upon this work. That risk will be very much minimized if we can send over a couple of men who will study the English markets, who will try and get track of the men there to whom our people may consign, and who will send that information to this country for the benefit of those who wish to engage in this trade. I have, therefore, asked for the sum of $6,000 out of this $100,000 to be devoted to that purpose. I cannot yet say that that will be all expended. That will depend very largely upon the success of those who are sent over and upon the proved utility of their work. I hope to be able to send such men there early in the season, probably starting next month, and I wish them to go to work and see what they can do. The continuance of the work or the extent of it or the time they will spend on it will depend very much on the success of it, but, at the same time, I feel it is very likely that these men will have to stay there pretty nearly the whole of the fiscal year, commencing 1st July. Under these circumstances, I do not think that $6,000 is an out of the way amount to vote for this purpose.

In addition to these things I must not forget to say that an offer was agreed to by the House last year of a bonus of a small amount to be given to every creamery in the country which would put up properly cold storage accommodation. I estimated that this would require $10,000 for the coming year, thinking some 200 creameries would make application. Instead of that I find over 300 have asked for the bonus, and say they are fulfilling the conditions. I have a man now going about examining these creameries to see that the work they have done is such as will warrant the payment of this bonus. As the result of this large addition, I am asking for $12,500 instead of $10,000 for this purpose. I may say that in connection with all this work, there has been considerable amount of printing and correspondence and travelling expenses which have already amounted to a considerable sum out of this year's vote and which, during the ensuing year, will also amount to a considerable sum.

And, in this connection, I may say that one thing that I think is important is that we should attempt to make use of the press in the old country to direct attention to our Canadian goods. We should try to get the newspapers there interested. And for this purpose I feel that it is necessary that we should have exchanges and should send articles to them and have them printed and have communications constantly before the English public, so as to direct their attention to our wares, that they may look out for the goods we are sending there. I am satisfied that when they make a trial of these goods, the goods will so commend themselves to the taste of the English people, that having tasted them they will look for more. I believe that in this year of Her Majesty's Jubilee when the attention of the whole British public has been turned to us as it never was before, we have a splendid opportunity which it behooves us to take full advantage of. It is especially necessary at this time that we should do everything we can to show the British people that Canada can supply foods of the highest quality and in the greatest variety to suit the taste of the English people. If we do that successfully and well, I am satisfied that the trade with England which we all desire will be largely stimulated. In addition to the tariff arrangements that this Government has made, this will afford a great opportunity which we can use with incalculable advantage to the producers of our country.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he has provided that there should be the same temperature for all kinds of goods, or will the different lines of goods have different temperatures?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The storage capacity on the vessels will be divided into compartments, and the steamship people will have to keep each compartment at the temperature required for the goods carried in it.

Mr. SPROULE. That is good. I understand the hon. Minister to say that refrigerator cars are to be run on the two great lines of railway. What lines of railway are these cars to be carried on, from what points are they to run and how often —weekly, monthly, or how?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot give that information in detail. The Grand Trunk Railway has eight routes running into Montreal, the Canadian Pacific Railway ten routes running into Montreal, the Canada Atlantic Railway, one, the Quebec and Intercolonial, one; the Quebec and Lake St. John, one; and there is also another line whose name I cannot give at the moment.

Mr. SPROULE. How often are these cars to be taken over these routes?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. As a rule, weekly.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it the intention of the hon. gentleman to have a bulletin issued at a very early day and distributed to the shippers and those who handle these goods so that they can take advantage of this storage system this season. For, I think, the arrangements are not generally understood. I saw an explanation of the system in one of the papers, but it was a mere outline, and it seems to me that more accurate information should be given so that the public may get the benefit of the use of the system this season. Is it the intention to get out the bulletin and also

to publish the details in the different newspapers in the country?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) was probably present when Prof. Robertson gave a complete outline of the scheme in the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, and I understand that provision was made to issue copies of Prof. Robertson's speech. But it was only an outline of the scheme and did not contain the detailed information that the public would require in order to take advantage of the system.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I was not present when Prof. Robertson gave his address, but I understood that all the details were covered by it. If that is not the case, I will see that the necessary information is published as soon as possible.

Mr. McNEILL. I did not quite catch what the hon. Minister said with regard to placing our goods on the market in Great Britain. I was much gratified to hear of the provision he was making in reference to the men he proposed sending across to the other side to push our goods in the English markets, but I did not understand whether there was any arrangement made for depots in different parts of the country. Has that idea been abandoned—the idea of having places where distinctively Canadian goods could be obtained, places to which the purchaser could be referred by those gentlemen who are going over to push the business. I may say that within the last day or two I had a very interesting letter from the old country from a gentleman who has resided in Canada for a number of years. He expresses great regret at finding, while in England, that our goods are so little known there and that so little has been done and is being done in the way of bringing them to the notice of the British public. He speaks of the great advantages which he thinks would accrue from the establishment of some kind of depot or store in different parts of the country where distinctively Canadian goods could be obtained, so that the public would understand that they were Canadian goods.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I may say to the hon. gentleman that that matter has been discussed, and it seems to me that there were great difficulties in the way of establishing a store or shop where nothing but Canadian goods could be sold until we were assured of a constant abundance of those goods to keep that store thoroughly supplied. Another difficulty is that any other establishment of that kind starting would have to meet the keenest competition whereas, if we could put our goods into the hands of already well-established commercial houses, we should have all the advantage of their connection and their reputation. That is one of the things, however, which, probably, will be looked into by the gentlemen whom I propose to send over, and upon their report we will take action. I may say, in this connection—perhaps it may not be necessary, but it is just as well, perhaps—that the gentlemen I propose to send over are not at all to act as consignees or agents for individuals, but simply as general assistants and friends of those who trade. Their duty will be to obtain information, to put our people into communication with the English people, but to allow the trade itself to be done by the exporter here and the importer there. But they are to be available in case of difficulties arising. In case our people believe that they are not properly treated by their consignees, they may call upon these gentlemen to go and investigate the case and see that justice is done. I do not wish that the public should suppose that these gentlemen are to be agents or consignees.

Mr. McNEILL. I hope the hon. gentleman will not suppose that the remark I made with regard to depots was made in a spirit of hostile criticism, because I wish to say I congratulate my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) very heartily upon the course he is pursuing in these matters.

Mr. BAIN. Would it not have facilitated the scheme of the hon. Minister if he had established more than one cold storage depot in the North-west Territories. He has only one, at Calgary.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Each creamery which we have established in the Territories has cold storage accommodation for its butter, and I think with that and with the collecting warehouse in Winnipeg, there will be no trouble.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is it the intention of the Minister to provide, out of this grant, cold storage in connection with the transportation of fresh fish?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This cold storage accommodation is equally available for fish exported as for other goods. Any goods that anybody wishes to send in cold storage they are welcome to send, and the more the better.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Can this arrangement be applied to the transportation of fresh fish between the provinces?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It was not at all part of the scheme to deal with interprovincial trade.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I heartily approve of the policy of the Government in providing cold storage for the export of perishable farm products, and I regret that the same policy is not extended to the very large and important fish industry. We have in the eastern provinces an important portion of the fish industry of Canada. To-day, and for years past, I may say, the price of

fish is becoming lower, and the fishermen find it more difficult to get paying prices for the product of their labour. In the principal cities of Canada, notably in Montreal and Toronto, the fresh fish that is consumed comes from foreign countries, a large portion of it comes from Portland and from other fishing ports in the United States, while in the lower provinces, notably around Halifax, and the Island of Cape Breton, large quantities of fresh fish are caught, but the people who are engaged in fisheries are obliged to take a price very much lower than they could realize if they had facilities for shipping their fish to the upper provinces. Take the articles of cod fish and haddock; fishermen get only about a cent a pound for that fish where they are obliged to dispose of it at home, while in the cities, consumers pay five, six and seven cents a pound for the same kind of fish that comes from Portland and other places. Now, I am sorry that the Government does not see its way on the present occasion to include the article of fresh fish caught in our own waters in their arrangement for providing facilities for shipping perishable food products, so that this fish may be sent to the upper provinces. I attach as much importance possibly as any member of this House to the necessity of securing all the markets that we can outside of our own provinces for the products of the country, but I consider that we ought to do just as much to keep for ourselves the markets that we have in our own country, and especially in regard to the products of the fishing industry. That is an industry that is prosecuted with great risk of life, and with much danger and hardship to the people who are engaged in it, much more so than attends the industry of farming. Although I am fully in accord with the policy of the Government in providing those facilities for the transport of the products of the farm, yet I consider that some measure of assistance should be extended, particularly to the fishing industry, as long as we have a market within our own borders for a large portion of the products of that industry. We have fish equally as good in quality as can be procured from other places, and we have all the different kinds of fish that are consumed in the cities of this Dominion. I hope that the Government will reconsider this matter, and I hope that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who is personally acquainted with the value and importance of this great industry on the shores of the maritime provinces, will take some interest in this matter and see that the fishermen of the maritime provinces are considered in connection with this system of cold storage for the transportation of perishable products.

Mr. MARTIN. I heartily endorse the remarks that have just been made by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. McDougall) in respect to the need of providing cold storage facilities for the shipment of fish within the provinces. But I wish specially to call the attention of the Minister to the fact that I see there is no completed arrangement for cold storage so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned. The hon. gentleman has told us what he is doing in St. John, in Calgary, and in Revelstoke, and in all the other parts of this Dominion, but he comes before the House and has to admit that he has not completed any arrangement so far as regards Prince Edward Island. I do not think that is very satisfactory to Prince Edward Island. I do not see why an exception should be made in favour of St. John, though I would like very much that St. John should get all the favours that she can. I do not see why an exception should be made in favour of Revelstoke or in favour of Calgary. I think it would be much more satisfactory to the House if the hon. gentleman, with this large sum of money at his disposal, should pay a little more attention to that province. But not only is that the case in regard to cold storage, but the hon. gentleman comes before the committee with arrangements incomplete as regards transhipment to Great Britain. He has told the committee that arrangements are complete at Montreal, at Halifax, at St. John, but when he comes to Prince Edward Island he says the arrangement is not complete at all. In every case Prince Edward Island comes in at the last. He has talked very nicely about the Jubilee of Her Majesty, but I think the people of Prince Edward Island can hardly join in it very heartily if the hon. gentleman is going to treat them in this way. If the loyalty of the people of Canada depends on the transhipment of butter in cold storage, what must the hon. gentleman think of the loyalty of Prince Edward Island? The loyalty of the people of Prince Edward Island does not, however, depend on those favours. I think this item should be allowed to stand over until the hon. gentleman has made some arrangement for that province. It is unfortunate that that little province should be singled out to be slighted on every occasion. Last night I had occasion to point out that Prince Edward Island was left out while special favours were dispensed to other provinces. Now, I do not say this in any carping mood. I know that the people of Prince Edward Island are entitled to as much consideration in regard to this industry as any other part of Canada, and I trust that when the Supplementary Estimates come down, in which I understand the hon. gentleman is asking an additional vote, we shall find that justice is meted out to that little province.

Mr. GILLIES. I want to address a few remarks to the committee on the question that has been raised by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall), and in doing so I must endorse the words that have fallen from my hon. friend in regard to this

very important matter. For my part I may inform the committee that I do not speak in any sectional spirit when I call the attention of the Government, particularly that of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to this particular subject. Last year I took occasion to draw attention to the general question now before the committee, the question of the Atlantic fisheries, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave me his close attention and promised that the matter which had been brought to his notice, would receive full consideration from himself and his colleagues. I am quite confident the hon. gentleman meant what he said and that he will carry out his promise. I cannot understand why the vast industry known as the Atlantic fisheries should not be promoted in every possible manner. Two items which the committee voted a few minutes ago aggregate an expenditure of $180,000 to further the agricultural industry, namely, an item of $80,000 for cold storage, and an item of $100,000 for promoting the dairying industry in the North-west. When we look at the large industry of the Atlantic fisheries, amounting to the value of $10,000,000 annually in the three lower provinces, employing, as they do, a large number of people, and prosecuted as they necessarily are in a very limited manner, I fail to see why the Government should not direct their attention to the promotion of that industry in a manner that would and must commend itself to the people, particularly those of the upper provinces. We have the means down there of providing Ontario and the west with first class fish. There is no reason why the markets of Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto, Guelph, Kingston and other large cities should not be supplied daily with the best class of fresh fish from the lower provinces. That could easily be done if cold storage were provided by means of refrigerator cars; and if it is necessary in the interest of the western farmers, whose interests are small in comparison with those involved in the Atlantic fisheries, for the Government to provide cold storage warehouses and other accommodation, why should not the eastern fisheries interests obtain similar assistance? I hold up both hands in support of the policy of the Government in regard to furnishing assistance to the agricultural interest of the west, but at the same time I ask attention to this matter which I am now endeavouring to bring to the notice of the committee, a question which we desire to press on the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in the most cogent manner possible. I therefore hope to see, if not in the Supplementary Estimates of the present session, a sum provided in the Estimates next session for furnishing refrigerator cars for the transportation of fish from the east to the west: and if it is not possible to do anything this session, I trust the representatives of the eastern provinces in the Cabinet will secure for this important industry that assistance which its necessities demand.

Maintenance and repairs to Government Steamers..... $112,400

Mr. McDOUGALL. What steamers are to be repaired out of this vote?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). This is for the maintenance of the Government steamers. These are the "Newfield," "Lansdowne," "Stanley," "Aberdeen," "Quadra" and "Druid." This vote includes payment of wages, equipment, maintenance and repairs.

Mr. SPROULE. There is a reduction of $34,178. How has this saving been effected?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is a reduction of the amount named. It arises largely in this way: "La Canadienne," the vessel that formerly was engaged in the protection of the fishery service in the gulf from Quebec down, had become disabled, and last year the report made on her was that she would require extensive repairs. She will, therefore, be repaired during the summer. The "Aberdeen," which was in the marine service last year, will take "La Canadienne's" place for fishery service. That saves the maintenance of the "Aberdeen" last year, so far as regards this particular vote. Then there was another item, $4,000, which was asked last year and obtained, for hauling off the "Quadra" which had got on the rocks off British Columbia. Then there was an item in the Supplementary Estimates of $10,000 for the winter steam service.

Reward for saving life..... $7,000

Mr. SPROULE. I observe there is a reduction of $1,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. With the object of seeing if any saving could be effected, without impairing the efficiency of the service, I made an accurate examination of the expenditure during six or seven years, and I found we were taking a grant of $8,000, although we never spent more than $7,000. I therefore determined that it was not necessary to take more than $7,000.

Investigation into wrecks..... $1,000

Mr. SPROULE. Is this for investigation into the ordinary wrecks?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Yes. Time and again we have to investigate these, and some of the investigations last a good while; for instance, in the case of the "Warwick," at St. John the other day, the inquiry lasted for a fortnight.

Canadian Registry of Shipping..... $500

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is it intended to publish a new Canadian registry of shipping this year?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, it is published every two years.

Tidal Service—Tide gauges, instruments and staff..... $2,500

Mr. FOSTER. What is the occasion of this decrease of $12,500 in this vote?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The "Aberdeen," which was engaged in this service last year had to be transferred to the fishery protection service to take the place of "La Canadienne," which ship is laid up for extensive repairs. That necessarily makes a large saving in the tidal service. It is not, of course, essential to carry it on this year. The tidal gauges will continue as usual, but the service in which she was engaged, taking the density of water and the velocity of the tides here and there, cannot be done this year.

Mr. RODDICK. With reference to these tidal surveys, it seems to me to be a mistake on the part of the Government to reduce this estimate to such a large extent. This is a very important matter, and in view of the fact that we are about to have—and I sincerely trust we may have—a fast Atlantic service at an early date, it would be a very great mistake on the part of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine to do away with this survey, as he practically will by reducing the vote to $2,500. It may not be known that this question is looked upon as a very important one, not only by the shipping interests of Canada, but by the scientists of Canada, and in fact of the world over. This survey system originated in Montreal in 1884, when a meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science was held there; the association, which is to meet this year in Toronto. It was there decided to memoralize the Government on this question, and a memorial was forwarded to the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who, I think, was my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster). At that meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, it was decided that this survey was of the utmost importance, and that it was most necessary that the tides and currents of the Straits of Belle Isle and Cabot's Strait should be thoroughly understood. The attention of the Minister of Marine was drawn to the matter, not only by the British Association, but by a report which was subsequently sent to him by the late Lieut. Gordon. In this report Lieut. Gordon expressed the conviction that until we had an exhaustive examination of the whole system of tidal movements, carried out on similar plans to those which have been made on the United States coasts and on the coasts of Great Britain, we shall always be subject to an annual amount of maritime loss due to the lack of information in regard to tidal currents. He also points out

That, in the eighteen years, from 1870 to 1887, the aggregate loss was a little over fifty million dollars, or an average of $2,782,000 per annum; and in the same period the loss of life has been 4,308 lives. A certain proportion of this loss of life and property is certainly due to imperfect knowledge of the currents; and if the number of narrow escapes of vessels from disaster or wreck were known, it would add a powerful argument in favour of proceeing with the work forthwith.

He also adds:

That, if we could only get a record of the narrow escapes, the delays, and the errors of position discovered when a fog clears away, no further argument would be required; but captains of vessels, as a rule, dislike to admit that they have been out of position; and dangers escaped are only remembered in a practical sense, by giving the ship a little more offing the next voyage, when, if the weather is thick, it may be found that the ship is as far north as she was on the previous trip to the south. It is the more difficult, under these circumstances, to collect evidence on the subject. He is himself convinced, however, of the extreme desirability, if not the absolute necessity of proceeding with this work as soon as possible.

Subsequently to that time, the following memorial was sent to the Government signed by 393 masters and officers of vessels:

We, the undersigned, masters and officers of vessels engaged in the navigation of the Gulf of St. Lawrence and of the waters on the Atlantic coast of the Dominion of Canada and of Newfoundland, desire earnestly and respectfully to petition the Government and Parliament of Canada, that they would promptly take such steps as they may deem advisable to obtain as thorough a knowledge as possible of the currents in these waters, whether due to the tides or to any other cause, and to distribute amongst mariners the information obtained. We believe that the serious loss of life and property due to shipwrecks attributable to unknown currents during fogs or hazy weather, may thus be greatly diminished. In such weather these currents are a cause of great anxiety and danger.

Now, Sir, it seems to me that with such strong evidence as that before us that it would be a great mistake on the part of the Government to reduce this vote to the extent that is proposed. As I have said, we should endeavour in every possible way to make the way clear for this fast Atlantic service of ours, and certainly we should take every precaution in our waters, in order to prevent disasters which might possibly occur. I feel very strongly on the point, and I have taken council with some of the prominent shipping men in Montreal, and I trust the hon. Minister will endeavour to induce his Government to retain the original amount of $15,000 for this purpose, and if possible increase it so as to make this service perfect. I understand that the vessels which have been employed recently have not been quite up to the mark, and I hope that if he continues the matter he

will see that this deficiency is also corrected.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries what changes he has made in the commanders and officers of the Government vessels since assuming office?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not aware that I have made any. The only change I can recall is the appointment of Commander Wakeham to the charge of the Hudson Bay expedition, and the appointment of Commander Lavoie to his place in the interim. But I have not made any changes in any of the captains or officers of ships that I am aware of.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The same officers or captains?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The same captains, second officers, and engineers, and most of the crews. It is not a service in which changes can be made properly. Men are specially trained to understand the semaphores and signals. Commander Spain gave me the names of the men who he wished taken back, and they were all taken back so far as I know. If the hon. gentleman has any one in his mind particularly, I shall be glad to answer, but I think he will find that I have made no change.

Removal of obstructions in navigable rivers $1,000

Mr. FOSTER. That is a very small vote.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I found that we had been voting $3,000 year after year, and by taking the average of seven or eight years back, I found that we had not spent more than $1,000. There was no sense in taking $2,000 more than we wanted.

Winter Mail Service..... $7,000

Mr. FOSTER. Why the increase there?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Increased efficiency requires increased expenditure. The cost of this service for 1895-96 was $7,779, while the vote was $5,000; and as this was not sufficient to meet the expenses connected with the service, a supplementary vote of $2,000 was granted by Parliament. I may say that $7,000 will not be sufficient, and I shall have to ask for something in the supplementary Estimates.

Salaries and allowances of Light-keepers. $205,000

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if any provision has been made for the additional light that was asked for Thornbury on the Georgian Bay?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not got that name. But we are not now at the right vote for that. For large lighthouses we take special votes. Out of the general vote Colonel Anderson, the engineer, defrays the expense of constructing small lighthouses in different ports, and if the one the hon. gentleman refers to is to be built at all, I fancy it will be built out of the general vote.

Agencies, rents and contingencies..... $15,510

Mr. FOSTER. Any change in these agents?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Construction, &c., of Lights..... $20,000

Mr. FOSTER. It is usual for the Minister to state where he proposes to expend this money.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The following items that were voted last year in the supplementary Estimates will require to be re-voted; the fog-alarm at Belle Island, the new lights on the Lake of the Woods; the light and fog-alarms on Flower Pot Island; the Georgian Bay Range; the light at Port Dover; lights and fog-alarms at the Sisters and at the entrance to Vancouver; the pole light at Chimamis, B.C.; and the light at Eastern Harbour, N.S.,—$15,000. The particular sum now before the committee is the general sum out of which all the smaller lights are, I believe, constructed.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is it proposed to expend this $20,000?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. All over the Dominion. We have no particular lights made up for this.

Mr. FOSTER. It has been the custom to lay upon the Table of the House a statement as to what lights were to be built out of this vote. I always did it when I was Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I think my predecessor did it also. In fact, I had to do it before I got my estimates through.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If there is such a list, I shall be happy to give it on concurrence.

Mr. PRIOR. The hon. gentleman has stated that he proposes in the supplementary Estimates to ask for a re-vote for the pole light at Chimamis and one at the entrance to Vancouver, and also one at the Sister Islands; but a light is wanted at Fiddle Reef, just outside of Victoria, more than any of those. It is asked for by every captain who runs between Victoria and Vancouver and the northern coast.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I mentioned that matter to Colonel Anderson the other day, and he said it was his intention to proceed with the removal of the wreck of the "San Pedro" outside of Victoria, and that he

would build these other lights. He had not then made up his mind whether he would build a light on the Fiddle Reef.

Mr. PRIOR. I would like to impress upon the hon. Minister the fact that the necessity which calls for a light at Fiddle Reef calls for one at this point. It is on the east coast of Vancouver Island.

Repairs to wharfs..... $3,000

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is a practice existing many years whereby the Marine Department takes charge of small repairs to wharfs on which the Government collect wharfage, and this item is for the repairs on such wharfs.

Observatory, Toronto..... $2,700

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The expenditure last year was $2,747, and the decrease is effected by dispensing with two small observatories which Mr. Stupart thinks we need not continue.

Meteorological Service..... $60,930

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The reduction is brought about in this way. I sent for Mr. Stupart, who is a very careful and accurate man, excellently fitted for the position he occupies, and spent a couple of days with him in the department going through the entire staff of the Meteorological Service, in order to see whether money could not be saved without impairing the efficiency. We succeeded in making a saving by cutting down salaries which were unequal in their amount. Where there is a large number of officers scattered through the Dominion and the salaries have not been revised for a length of time, it frequently happens that some men receive three times what is paid other men in other places doing exactly the same work, and in such cases we cut down the larger salary.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there any change in the distribution of the reports?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Hydrographic Service..... $16,000

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This work is being carried on in the Georgian Bay by Mr. Stewart, who is a graduate of Kingston Military College and was trained under Commander Boulton. When Commander Boulton was removed to England, Mr. Stewart took his place and is discharging his duties admirably. He sends home the result of his work every year to the observatory at Greenwich and gets the charts that he makes tested and verified and approved of. He takes up his work this year where he left off last year.

Mr. SPROULE. How long will it take to complete the work?

Mr. DAVIES.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It will not be in the public interest to drop this service for a good many years. In these large waters where shipping is increasing every year, we must have very accurate charts made. It will be found that the country is repaid ten times over the small expenditure incurred. Year by year, Mr. Stewart finds out shoals and rocks, which he marks on charts for the benefit of shipping, and I do not anticipate stopping this expenditure for some years. As soon as he finishes Georgian Bay, he will go on to some other waters.

Mr. SPROULE. I consider this most valuable work. I had inquiries some time ago for some small books in connection with navigation that I got from the department, but this year I was told that there are none for distribution. I think they were the regulation and navigation laws, &c.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There are books which are printed at the expense of the Government and for which a small fee is charged. There are no books which have heretofore been distributed free or on payment of a small fee which are not distributed now the same as formerly.

Mr. MONK. I would like to call the hon. Minister's attention to a matter of small importance. It is, that the Lake of Two Mountains, 20 miles from Montreal, has never been surveyed. It is a body of water 15 miles long by about 2 or 3 miles wide, and is now frequented by a large number of pleasure yachts in the summer and also other vessels. I think it would be desirable that a survey should be made of that body of water. It is not an expensive matter. I have been told that a survey could be made for considerably less than $1,500. It seems strange to visitors going to Montreal, going up to Ste. Anne's across Lake St. Louis, and thus reaching this body of water, which they frequent very largely, to find so large a body of water so near Montreal that has not been surveyed. I have sought information, and have been told that Lake St. Louis, which was surveyed as far back as 1836, has never been surveyed since, and that the Lake of Two Mountains, which lies on the north side of the island, and Lake St. Louis could both be surveyed for a sum not exceeding $2,000. But what is of more pressing importance at the present moment is the survey of the Lake of Two Mountains. I think that if the hon. member for Two Mountains (Mr. Ethier) were here, he would bear me out in the statement that this survey should be made.

Marine Hospitals—Care of sick seamen in marine and other hospitals in the Maritime Provinces..... $35,000
Shipwrecked seamen $3,000

Mr. ELLIS. I would like to ask the hon. Minister, what is being done with reference

to the application from St. John concerning the cemetery. The Government have lots in the cemetery, in which are interred the bodies of the seamen who die in the hospital, and who must be buried at the public expense. These lots are in a very dilapidated condition, and not in keeping with other portions of the cemetery. The Government, as it has large amounts accruing for this service, should have the lots in a condition in keeping with the rest of the cemetery.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I thank the hon. gentleman for calling my attention to the matter, which had not been presented to me before. I will take measures to see that the present state of affairs complained of does not continue.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we had better stop at that.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Well, if hon. gentlemen wish. Of course, we shall understand that they will give us liberal facilities to-morrow.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We are always ready to do that.

Resolutions to be reported.

ADJOURNMENT—EXPORT OF PULP-WOOD.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House. I may mention to the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), with respect to the question he put to me in reference to pulp-wood, that, without at all desiring to prejudice the question as to what may be done, one way or the other, as to export duties, I am authorized to inform him, that occasion will be taken to prevent any parties who are making contracts for pulp-wood now, suffering, whatever the course adopted ultimately may be.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11:20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 14th May, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 106) respecting the Dominion Safe Deposit, Warehousing and Loan Company, and to change the name of the company to the Dominion Safe Deposit and Trusts Company (Limited).—(Mr. Gibson.)

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to remind the hon. Minister of Marine (Mr. Davies) of the orders adopted by this House in September last calling for several returns which I would have much liked to have laid on the Table, and which it will not take long to prepare. One relates to the case of the sub-agent of the department at Pictou, and the other to the life-boat. I would also be obliged if the members of the Government present would call the attention of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), who is not here, to the return called for on the 3rd of May regarding the dismissal of the car inspector and car oiler. Though this return was called for but a short time ago, yet hon. gentlemen know that every effort is made to hasten the business of the House, and, as this correspondence must be very short, I would like if this return, as well as the others, could be brought down as soon as possible.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I called the attention of the officers in my department to the remarks of the hon. gentleman the other day, and asked to have both these returns made ready at once, and I was given to understand that they would be ready in a day or two.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not wish to bore hon. gentlemen opposite, and I will not do so any more. I have spoken so often about the matter I wish to refer to that I am really ashamed to do so again, and this shall be the last time of asking. There were three returns I was careful to ask for very early in the session. One was a return of the commissions appointed to try partisan offences and their reports, and the other a return of the officials dismissed in York and King's county. These would not take much time. This is my final plea, and I ask that these returns be brought down.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The hon. gentleman has named only two. What is the third? If my hon. friend forgets his returns, no wonder we do.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, but if my hon. friend will give give me the returns I bring to his attention, that will be sufficient.

The PRIME MINISTER. You would be satisfied with these two.

Mr. FOSTER. For the present—yes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. RUSSELL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I rise to a question of privilege, a matter not of great moment, but one in respect to which I wish to be set right. I see it stated in one newspaper that I did not vote on the motion of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) in favour

of the free admission of agricultural implements. The account of that vote given to the Halifax "Morning Herald" represents me as not voting. My reason for not voting was that I had an arrangement with my hon. colleague (Mr. Borden, Halifax) who, I supposed, would vote in favour of the motion. In effect, I was paired with that hon. gentleman on all party questions in this House that should come up in his absence. I was not quite sure whether this was a party vote or not, but, as the hon. member for Assiniboia seemed to be leading the Opposition on this question, I thought it to be my duty to give my hon. friend the benefit of the doubt. Certainly I had no desire to shirk any vote on that question, and whatever my opinions might have been with respect to the subject of the duties on agricultural machinery, I would have felt bound to vote in favour of the motion to go into Committee of Supply, which, as I understand the procedure of the House, was the only question upon which we were voting.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will be good enough not to go into the reasons which caused him to vote as he did, but simply to state the facts.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not propose to do so, but simply to say that I wanted to give the benefit of any doubt that might exist to my hon. colleague, and for that reason alone I felt that I ought not to vote, although very desirous of doing so.

INVERNESS ELECTION PETITION.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the House to a statement which I find in the Halifax "Herald," which is as follows :—

The Inverness election trial was yesterday further adjourned to July 7th, the judge stating that the respondent was evidently attempting to evade service.

Sir, this is rather a serious charge against me and I wish to set at rest the minds of the House and whoever else may be interested in my conduct in regard to this matter. I also wish to put myself right before his lordship the trial judge in this case, because his lordship is evidently misinformed, as I shall presently demonstrate to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot go into questions affecting the courts, however interesting they may be. He must confine himself to what affects himself.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). As a member of the House, Mr. Speaker, I think you will agree with me that this concerns me very directly, and I wish to prove by what I will proceed to read to the House, that the charge made against me in this connection is unfounded :

DOMINION CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT.

Dominion of Canada,
Province of Nova Scotia. } In the Supreme Court.
To wit :

Between

Hugh Cameron,
Petitioner ;

and

Angus McLennan,
Respondent.

Take notice that Richard John Wicksteed, Esquire, Barrister-at-law, Commissioner for taking affidavits in Ontario for use in the courts of the province of Nova Scotia, the Examiner appointed by order of the Honourable Mr. Justice C. J. Townshend bearing date the twenty-ninth day of April, 1897, will attend on Wednesday, the fifth day of May instant, at his own office, situate in Wellington street of the City of Ottawa, in the county of Carleton and province of Ontario, and being Number one hundred and ten of the said street, at three o'clock in the forenoon precisely, for the purpose of taking your examination, as witness on behalf of the Petitioner in this action, pursuant to the said order.

Yours, &c.,
D. McNEIL,
GERALD TERNAN,
Petitioner's Solicitors.

Dated Ottawa, 4th May, 1897.

D. McNeil's name is struck over with a pen, in the original.

To Angus McLennan, Esq., M.P.,
Respondent.
Ontario.

In the County Court of the County of Carleton.

I order and command that Angus McLennan, Esquire, M.P., do attend before Richard John Wicksteed, Esquire, on Wednesday, the fifth day of May instant, at three o'clock in the forenoon, at his office, No. 110 Wellington street, in the city of Ottawa, in said county, to be examined before him as a witness on behalf of the Petitioner herein under the order of the Honourable C. J. Townshend, dated Halifax, April 29th, 1897, pursuant to the statute in that case made and provided.

W. A. ROSS,
Judge of the County Court of the County of Carleton, and Local Judge of the High Court of Justice for the Province of Ontario.

Dated Ottawa, 5th May, 1897.

On the same day, the 5th of May, I found this paper in my room at about half-past eleven o'clock p.m., and as it was evident that I could not turn back the hand of time, in my desperation I appealed to counsel, and that counsel learned in the law advised me that it was impossible for me to obey this subpœna, and I may say that I had a very decided opinion in the same direction before I consulted counsel. However, I thought it wise to consult counsel in the matter, and this is my answer to the charge that I evaded the service of the instrument. I submit this to the House in order that I may set myself right before the House, and before the learned judge who is supposed to try that suit.

SUPPLY—DISMISSALS FROM THE PUBLIC SERVICE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. CAMERON. I desire, before that motion is carried, to say a word or two to the present Administration and to the members of the House generally. We have been listening for some time, judging by the reports in the public press, to long discussions, some times interesting and some times very uninteresting, as to the action of the Government in the dismissal of Government officials. Strong language has been used, and very strong language has been used by the leader of the Opposition, judging by reports from the public press. We were told that the present Administration were demoralizing the whole civil service of this country by their conduct in dealing with the officials of the Government, both in the inside and in the outside service. We were told, according to reports in the public press, that we were introducing the spoils system into the administration of Canadian affairs. Sir, I venture to say now that no Government that has existed in Canada from the days of confederation, when the first Parliament met in the fall of 1867, until now, has acted more leniently and with greater forbearance to offensive civil servants than the present Administration has done. We were told that it was a great outrage upon public sentiment and the public feeling of this country; we were told that the hon. gentlemen upon the Treasury benches were dragging the civil service and the Crown into the dust. Sir, the hon. gentleman who made those statements arrived at one conclusion upon an assumed state of facts and by a certain process of reasoning; I, Sir, have arrived at the conclusion that the Government is censurable on another state of facts and by another process of reasoning. Hon. gentlemen opposite, and especially the leader of the Opposition, desire to censure the Government for dismissing without cause, or with cause, a certain number of civil servants; I, Sir, if I desire anything, desire that the Government should be censured for not dismissing ten instead of one civil servant. Now, I wish to draw the attention of the House for a moment or two to what appears to be a very peculiar and extraordinary case. It will be recollected by those who have paid any attention to the proceedings of the House that some days ago I asked a question, and that question was in the following words:—

Mr. CAMERON asked:

"1. Who is the manager or superintendent of the Industrial School, Winnipeg?

"2. When was he appointed?

"3. What was his former occupation and where did he live at the date of his appointment?

"5. What is his salary or allowance?

"6. Is the school denominational? If so, to what denomination does it belong?"

I was answered by the Minister of the Interior, and the answer is in the following words:—

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). 1. The Rev. John H. Fairlie is the Principal of the Industrial School. 2. He was appointed on the 15th September, 1896. 3. He was formerly a master in the Mohawk Institute, Brantford, and at the date of his appointment he resided at Meaford, Ont. 5. His salary is $1,000 a year with free quarters and rations for himself and wife. 6. The school is denominational. The school does not belong to any denomination, but is conducted by the Department of Indian Affairs as a Church of England school.

Sir, to my amazement I found that Rev. John Fairlie was appointed in September, 1896, appointed by the present Administration. I, who have unbounded faith in the conduct of the present Administration, must express my extreme regret that the Government appointed Rev. John Fairlie to any position under this Administration, and especially to a responsible and lucrative position such as that which Rev. John Fairlie now occupies. The Rev. John Fairlie resided in my riding for many years. He was rector of the English Church in Clinton. He was not a pronounced success. Inside of two years he emptied the church, all the leading men of the church left him and went to other churches. He was complained of by his parishioners to his bishop, and his bishop removed him from Clinton. He then seems to have become one of the sub-masters in the Mohawk Indian School at Brantford. He remained there but a short time, and then moved to a place called Meaford, and when in Meaford he was appointed by this Administration to the position of Superintendent of the Indian School near Winnipeg. If that had been the only thing in connection with Rev. John Fairlie, I would not have very much to say on the subject. But to my certain knowledge the Rev. John Fairlie of Clinton was a Tory of a very pronounced type, and the first I heard of him in that connection was when two of his own parishioners wrote me from Clinton to Goderich asking me if it was possible that this Administration had appointed him to be superintendent of the Indian school near Winnipeg. I answered that it was impossible, that it must have been done by the late Government, because that kind of thing they had been in the habit of doing for eighteen years. I was not satisfied, and therefore communicated with one of the departments at Ottawa, and to my extreme surprise I discovered that this Rev. John Fairlie had been appointed by the head of one department at Ottawa, acting for another head of a department, who was not then in the city. That is not all. This Rev. John Fairlie has made himself somewhat notorious since his appointment. I

was curious to know upon whose recommendation the Government assumed, or rather the acting Minister assumed the responsibility of appointing this man. I knew the local members of the Liberal party had not been consulted on the subject. I discovered that the only recommendation was the recommendation of the superintendent of the Mohawk school in Brantford. I do not know what his politics are, but I have a very shrewd suspicion as to what they are, and they are the same politics as those held by the Rev. John Fairlie. That is not all. So far the thing might have been pardoned as having been done inadvertently; but I charge here that the man was utterly unfit for the position, that he had not the least qualification for the position. The fact that he emptied his own church and was removed by his bishop, and remained a short time as under-teacher in the Mohawk school, certainly afforded no justification for his appointment and no qualification for his appointment to the position he now occupies. That is not quite all. We all know the Minister of Public Works. I think everybody in Ontario knows him now. The Minister of Public Works last fall, I judge by the reports in the public press, took a trip to the far west, out to the Pacific coast. On his return I understand the Minister of Public Works remained over for some days at Winnipeg, and while there was invited by the mayor of the city, by the president of the board of trade and by some of the members sitting in this House from that locality to visit the neighbourhood of Winnipeg, and among other places they visited the Industrial School situated seven or eight miles out of the city. I believe a few of the hon. gentleman's friends, whether political friends or not I do not know, nor do I care, accompanied the hon. gentleman on his trip to visit the Indian industrial school.

Mr. HUGHES. Were there fifty?

Mr. CAMERON. I do not know how many were there. Among other places visited was the industrial school, which was quite natural. The Minister of Public Works is a distinguished member of the present Administration. He is a man favourably known all over this wide Dominion of Canada now. He is a man who commands the confidence and respect at all events of his own political friends, and it is known as a matter of fact that he commands also the confidence and respect of a great many of his political opponents. He visited the Indian school, and one would naturally suppose that when a distinguished Canadian and prominent member of this Administration, a man who occupies so prominent a place in the eyes of the Canadian people, visited the school as a Minister of the Crown, he would have been treated with common courtesy, respect and decency. Usually we know when a distinguished man visits one of these public schools a holiday is declared for the children in honour of his visit. There was no holiday declared on that occasion. The party drove out a distance of about eight miles; I think it was in the fall of the year, and it was raw, cold and disagreeable. Naturally the Minister of Public Works and his friends, knowing there was no accommodation at the place, took with them the necessary ingredients.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CAMERON. Now, you know, Mr. Speaker, in fact everybody knows, that the Minister of Public Works is a teetotaller. If the word "ingredients" meant something more than cold water and ginger-beer, as hon. gentlemen opposite clearly indicate, and which they would fortify themselves with in such a case, they might laugh; but as the hon. Minister is known as a teetotaller, I take it for granted that so far as he was concerned he took nothing but teetotal drinks with him. It was quite natural that the party should carry the necessary refreshments. They made application to the head of the school for hot water for tea, not for hot whisky. I am told hot water was refused. They wished accommodation in the school room for lunch during the afternoon. That request was denied, and denied not in the most gracious manner, but, as I am informed, in the most ungracious and discourteous manner. I say that the moment the Minister and his friends were so treated the man should be removed. That is not all. The public press of Winnipeg took notice of it, and pointed out the want of courtesy and want of respect and even disrespect shown to the Minister of Public Works. This Rev. John Fairlie, a late rector in the English Church, a parson, rushed into print, and published in the "Nor-Wester" a letter from which I shall read a few extracts to the House. I say here and now, before the Ministers, and before the heads of the department responsible for this man's appointment, the moment his conduct was such as I have spoken of when the Minister of Public Works visited the school, that moment he should have been dismissed. In the first place, he never should have been appointed, and in the second place, when he was appointed by an oversight, he should have been dismissed. He rushes into print and he uses the following choice language:—

Mr. DAVIN. What is the date?

Mr. CAMERON. It is dated the 4th November. His letter is headed, not by Mr. Fairlie himself, but by the editor, showing that they are both sailing in the same boat; the letter is headed in large letters, "A Jamboree." Now, of all the members in this House, not even excepting the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), I never would suspect

my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works of indulging in a jamboree. I might suspect my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), but I never could suspect the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), and the headings on the letter go on, "A Jamboree." "Tarte and the Gang had a glorious time at the school." "A regular spree." "Champagne and whisky and cigars were indulged in galore"; and then the Rev. Mr. Fairlie, an ex-rector in the English Church, a person supposed to be of some standing, writes the following:—

That I refused to loan the tables and chairs for use outside the institution is true, but my instructions from the department are "to lend nothing," and I try to obey orders, and am not blameworthy on this point. That I refused either hot or cold water, is not true.

I am told as a matter of fact that he refused the hot and cold water, and refused the table. He says here, that he was told by the department to lend nothing. Is the man sane, or is he a madman, that he cannot distinguish between the lending of an article, required by a Minister of the Crown for a lunch, and between the ordinary lending out of the property of a school. The Rev. Mr. Fairlie continues:

There may have been a bad smell in some of the rooms, as you say.

I do not wonder at that, considering the man that was sent to take charge of them.

There may have been a bad smell in some of the rooms, as you say, but that would be in one of the smaller rooms, and when a dozen men, who have spent two hours at a banquet where champagne and whisky and soda were served, and cigars freely smoked, get crowded into a small room, it is not conducive to sweet smells.

Now, this is the language made use of by the Rev. John Fairlie, an ex-rector of the English Church, and a parson of that church for some years, and now superintendent of the industrial school at Winnipeg. The moment that letter appeared in the public press I say that this Government ought to have dismissed that man without any further inquiry. A man who will write such a letter as that of a Minister of the Crown, and those who accompanied him, is utterly unworthy to fill that position. He was unworthy to fill it from the beginning, and he further proved himself to be unworthy by the publication of such a letter as this. He goes on to write:

I challenge the fullest investigation of my work and conduct of the school, by either the Government, or city council, or board of trade—only, instead of spending two hours and ten minutes at a luncheon with champagne and whisky, and only eleven minutes in the school, let them reverse the order, and give two hours for the inspection and ten minutes for lunch without whisky and soda, and I will be content to bear their criticisms.

You see how particular he is to put in champagne and whisky in several paragraphs of his letter; the implication being that the Minister of Public Works went there on a big jamboree, indulging in champagne and whisky, and passing the intermediate moments in smoking, perhaps very bad cigars. Now, Sir, I am told by those who were present, and I dare say it will be confirmed here to-day, that that statement is absolutely without foundation. There may have been champagne possibly; I know nothing about that, I care nothing about that. There may have been some whisky; I know nothing about that; and very likely there were cigars, but is that any justification for this official of the Government sitting down deliberately and by implication, if not directly, making this scandalous charge against a Minister of the Crown. Sir, I say again, that the moment this letter appeared in the public press, this man ought to have been dismissed. The moment it came to the knowledge of the Administration that this man acted in such a most discourteous manner towards a Minister of the Crown and the mayor of the city of Winnipeg, and the president of the board of trade, and at least one member of this Parliament, he should have been dismissed. I say further, that Mr. Fairlie never ought to have been appointed. I say that his record shows that he is not a man to fill the position of superintendent of an industrial school.

Now, Sir, I make these statements, because, in the first place, I wish to bring this matter to the attention of the House and the Government, and, in the second place, because hon. gentlemen opposite have been, for the last month, day in and day out, in season and out of season, denouncing this Administration for removing men without any reason or cause. I repeat, that so fas as I have heard the discussions in the House, no man has been dismissed without reasonable justification. I say, Sir, that if this Government does its duty, for every man they have dismissed from the public service for offensive partisanship they ought to have dismissed ten. I trust that hereafter when charges are made against publis officials for improperly interfering in political contests, and those charges are proven, these officials will be allowed to engage in their political proclivities without being encumbered with a government office and a government salary. I make the statements I have made because this Government has been so forbearing and so kindhearted and so lenient, that they have kept in their employment and re-engaged, time and again, as I and others in this House well know, officials whose services should have been dispensed with. There is only one way to deal with this subject—let hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House kick as much as they like—and that is the way the Conservative party dealt with the officials of this Dominion after the election of 1878.

I recollect well that in 1879, on the dredge that was then working in my county, there was not a hand left who was appointed by the Mackenzie Administration. In that respect hon. gentlemen on this side of the House ought to take a leaf out of the book of hon. gentlemen opposite—I would be sorry if they did so in any other respect—and deal with these officials as they ought to be dealt with. I submit the matter to the House. I do not propose to make any motion; but I would like very much to hear what excuse the Minister of Public Works makes for this official, appointed by the Administration of which he is so distinguished a member, and I shall wait for it and listen to it with a great deal of patience.

Mr. JAMESON. Mr. Speaker, as I was present on the occasion referred to, I would like to say a few words with regard to the events detailed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cameron) who has just spoken. When the hon. Minister of Public Works came to Winnipeg, I occupied the position of mayor of that city, and in that capacity I asked him to accompany us to St. Andrew's Rapids, for the purpose of investigating the necessity of improving the river at that point; and, as we would be absent a whole day, I asked the Minister of Public Works, on behalf of the city of Winnipeg, to a lunch such as we are accustomed to give in that city. We in the city of Winnipeg are accustomed to treat gentlemen as they should be treated. We entertain them, especially gentlemen of official position like the Minister of Public Works, as we think they should be entertained, and we wish to maintain a reputation for doing so. We did not wish to go down there and give the Minister of Public Works anything but a decent kind of lunch, and I admit that amongst the drinkables given there was champagne. But I deny that there was anything in the shape of a jamboree, or drunkenness of any kind. In fact, after we returned, we again entertained Mr. Tarte to dinner at the Manitoba Hotel. So that there is ample evidence that the statements made by Mr. Fairlie to the paper were absolutely false and malicious. I do not wish at this early stage of my parliamentary experience to criticise Ministers whom I am bound to support, although I must express some sympathy with the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. The facts are these. Mr. Tarte was the guest of the city of Winnipeg. He did not know what sort of lunch we were going to give him; he did not know what there was to drink or to eat, but he accepted our hospitality such as we had to give him. This gentleman, Mr. Fairlie, seems to be an extreme temperance crank. There is no doubt he did not treat us with the courtesy due to a Minister of the Crown. When I asked him if we might be entertained in the industrial school, he said it was against the rules of the department to allow any liquor to be introduced into the school. I admitted the force of his objection, and said: "Then, Mr. Fairlie, we will have our lunch in the building adjacent to your school; but we propose to entertain the Minister as we are accustomed to entertain gentlemen in his position, and shall not be guided by your wishes as to what we shall eat or drink at our lunch." When we had our lunch in the building adjacent to the school, Mr. Fairlie refused to give us the most ordinary courtesies; he refused to provide hot water for tea, which some of us drank. Some of those present were total abstainers, and they drank tea, and Mr. Fairlie refused to give us hot water even for our tea; and after the lunch was over, when we went into the school-house again, he treated us with discourtesy. He followed that with the attack he made on the Minister of Public Works in the papers—an attack which was copied in the eastern papers all over Canada—in which he stated that we were all on a big spree or jamboree on that occasion. I must say it shows the extreme Christian forbearance of this Government that they submit to an insult of this kind from an official without any complaint. I have formed the opinion, especially after what I have heard in this House of the iniquitous manner in which the Government are treating some of their officials, that so far as my constituency and its surroundings are concerned, the officials have been treated with the most extreme forbearance. Mr. Fairlie not only treated us with discourtesy, but he has spread slanderous statements about the Minister of Public Works. The Minister of Public Works, at that luncheon, was one of the total abstainers. I confess I was not. At the same time, I maintain that we behaved ourselves with the greatest decorum, returning to the city in as good and sober a state of mind as we left it. I do not know that it is necessary for me to say anything more on this matter. I rose for the purpose of adding my testimony to the effect that this statement of Mr. Fairlie was a gross slander on the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I want to add, Mr. Speaker, just one word to what has been said. I had the pleasure of participating in the trip down to St. Andrew's Rapids, and I wish to direct attention to one or two points that have not been referred to. I may say that the greatest indignation prevailed among the business people of Winnipeg because of the scurrilous letter which this reverend gentleman sent to the paper; and that indignation will be increased when I inform the House that this gentleman first sent that letter to myself for publication in the paper of which I have the honour to be editor. When I read the letter, and saw that it was filled with lies from beginning to end, I declined to publish it. However, I published Mr. Fairlie's denial

that he had refused to furnish hot water. I published all of the letter that it was proper to publish, and explained why the balance was not published. Now, this Mr. Fairlie denies in that letter that he refused hot water to the lady who was the caterer. I may say that when that application was first made by the president of the board of trade, Mr. F. H. Mathewson, and by the mayor of Winnipeg, who had just sat down, for permission to have lunch in the school, it was refused, and I think properly refused; and in my paper I commended Mr. Fairlie for refusing to have the lunch in the school, because wines might be used. After the refusal, the president of the board of trade, and I think the mayor, asked him if he would lend a few tables in order that the lunch might be held in the school-house adjoining. This he brusquely refused to do, and compelled that poor woman to cart tables and chairs all the way from Winnipeg, a distance of over eight miles. And this is not the worst. Even when these tables and chairs had been carted down, and the poor lady applied to Mr. Fairlie for hot water he absolutely refused to give it. I have her statement to that effect in her letter which was published in the "Tribune" of Winnipeg. The charge is also, I think, made in Mr. Fairlie's letter that it took two hours and ten minutes to complete that lunch. My recollection is that we were not sitting there more than three-quarters of an hour, or not more than an hour at the most. I sat myself next the Hon. Mr. Tarte, and I can testify that he was a teetotaler, upon that occasion at least, for he drank no strong liquor. But inasmuch as there were a number of Conservatives with us on the trip, I could not say as much for the entire party. What increased the indignation of the people there in connection with this matter was the fact that on the strength of this letter of the Rev. Mr. Fairlie, the statement was sent broadcast throughout the Dominion that the Minister of Public Works had been on a big jamboree at this school inspection. Upon the strength of that report, the "Mail and Empire" was able to describe him in its editorial "as an Eastern Sybarite who carried his wet groceries around with him."

On the question of dismissing public servants who have taken an active part in politics, I have never said a word publicly but have felt very deeply, especially coming, as I do, from the North-west, where, I may say for the information of the House, the party organization which has existed in that country for the last ten or fifteen years has been almost entirely carried on by civil servants, and it is my profound conviction that the Government has shown the utmost forbearance in dealing with these people. I believe that had the case been reversed, had it been the Conservatives who came into power instead of ourselves, they would have dismissed from office for active participation in politics ten officials for every one this Government has dismissed. When I hear hon. members opposite denouncing the Government in such strong language, when I hear them declaiming about the stupendous outrages perpetrated, the utter absurdity and ludicrousness of the thing provokes me to laughter. I believe that there are hundreds of these officials throughout the Dominion to-day who marvel that they have been left in office so long, and for my part I would be inclined to advise the members of the Government to pay very little heed to the denunciations of hon. gentlemen opposite, but to have no hesitation whatever, where it is clearly shown that officials have participated actively in politics, in cutting their heads off.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). As the Minister whose conduct is called into question, it is perhaps fitting that I should say a few words on this subject. I have no doubt that the Government is open to indictment at the hands of my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Cameron) for having been guilty of appointing a Tory to office. We recognize the gravity of the offence which we have committed; and perhaps it will be proper for me to say that if the hon. gentleman will stay his hand and not condemn us too severely, we will try and not offend in that respect very often in the future. In respect of the particular matter under discussion, I simply desire to say that the appointment was made upon the recommendation of the late Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs (Mr. Reed), who, I have no doubt, satisfied himself that the appointment was a proper one and that the gentleman appointed would be an efficient officer. Immediately after I took office, my attention was called to this, and I may say that I was in Winnipeg at the time the occurrence took place and the fact was brought to my notice there that this gentleman's conduct was open to question in regard to this particular matter. And here let me say that I think it is the greatest tribute to the forbearance of the Minister of Public Works that he did not at once demand the dismissal of this officer. I was somewhat surprised that he did not feel it his duty, under the circumstances, to ask for this gentleman's instant dismissal. When the matter was brought to my attention, I spoke to my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, and we agreed that inasmuch as I had no time before the session to carefully investigate the industrial schools of the North-west, or any one of them, it would be well not to deal with this when the matter was fresh and the people were irritated, but to let it rest until I had time to deal with the management of the schools, which otherwise required investigation, which I proposed to make at the close of the session. That is the position in which the matter

stands at present. We have determined to look into this matter and see that the official is properly dealt with and that no person shall have cause to complain of the conduct of any officer holding so important a position in the service.

Mr. CRAIG. I do not think the Government will thank the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) for bringing this matter before the House and the country. I think it is an episode which they might very well have desired should be passed over. As recited by the hon. member for West Huron, himself, it is not at all favourable to the Government of the day, and I do not think it will have that effect in the country. Before dealing further with that question, I wish to refer to a few remarks made by the hon. member for West Huron on the subject of dismissals in general, and I repeat that I am a little surprised he should have brought that subject up, because we have been charged over and over again by hon. gentlemen opposite with wasting time in discussing such questions. In view of this charge so frequently made, it will be interesting to the country to learn that to-day it is not this side of the House but the opposite side which has brought up this discussion and delayed us from going into Committee of Supply. But let me call the attention of the House to this fact, that the only reason why we find fault with the Government is this, that when this matter of dismissals was brought to the attention of the House last session, the hon. First Minister rose in his place and made the solemn pledge that in every case, before any one would be dismissed an investigation would be held and the accused —whether charged with offensive partisanship or any other offence—would have full opportunity of defending himself. I hold therefore that every official in the country is justified, just as the House is justified in placing the most implicit confidence in that formal pledge given by the leader of the Government. No pledge could be more solemn. It was made openly in this House, it was made to the country, it was made to the office-holders throughout the Dominion, and therefore we have the right to complain in every case in which it is violated. Now, what does the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) say? He says the Government have been very lenient, he says that where they have dismissed one official, he would have dismissed ten. I heard a few "hear, hear's" in response to that, but am glad I did not hear many, and I hope that is not the prevailing sentiment among hon. gentlemen opposite. I am sure there is no justice in it, I feel confident that no one, no matter how extreme a partisan he may be, would endorse such a proposition. We have been satisfied to accept the position laid down by the hon. First Minister, that when an office-holder is accused of offensive partisanship, and when he has had an opportunity of defending himself, and the charge has been brought home to him, then, and then only, will he be dismissed. I accept this position, although I am free to confess that in my opinion an office-holder should be allowed a certain latitude, and that political partisanship should not be a bar against his holding office unless that partisanship was displayed in an offensive manner. I am surprised to hear the proposition laid down that absolute neutrality in politics is the price of holding office under the Liberal party. I wish that hon. gentlemen opposite would take the trouble to impress this doctrine upon their office-holders in Ontario. I wish they would indoctrinate their own followers in the provinces with this idea and force them to follow the rule that absolute neutrality in politics is the price of holding office. In my own election, for instance, the most active stumper against me was the inspector of licenses for that county. It was he who was the petitioner when my election was protested. I mention this to show how little consistency there is in the party opposite laying down that proposition and enforcing it against office-holders appointed by the late Government, when in Ontario they take no such stand, and not only allow but encourage the office-holders appointed by themselves to display the most active partisanship. Now, to come down to the matter that has been brought before the House by the member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron), I may say that I remember reading about the incident at the time; and, while I had the idea that the Minister of Public Works was a total abstainer, I had no idea that he was indulging even in tea too strongly. Still, I gathered the impression that the party that were with him were having a pretty good time, and that they had taken an ample supply of champagne and whisky and were enjoying these things immensely. Where is the fault that is imputed to Mr. Fairlie? The member for Winnipeg (Mr. Jameson) puts his crime in a very few words: he says that Mr. Fairlie is an extreme temperance crank. I do not know that it is a crime to be an extreme temperance crank. I myself am a total abstainer, although I am not a crank. But I do not think that the majority of the people of the country will find fault with Mr. Fairlie with being an extreme temperance crank. I do not think that hon. gentlemen opposite would like to have it understood that the Liberal party objected to an extreme temperance crank holding office under them. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) objects to that and thinks that he should be dismissed. What did he do?

Mr. RICHARDSON. He lied.

Mr. CRAIG. I do not know that it is recognized by the Liberal party as a crime

for a man to lie. I will not apply that further. But, Sir, what did Mr. Fairlie do? So far as I remember, he did this: The party was going to entertain the Minister of Public Works, and as they were to go near this Indian school they wanted to have luncheon in the school. But Mr. Fairlie, being an extreme temperance crank, as the hon. member for Winnipeg says, refuses to allow that on the grounds that it was against the rules to allow intoxicating liquor in the school. He was willing, I understand, that they should have luncheon there if they would leave the whisky and champagne outside. But you could not separate them from the whisky and champagne. They said: If that is to be left outside, we will stay outside too. And so the member for West Huron says that Mr. Fairlie was so discourteous as to refuse to allow them to have luncheon in the school, with whisky and champagne as part of the refreshments. Now I say, in all seriousness, that Mr. Fairlie acted as he should have acted in that case, that he carried out his instructions to the letter and that he deserves not dismissal but praise, that he deserves an encomium from the Minister of Public Works for doing as he did. I am sure that any man who does his duty, who obeys his orders, should not be visited with punishment. Had he obeyed his orders even against the head of his own department, he would deserve praise for his courage and consistency. If Mr. Fairlie had allowed this party to have lunched in the Indian school, with whisky and champagne as accompaniments of that lunch, he should be dismissed, as he would not be worthy to occupy his present position. But a great point is made of the fact that Mr. Fairlie wrote a letter. It is said that he represented this affair as what is called a jamboree. But Mr. Fairlie did not call it a jamboree. We know what editors are. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) knows what editors are. If that hon. gentleman had received a letter like this that might reflect against some member of the Conservative party, he might say that the incident referred to was a jamboree, but that would not make the writer of the letter say so. Well, it is said that Mr. Fairlie lied in that letter. I doubt if it can be shown that he did not tell the exact truth. I believe he did, or that he intended to tell the exact truth. I say he deserves credit for writing that letter, because he had been misrepresented in regard to this matter, and this was his defence. The question is, is the letter true?

Mr. RICHARDSON. No.

Mr. CRAIG. The hon. member for Lisgar says it is not true. Well, now I think that this is one of those cases where investigation is required. Some say that the letter is true, some that it is not true. How are we going to decide? I was very much amused, and the House was amused, with the remarks made by the hon. member for Lisgar, when that hon. gentleman said that Mr. Fairlie ought to be dismissed because he had refused to give hot water for tea.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I did not say that he ought to be dismissed because he refused to give hot water for tea. I say he ought to be dismissed because he lied in his letter and slandered the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. CRAIG. I heard some remark of that kind—that he ought to be dismissed for discourtesy, and one way in which it was said he had shown discourtesy was that he refused to give hot water for tea. Now, Mr. Fairlie denies that. Even had he refused hot water, he might have been justified as an extreme temperance crank, for he might have been afraid that they would use it for whisky, and he did not want to be an abettor in that. He refused tables, we are told. It is coming down to pretty small matter to say that a man should be dismissed from an important office of this kind because he refused tables and hot water for a luncheon party. The whole question is: Did Mr. Fairlie, in what he did, carry out his instructions in refusing to allow whisky and champagne to be taken in that industrial school? Does he conduct the affairs of the school generally in a proper manner? If he has carried out his instructions, if he conducts the school in a proper manner, let him be commended. If it is said that he did not carry out his instructions or that his administration is not satisfactory, let that matter be investigated and the case decided fairly and justly.

Mr. FLINT. As a total abstainer and one representing that element in the total abstinence party who endeavour on all occasions to act the part of gentlemen in our social relations with others who do not take precisely the same view of this subject that we do ourselves, I think this discussion, and the newspaper extracts that have been read amply prove that, whatever else the Rev. Mr. Fairlie may be, he is not a gentleman. He did not betray in any portion of his conduct as it has been recounted here the instincts of a gentleman in his treatment of these distinguished men who visited his school. If every man who is a total abstainer and who happens, in the intercourse of society, to mingle with others who partake of wine and champagne is to be stigmatized as associated with drunkards and with persons who go on what are called jamborees when they associate together in luncheons, the comments in Mr. Fairlie's letter might be justified. I was amused at the ironical laughter and cheers from the other side of the House whenever champagne or whisky or hot water was mentioned, these cheers and this laughter coming from gentlemen who every day mingle in the best social life of Ottawa, where hot water and champagne and whisky at times

are used without the slightest intimation or hint or an impropriety on the part of those who use them. I was surprised that gentlemen who see such refreshments customarily used in best society should uphold a man, whether he be a total abstainer or whatever he may be, who would endeavour in the public press to give the impression that simply because certain gentlemen use these refreshments or were present when they were used, they were a party of rowdies and were guilty of improper conduct. The only inference to be drawn from the letter of Mr. Fairlie, the inference that was drawn, as shown by the comments of the Tory press throughout Nova Scotia and elsewhere, was that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works was one of the most guilty parties in the matter in countenancing and taking part in what is known in slang phrase as a jamboree. There is no reason why the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Craig) or myself, or any other of my hon. friends who are total abstainers, might not have been joined in that condemnation if we had by accident accompanied that party visiting the industrial school. But I must say that had I been a Minister of the Crown, had I been a simple member of this Parliament supporting this Government, and been of that party, and seen the use that was made of the letter of the Rev. Mr. Fairlie, and been a witness of the discourtesy, the gross and unpardonable discourtesy, of a public servant in his treatment of these gentlemen, I would have had his official head in twenty-four hours. I say it is intolerable that a public man should be treated in this way, and I think that the whole course and conduct of this gentleman shows that he purposely did all he could to make the visit of these gentlemen as disagreeable as possible. Even if these gentlemen did call for hot water for the liquor which they considered perfectly proper to partake of, what business was it of his to interfere with their enjoyment? Was he to assume that they were guilty of improper conduct unworthy in a public school? My hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) has said in regard to his refusal of the school-room for the purpose of luncheon that it might be justifiable on other grounds, and that he might in a dignified manner pleaded the rules of the department; but when the rest of his conduct is exhibited, his gross refusal of the ordinary decencies of life to gentlemen visiting the school from the city, his conduct was most censurable. The Minister of the Crown was the guest of the city of Winnipeg on that occasion, and aside from the fact of his subsequently writing this absolutely false letter on the subject, I think it was the duty of the Government to have dismissed that man, and I for one would heartily have supported the Administration in such dismissal.

Mr. FLINT.

Mr. SPROULE. I would not say anything on this question but for the fact that I have been well acquainted with the Rev. Mr. Fairlie for several years before he went out to the North-west. I do not know by whom he was appointed or recommended, but I do know that in my section of the country he was for a length of time a very much respected and respectable member of the Episcopal Church, and was in charge of a congregation there. I also know that he had strong temperance sentiments; but that he offensively imposed them on others, I never heard until this incident. Now, I regret to hear so much said against him, because I am quite sure that it will not be accepted by those who are acquainted with that gentleman. I am not here to defend his conduct, I never saw that letter, and I am not able to say whether it contained lies or truth; but from my knowledge of the man, knowing that he was in charge of an industrial school, there for the purpose of helping to civilize an uncivilized people, and to educate the rising generation, I have no doubt at all, from what I know of him, that he assumed it to be his duty as far as possible to cultivate and improve their moral sentiments and religious tone as much as he did to educate them in other lines; and that he regarded it as important to set before them good examples, and to avoid as far as possible that any bad example should be shown them. I have no doubt that he endeavoured to carry out the instructions that were given him when he was put in charge of that school to the best of his knowledge and belief. He might have gone beyond what some other men would have done on this occasion, but knowing him as I have done for so long a time, and believing him to be a respectable and intelligent member of the Episcopal Church, and a strong temperance man, and withal a gentleman so far as I ever knew or heard of him, I would be very sorry to believe that he intentionally did what has been attributed to him as indefensible conduct. I must confess that when I heard of the incident, I was pleased to know he did his duty. I noticed that the Minister of Public Works paid no attention to it afterwards, but left him alone, and I thought it was really very much to his credit that he did so. If Mr. Fairlie did what was wrong, it would react upon himself more than it would upon the Minister of Public Works. Amongst the temperance people of this country, and where temperance sentiment is strong, and amongst the ministers of the gospel of this country, I do not think they are very likely to condemn the Rev. Mr. Fairlie because he tried to set a good example before the rising generation, and to carry out what he believed to be his instructions when he was put in charge of that industrial school.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would ask the hon. member from Grey if he is aware that his

own brother, Alderman Sproule of Winnipeg, accompanied that party down the river and participated in that lunch, and further, that his own brother who is a total abstainer, wrote a letter to a Winnipeg paper expressing the utmost indignation and disgust at the conduct of that gentleman, and at the untruth contained in that very letter that was read this afternoon.

Mr. SPROULE. That may all be, but I am quite sure that I may safely say that if he accompanied that crowd he would neither endorse the use of liquor or use it himself. But as to the correctness of what appeared in that letter, I know nothing about it. I am not denying the contention of those who say that it contained a falsehood, nor am I defending the letter, because I never saw it. I am only speaking of the gentleman as I knew him in the past, and because I believe him to be an honest, Christian man.

Mr. BERGERON. I did not intend to say anything about the Fairlie matter, because I know nothing of it. If this discussion has been started by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) with the object of giving a certificate to my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, I may take the occasion of saying that I am happy to bear testimony to the fact that although I have not known the hon. gentleman to be a teetotaler, I have known him to be a very moderate drinker; and as far as smoking is concerned, I know that not only does he not smoke himself, but he hates the company of smokers. But it was not to say this that I now claim the indulgence of the House. I intended yesterday, when this question of dismissals was before the House, to give some few cases which happened in the riding which I have the honour to represent; but afterwards, having heard so much about dismissals, I was afraid that the House might be tired, and I did not speak. But since the question comes up again, it may be interesting to the House to know some cases that have occurred, and which I will give in answer to the reasons advanced by hon. gentlemen opposite who think that the Government should have dismissed more employees than they have done, and also in answer to the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), who is astonished at the forbearance of the Government in making, as he says, so few dismissals. Now, if my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works has been generous as was claimed by the Minister of the Interior a moment ago in the case of Mr. Fairlie, I am afraid that he has not been quite so generous in the cases of a number of poor employees in the county of Beauharnois. Since the session has commenced, I have asked the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals for his reasons for the dismissals of those employees on the canal, and every time the Minister of Railways and Canals or the Postmaster General have answered that they were dismissed summarily without any investigation, upon the recommendation of the hon. Minister of Public Works. Now, yesterday I heard my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister) say that the Government did not intend to introduce the spoils system into this country. Mr. Speaker, allow me to say that the spoils system has already been brought into the Dominion of Canada, for if it is not the spoils system, I would like to know what else to call the dismissal of Conservative employees upon the public works. I am aware, both from personal knowledge and from hearsay, that in my own district employees have been dismissed for the sole reasons that they had been appointed by the Conservative Administration, and because they went to the polls and voted on the 23rd of June last. They were men who had taken no more share in elections than the employees of this House, some of them had not even gone to public meetings, but they were dismissed simply to make places for partisans. When I say that the spoils system has been imported into this country, I mean this: That three lockmasters on the Beauharnois Canal have been dismissed and have been replaced by the most active and offensive partisans belonging to the party of hon. gentlemen opposite. The Minister of Public Works, when he went into the county the other day, must have heard that the men who were recently appointed have been working night and day in the recent provincial elections that took place on the 11th of May. The lockmaster of lock No. 6, whose lock was broken the other day by the steamer "Ocean," after being appointed on the 1st of May, was at the town of Beauharnois on the 4th of May, the day of the nomination, without the permission of his superintendent, having left his work and left his lock, and was serving liquor behind the bar of a hotel in the town of Beauharnois. Hon. gentlemen opposite might not call that active and offensive partisanship, but everybody knew there what it meant.

The postmaster at Beauharnois, Mr. Laurin, who has replaced Mr. Doutre, the old postmaster, on the recommendation of the Minister of Public Works, was an active and offensive partisan during the last elections. When I was at Valleyfield the other day, the postmaster, Mr. Pitre, received a letter telling him to transfer the post office into other hands. The original letter is in French, and I give a translation:

Post Office Inspector's Office,
Montreal, May 8th, 1897.

Mr. D. Pitre, Valleyfield, P.Q.

Sir,—I am just in receipt from the Post Office Department of a letter informing me of the transfer of the post office to Mr. E. Dion, of your locality, who has been appointed in your stead. The transfer of the office will soon be made by one of the officers of the department.

You will please comply with this notice. In the meantime, please make arrangements to hand

over to your successor, through this officer, the stamps and the money and all that is now used for the working of your office.

J. W. BAIN,
Post Office Inspector.

I call on the Minister of Public Works, who now knows every one there, to state who is this E. Dion, to whom the office has been transferred. In my opinion he is the most active and offensive partisan—I do not say he is not a respectable man—in the whole county of Beauharnois on the other side of politics. The hon. Minister knows it. Probably he is the man who helped the hon. gentleman in his election more than any other.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Was he in the public service ?

Mr. BERGERON. If the hon. gentleman wishes to interrupt me he must take off his hat. The hon. gentleman is in the habit of interrupting members, and he should not do it without taking off his hat. He may speak when I have finished, if he pleases. I was speaking about the new postmaster, and was saying that during the late election, even after he was appointed—this letter is dated 8th May—he was working probably more than any one else. Not only was that the case at the election in June, but during the last local election. Is it not apparent that when any person is so appointed and the spoils system is introduced, so soon as another Administration comes into power this man would have to go purely and simply for the reason that he was an active and offensive partisan ? It is evident that the spoils system has now been introduced into this country. I want to bring to the attention of the House a matter which I think will strike forcibly every hon. member on both sides. We have heard very much about the public service and in regard to public servants being allowed, as the Prime Minister declared last session, to give their votes like honest and respectable men, and that every public servant is allowed to go and vote according to his conscience. This declaration was made by the Prime Minister in this House. Have public employees been allowed to do so ? Have they been allowed to go like honest and respectable men and put their ballots in the electoral box ? No. In Beauharnois there are 75 employees on the canal. Those employees are nearly all Conservatives, having been appointed on my recommendations during the eighteen years during which I had the patronage of the county. When I became a member of Parliament one-half of the employees on the canal had been appointed by the Liberals. Not one of those employees was dismissed by a Conservative Government or their dismissal asked by myself. Their places have been made vacant by death or from officers being superannuated at their own request. Here is a letter sent by the Liberal committee in Beauharnois to every one of the employees on the Beauharnois Canal. The original is in French, and I give a translation :

Beauharnois, 10th May, 1897.

Sir,—I am asked to inform you, that it would be better for you not to vote at the election which takes place to-morrow, for, in doing so, you risk to lose your place.

It is left to you to act in your interest.

By order,
THE COMMITTEE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). By whom is it signed ?

Mr. BERGERON. "The Committee."

The PRIME MINISTER. Then there is no signature ?

Mr. BERGERON. I think the Minister of Public Works knows the writing. This letter, I say, was sent to every man on the canal. We all know human nature. The next day every one of those employees voted against the Conservative candidate. They said they wanted to save their positions. I do not know but that stronger proof could be furnished in the form of affidavits made by some of the men stating that they would vote for Mr. Bisson. Has it come down to this, that employees performing their duty, working hard night or day for $1.25, and having to pay their share of taxes and perform their duties as ordinary citizens, and especially after they have been granted the right to vote, should be treated like slaves, and threatened with dismissal unless they support the powers that be. If such be the case, those men should not have the right to vote, because their judgment is biassed ; they cannot vote as honest men, but are obliged to cast their votes for a certain candidate in order to hold the positions they occupy. I am reminded that the Premier last session declared on the floor of Parliament that no man should be dismissed unless an investigation was granted and held, so that the charge might be investigated. I declare to my hon. friend now that three lockmasters on the Beauharnois Canal were summarily dismissed without more than two days' notice at the end of April, two or three days before the 1st of May ; and I tell him further, that some of those men who had occupied houses for ten or fifteen years, received notice that they had to be abandoned before the 1st of May for new occupants. No reason was given for these dismissals, no investigation was held, they were purely and simply made on the recommendation of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works given to the Minister of Railways and Canals. Some of those men had worked on the canal eighteen years and had always efficiently performed their duty. This fact can be ascertained by asking the superintendent, the engineer

in Montreal or Mr. Schreiber, and they will testify that the men have all performed their duty; and in fact the only fault that can be found is that at elections they voted Conservative, having been appointed by a Conservative Administration. I repeat that I am very much surprised such action should be allowed after the distinct and emphatic statement made and the position taken last year by the Premier on this subject. The hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) yesterday spoke of the employees of the canal as if they were ordinary day labourers, stating that they could be dismissed when the Government wished and replaced whenever their services were required. So far as I know the position of these men on the Beauharnois Canal has never been understood in that way. They have been appointed during good behaviour, and it has always been perfectly understood in the fall that they would be employed next spring. I heard the member for Welland make a statement which shows that the same system prevails on the Welland Canal. These men sometimes built small houses for their accommodation. This was particularly the case with the fourth lockman appointed on the Beauharnois Canal. The desire was expressed that the same number of lockmen should be appointed on the Beauharnois as worked on the Lachine, Cornwall and other canals, and the present leader of the Opposition, when he occupied the position of Minister of Railways and Canals, thought it an act of justice to the employees of the Beauharnois Canal that the same number of men should be employed. Therefore, a fourth lockman was appointed on each lock, and these men had to build their own houses. They did so. What sum can those men be able to obtain for their houses to-day, when they are built far away from villages, as we all know is the case with houses near canal locks? These men were appointed during good behaviour, and so long as they performed their duty to the satisfaction of the superintending engineer. Some of them had been there as long as thirty years, and others who were superannuated since I became a member of Parliament, were employed for forty years and had educated and reared their families there. It is looked upon as a piece of tyranny to turn these men out on the streets, merely for the reasons which have been stated in this House. The other day another man was dismissed named Laderoute, who has been connected with the canal for twenty-five years. He was an honest and respectable man who received $1.75 a day, and who always did his duty faithfully. I suppose we will be told that that dismissal was in the public interest and in the interest of economy but, nevertheless, that man has been replaced by two men. A week ago to-day I was driving along the Beauharnois Canal going to a public meeting, when I saw a gang of eighty men there with two foremen, and one-half of them were watching the other half doing nothing. One of the foremen is named Michel Cousineau whom my friend (Mr. Tarte) will remember, and Cousineau is about the most violent and insulting Liberal politician in the county of Beauharnois. The other foreman was an old employee named Chevalier whom they have made foreman since Laderoute was dismissed. I mention this to show that the spoils system has been introduced by the present Government. Every public employee, whether here in Ottawa or on the Beauharnois Canal, is afraid of losing his position the next morning. Although they may be perfectly convinced they have done their duty, although they may have been diligent and efficient public employees, yet every one of them is afraid of being kicked out in the morning for political reasons. It is a bad thing for Canada that the Government introduced this spoils system, because public employees will take means to provide for themselves, fearing that when the next Government comes into power they will lose their positions. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) said he was surprised that more public employees had not been dismissed, and the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) asked: What would have happened if the Conservatives had come into power last June, instead of the Liberals? I will tell what did happen when the Conservatives got into power before, and I will emphasize what I said the other day for the benefit of the Minister of Public Works who is now in his seat. When that hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) was on the same side of politics as I am, there was a man in the county of Beauharnois who insulted the Conservative party on the hustings, who wrote in the papers against them, who went about speaking against them, and who was a most violent Liberal politician. His name was Mr. Beique, and he was the superintendent on the Beauharnois Canal. He called Sir John Macdonald names which, taking into consideration the audience he was addressing, were most damaging. He called Sir John Macdonald an old Orangeman, an old Freemason, said that he had been the greatest enemy of Roman Catholics and French Canadians, and described Sir Hector Langevin as a thief, and other names just as sweet. That man had been appointed on the canal by Sir A. A. Dorion under the Mackenzie Administration. Well, was he dismissed when the Conservatives came into power on the 17th September, 1878? No, Sir. The Liberals of the county were asking not to dismiss him because he was a poor man; they acknowledged that he was guilty but they pleaded that he should be retained. The Conservatives were asking—just like, I suppose, to-day the Liberals are pestering the lives out of my hon. friends opposite—that he should be put out of his position. I took a middle course, and

at the suggestion of the then Minister of Railways and Canals (Sir Charles Tupper), an investigation was granted to Mr. Beique. As far as the discharge of his duties were concerned there was nothing particular against him, although charges might have been brought: but it was admitted and proven that he had taken a violent and offensive part in the elections. Now, Sir, let me tell this to the House. Sir Charles Tupper, then Minister of Railways and Canals, asked me not to press for the dismissal of Mr. Beique. He said to me: If you wish him dismissed, of course we will do it, but I am an older politician than you, and if you take my advice you will not have him dismissed, because he will behave better in future under the Conservative Government, and it would be a bad precedent to have any dismissals.

Mr. DESMARAIS. Was that the only reason given at the time?

Mr. BERGERON. Yes.

Mr. DESMARAIS. I think there was another.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to hear it.

Mr. DESMARAIS. Very well; at the time Mr. Mousseau became Prime Minister of the province of Quebec, he wished, in order to have his successor elected in the county of Bagot, that Mr. Beique would not be dismissed. I was a candidate in Bagot, not supported by some of the leaders who made the arrangement, and so Mr. Mousseau, to carry out his promise, obtained the non-dismissal of Mr. Beique.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BERGERON. Hon. gentlemen opposite had better wait a moment before applauding. My hon. friend (Mr. Desmarais) is entirely mistaken. The Beique affair which I speak of happened in 1880, and Mr. Mousseau only went to Quebec in 1883. The whole thing was settled long before that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DESMARAIS. There were two inquiries?

Mr. BERGERON. There was only one.

Mr. DESMARAIS. And the arrangement was communicated to me by Mr. Mousseau himself.

Mr. BERGERON. That does not make any difference, because I tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Desmarais) that the whole matter to which I refer was settled in 1880, as can be seen by the records of the Department of Railways and Canals. It would perhaps be diplomatic for Mr. Mousseau to do such a thing, but the question as to whether Mr. Beique should be dismissed or not was settled in 1880 by the then Minister of Railways and Canals (Sir Charles Tupper), who is now chief of the Opposition. I mention these things to bring to the notice of my hon. friend the Premier, the pledge which he gave last year that no employee should be dismissed without investigation, and I also bring it to the attention of the House to show that if the Minister of Public Works has been lenient towards Mr. Fairlie, he has been very severe towards the employees of the Beauharnois Canal.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). Mr. Speaker, perhaps it is as well that I should say a word or two in answer to the speech of my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron). In the last federal election I was a candidate against him. He made a good fight and I was defeated, but I was defeated because of these two things: First, one hundred of the men who were in favour of me were locked up on polling day and could not get out to vote; and, second, the employees of the Beauharnois Canal, with scarcely any exception whatever, were an organized gang which followed me from parish to parish and insulted me in the most outrageous manner. I do not complain of having been defeated; it did not kill me, and if my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) had not made the speech that he has just delivered, he would have been a little more just. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) will readily admit that I was not severe upon his friends. Some of them were dismissed, but a great many more should have been. I could not stand eight or ten of the men who insulted me in the most violent manner, and I asked that they be dismissed, just to give an example to the other employees that they had to behave themselves. Now, Sir, I say this, and my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) knows it just as well as I do, I was followed from hustings to hustings, from place to place, by the employees of the Beauharnois Canal, who yelled at me and insulted me, calling me a thief and a traitor and a renegade, and all that sort of business. Well, Sir, I did not dismiss them, although I know them by sight, nearly every one of them, and my hon. friend does too; and I am not going to do so—perhaps not many more, because I am not a vindictive man in any way. Moreover, I am free to say this much, that the employees of the canal on that occasion, a great many of them, were forced to do what they have done. I have to draw the line somewhere. In my department there are men who have taken a most active part in the last elections; I know that well; but when they came to me and represented to me that they had been instructed to do this and that, I drew the line there, and did not dismiss them, and I think I did right. When an employee is instructed to do a thing, and does it, if it is not an immorality, he is not guilty. That is the rule I follow. In the county of Beauharnois, I say again, I have been insulted in a most outrageous manner.

Mr. BERGERON. Not by those men.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, by those men. I have seen every one of them at the foot of the hustings laughing at me. I told them: "On the 23rd of June we will be in power, and you should not insult me, for I will then have to deal with you." They did not believe me, they were so sure of the election. But now times have changed, and my hon. friend cannot, nor can this honourable House, expect that we shall be obliged to keep in office all our opponents. But my hon. friend complains that during the last local election some of the employees of the canal have been threatened, and he has just handed me a letter. I do not know the handwriting, but I beg to say immediately that this letter is a most outrageous letter. My instructions in the department are in black and white. When the elections came, I instructed my chief officers to issue instructions to all the branches to this effect, that all my employees, whatever might be their political persuasion, were perfectly free to vote; and I did not do anything else. I claim that a man who threatens another man because he exercises his right to vote is not fit to be an elector. My hon. friend mentions my son. I hope my son has not dishonoured my name. I asked him, because I heard that the accusation had been made against him, that he had threatened men with dismissal if they did not vote for Mr. Bisson. He gave me his word of honour—and so far he has never deceived me—that there was not a word of truth in that, and I believe him. If my hon. friend can produce evidence that my son has been guilty of such an offence, I will be the first man to apologize before this House; but he has not done so. Some of the friends of my hon. friend went to him, I know—one of them especially—and said to him, "I am a Conservative, and I would like to vote." My son answered, "You are perfectly free to vote; but you know what accusations might be brought against you. I know that my father will never ask that you be dismissed, but perhaps it would be just as well for you not to vote."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am very frank about it—he gave me that explanation. The man went and voted, and he will not be dismissed; he need not fear anything. I need not say much more about the Beauharnois cases. My hon. friend knows right well that I could dismiss fifty more of them.

Mr. BERGERON. Every one of them?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, with a few exceptions.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend will do me a great favour by naming the exceptions, because I intend to show the House, if he will allow me, that he is entirely mistaken.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not prepared to go into detail; but my hon. friend knows that during that election I was insulted from hustings to hustings. I could dismiss every one of them, and would be quite justified in so doing. But I will not do it. There may be a few more heads to go, but not many.

Coming to this jamboree at Winnipeg, I have only one word to add. As has been stated, I had the pleasure of visiting the city of Winnipeg, and I was invited by the members of the city council and the city board of trade to visit St. Andrew's Rapids. I was the guest of the city and the board of trade; the most important business men of the city, besides members of the local government were there. I was invited to lunch. We had lunch in a public school, just opposite to the industrial school. I did not know before the lunch was over one word of what has been known since. I may say that I was surprised not to be invited to visit the industrial school, as I was a Minister, and rightly or wrongly I was there. I made up my mind that it was my duty to visit the school, and I knocked at the door. The door was opened, and I visited the school. I may say that the school was in very bad order indeed. But I had nothing to say against Mr. Fairlie, because he explained that he had been called up there only a few days before. When the visit was over, Mr. Fairlie took me apart and told me of this incident. He said: One of your friends telephoned me asking for the use of one of the rooms of the school. I asked him if liquor was to be served, and he answered that it was. I told him that I was a total abstainer, and I thought it was a great deal better not to allow him the use of the school." I said to Mr. Fairlie, "You did perfectly right." I did not use one word of reproach against him, and I do not bring any reproach against him to-day. But what I cannot understand is the letter that he wrote. The gentlemen who were at lunch with me were gentlemen in the true sense of the word. I was not the man insulted, and I did not feel insulted, by the letter he wrote. A very bad use was made of the letter. My friends of the Tory press intimated that I was drunk—that I was drunk during that whole trip. Well, one slander more or less I do not care for. It is all over now, and I do not ask for the dismissal of Mr. Fairlie, because I think he was a great deal more to be pitied than blamed. The lunch lasted about three-quarters of an hour; it was the meal of gentlemen lunching together. The letter which Mr. Fairlie wrote is false from beginning to end. I thought he had apologized for it, and there may still be time for him to apologize for it. He made a great mistake. But he may have been misled, he

may have been told that there was an excessive use of liquor there, and for all those reasons, and because I did not bother very much about it, I did not ask for his dismissal. But I think that my hon. friends opposite should join with us in giving those employees who will not behave themselves a lesson. My hon. friends are altogether mistaken when they say we are eager for dismissals. They are wrong. There is no pleasure nor is there any political benefit in dismissing people. I am not anxious for dismissals, but, at the same time, I am sure my hon. friends will agree with me that the public service of this country should be faithful and respectful to us. That is all we ask. I think it is about time there was an end to these discussions about dismissals. My hon. friends opposite surely cannot expect to intimidate us, and they may rest assured that we will do our duty and nothing more.

Mr. BERGERON. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, and the consent of the House, I would like to say just a word in reply to my hon. friend.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman can say it in committee.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has been too often in this Chair not to know that he cannot do so without the consent of the House.

Mr. BERGERON. I have only a word to say, and I have seen this privilege given several gentlemen in this discussion, and I do not think that because I have been in the Chair, I should be refused the same privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman may make an explanation, but I understood he intended going further.

Mr. BERGERON. I merely wish to make an explanation. My hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) spoke somewhat passionately in reply to some statements concerning his son, and I can very well understand his doing so, and I wish to say that I have no desire of charging the hon. gentleman's son with any wrong-doing. I simply wished to recite the facts. The hon. gentleman's son was in Valleyfield, and he happened to be in the Larocque House at the same time that I was. He was in a room there, and my hon. friend, of course, is aware that I would not go there to see what was taking place, but there was no secrecy about it, the employees of the canal went into this room one after another, and the landlord of the hotel mentioned the fact to me and said that Mr. Tarte, jr., was confessing them. These men were brought in there and the consequence was that the next day they voted for the Liberal candidate and against their own convictions. I wish it to be understood that I do not say my hon. friend would have done an injustice wittingly, but I say that if he had granted an investigation—not merely an investigation by Mr. Mercier with his little bench, but an investigation by a judge or somebody in a position to make a proper inquiry—he would have found out that Cardinal, Rufiange, Mathieu and Julien, Danis, Lefebvre and Monette, the men who were dismissed and who were permanent employees never took any active part in politics. He would have found that not one of them ever opened his mouth in any public meeting. I make the declaration here that if he grants an investigation, these men will prove by the evidence of the hon. gentleman's own Liberal friends that they have not done so. I do not say that some others may not have done so, but these men have not, and my hon. friend has been misled into recommending their dismissal without having the facts properly before him. I repeat to him that if an investigation, such as was promised by the hon. First Minister were granted, these men would be still at work.

Mr. McCLURE. I have listened to a number of debates during the short time I have sat here on this question of dismissals, and in the course of every one of them, I have heard members complain that the spoils system is being introduced into this country. I have waited, expecting that somebody would make the statement which was made here to-day, that the spoils system has long been introduced into this country. We have recognized in the maritime provinces, for a number of years, that we have been working under the spoils system. I would ask these hon. gentlemen who are complaining of the number of dismissals to take into account the fact that we are placed in a somewhat peculiar position as regards the civil service of this country. It is very easy to make comparisons, it is very easy to say that the Conservative party did not make such wholesale dismissals as the Liberals are now asking, but I would call the attention of hon. gentlemen to this fact, that when the Conservative party came into power in 1878, they were in a very different position from that in which the Liberal party stands to-day. There had been a Liberal Administration in power, it is true, but only for four years, and the Conservative and Liberal members, from the maritime provinces at least, will bear me out in saying that during the four years of the Mackenzie Administration there was no such thing as wholesale dismissals known, and more than one Conservative has made the statement publicly that one reason why the Mackenzie Administration was defeated was because they left their enemies in office. Now, when the Liberal party came into power, they found themselves in this peculiar position. In the county of Colchester, which I have the honour to represent, the Conservative party organizers and the civil servants of the Do-

minion have been practically one and the same. When we fought the Conservative party in the county of Colchester, with that party unaided by the civil servants, we defeated them, but when we had to fight them with the power and patronage of the Government against us, they defeated us by majorities of hundreds. I well recollect the evening of the 23rd of June. There were some 400 Government employees who voted in the town of Truro on that occasion, and I could give the House the names, not of ten or twenty, but of a hundred employees of the Government in that town, honourable men whose word I respect, who told me that on that occasion they cast their vote against me because they had been taught to believe during years that if they did not vote Tory they would lose their situations. This Government, on taking office, found that the civil service of the country had been organized against them as a party machine, they found that not only were the civil servants active workers against them, but that down in our part of the country, the doctrine among them seemed to be that they drew their pay, not so much for the work they did for the country as for the aid they gave the Tory party, and I could point to cases in Colchester where they never did any work for the country but a great deal for the party. And since this Government has come into power almost all the changes in that county have been directed in the abolishing, not partisan officials, but offices created for the purpose of paying salary to officials in order that they might do party work. It is all very well for these gentlemen to-day to protest against the introduction of the spoils system. It is all very well for them to lift up their voices loudly against the dismissal of public servants, when for eighteen years they have been engaged in the work of filling every office in the country with their own friends, and have kept them in those offices in order that they might do some service in the future as they did in the past for the party that gave them those offices. I am not asking for wholesale dismissals. I am not clamouring for dismissals of these men, because I recognize that many of them who acted as offensive partisans in the last election did so from necessity, and I am willing they should be given an opportunity to repent, and many of them have repented and shown proofs of repentance by casting their votes on the Liberal side. I am prepared to forgive them if they continue to cast their votes for the Conservative party, but I say that no civil servant should be forgiven if he so far forgets his duty to his country as to give his first service to his party and the second to the country that pays him. I say we have had the spoils system in Canada and hon. gentlemen opposite are reaping the fruits of it. I say if it has become necessary, in order to purify the public service and to expel the spoils system from this country, that certain public officials should be dismissed, let them take their medicine. This dismissal of public servants is not the introduction of the spoils system, but it is the expelling of the spoils system. It is getting down to a solid basis. While we say that no man should be dismissed because of the party to which he belongs, it is time that we should preach the other doctrine that no man shall be held in office because of the party to which he belongs.

Mr. DAVIN. I sympathize heartily with the proposition laid down by the hon. gentleman who has with eloquence addressed the House for the first time, but I may point out that it is the exact opposite of the proposition of the hon. gentleman who opened this debate! My hon. friend from West Huron (Mr. Cameron) laid down that because Mr. Fairlie was a Tory, it was very wrong to appoint him. Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to a more serious view of this question than has yet been presented. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) has taken a very proper course; and that taken by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) up to the present moment, will commend itself to every just-minded man. But we have here to-day one of the most extraordinary spectacles that have ever been seen since the great temperance movement began. The hon. member for West Huron makes an indictment against Mr. Fairlie, a reverend gentleman, because when a Minister of the Crown went down to the Rupert Land industrial school, of which he is principal, he did not place his school at the disposal of the statesman and his friends, for a lunch at which intoxicants would be used. You will observe, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister of Public Works does not endorse the charge. On the contrary, he says that when Mr. Fairlie told him what had happened, how he had refused to allow intoxicants to be brought into the school, he said: You did perfectly right. But now we have another doctrine which, however, the Minister of the Interior does not seem to have endorsed, and we have an extraordinary proposition laid down by my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), who is the spokesman of the Dominion Alliance in this House. I would call his attention to it, because I am perfectly certain he uttered the proposition in his sober moments. That proposition is that a strict teetotaler, who is also the principal of an Indian school, is no gentleman if he refuses to lay his school room at the disposal of gentlemen, who want to drink moderately and as gentlemen, whisky and champagne.

Mr. FLINT. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) is stating what he attributes to me, I desire to say that I never made any such statement. I stated distinctly, in so many words, that in regard to his declining to al-

low the school room to be used for the lunch, Mr. Fairlie was quite right. I condemn him for his letter and for his misrepresentations of the Minister, as well as for his discourtesy.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend will see what he said in "Hansard" to-morrow. What he is aghast at is the terrible proposition he laid down when I put it before him in its nakedness. But he was not aghast at it when he stated it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) will notice that the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) has repudiated that statement.

Mr. DAVIN. Of course I accept the hon. gentleman's repudiation. What I say in my own way is that he repudiates it because he shrinks aghast from it when I put it before him. I accept his statement. Let me point out what the hon. gentleman said. If he will remember, he said something like this: That Mr. Fairlie was no gentleman because those of us who are teetotalers and mix in the best society cannot mix in that society without meeting with people who drink champagne. My hon. friend (Mr. Flint) nods his head in endorsement of what I say. What is the point of that if it is not that Mr. Fairlie did not behave like a gentleman because he resented the suggestion made by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Jameson), then mayor of the city of Winnipeg, that a lunch at which champagne and whisky would be drunk should be served in the school? My hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) spoke somewhat harshly of this gentleman. We have the statement from the mayor of Winnipeg of that time that down they went prepared to give a lunch of the kind usually given by the most hospitable city of the west. We know what Winnipeg is—it is a hospitable city. My hon. friend (Mr. Jameson), whom I have long known, is a man of large heart and genial and kindly disposition, and, no doubt, he was determined to do honour to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte). But let me point out that, the very moment they brought intoxicants of any kind—champagne, claret, no matter how gentlemanly the drink—into this school, they committed an offence against the Indian Act and placed themselves within the clutches of the criminal law. If Mr. Fairlie had consented to what the mayor of Winnipeg at that time proposed and had allowed them to lunch in the school, which is Indian territory where some sixty Indian youths are being educated, there is not a man who sat down to the table but would have been guilty of a breach of the Indian Act. Even my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) himself, merely sitting down at the table, and even though he were not drinking intoxicants, would be sanctioning their use and would be brought under its ban. To have in one's possession a vessel that had contained intoxicants would do this. And we are told, forsooth, that when a Minister of the Crown—who does not resent it himself—goes to this school and the person who is entertaining him is not allowed to break the law, the public officer who refused to sanction a breach of the law must be condemned! Why, my hon. friend from Lisgar ought to have been thankful to him, because he too was of the party, and he too would have broken the criminal law if Mr. Fairlie had not known what was his duty as principal of the school.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I distinctly stated from my place here that I approved of Mr. Fairlie's action in declining to allow wines to come into the school. The very day after the incident I wrote an article in my own paper in which I distinctly said that I commended him for it, for I honestly believed that it was a commendable action.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, an account of that visit appeared in the "Tribune" of the 27th, an account which is evidently written by somebody who was irritated at what took place:

> At St. Andrew's, the party called on John McDougall, the genial sergeant-at-arms, and were hospitably entertained. John, who always does the right thing, presented Mr. Tarte with a breast-pin—an Indian arrow point, mounted on gold, which the Minister will regard as a precious souvenir.

I may say in passing, that if the genial John McDougall had remembered what was the most prominent feature of the administration of the Minister of Public Works, and had divined with insight his ministerial character, he would have presented him, not with an arrow head, but with a tomahawk.

> Returning, the party stopped at the industrial school, where lunch was served in the adjoining public school-house by Mrs. Hample. A finer lunch was, perhaps, never served in the west. It reflects great credit upon Mrs. Hample, who had to contend with great difficulties, for the discourteous officers of the school had refused to lend tables, chairs or anything else; in fact, they had even refused to furnish a little hot water for the tea and coffee. After lunch, the party were conducted over the school by the principal. The institution is one of the most villainously constructed buildings it would be possible to imagine, and is a disgrace to the department.

Mr. Fairlie was not responsible for that. Now, that was the occasion of the attack upon Mr. Fairlie, and it shows irritation.

Mr. RICHARDSON. How?

Mr. DAVIN. I will let the House learn that. Sir, when I am interrupted from the other side of the House, when, therefore, somebody is doing what he has no right to

do, and when the interruption goes on, and I hit back, and the person I hit at scatters a little, and you or somebody in the Chair comes to that person's defence, I shall protect myself from those gentlemen, and neither one of them nor the whole of them sitting over there, can awe me here, nor in any other public meeting. So, therefore, in order that I may be free to pursue this course if necessary, I ask in the first place for your protection

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Under the rule of the House nobody has a right to interrupt an hon. member who has the floor, except with his permission; therefore, if anybody wants to interrupt the hon. member for Assiniboia while he has the floor, he must get his permission.

Mr. DAVIN. Now, this gentleman, Mr. Fairlie, wrote a letter to the editor of the "Tribune," and what do you think the editor does? He does not publish the letter, but he has an article headed "The Industrial School Episode."

The "Tribune" has received from Mr. John H. Fairlie, principal of the Rupert's Land Industrial School, a letter referring to the account which was published in this paper concerning the recent visit of the Minister of Public Works and party to the school. Mr. Fairlie's epistle is in such utter bad taste, and, withal, so impudent and gratuitous in its insinuations, that, out of regard for Mr. Fairlie himself, we deem it best, in his own interests, to withhold publication. To be quite fair to the principal, however, we will quote that portion of the letter in which he seeks to exonerate himself from the charge of discourtesy. He says:

Then he quotes what Mr. Fairlie said:

"When I was told that the Mayor of Winnipeg and members of the board of trade wished to have a lunch at the Industrial School on their return from the rapids, I said I would be pleased to have them visit our school and would show them carefully through every department. Was that discourteous? When I was asked if we could assist in giving them a lunch, I said they were welcome to our dining-hall tables, chairs, dishes, and everything that we had; that we could furnish some roast beef, good bread and butter, tea and coffee, in abundance, and our girls would serve the tables. Was that discourteous, sir?"

Then the article continues:

Mr. Fairlie then goes on to say that the reason he declined to allow the lunch to be served within the precincts of the school was, because wine was going to be served. There is, perhaps, not one man, woman or child in the province but will applaud him for the stand and say that he was perfectly right.

That is what the editor of the "Tribune" said while the thing was fresh in his mind.

Mr. RICHARDSON. That is what I said this afternoon.

Mr. DAVIN. I am dealing with more than the hon. gentleman. I read in a letter from Ottawa to his paper how he and some other western members waited on the Ministers, and took them by the throat, and settled beforehand the changes that were to be made in the tariff, and announced it beforehand, and he said that he and Mr. Oliver, and Mr. Douglas and others with him spoke, but said he: "I spoke first." I know very well that my hon. friend is a very important man, I do not underrate his importance; I know he is a master of a paper, and that he is leader of a chosen band, but he is not everybody. But at the present time I am not dealing with him, but with the member for Huron. The member for Huron condemns the editor of the "Tribune" as an endorser of the action of Mr. Fairlie, the very action that was condemned strongly here to-day by the member for Lisgar.

Recognizing the absolute righteousness to the principal's position, Mr. F. H. Matthewson, president of the board of trade, promptly acquiesced and it was arranged to serve the lunch across the road from the industrial, in another building. Application was then made for the loan of a couple of tables and a few chairs, but this was refused, and Mrs. Hample, the caterer, was obliged to cart chairs and tables all the way from Winnipeg. Application was also made for a little hot water for the tea and coffee, but even this trifling request was churlishly denied, and Mrs. Hample had to make the best of it.

The one charge, that of discourtesy, that he refused to give hot water, made by the "Tribune" is positively denied by Mr. Fairlie. As regards one of the charges against him, made by the member for Huron, the Minister of the Interior has, by his silence in the past, endorsed Mr. Fairlie; and the Minister of Public Works here to-day has stated that he endorsed Mr. Fairlie. But the member for Huron comes forward and brings an indictment against him because he did not give the school for the drinking of champagne and whisky, and was not in fact prostrate on his belly before the Minister of Public Works. Why, if the member for Huron had read English history he would have remembered what a great king said of an English judge who has become famous in history, because he did rate, rebuke and roughly send to prison the immediate heir of England for forgetting the place, the majesty and points of law and justice. He thanked God that he had such a judge. What we should have expected from an experienced man like the member for Huron, would be that he would come here and say with the Minister of Public Works: Thank God that we have a school teacher that respects his duties to his country, his duty to his office and the law of the land, more than the awe that is supposed to fill the breast of every one at the appearance of a new-fledged Minister. I know very well that in the breast of both Liberals and Conservatives, but apparently more in the breasts of Liberals, a Minister, and

especially a new-fledged Minister, is a wonderful thing. He is an Honourable, he is a P.C., he and his colleagues are all lords and hon. gentlemen of high degree, and no doubt they feel immensely swelled out in the head and otherwise, and think, and others think so, too, that we ought all to go down on our marrowbones to them, and worship them, as we are told the Israelities did the golden calf in the wilderness. Well, my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works had more sanity than that. Mr. Fairlie wrote a letter in reply to what he contended was a misrepresentation. The letter was not published and thereupon he did what he had a perfect right to do in order to vindicate himself. He sent the letter to the "Nor-Wester." Is he responsible for the head line, jamboree? What is a jamboree? It is a western word. My hon. friend from Winnipeg knows what a jamboree is. It is said to be an eastern word, too. What is a jamboree?

An hon. MEMBER. Do you know?

Mr. DAVIN. I do know something about it. When a number of gentlemen start out from a city famous for its hospitality, the guests of a mayor known for goodfellowship—when a crowd goes out with champagne and whisky and whatnot, it is travelling very much as they used to do in Ireland, as described by Valentine Vousden:

> Some beef, some bread, some porter,
> And some whisky in a jar,—
> Och, that's the way to travel
> On an Irish jaunting car.

On that occasion the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) and other gentlemen and the Minister of Public Works were travelling in something grander than an Irish jaunting car—they were travelling in a special car. They had nothing so vulgar as porter, but they had whisky and soda and choice brands of champagne. And why should they not? my hon. friend asks. Mr. Fairlie was not responsible for the headaches. Mr. Fairlie asked to have his letter published, and newspaper men know that it is the practice to publish a reply.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It was also sent to the "Free Press."

Mr. DAVIN. I have had as long an experience of journalism as either my hon. friend or the editor of the "Free Press." I know what is the duty of a journalist: it is that if a man accused by a newspaper, sends a reply, it is the duty of a journalist to publish it. The Finance Minister is a journalist, and he knows what the practice is. Especially is this the case when the newspaper has criticised it. To criticise a letter he receives, and then put it into the waste paper basket, or into a pigeon-hole, is equivalent to slapping the man's face and then boxing his ears. Mr. Fairlie asked to have his letter published in the "Nor-Wester," and that journal published it. Is there anything disrespectful in it? The only part of the speech delivered by the Minister of Public Works with which I find fault is when he said that this is a tissue of lies. I should like to ask the hon. Minister where the lies come in.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will tell the hon. gentleman. When Mr. Fairlie says that those who went there were smelling of liquor, and when he intimates that they were drunk—he states what is not true, and he must have known it.

Mr. DAVIN. He does not say that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He says that.

Mr. DAVIN. I will read the part of the letter to which the hon. gentleman refers. Mr. Fairlie says:

> There may have been a bad smell in some of the rooms.

It was the olfactory nerves that were in a sensitive state. This gentleman who complained of the odour, was travelling with a Minister of the Crown; he felt big; he was with one of the gods; he was grand and glorious; he was travelling with my lord. Then he said there was an offensive smell.

> There may have been a bad smell in some of the rooms, as you say, but that would be in one of the smaller rooms, and when a dozen men, who have spent two hours——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is not true.

Mr. DAVIN. Does the hon. Minister mean that the time stated, two hours, was not true?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is not true that we were there two hours.

Mr. DAVIN. Did the hon. gentleman spend one hour, one hour and a half, or one hour and three-quarters there? I will accommodate him; I will not bind him to a certain time. Are you going to hang a man because he did not take out his ticker and estimate the time when My Lord and his A.D.C. and other jovialists were together? I will take what time the hon. Minister likes. As Mr. Burke says: "Odzooks! are you going to hang a man for an old song?" Suppose it was only one hour—for there is nothing in the length of time. It is not a very outrageous act to stop two hours at luncheon. I could talk with the Minister of Public Works for two hours. The letter continues:

> —and when a dozen men, who have spent two hours at a banquet, where champagne and whisky and soda were served, and cigars freely smoked, get crowded into a small room, it is not conducive to sweet smells.

Is there anything wrong in that? I have heard the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) say things very like that. I am sure the hon. gentleman on the platform, and bursting with teetotal zeal, will say to the crowd listening to hear the words of sincerity falling from his lips, something of the sort:

—two hours at a banquet, where champagne and whisky and soda were served, and cigars freely smoked, it is not conducive to sweet smells.

That indictment is very mild. No matter what the gathering may be, yet if men sit down for two hours, drink champagne and whisky and soda, and smoke cigars and begin to exude, the air becomes close and the conflicting gasses do not conduce to sweetness of smells. Further:

I noticed this also, but did not think that the "discourteous" officers of the school were to blame for it.

This man is a teetotaler, and I will lay it down, and I shall be supported by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) and I am satisfied I can get a dozen members of the Dominion Alliance to side with me, that if a man does not drink whisky or champagne himself and goes into the company of a dozen or two dozen men, who for half an hour or two hours have been drinking a little champagne or whisky, he will smell the "pisin." An hon. friend near me says that is his experience. I will now read the letter, because that is only just to Mr. Fairlie.

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

After Recess.

CALGARY AND EDMONTON RAILWAY COMPANY.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 33) respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Mr. Osler.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. OLIVER. This clause is a new one. It was not drafted in the committee, and it seems to me that it does not altogether express the intention of the committee. I would therefore ask the hon. gentleman if he would agree to the addition of a few words to clause 2, which would clearly express what I think was the unanimous agreement arrived at in committee. I had proposed a very definite amendment in committee in regard to the location of the proposed extension of the railway into the town of McLeod, and there was some dispute about it. The idea was that the amendment should be practically of the same effect as the proposal I suggested, except that it did not bind the company to time.

Mr. SPROULE. The clause read by the Chairman is exactly as was agreed to in committee. Could not the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) let the Bill go through committee now, and give notice of his amendment on the third reading?

Mr. OLIVER. It was thoroughly understood in the committee that the interests of the town of McLeod should be protected in the construction of this railway. It was stated in committee that the company did not get unlimited time to complete the railway because the time is limited by the General Railway Act. I humbly submit that it is only fair that the amendment should state what I wish to convey.

Mr. WILSON. The amendment to clause 2 is just the same as agreed to by the Railway Committee.

Mr. OLIVER. It is not according to my idea of what the Railway Committee agreed to. I would like to add the following words to the clause, and I think there will be no objection to them at all:—

Such route and plan shall provide for the establishment and maintenance of a station for receiving and delivering freight and passengers, within the present corporate limits of the town of McLeod.

Mr. SPROULE. That was objected to in the committee, and the amended clause, as read by the Chairman, was adopted instead thereof.

Mr. HUGHES. The Minister of Railways accepted the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition in committee, and said that the Government would take special care that the views of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) in relation to locating the line through McLeod, would be carried out. It was the opinion of the Minister of Railways that it would be more advisable not to insert these words in the clause, but that the council would see that McLeod was protected.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) cannot propose an amendment now without giving notice. As there seems to be some difference of opinion with regard to the effect of the amendment, it would perhaps be better to let the Bill go through committee, and give notice of amendment on the third reading.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That suggestion is a good one. This proposal was made by the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) in committee, and the conclusion arrived at is stated in the amended clause as read by the Chairman. We all believed that it would completely protect the interests of the town

of McLeod and carry out the view of the hon. member (Mr. Oliver). In the absence of the Minister of Railways, who gave this question so much attention, I think it would be well to adopt the suggestion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. McMULLEN. The leader of the Opposition is quite right in a sense. The question of the possibility of the road completely evading McLeod was the question under discussion, and the Minister of Railways agreed to see that the town of McLeod would not be evaded. But my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) wants to further protect the town by inserting a clause providing that the company shall erect and maintain a station for freight and passengers in the town. They have now a freight and passenger station some two or three miles from McLeod; but the fact of the railway running through McLeod would not be of any benefit unless they erected a freight and passenger station in the town.

Mr. SPROULE. There is this difference in what the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) says. The promoter of the Bill says: "We may never extend the railway to connect with the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, but if we do we must go through the town of McLeod, and we will have a passenger station ther " But the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) wanted to impose on the company the obligation of building a station at McLeod, whether the railway was to connect with the other railway or not; and the Railway Act provides that unless they commence the railway within two years and finish it within five years, their charter Act will be null and void. Therefore they would be obliged within that time to build a passenger station at McLeod whether they connected with the Crow's Nest Pass Railway or not, and that the promoter of the Bill objected to. But it was said that if they connected with the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, there was no other way to go except through McLeod.

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend wants the Bill to provide that.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I must say that the clause as drawn by the clerk of the committee is in accordance with the decision of the committee so far as I understood it. There was a compromise arrived at by the members holding the different views, and I think the clerk has drawn the clause very strictly in accordance with the agreement arrived at. However, if the hon. member for Alberta is not satisfied with the clause, and wants to make it more distinct, he is quite within his right to move in that direction. If he had proposed this amendment, worded as it is now, in the committee, it might possibly have been adopted. I cannot possibly see any objection to the wording of the amendment as he proposes it. It was clearly understood that the desire of the members of the committee should be carried out in that direction if the road should be extended.

Mr. HUGHES. I agree with what the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) states, and those present at the meeting of the committee will remember that when the point was brought up in regard to the station for freight and passengers within the limits of McLeod, the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) said he would see that the wishes of the hon. member were carried out. I think the hon. member deserves credit for the way he stuck to his point, and, having got the guarantee of the Minister of Railways, I think he should be satisfied with this amendment. It is, I am informed, very unusual in railway bills to insist that a station for freight and passengers shall be at any given point. There is no doubt that the railway company would place the station at McLeod if they ever went that way. I think the hon. member's wishes will be met by the amendment, and I think he should let it go through.

Mr. LISTER. The struggle in the committee, so far as the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) was concerned, was to secure what he believed were the rights of the town of McLeod. He contended that the understanding was, when the bonus for this railway was voted, that it should touch McLeod as well as Edmonton, and he said the company had broken its engagement in not touching the town, but remaining two or three miles away from it, with the object, it was suggested, of building up a rival town to the old place. He urged as strongly as possible that the rights of the town of McLeod as originally understood should be regarded by the present legislation; and there is no doubt that it was upon the minds of the committee that McLeod's rights, so far as they could be protected by this legislation, would be protected. Now, I am bound to say that while the intention of the committee was that this railway should touch McLeod, the section as introduced into the Bill is quite indefinite. While we are all alive and while the Minister of Railways is alive to what took place in committee, it may be that this railway will not be built for many years to come; and I think this clause should be made perfectly definite so as to carry out the intention of the committee, which was that this railway should be carried, not near to, but into the town of McLeod, which I believe was the original intention when the money of Canada was voted to give McLeod railway communication.

Mr. HUGHES. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat will, I am sure, see

his error when I point out that it was stated to the committee that the bonus did not require the company to build a railway south of Calgary even, but they could limit themselves to construct the line north to Edmonton.

Mr. LISTER. The Act states at or near McLeod.

Mr. HUGHES. No.

Mr. CRAIG. There was a great deal of discussion on this question in the committee, and, as the chairman of the Railway Committee has stated, the amendment now before the House was agreed to as a compromise. The promoters of the Bill objected to any definite statement such as is now proposed, and this clause was offered as a compromise, and accepted by all the parties after a long discussion ; and I think it is hardly fair now to open up the matter again, when those interested in the road are not present to offer their side of the argument. I think it would be better for all parties to accept the clause as amended, because it was felt by all in the committee that the rights of the town of McLeod would be amply protected by that amendment, which provides that if this railway is extended to the Crow's Nest Pass, the plans must be submitted to and approved by the Minister of Railways, and the Minister said that he would take care that the rights of McLeod were protected. There is some force in what the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) said that of course the present Minister of Railways will remember this, but that if the time is long extended another Minister might not ; but there will no doubt be some one to bring the matter to his attention. So that I do not think that is a strong argument.

Mr. LISTER. Will the hon. member say that his recollection of what took place at the Railway Committee was that McLeod was to be protected ?

Mr. CRAIG. In this way, by this amendment.

Mr. LISTER. Does the hon. member say that this amendment protects McLeod ?

Mr. CRAIG. It was thought so at the time by all parties.

Mr. LOUNT. My recollection of what took place in the committee is in harmony with the utterances of the last speaker. It was intended beyond a doubt to protect Fort McLeod by having the railway pass through that town and having a station there ; but it will be remembered by the hon. gentlemen who were present on that committee that the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler), who is a part owner of this railway, and one of the promoters, offered his opposition, to the demand that was then made to run the road into Fort McLeod. He, however, after discussion, was willing there should be a compromise, and a compromise was arrived at, and the result was substantially what has been read by the Chairman. Now, I would suggest that it is only fair to the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) that the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries should be accepted. The hon. member for West Toronto is not here, he is very largely interested in this road, and the effect of the amendment asked for by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) is perhaps greater than he would be willing to accept. It will be remembered that the hon. member for West Toronto was rather desirous of withdrawing the Bill than grafting upon it some conditions which were beyond the capability of the road to accept, and as he is not here to-night, it seems only fair that no discussion should take place with regard to the proposed amendment until he is present and able to say whether or not he will acquiesce in the amendment. No harm would be done by passing the Bill through to-night, it being understood that on the third reading such an amendment might be discussed, if, in the meantime, a compromise be not reached.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My understanding of the discussion in the Railway Committee was this, that in the event of the road being extended to Crow's Nest Pass, it should pass in or near the town of Fort McLeod, and that any dispute in that connection should be determined by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair). The question of stipulating that the road should have a station at Fort McLeod was not brought to the attention of the committee and may have been overlooked by the hon. member in charge of the Bill. I would think that, subject to any notice to the promoters, some clause might be added which would make it necessary for the company to have a station in or near the town of Fort McLeod in case the road should be extended to Crow's Nest Pass Railway.

Mr. HUGHES. If the hon. member for Alberta insists on pressing his amendment, I would ask that the suggestion made by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Lount) and others be accepted, namely, that the Bill should pass through committee and then be allowed to stand until the hon. member for West Toronto is present. I was requested to take charge of the Bill in his absence, and I hope the hon. member for Alberta will not press his amendment ; but if he insists on doing so, I would ask him to accept the suggestion made.

Mr. OLIVER. If the House will bear with me, I should like to explain why I was anxious to bring this matter before the House now. I did not expect that there would be

any necessity for me to press the amendment because I thought it was thoroughly understood by every hon. gentleman in the committee and would be quite satisfactory to the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill. I only made the proposition, fully expecting it would be concurred in. The reason I made it was to give definiteness to what, I think, every one admits was the general understanding of the committee, namely, that the town of McLeod should be protected. While we have the assurance of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, in whose assurance I have every confidence, that so long as he is Minister of Railways and Canals the interests of Fort McLeod will be protected, at the same time he may not always be Minister of Railways and Canals.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. How long ?

Mr. LISTER. Twenty-five years.

Mr. OLIVER. He may not be Minister all the time. Many changes may take place.

Mr. HUGHES. You are not throwing any doubts on your tenure of office, are you ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, but the hon. gentleman might take some other department. The section of the Bill does not express the intention of the committee, which was to protect the interests of the town of McLeod, and all I want is that that intent shall be expressed, so that whoever may be Minister of Railways and Canals or whatever circumstances may arise, there will be no question about protecting Fort McLeod. I think that is fair and that everybody in the House will agree to it.

The town of McLeod is a place of 700 or 800 people. It is the largest business centre in southern Alberta, but owing to the uncertainty of its connection with the railway, it is at a standstill, so far as building is concerned. It is certainly not desirable that people should be prevented by such uncertainty from investing their money in improving this business centre. If the House wishes to see that western country opened up, it is desirable that every reasonable opportunity should be given the people located there to invest their money in improving property, which they would not be justified in doing if the uncertainty I have referred to be allowed to continue. All I ask is that the people of McLeod shall have definite assurance that whenever this railway extension is made, they will not be sidetracked but will have the railway facilities necessary for the prosperity of that town as a business place. If the House will agree to those words being added, it will mean the investment of a large amount of money in McLeod during this and succeeding years in the building up of that town, so as to make it a credit to that country and the Dominion ; but if the House refuses to give the assurance to the business people of McLeod that their interests will be protected, they will not be disposed to risk their money in building up a town which may afterwards be sidetracked. I did not suppose for a moment that any hon. gentleman would take a position antagonistic to that proposition. I did not suppose that the hon. gentleman, above all others, who moved the resolution would take such a position, I cannot imagine that he will, and I would ask the hon. gentleman to state whether he does take that position.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The hon. gentleman is out of order with his motion in any case. No matter whether we agree to it or not, it is out of order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that I am much more surprised, and I think hon. gentlemen who are members of the Railway Committee will be much more surprised, at the attitude taken by the hon. gentleman than he can possibly be at anything that has occurred. The hon. gentleman knows that a very large number of the members of the Railway Committee were present when this Bill was before the committee. He knows that he pressed this very question in the strongest and most forcible manner, he knows that the promoters of the Bill were unwilling to accede to it, and he knows that the very terms now used in the Bill were arrived at by the committee as a compromise between what the hon. gentleman wanted and what the promoters of the Bill were willing to concede. There was the greatest possible sympathy on the part of every member of the committee with the town of McLeod, and the committee were most anxious to do every thing they possibly could. There was not a gentleman in it, I am sure, but was most anxious that anything that could be done in the interest of the town of McLeod should be done. But after the fullest and most complete discussion, this compromise was agreed to by the committee unanimously. And the hon. gentleman comes down, and in the absence of the gentleman who opposed the proposition which he is now making, he endeavours to press upon the House something entirely different from that which he, in common with every other member of the committee, agreed to in committee. I can only say that the House has a right to expect that when the committee like the Railway Committee, which is a small Parliament in itself, exhaustively discusses a subject and arrives at a conclusion, that this conclusion will be respected at all events by those who were parties to it.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to repeat that I have no desire to press upon the committee anything that is contrary to the ideas of the Railway Committee. I did not consider that this suggestion was contrary to the understanding in that committee, but as it appears the hon. gentleman holds that

it is contrary to that understanding, I suppose I would be out of order in pressing it further. I am sorry the hon. gentleman did not make the statement before. I will not press the matter now, but will bring it up on the third reading.

Mr. HUGHES. Will you move the third reading now ?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Bill reported.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 79) to incorporate the Dominion Portland Cement Company.—(Mr. Britton.)

Bill (No. 84) to incorporate the Continental Heat and Light Company.—(Mr. Rosamond.)

Bill (No. 88) to incorporate "Les Cisterciens Réformés.—(Mr. LaRivière.)

Bill (No. 34) to incorporate the Canadian Securities Company.—(Mr. Madore.)

Bill (No. 74) to incorporate the National Life Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Lount.)

Bill (No. 78) to amend the Act incorporating the Ontario Accident Insurance Company.—(Mr. Osler.)

Bill (No. 97) for the relief of Adeline Myrtle Lawry—on division.—(Mr. Landerkin.)

THE MYCENIAN MARBLE COMPANY.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 83) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Mycenian Marble Company.—(Mr. Rosamond.)

(In the Committee.)

On the preamble,

Mr. SPROULE. The patent was applied for, and part of the money paid, the company commenced operations, but through the negligence of their officers they did not tender the rest of the money for the extension of the patent. Therefore, after the time expired, the Commissioner of Patents could not receive the money without he got authority to do so, and this is an application to get that authority.

Mr. LISTER. This is legislation that has been refused two or three times in this Parliament.

Mr. SPROULE. No, I remember distinctly that we put through one or more Bills of the same character some years ago.

Mr. LISTER. I remember several years ago a Bill of this kind being refused by Parliament. I think it is not good legislation.

Mr. SPROULE. This was reported by the committee without any amendment.

Mr. LISTER. The man has a right to his patent if he complies with the law, but not otherwise. He has not done it in this case, and I do not see why the public should be deprived of their right in order to give him a right which he does not possess.

Mr. SPROULE. There is no other person claiming the right.

Mr. LISTER. That makes no difference. The public are entitled to it. Every citizen of Canada is entitled to it.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. In this case it is not binding on the commissioner to grant the patent, he is only impowered to do so if he chooses. In every other particular the application is correct. The commissioner is not bound to accept.

Mr. LISTER. This is giving him power to do something that he has no power to do now.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Unless the hon. gentleman is very anxious to get it through to-night, perhaps he would let it stand. I thought the Minister of Agriculture would have been here, who, I assume, has looked into this Bill, and there will probably be some objection to its passing without his assent being known.

Mr. SPROULE. I have no objections to letting it stand, but I do not think there is the slightest objection to the Bill. I have a very distinct recollection of our passing Bills of the same character once or twice or three times in this House. As the parties have made a very large investment, and are carrying on their operations, and it was only through the carelessness of one of their officers that the money was not tendered, it was purely accidental. No one claims that any injustice is done to the public and no one claims a right to patent except the people who control this legislation. If the Minister wishes this to stand, I have no objection.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My recollection accords with that of my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister). Some years ago a similar Bill came up, and there was a great row in the House about it, and about the inadvertence of the officer being accepted as a sufficient reason for renewing a right which had expired through lapse of time. I think we had better wait until we see what the Minister of Agriculture says about it.

Mr. WALLACE. The case to which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries refers was not similar, there were objections to the Bill itself on its merits ; in this case there is no such objection. There was simply an error of the solicitor in failing to do his business, and they are coming to this House to correct it. I understand this matter has been before the Private Bills Committee,

where it has been fully discussed, and they have passed it after examining into all the circumstances. If there were any objections to the Bill on its merits, it would be proper to let it stand, but I understand there are none.

Mr. LISTER. When did the patent expire ?

Mr. WALLACE. It expired without their knowledge and without that of their solicitor, and the deposit was not made that it might be continued. I have a recollection of similar Bills being passed through this House a number of times. If there are any objections to it, any private interests being jeopardized, these, of course, would be fatal objections ; but, as it stands now, there are none.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I have a distinct recollection of two or three Bills similar to this one being before this House years ago, and they were thrown out for the reason that the public had acquired rights in the patent, and that this Parliament had no right to take away that which had already been given to the public, for the benefit of certain individuals. I remember one case in particular similar to this, where the solicitor had forgotten to send in the money at the proper time, and this Parliament refused to pass the Bill on that ground, and because public interests would not be subserved by such legislation.

Mr. HUGHES. That being the case, it is very peculiar that the Deputy Minister of Finance, who attended the committee, should not know something about it ; yet the Deputy Minister of Finance was present before the committee, and stated that the Minister of Agriculture had no objection whatever ; the Bill had been examined and there was no objection whatever on the part of the Government to its passing.

Committee rose and reported progress.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 86) respecting La Banque du Peuple.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

Bill (No. 100) to incorporate the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Navigation Company.—(Mr. Maxwell.)

Bill (No. 102) respecting the Ottawa Gas Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Bill (No. 103) respecting the Canadian Fire Insurance Company.

RESTIGOUCHE AND VICTORIA RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton) moved second reading of Bill (No. 99) respecting the Restigouche and Victoria Railway Company.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. Speaker, there will be a good deal of discussion on this Bill and also on Bill (No. 104), and as I do not wish to interfere with the other Bills, this order had better stand now and let the others proceed.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Before the Bill is put in that unfortunate position, I ask the hon. member (Mr. Costigan) to consider well. He is merely taking advantage of the hour having expired, which is allotted to Private Bills. He can let it go to the committee where its merits will be discussed, but keeping it back now is only blocking it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Yes, blocking it, and if it is blocked now I give my hon. friend fair warning, that if he undertakes to block a Bill in the interest of his own province, then all other Bills coming up after this at this late hour of the session, will share the same fate.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. McALISTER. Due notice has not been given of these Bills Nos. 99 and 104. It is only three weeks since the first notice of these Bills appeared in the local papers and that is not in accordance with the rules of the House. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Domville) has no right to say that we want to block the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not want to look at the clock just now unless it is the wish of the House, but if there are any other Bills to which there is no objection, they might be read a second time. Shall the hon. member (Mr. Wood, Hamilton) have leave to withdraw his motion ?

Motion withdrawn.

RESTIGOUCHE RAILWAY AND BRIDGE COMPANY.

On order for.

Second reading of Bill (No. 104) to incorporate the Restigouche Railway and Bridge Company—(Mr. Domville.)

Mr. McALISTER. Stand.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Does the hon. gentleman object to the second reading of this Bill ?

Mr. McALISTER. Yes.

Mr. DOMVILLE. He takes the full responsibility, does he ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Certainly.

Motion withdrawn.

SUPPLY—DISMISSALS FROM THE PUBLIC SERVICE.

Mr. DAVIN. I find myself, Sir, in the novel position of defending two Ministers of a Government I do not support, against the attack of an eminent follower of theirs. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) made an attack upon the Minister of the Interior, and by implication the Minister of Public Works, because if the position

taken by the hon. member (Mr. Cameron) is correct then the Minister of Public Works, from his standpoint, was wanting in his duty in not urging the dismissal of the Rev. Mr. Fairlie, and the Minister of the Interior has been wanting in his duty in not dismissing this rev. gentleman. But, Sir, I honour the Minister of the Interior for the course he has taken. He said, when he was coming down here, that he was to have a free hand, and the only thing I regret to-day is that having taken a free hand and having done right in regard to Mr. Fairlie, he showed this afternoon a tendency to apologize. It will be in the memory of the House, that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) stated, he had no complaint to make against Mr. Fairlie except that he wrote a letter on the papers. He told us, that Mr. Fairlie came to him after this luncheon, told him what he had done, and the Minister turned round to him and said: You did quite right. That was a clear statement that we got from the Minister of Public Works. I did not read it in its entirety the account given by the member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) in his own paper, the paper that he edits, and I will do so now. I think myself, that the public ought to thank the member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) for having brought forward this question, because important as the many questions are that come before this House from time to time, no question could be so important as the character of the public men that are ruling the country, and nothing could shed a stronger light on the character of certain men sitting on the other side of the House, than this transaction. It is one of the important functions of the public press, and of the "Hansard" for while we pay $40,000 a year to keep the public eye on hon. gentlemen in this House, as to what we do here, in order that they should see the character of the men that are governing and ruling the country. This article on "Visiting the Rapids," goes on:

Returning, the party stopped at the industrial school, where lunch was served in the adjoining public school-house by Mrs. Hample. A finer lunch was, perhaps, never served in the west. It reflects great credit upon Mrs. Hample, who had to contend with great difficulties, for the discourteous officers of the school had refused to lend tables, chairs or anything else; in fact, they had even refused to furnish a little hot water for the tea and coffee.

And we remember how, in his old-time humorous way, the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) used to make these benches ring with Liberal cheers when he discoursed on Indian affairs. We had the hon. member making very pleasant fun about that hot water, and what it might have been used for—and we know what it can be used for—at the close of one of the finest banquets that ever took place in the west.

After lunch, the party were conducted over the school by the principal. The institution is one of the most villainously constructed buildings it would be possible to imagine, and is a disgrace to the department.

I may say here, speaking as a critic—and I am sure that my hon. friend, the learned editor of the "Tribune" will not object to my saying this, considering that he is here criticising the language of this reverend gentleman—that the institution he speaks of here is the school, and he confounds the institution with the building; but we will pass that. I say it just for the benefit of my hon. friend.

It was ill-smelling in places, and sadly in need of whitewash and cleaning. Some Indian children were put through their facings by a schoolteacher, who spoke to the poor youngsters, while he flourished a great goad to inspire them with, as if they were so many convicts requiring the discipline extended to Siberian convicts. The writer is not in a position to say what kind of treatment Indian children require, but, with such a teacher, it is safe to say that they will never learn what love means, or will never cultivate a single grace of life.

We know what an embodiment of sweetness and light and all the charities the hon. member for Lisgar is in this House; and mark, Mr. Speaker—because you, Sir, like a few others of us, belong to the literati of this country—mark the grammar here, and the correct and elegant use of the disjunctive particle.

Those who have read, in "Nicholas Nickleby," Dickens' description of Dotheboys Hall, may be able to form some idea of the way in which, judging by certain points observed in a hurried inspection, the so-called industrial school is run. And yet the country has to pay $160 a pupil per year for these little children.

If the Rev. Mr. Fairlie had only known that not merely a Daniel, but a Chesterfield had come to judgment! He goes on, all the Christian feelings of his nature rising up:

If they were but taught the graces of life, if they were but taught what love is, it would not be so bad. But there were no evidences about the place, except the dusty motto here and there, that any one about the institution knew, or cared, what the meaning of the word is. The country pays the piper, and nobody seems to care. Unless the new Government goes into this whole "industrial school" business, and either wipes it out or reforms it, it will utterly fail in its duty to the country.

Now, Sir, mark what I am going to read:

Even the Minister of Public Works could with difficulty repress the disgust he felt at the way in which the party had been received.

Even the Minister of Public Works could scarcely repress his disgust at the way the party had been received, and the Minister of Public Works told us a short time ago that he was perfectly satisfied, and that he had told Mr. Fairlie that he had done right. There is a clear contradiction,

and the hon. gentlemen may reconcile it among themselves. Either the statement made by the Minister of Public Works must be the one that is historical, or the statement here in the "Tribune"; you cannot reconcile the two, because they are as diametrically opposed as black is to white. The Minister of Public Works declared that he had no fault to find with what had taken place there, that the only fault he had to find was with the letter of Mr. Fairlie, which he characterized as containing untruths. I am going to read that letter, and I am sorry the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) is not here and that the hon. Minister of Public Works is not here. But, as I said on another occasion, happily the public are here, and those gentlemen with an ostrich policy will land them in public contempt. This is the letter which the hon. member for Lisgar would not publish, although he would comment on it. He would hit the man before the public, but he would not give the public what the man had said and—as I said on another occasion in this House when a poor person was being hit in a way in which hon. gentlemen would not dare to hit that person outside—this Parliament of Canada can be employed in no nobler office than in defending any citizen of Canada who is wrong or about to be wronged by power. This letter is as follows:—

> My attention has been called to an article in your issue of the 27th instant, headed "Visiting the Rapids," and in which you criticise the management of the Rupert's Land Industrial School, and speak untruthfully and unkindly of its officers; and I ask for a short space in your paper, that I may offer some corrections.
>
> When I was told that the Mayor of Winnipeg and the board of trade proposed having a lunch at the industrial school on their return from the rapids, I said I would be pleased to have them here, and would show them carefully through every department of our school. Was that discourteous?
>
> When asked if he could assist us in preparing a lunch, I said they would be welcome to the dining-hall tables, chairs and dishes, and we could give them roast beef and pickles, good bread and butter, and all the tea and coffee they wished to use. Was that discourteous, sir? So far, all will agree with me that it was not. But I made one stipulation which the men composing the delegation evidently considered discourteous, and which has led to the slanderous and untrue criticism which you publish of our school.

There can be no doubt that they did propose it. The mayor of Winnipeg, I see, has also gone into hiding—I will not use the phrase that has become classical in this House, and say that he has taken to the woods or crawled under the barn; but I think the hon. member for Yarmouth has run for shelter somewhere, and the hon. Minister of Public Works is hiding his diminished head. But it is to me one of the most extraordinary things that has ever occurred in the history of the temperance movement, that a man who was here the Gamaliel of the Dominion Alliance of Canada should rise and say of this Rev. Mr. Fairlie that he did not understand how to behave as a gentleman because he would not allow into an Indian school whisky and champagne—and whisky and champagne not in any small quantities, but in cases, in the voluminous style that we all know the profuse hospitality of Winnipeg exacts.

Let me call attention to the way in which this school was managed before Mr. Fairlie went there, and I presume Mr. Fairlie was appointed not to lower but to improve it. Here is the report of the principal, Mr. John B. Ashby:

> In moral and religious training, I must, in the first place, mention that we have been greatly favoured by the advent of the Reverend A. Silva-White into the parish. * * * In going out to work with white people, they are easily led into bad habits, such as swearing and drinking. It is, therefore, most important that they should be placed only in those positions where their moral, as well as their worldly, welfare will be looked after.

There is the danger. They found by experience that these young Indians were specially exposed to falling into drinking habits, which we all know to be the greatest peril to which the young Indians are exposed; and will any man say, whether he be a member of the Dominion Alliance or not, whether he be a member of Parliament or not, whether he be a man who goes from place to place pulling a long face and making long speeches from time to time, as the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) does or not, whether he be a reverend gentleman or not, will any man dare to say that when so great a risk confronted the principal and teachers of this school, the gentleman in charge did not do his duty in saying to those gentlemen: You must not bring intoxicating liquors within these walls? But that is not all; the mayor of Winnipeg (Mr. Jameson), who is now a statesman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. DAVIN. We must assume that having been elected to Parliament, he is, at any rate, a budding statesman. Here is the Indian Act, and let me read clause 94:

> Every one who is found in possession of any intoxicants in the house, tent, wigwam or place of abode of any Indian, or of any person, or upon any other part of the reserve or special reserve, or who sells, exchanges with, barters, supplies or gives to any person, on any reserve or special reserve, any intoxicant, shall, on summary conviction, before any judge, police magistrate or stipendiary magistrate, or two justices of the peace, or Indian agent, upon the evidence of one credible witness, other than the informer or prosecutor—shall be liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months and not less than one month, with or without hard labour.

Now, let me read to you clause 100, which provides that:

And any intoxicant imported, manufactured or brought into and upon any reserve or special reserve, or into the house, tent, wigwam or place of abode, or on the person of any Indian or non-treaty Indian, or suspected to be upon any reserve or special reserve, may, upon a search warrant in that behalf being granted by any judge, police magistrate, stipendiary magistrate or justice of the peace,——

The clause goes on to provide what should be done to persons who would even bring intoxicants to an Indian reserve, and, for the purposes of the law, this school was an Indian reserve. Instead of attacking this poor man, hon. gentlemen opposite should applaud the course he took. Look at the gentlemen who were in peril of being brought under the criminal law. I need hardly tell you that on the faces of these gentlemen you will find nothing that would indicate congenital penitentiary birds. Just look at the men—the hon. Mr. Tarte, the mayor of the city of Winnipeg, &c., altogether fourteen names of leading citizens, including the Hon. Robert Watson and others. And they took up on the way Mayor Dagg of Selkirk, Mr. Cumming and three others, so that we have seventeen leading gentlemen and others. It was evidently a pretty large party, and I may say, from what I know of Winnipeg hospitality, that with seventeen gentlemen and others, the champagne must have been profuse and the whisky galore.

What was, then, the duty of this Mr. Fairlie? He was, for the purposes of the Indian Act, as principal of that school, an agent in a legal sense, and as such he was empowered and bound to arrest anybody found in possession of intoxicants. It would have been his duty, if these people had gone into that school and put whisky and champagne on the table, to arrest them; and yet he is to be censured and denounced because he refused to place himself in the position of being compelled to arrest these gentlemen, among whom was a Minister of the Crown—and not only a Minister of the Crown but a Minister of the Crown with all his blushing honours new. He has calmed down a little since. We know how a party which has been long out feel on again attending office; we know from experience and observation that there is a good deal of the beggar on horseback in us under such circumstances, and we have seen a good deal of it, I am sorry to say.

What can be thought of the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), who is at the head in this Parliament, of a great organization for the promotion of total abstinence by the destruction entirely throughout the Dominion of the manufacture and use of intoxicants. "He may be a very good school teacher," said the hon. gentleman, speaking of the Rev. Mr. Fairlie, "but he is clearly not a gentleman, because in society we have all to mix with people who take a little champagne." And I am afraid that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Flint) belongs to that class of teetotal propagandists who, when they go out to dinner, never miss the Roman punch.

These children fall a prey to the evil of drink only too easily, and if, as you state in your paper, the officers who try to guard them against such evils in their childhood's days, have no "love" for their pupils and do not know or care what the word means, then, what can be said of those gentlemen who were so angry because they were refused permission to bring champagne and whisky into the school to be used in the presence of "these poor wards of the country?"

Now, there is no misstatement here, because every word is corroborated by the mayor, who gave the feast. As we go further, let me see if there is any misstatement:

This matter of having whisky into the school has caused trouble in the past; the correspondence is still on file in this office, and I would have been guilty of criminal negligence and would have deserved the severest criticism, if I had permitted any indulgence whatever. I am certain that every earnest and honest man will uphold me in the stand I have taken.

Unfortunate, deluded, confiding Fairlie! He little thought there would have been an earnest and honest member in this House of the Dominion Alliance who would say to him: Sir, you are not a gentleman.

That I refused to loan the tables and chairs for use outside the institution, is true, but my instructions from the department are to "lend nothing," and I try to obey orders, and am not blameworthy on this point.

Well, if a man carries out his instructions, there is nothing ungentlemanly in that.

That I refused either hot or cold water, is not true: I told them they could have both.

The only charge left, after it is all pared down, is that they were refused hot and cold water, and that he distinctly denies. He says he was ready to give them both, and even give them tea as well, and beef. We all remember that scene in "Punch," in which two Guardsmen are depicted, the one saying to the other:

"Aw, did you know Bwown of owah's?" "Yahs." "He ate beef and poak." "And did he die?" "Why, of caws, he died."

Of course he did, he died when he ate anything so coarse as beef and pork. For these grand people to eat anything so coarse as the fare the Rev. Mr. Fairlie offered them would have meant death. I have no doubt they had blue points, lobster bisque, sweetbread pâtés, truffles, ducks, red head and canvas backs, fricassée of various sorts, gelée glacée, neapolitan ice cream, liqueurs, claret, five year old whisky and champagne, cooled to 48. I do not know that previous to coming here the hon. gentleman from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) knew the temperature to which champagne should be cooled, but he knows it now, for we often

see him flourishing and flaunting about in his dress clothes.

In regard to the buildings, I must say, that I do not think any person is capable of giving a fair criticism of the building from a ten-minute inspection. One room and a hall were in the hands of the carpenters undergoing repairs, being kalsomined and painted, and were in the same state as they would be in your own house under similar circumstances. You seem to have noticed this, but you neglect to state that the rest of the buildings, the halls, dormitories dining-room, kitchen and laundry, were in perfect order and spotlessly clean.

I hope my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works is not going to glide out, because I am about to ask him to point out the lie in this letter. He has stated that there are untruths in it, and I would like him to show where they are. I hope he will not slide away.

This school is our home, and I guarantee that we keep it as clean and sweet as you, or any other gentleman on the delegation, keeps your homes in the city (though yours is the easier task), and you, or any others, are welcome to come and inspect it at any time, even on a Monday, the day when most homes are a trifle disordered.

There may have been a bad smell in some of the rooms, as you say, but that would be in one of the smaller rooms, and when a dozen men, who have spent two hours at a banquet where champagne and whisky and soda were served, and cigars freely smoked, get crowded into a small room, it is not conducive to sweet smells. I noticed this also, but did not think that the "discourteous" officers of the school were to blame for it.

Is there any imputation there? It is admitted by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Jameson) that there was champagne and that there was whisky. It is admitted that these were drunk. We know that when men take wine they want a cigar also. It is perfectly certain that cigars were smoked. And with the fumes of cigars and chamgagne, mixed up with Corby's, Hennessy's, or Seagram's, we know what combination you would have there; and you must remember also that they had visited the hospitable Mr. Macdougall before they went to lunch. He is a western man, and the reporter declares that he treated them well, and they were prepared for their lunch by this courteous gentleman. If you get seventeen men and others in a room under such circumstances, the odour will not be quite that of a garden that the Lord hath blessed.

Your attack on the teacher was serious, but he is capable of defending himself, and I only wish to say here, that Mr McDougall, the teacher, is a gentleman of experience in dealing with Indian children, knows well how they should be handled, and is, I believe, more popular among the Indian children than any other teacher in Manitoba to-day. These children are taught what "love" means in a way in which the writer of this article never learned it—not that love which is a mere empty sound, but rather "that love which worketh no ill to its neighbour," that charity which suffereth long and is kind—the same love which the Master taught.

You speak of the necessity of the Government either reforming or wiping out these schools. That is just what they are trying to do. The present Government sent me here on the recommendation of the superintendent of the Mohawk Institution at Brantford, a man who knows more about Indian schools than any other man in Canada, and under whom I was trained, with instructions to reform the school; but it is a work that cannot be done in three weeks, the length of time I have been in charge; and yet, when I make the attempt to reform, and forbid whisky within the walls, you abuse me in your paper for being discourteous.

Just as the hon. gentleman for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) said—he was not a gentleman. And what is the charge made against this unhappy man for refusing to patronize and sanction this champagne swill? The charge made by the hon. member for Winnipeg is that he is a temperance crank because he would not break the law of Canada. That made by the hon. member for Yarmouth is that he is not a gentleman, and that made by the hon. member for Lisgar is that he was discourteous.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Not at all; it was that he told a lie.

Mr. DAVIN—

I challenge the fullest investigation of my work and conduct of the school, by either the Government, or city council, or board of trade—only, instead of spending two hours and ten minutes at a luncheon with champagne and whisky, and only fifteen minutes in the school,—

What a terrible amount of sack to a few pennyworth of bread. You remember what Prince Hal said when he went through the pockets of Falstaff and found a tavern bill for one-half pennyworth of bread and capons and gallons and quarts of sack: "O monstrous! but one-half pennyworth of bread to this intolerable deal of sack!" Over two hours for champagne and whisky and ten minutes for the school.

—let them reverse the order, and give two hours for the inspection and fifteen minutes for lunch without whisky and soda, and I will be content to bear their criticisms. Our school is clean, our children are as clean, as comfortably clothed and as happy as the children of any large family in Winnipeg; their mental and moral training is just as careful, and probably more careful, than that given to your city families; their physical health is carefully watched: every child in this school is seen by me personally between 10:30 and 11 p.m., every night, so that I know they are all asleep and well before I go to bed.

Does this seem like neglect of duty or as though the "discourteous officers of the school" did not know what "love" means, or care to teach the children the graces of life?

I understand my duty, sir, and I daily ask God for strength to perform it fully and fearlessly, even to the extent of forbidding so powerful a delegation as yours to bring whisky within its walls.

JOHN H. FAIRLIE,
Principal.

Rupert's Land Industrial School, Oct. 29th, 1896.

Sir, the wolves of the spoils system may pursue that man to destroy him, but that letter will remain to his honour for ever in Canada. I will send this letter over to the Minister of Public Works and ask him to point out where the falsehood is. He assured us that this reverend gentleman came to him afterwards and explained what he had done, and the hon. Minister told him that he had done right. I defend and honour the Minister of Public Works for that. But he added that what he complained of was Mr. Fairlie writing that letter, which I understood him to characterize as containing untruths. With the admissions we have and with what we know of the facts, as incontrovertibly proved as if they had been brought out in a court of justice under cross-examination, will the hon. gentleman point out that there is a single untruth in it or that there is anything in the facts to show that this employee of the Government did not act the part of a brave, honourable and just man, and one consistent with his principles, when, instead of currying favour with a powerful delegation and winking at whisky and champagne drinking illegally and criminally within those walls, he firmly refused to permit it? He was bound to act as he did, because, apart altogether from the criminal law, he is a clergyman; and I am told by my hon. friend who sits near me, and who spoke here to-day, that he is a consistent believer in teetotalism. As such and as a clergyman no doubt he was perfectly familiar with what the hon. member for Yarmouth must be familiar with: Touch not, taste not, handle not. Sir, I honour the Rev. Mr. Fairlie, and I hope that the reverend gentlemen in this House will give the weight of their voices against the Government—or rather against not the Government, for up to this time the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of the Interior have done right, for which I honour them—but against the powerful supporter of the Government who is urging the Ministers to strike at this man, because he was not "gentlemanly" enough to forget his principles, to forget that he was a clergyman, to forget his duty to God, to forget his duty to the Government as the principal of an Indian school, and to forget as a citizen of Canada what is due to her laws.

Sir, it is a serious and painful thing to witness the demoralizing effect of power on the hon. gentlemen opposite. I have had occasion this session to point out the quick decadence amongst hon. gentlemen occupying the Treasury benches, but that need not necessarily have involved degradation, deterioration and falling off on the part of their supporters. But take the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint); we have heard him from a bench behind me, rise and make speeches on the subject of prohibition, we have heard from him fluent arguments as to the imperative need of getting rid entirely of the great evil of the trade in intoxicants. But no sooner did they get into power than not merely do we find on the Treasury benches gentlemen forgetting their previous professions and pledges; but we find that moving in the higher places of genial society frays away the moral stamina of the hon. member for Yarmouth, teetotaler as he is, and earnest expounder as he is of prohibition. He tells us here that the principal of an Indian school who refuses to have the fatal drink placed before the eyes of his Indian children, that that man, because a member of the Government of Canada was in the delegation, has no politeness. I have seen no interest taken in the debate by my hon. and reverend friend from Eastern Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas). I see my hon. and reverend friend the member for Vancouver (Mr. Maxwell) here. I am glad to see that he takes an interest in it, and I hope that he will rise and express his indignation at the course taken to-night by some of his party. The hon. member for Eastern Assiniboia describes himself in the "Parliamentary Companion" as having been elected as an Independent Patron, and he gives himself out to the world at large as having stood as an Independent Patron, and that by and by he was called an Independent Grit. And then he came afterwards to so present his views that people called him an Independent Conservative Patron, and that he used to call himself an Independent Liberal-Conservative, and a Liberal Grit Patron. However, I am told now that the hon. gentleman has blossomed into a full Liberal, and attends the Liberal caucus. Well, I cannot refer to a previous debate, but I can refer to a circumstance that bears on the degeneration of which I speak. The other night when I was here fighting in the interests of the farmers, where were those gentlemen that should have been here to support me? If the vote had taken place the night before, I am told that my hon. friend from Lisgar would have voted for me. He said that to one of my friends. He shakes his head. I won't say of him as Daniel O'Connell once said of a learned judge when he shook his head, "There is nothing in it," but I take it as a polite denial. I was told the patrons were going to vote with me. They have voted with me once or twice in this House, but where were they? A change had taken place in them within twenty-four hours. I know what happened. I know the influence of social blandishments. Some hon. gentlemen who come to this House—it occurs in every party, I am not making it a point now against your party, it is in the interest of a Government to make men who are behind it as tame as mice if they can, and I am bound to say that one mouse seems to have broken out of the trap to-day—soon feel the hypnotizing effect. The atmosphere of Ottawa is not congenial to independents.

Hon. gentlemen come down here, and they are going to be independent, they are going to do what the hon. member for East Assiniboia said at Qu'Appelle he was going to do; he said he was coming down here to deal a death blow to protection. He also said at Qu'Appelle, What have I to do with Mr. Laurier? And now he attends the Liberal caucus, and votes against a motion made in the interest of the farmers whom he is supposed to represent. Well, what happened in that twenty-four hours? Why, Sir, they were squared, and then a dinner party was given in their honour. One dinner party, I read of in the "Citizen" was given at the Club where we find the names of T. O. Davis, J. A. Macdonnell, J. M. Douglas, who, as we read in the "Parliamentary Companion," describes himself as a Liberal, and received the nomination of the Patrons of Industry as a Patron. Then there was Mr. Tolmie, an Independent, elected as a Patron of Industry. Then we had another dinner party the same night. W. V. Pettet, from Prince Edward County, who is described as an elected Patron of Industry, he was dining out, and the others were dining out, instead of supporting me in fighting the battle of the farmers. But they came in with their white ties on, and their evening dress, and the rose in their button hole, having partaken of a dinner that was the sacrament of their betrayal of the farmer.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman is going a little too far.

Mr. GIBSON. I rise to a point of order. I say the hon. gentleman should withdraw the statement that he has made, that the dinner was held for the purpose of influencing these members to do as they did.

Mr. DAVIN. I said nothing of the kind. I was not in the least out of order; if I was out of order I will put myself in order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. I did not understand that the hon. gentleman made a specific charge against the hon. gentlemen whose names he mentioned, but at the same time I think there is an insinuation contained in his language, and I would advise him not to go so far.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I certainly would not charge them further than this. I am asking your ruling whether it is out of order—and if it is out of order I will not make the charge—but what I charge them with is this, with deserting Patronism. Is that out of order?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. No.

Mr. DAVIN. Then I charge them with deserting Patronism. Not only that, but I charge the hon. member for Yarmouth with having deserted his colours, and being false to his role here as a protagonist of the temperance cause. I say that the position taken by the member for Yarmouth will be known from one end of the country to the other, that he, a temperance man par excellence, said of a reverend gentleman whose letter will be read in the "Hansard," that because he would not place that perilous cup that the hon. member himself has so often denounced as the destroyer of homes, as the maker of widows and orphans, as the murderer of conscience and self respect—that because that reverend gentleman would not put this thing before those Indian children, he is not a gentleman. Sir, he is a minister of the Church of England, and as such, I presume, he has received the education of a gentleman, and that letter is the letter of an educated and independent man; and I say if there is any lack of what is gentlemanly anywhere in regard to these transactions, it is in not dealing openly and fairly with this man and giving him the investigation he asks for, but under cover of the privileges of Parliament, making charges and insinuations, which are groundless, and if that were not so trifling, petty and irrelevant. I will not go into the general question of dismissals at present. I may do so on another occasion. I may have something to say about that matter when the time comes. But I will say here, that there could not be a plainer duty before any member of Parliament than to do what I have attempted when there was a clearly wolfish effort made by a gentleman to destroy this unfortunate man, to stand up and to the best of my poor ability make it clear that the man has acted within his duty, that he has acted perfectly honourable, that he has not uttered any untruths, that he has not been discourteous, and that the charge made against him has not been sustained; that there is a clear contradiction between the statement made by the hon. Minister of Public Works and by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson). Hon. members know very well what a judge thinks of a case when the witnesses on one side contradict each other flatly. We know very well what judgment a judge is inclined to give under those circumstances. In this case the judgment that will be given, which will be that of the public, will be this: that Mr. Fairlie did his duty, that he behaved like a clergyman, like a true principal of an Indian school; that so far the Minister of the Interior has acted rightly in sustaining him, and only failed in adopting an apologetic tone here to-day, and that the remarks made by the Minister of Public Works in regard to that letter are not well founded—because I hand the hon. gentleman the letter and I defy him to point out a single untruth—and the hon. member for Lisgar is in the dock and already condemned.

Mr. MAXWELL. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked, in dulcet tones, to say a word on this question by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. I do not think that this particular enticement would have any influence over me. I would not like to make

that hon. gentleman my guide in particular matters, because I have been taught in my youth from the good old book that there are blind leaders of the blind, and I am afraid if I should follow the hon. gentleman, we might both fall into the ditch before we had gone far. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I have in some ways been almost ashamed of the spectacle which we have witnessed in this honourable House. I think it ought to be the effort of every hon. gentleman, and especially of a learned gentleman, to make this House a model House to the citizens and public of Canada. I do not know that it is doing us any good, so far as the public are concerned, that we should descend to the level which we have reached to-night by listening to the hon. gentleman.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. MAXWELL. I hope to make plain what I mean before I sit down, and I hope that the distinguished gentleman with the small hat on will possess his soul in patience, or I may devote some attention to him instead of to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. I have been called upon as a clergyman to say something on this matter. It is not the first time that I have witnessed the gushing style of the hon. gentleman over persons whom he supposed to have been unjustly dealt with. I can remember his weeping over a now famous character called McManus, a distinguished lady whom he knew very well, and who does not bear the most reputable reputation in Canada—and I put two and two together. When an hon. gentleman stands up in this House and asks me as a member of this honourable House to have such a character in connection with the Government of this country, I am mightily afraid to have anything to do with him when he gets into the gushing mood again. A great deal has been said this evening with respect to this banquet which took place in the North-west. One thing amused me very much. I do not know much of those orgies, which the hon. gentleman so beautifully described; but I thought this, that no member of this House could have described a bacchanalian orgie as faithfully as the hon. gentleman, because I could not but have the impression forced on my mind that he has been through them over and over again. Now, I do not know anything about them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MAXWELL. I am willing to accept the descriptions which have been presented to us this evening; but I am perfectly certain that the gentlemen who accompanied the hon. Minister of Public Works to this banquet were far superior to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MAXWELL. I mean no insinuation at all; but I say those are men of undoubted reputation and character in their respective localities, and it was not fair, manly or just that any aspersions should have been cast on their characters as to what they drank or did on that particular occasion. I am sure they would conduct themselves as any hon. gentleman would have conducted himself if he had been present on that occasion. The hon. member has referred also to my reverend colleague (Mr. Douglas). I am very touchy so far as regards my companions in my profession are concerned, and I do not think I say anything disrespectful to the hon. member when I state that it would be a good thing for himself if he bore such an excellent reputation and character as does my colleague who sits behind me here. He has been an honoured member and minister of the Presbyterian Church, and there is no ministry in Canada or in any part of the world that demands so high a character of its ministers as does the church to which my hon. friend honourably belongs. That gentleman has in many ways served his church and his country, and the fact that he was sent to this House by such a large majority eloquently testifies to the respect in which he is held in that particular locality. We have heard a wonderfully eloquent speech, so I may call it, with respect to the duties and excellencies of temperance. We say that sometimes the devil enters into the pulpit to give a sermon; and I could not help realizing that perhaps the hon. gentleman who was speaking had undergone some such transformation. Now, there is one great difference—and this is one lesson I should like to impress on the hon. gentleman's mind—and it is, that it is not what a man says particularly in this House that goes down with the people of this country. But, when an hon. gentleman gets up on the floor of this House, and attacks a man of the honour, and the respectability, and the excellence of character of the hon. gentleman for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) who, whatever he may say, bears the reputation in the country of being a man who honestly upholds his convictions, so far as intoxicating liquor is concerned, and when my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) attacks such a man as that, he need not believe that his word is going to be accepted against the hon. member for Yarmouth. Whatever he (Mr. Flint) said to-day, I am perfectly certain of this: That he is a far more genuine friend of the temperance cause than my friend (Mr. Davin) who has just taken his seat. Now, I do not intend to refer to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) further than this: He says that the public are deeply interested in the character of its public men, and he says, that this banquet throws a lurid light on the character of men who sit upon this side of the House. Now you know, Mr. Speaker, that those who live in glass houses should not throw stones, and when men attack

men they ought to be pretty sure, and they ought to be pretty certain that they cannot be attacked themselves. The country has just passed its verdict upon hon. gentlemen opposite, and if I was so minded I would not have very much difficulty in ransacking the archives of the history of the Conservative party to find out, at least, the character of some men who have been held in high honour and high esteem by that same party. And, if I should bring this to light, I think hon. gentlemen opposite should hold their heads down and should be the last men on earth to attack the character of men who, so far as we know, are spotless in the eyes of the country.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of trying to elevate this debate a little higher. I know it is a very difficult thing to do, owing to the present state of education which hon. gentlemen opposite have attained, but I am hopeful that after giving them a few lectures we may be enabled to develop them a little more, cause them to rise to a higher level than they have attained at the present time, and to look on matters, not so much in the interest of narrow selfishness, but to look on them, as these interests will be considered and will be judged by the people whom we represent here. I wish to read a letter that was sent to the daily "Nor'-Wester" by J. C. Sproule, alderman of the city of Winnipeg, the brother of a respected member of this House. The letter is to the following effect :—

Sir,—In your morning edition of November 4, you have a letter sent by John H. Fairlie, principal of Rupert's Land Industrial School. With the letter itself I cannot find much fault,——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MAXWELL. Hon. gentlemen opposite had better wait a minute.

—With the letter itself I cannot find much fault, as I am in perfect accord with the principal when he objected to allow liquor to be brought into the school ; but what I do take objection to is, the heading of the letter, in heavy leaded type, "A Jamboree, "Tarte and the Gang at the School."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MAXWELL. Well, gentlemen, those who put this heading there were men belonging to your own party. If you like to get up in this House and condemn your friends, then do so, but we must remember that it was an exponent of Conservative principles in the city of Winnipeg who put this heading on this particular letter. Mr. Sproule continues to write :

As a member of the city council, I was present, but was not aware that wine had been provided, until I arrived there, and, in justice to myself and other members of the deputation, I must resent the insinuation that it was either a "spree" or "jamboree." I was pleased to note that those who did drink wine, did so sparingly, and that quite a number of those present did not touch either wine or other liquor, notably the hon. Minister (Mr. Tarte), J. H. Ashdown, Alderman McCreary and myself. Now, Mr. Editor, I hope you will pardon me for mentioning these names, but, as they are all public men whose character and public usefulness might be injured by even an insinuation of that kind, I have been particular to mention them. Another reason why I refer to it is this. Alderman McCreary and myself are candidates for the position of chief magistrate of this city, and I do not want any citizen to think I am capable of going on a spree or jamboree, or of using tobacco or liquors of any kind. I have been particular to mention Alderman McCreary, because he is my opponent. I repeat, that it gave me pleasure to note that he did not indulge in any kind of liquor during the banquet.

Hoping that I have not trespassed upon your valuable space.

(Sgd.) J. C. SPROULE,
Alderman.

Winnipeg, November 5, 1896.

Now, so far as the dismissal of the Rev. Mr. Fairlie is concerned, I will only say this : That I have absolute confidence in the Minister of the Interior that after he has made due investigation as to the circumstances of the case, he will do what is right. And, if the reverend gentleman has been discourteous, if he did not act as a man should have acted in that particular position on that particular occasion, then I do not care whether he wears a black coat or a white one if he has not done what is right, he ought not to be there.

I have listened to a great deal of what has been said in this House on the question of the dismissal of public servants. I confess it is one of the most important subjects we can discuss here, and, speaking for myself, to dismiss a man is one of the hardest things which is given to me on this earth. I do not look so much to the man, as I do to his wife, perhaps to his family, and I take into consideration all the effects that may follow from the dismissal of any man who has a particular position in connection with the country's service. Now, Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen will, I think, agree with me, that there are two points which we ought always to take into consideration. First, the duty of the state to the servant. I believe it is the duty of the state to the servant to see that he is properly provided for, to give him a salary that will enable him to live in due competence, to make him comfortable in his home, as well as his wife and his family, and that so far as all these circumstances are concerned, he ought to have a fair field and fair favour with regard to any promotion that may come in his way. But, I think also, Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen will agree with me in this : That the servant has a duty to the state which also must be taken into consideration, and, as he has gone into the service of the state—not of the party ; as he has gone in to devote his time and his talents to the furtherance of the interests of

the state as a whole, that the state—not a party, has a right to demand of that man that he should give his due and absolute attention to all that concerns the whole, and not any part of the whole. Now, with regard to the question which crops out of this, what is the present condition of things. The House will agree with me that the civil service of this country is purely political; at least it is very nearly so. Hon. gentlemen opposite during their long tenure of office, have been putting Conservatives, one by one, into the public offices which have become vacant. So far as my own constituency is concerned, I know of only two Liberals in the postal service, in the customs service, in the inland revenue service, and in all the other departments in which the officers are employed by the Government; only two. No hon. gentleman will say that there were no Liberals, at least equally well fitted as these gentlemen who have been appointed. I am speaking impartially when I say that the best men have not been appointed in the past, and that the men who have been appointed are the men who have in some way endeared themselves to the Conservative party. We hear complaints from the opposite side of the House that Conservatives are not getting justice now. I hear complaints from this side that the Liberals are not getting justice now. What does it all mean, but simply that the cry is political from beginning to end. My position with regard to the civil service is this, the time has come for the well-being of Canada, when politics shall be eliminated from the public service; when men who enter there should enter at the door of competition, when men should get promotion by the same method, and when we should have a pure service, and a pure body of men, entirely removed from those spheres of action where our passions are apt to grow hot and excited when dismissals take place. We should be able to point as the old country points to its civil servants, and say "These men do not interfere with us; they mind their own business, and they allow the politicians of the country to mind theirs likewise." What did the late Government do? I have not the prejudices of the old war-horses on this side of the House. I can respect and somewhat sympathize with my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Cameron) who has long fought on the political battlefields, and—I shall not say who has grown weak, for his voice was strong to-day, but who has fought a hard fight for his party—I can sympathize with him and with other men who have done such yeoman service for their party, and who in days gone by have seen men deposed from their offices because they were Liberals; and now that their party are in power, they naturally feel that the same treatment should be meted out to those men who tried to do their utmost against the Liberal party. At the same time, I say it ill-becomes the members of the opposite party to denounce the present Government for dismissing men, when they did the same thing themselves. Their eloquent appeals have no force with me, because they are simply reaping the harvest they have sown in days gone by; and this state of things will continue in Canada until we rise to the occasion and determine to put the servants of the country beyond the range of the politicians and politics and when we define their boundaries and limits, their uses and liberties. Not till then shall we be spared the pain of discussing and the pain of listening to harangues about men who have been expelled from the public service. So far as I am concerned, I have no sympathy whatever with the spoils system, and when hon. gentlemen opposite talk of the spoils system being introduced into the country now for the first time, I cannot help saying that they are stating what they know is not exactly true. I think I am stating what is correct when I say that in the whole province of British Columbia there have been only four or five dismissals by the present Government. Is that any indication of the spoils system coming into force? When we take into consideration the fact that almost every official out there is a Conservative, this ought to convince hon. gentlemen that when they talk about the spoils system being introduced, they are either talking about something they know nothing about, or else they desire to mislead the country. The same thing is true all over Canada to-day. There are hundreds, nay, thousands of Conservatives still in the service of the country, and these men will be retained in that service. At the same time, it is galling and provoking to know, as I know from my own experience, that the Conservative party went into the post offices and the custom-houses and said to the men there: "You must subscribe to the campaign funds, go to the committee rooms, and work here and there for the success of the party." I say it is tantalizing when you meet these men everywhere on the political battlefield, and a man must be very much of a saint if, when he gets the power in his hands, he does not visit on these men the full weight of their conduct. I had it from the lips of men themselves that they were coerced to assist the election of the candidate opposed to me. I do not blame the men exactly. I have a great deal of sympathy for them; but I say that it is mean and contemptible to force the civil servants of this country to do what in their consciences they feel they ought not to do against men who are just as much interested in the country as they are themselves.

Now, I have just one word to say to the ex-Finance Minister about an expression which dropped from his lips. I expected better things from that hon. gentleman, for, although I say it to himself, I have learned in many ways to respect and admire him. I say he is a credit not only to his party, but

likewise to Canada. I hope I may never descend so low as to denounce or besmirch hon. gentlemen who have risen to the front ranks in our political life. I say that men like the leader of the Opposition and the ex-Finance Minister are men whom we ought to respect and admire. I believe that if they were dead to-morrow, there is not a man on either side of the House but would pronounce excellent eulogies upon them, for their virtues and their usefulness to the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MAXWELL. I do not mean that in any sense but its right sense. I say I have learned to admire the ex-Minister of Finance. Having been a professor, I have been naturally drawn to him on that account more than perhaps I would have been if he had been an ordinary member of the House. I have been during a great part of my life listening to professors, and the excellent teaching I received from them has since had considerable influence on my life. I always seek to draw near to professors, thinking I shall get from them something to help me in my political conduct. I suppose it is hardly lawful to refer to a past debate, but I heard the hon. member practically twice assail the Premier of the country for having consulted with one Pacaud. We have had Mercier dinned into our ears, and I am not here to say anything of that late hon. gentleman except "requiescat in pace." But I will say this—and I think every French member of this House will join with me in saying it—that with all his faults he was a man whom French Canadians will not let die in a hurry; and when those of us who know that:

> Though they may gang a kennin wrang,
> To step aside is human.

When we take into consideration how brilliantly that man was endowed, and with what eloquence he thrilled the citizens of his native province, as I have often heard and seen him do we ought to change the expression of Shakspere, let the bad go and keep the good in the life that was an example and a pattern for us all. So far as Mr. Pacaud is concerned, I will not say that he was just as pure as all of us would desire; but, Mr. Speaker, it ill-becomes gentlemen to speak in a condemnatory way of men who have taken their hundreds and thousands when they stood by men who had stolen millions. Not only did they stand by them, but they proclaimed to the world, they taught the youth of Canada, something to this effect: "You are fools if you steal your hundreds and thousands; get connected with the Conservative party of this country, steal your hundreds of thousands, you will only get a few weeks in prison, and when you come out you will be treated to a champagne supper, and will be returned to Parliament a few weeks afterwards." I speak of that, Mr. Speaker, with sorrow and regret. When I came to this country, I came as a Conservative, as one who had been brought up at the feet of Benjamin Disraeli, the late Earl of Beaconsfield. I came into this country with all my sympathies on that side of the House, but as I came in contact with these scandals, these robberies of public money, I could not consistently any longer maintain any connection with a party which would countenance such scandals. Hence the reason that I am on this side of the House this evening advocating the things I advocate to-night. I say again that it ill-becomes a party to try and besmirch another party for doing small things, so long as they have had the big robbers on their side who have plunged their big hands into the public purse and stolen the public money. I have said these things just as an expression of my views with regard to dismissals and with regard to this matter which has been under discussion to-day. I hope that we will rise now above these matters which we have been considering to-day. I think both sides might now very well take this position. If there be black sheep on either side let us have them expelled, if there be any taint of corruption in our midst, let us have that taint extirpated, if there be anything in our political life which our people will condemn let us set our house in order and let us try honestly to make this House the honourable House we desire it to be. Let us try to make the politics of Canada so pure that they will commend themselves to all the people of Canada, and let us likewise make the effort so far as we, the representatives of the people, are concerned, to live and act so as to ensure and enshrine ourselves in the memories and hearts of the men and women who send us here to represent them as best we may.

Mr. QUINN. Whatever may be the result of the debate which has been raised by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) this afternoon on the conduct of the Rev. Mr. Fairlie, the House and the country cannot fail to derive some advantage from the discussion, because it has thrown some light upon the methods used and the excuses given for the dismissal of public servants. I shall delay criticising the honourable and reverend gentleman who has just left the House until he has had that drink of water for which, I presume, he has gone, and in the meantime I shall try and deal with the charges that have been made against the Rev. Mr. Fairlie, and then give to some of the hon. Ministers an opportunity to explain some of the dismissals which have occurred upon the Lachine Canal in Montreal. The Rev. Mr. Fairlie is charged by the hon. member for West Huron with having committed several grievous offences. He was guilty of hav-

ing refused to the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) on his visit to the North-west, the use of his school. He was guilty, according to the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Jameson), of being a temperance crank. He was guilty of having refused the use of the tables and chairs and the use of hot water—for the purpose of making tea, be it understood; and lastly he was accused and guilty—because, of course, having been accused it must follow that he was guilty—of having written a letter. Now these are the principal charges made against Mr. Fairlie, but they are not all the charges nor are they those upon which the different members opposite who have spoken are prepared to condemn him. In fact it seems to be the accepted thing, first to condemn, and then find some excuse, no matter how poor, afterwards. One hon. member condemns Mr. Fairlie because he refused the use of the school, another because he is not a gentleman, and a third, the hon. the Minister of Public Works himself, says Mr. Fairlie was perfectly right in refusing the school and acted a gentleman, but that he was wrong in writing the letter; and the hon. member for West Huron, who made the charge in the first instance, said that the most grievous offence of which Mr. Fairlie was guilty, in his eyes, was that he was a wicked Tory. Now, Mr. Speaker, this last offence is really the most serious and the only charge necessary to be made against any public officer in order to obtain a verdict against him of dismissal from the public service. Let us look at the charges made and then evidence in support of them, and let us calmly, as judges, decide whether Mr. Fairlie was guilty or not of the crimes charged against him, even that of being a wicked Tory.

It is charged that he refused the school, yet it is proven out of the mouths of those who made the charge that he only refused it under certain conditions. It is proven that he refused the use of the school for the purpose of a luncheon at which liquor was to be used. That is why he refused. Mr. Fairlie's letter is before the House, in which he declares—and his statement has not been challenged—that he not only offered the use of the school for the purposes of a luncheon, but even offered to supply the tables, and chairs and the luncheon itself to the extent of beef, coffee and tea, but that he would not consent to the admission of intoxicating liquor. He then is charged with being a temperance crank. Now, that is a very glib expression and very easily used, but I do not know that being a temperance crank is a sin or a crime or anything for which any person holding a position in the public service ought to be dismissed. What is meant by the term "temperance crank?" The term crank is a convenient one used to define a person who has extreme views on any subject. But the extremeness of a man's views depends altogether on the position taken by the one listening to him, and not on the position taken by the man himself. Therefore if a man is a consistent temperance advocate, however much we may differ from him, or however wrong or however extreme we may think he is, we have no title to call him a temperance crank. Having then examined the evidence concerning the refusal to allow the school to be used, and to allow the use of the tables and chairs and the hot water for tea, let us see what there is on the charge of writing the letter, which, mark you, Mr. Speaker, is the only complaint made by the hon. Minister of Public Works against Mr. Fairlie.

For the moment I would like to draw your attention to the statement which was made by the hon. the First Minister, when he, in the fullness of his heart, speaking from his place in the House, declared that no man should be dismissed from public office without the benefit of an investigation into his conduct. I need not remind you how the declaration of his as First Minister was received not only by his own supporters but by other hon. gentlemen who had the pleasure of listening to that statement. But when we look at what has occurred within the last few months, when we see so many members of the public service dismissed, does it not bring back vividly to our minds a certain letter written by a former Prime Minister of this country in which he declared that he was glad the strain was over, that he was too old to stand longer as a guard to the public treasury, too weak to resist longer the assaults made upon it? Is not this the counterpart of what we see to-day? Is it not the fact that the Prime Minister of this country has been too weak to resist longer the onslaughts that have been made by hon. gentlemen opposite, too weak to resist longer the pressure from behind that is intended to drive out of public positions the men who occupy them, in order that those who are hungry for the crumbs that fall from the Government table may enjoy the sweets of these offices?

In this particular case, the only charge that has been made against the Rev. Mr. Fairlie, the only charge upon which he can be indicted before this House and on which a verdict can be expected by those who seek to have him dismissed from the public service, is that in the letter he has written he has spoken disrespectfully of the Minister of Public Works or some other Minister or has said something which is absolutely and utterly untrue. The hon. Minister of Public Works said in his statement concerning that letter—I was careful to take down his words—that when Mr. Fairlie said that some of the guests smelt of liquor and intimated that they were drunk,

he said what was not true. I challenge the hon. Minister of Public Works to find in that letter one line which charges that some of the guests smelt of liquor or one word intimating that the guests on that occasion were drunk. I wish to draw your attention to this particular statement of the hon. Minister of Public Works not so much for the inaccuracy it contains, but to point out the injustice of any Minister, and much more any ordinary member of this House and still more of an ordinary citizen sitting in judgment on the actions or words of a public officer when he himself is either looking for the position or for any other reason does not understand the explanations given by that officer. I call your attention to the fact that so much was the Minister of Public Works prejudiced against this man that he, the judge, the one into whose hands the Minister of the Interior had, so to speak, delivered this officer's head had misunderstood the officer's words to such an extent as to declare that the officer had said some of the guests smelt of liquor and had intimated that some of them were drunk and that this was not true. If an hon. Minister can be guilty of things of this kind—I will not call them crimes—but if he can be guilty of misquoting, of misunderstanding, of taking a wrong view of things, how much more may we expect this of ordinary members of the House and of ordinary citizens who do not occupy the exalted positions of Ministers of the Crown, so well characterized by the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) in his short address this evening?

Now, the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Maxwell) declaring himself to be a clergyman and willing to throw oil upon the troubled waters, and wishing to raise this debate to a higher plane as a member of the Church, as a worthy Minister of the Gospel, spent the greater part of the time which he consumed in a tirade of abuse and vituperation against the hon. member for Western Assiniboia. I have no hesitation in saying that in my short experience in this House I have heard nothing to equal it. I am glad to say that it is the first time that an attack of this kind has been made, and I am perfectly certain that it is the last time it will be made in this House. Now, what did the hon. member for Burrard say? One of the things he charged against the hon. member for Western Assiniboia was that he advocated the interests of Mrs. McManus. Now, what is the case of Mrs. McManus. We have had this case in the House before and it was proven clearly to the satisfaction, not only of this House but of this country, that this woman was dismissed from her office on a report which did not ask for her dismissal but in reality sustained her in her position. But what then, was the actual cause of her dismissal? I will not say that the hon. member for Burrad whispered into the ear of the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) the same thing he whispered into the ear in this House, attacking the character and reputation of that woman—I will not say that it was on the ex-parte statement of hon. members who were interested in having that woman dismissed from the office in order that the place might be filled by some friend of theirs that she was dismissed. But I cannot but wonder at the Christian charity of a clergyman who will permit himself to use expressions attacking an inoffensive and undefended woman in this House which he has not the courage to make to the Postmaster General in a charge laid against that woman. My hon. friend from Western Assiniboia has just put in my hand a letter from Mr. Justice Richardson, as follows:—

Regina, 10th May, 1897.

Dear Mr. Davin,—The inclosed letter was received by me to-day. My only recollection of the writer and her husband is, that they kept what we considered at the time a very fair hotel. It was in the spring of 1883 that I first stopped over there, and then onward for one and a half or two years, when holding court sittings, I stayed at their hotel. Except for the brief sojourn each time in Qu'Appelle, I knew nothing of the people. Certainly, while there, their place was respectable, to all appearances visible to me.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) HUGH RICHARDSON.

Now, my hon. friend from Burrard states that he knew nothing of this woman, yet he has no hesitation, as I stated, in whispering not only in my ear but in the ear of another member of this House that this woman was of totally immoral character, after we had attempted to defend her before this Chamber. But my hon. friend has also, I think, transgressed the proprieties as a Minister of the Gospel, as a preacher of charity, when, with the words "Resquiescat in pace" still upon his lips regarding the late Mr. Mercier he does not hesitate to asperse the memory of other men who rest in their graves and ought to be allowed to rest there. I think that instead of the hon. gentleman having given us an evidence of Christian spirit, when he started out to lecture us, he has probably given us a lesson of how far one can forget himself in the heat of a debate; and probably the best thing to be done is to throw the mantle of charity over his conduct on this occasion. Now, the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McClure) also, in speaking on the subject, said that he hoped the time would come when in this country no man would be entitled to office because of the party to which he belongs, and that no man should be dismissed on account of the party to which he belongs. Yet professing such a doctrine as this before this House, I have no doubt that the hon. member for Colchester has formed one of the deputations to have many of the poor labourers removed from the Intercolonial Railway within his and adjacent ridings.

But it is not for the purpose of discussing the matter of Mr. Fairlie alone that I have risen this evening; but since the subject of dismissals in general has come before the House, I thought perhaps it might not be amiss to put before the House and especially the Government, some cases out of the very large number which have come to my notice in the city of Montreal. Perhaps I ought to preface my remarks by saying that within the last few weeks not only the men to whose cases I am about to refer, but all the men working on the Lachine Canal in the city of Montreal, have been ruthlessly thrown out of their employment, men who were in that employment for twenty, thirty, and some of them thirty-five years, still hale and hearty, and better able to perform their duties than the men who have replaced them; these men have been thrown out without a moment's warning. As a sample, I will read letters covering two particular cases. The first is that of a young man who occupied the position of storekeeper for two years. On the 30th of April, 1897, he received the following letter:—

Sir,—This is to notify you that your services, as storeman on the Lachine Canal, will not be required after the 30th inst.

Yours truly,

ERNEST MARCEAU,

Superintending Engineer.

To Michael Behan, Esq., Montreal.

Now, Sir, you will remark that this is dated the 30th of April, and it states that his services will not be required after the 30th instant. As a matter of fact, this letter was delivered to him about 8 o'clock on the evening of the 30th instant, after he had finished his day's work, after he had gone home intending to return the next day to his employment. What did he do? He immediately went to his late superintendent of the canal, and to the superintending engineer. From the superintendent he received this letter:

Montreal, May 1st, 1897.

To whom it may concern:

This is to certify that Mr. M. Behan has been employed, as storeman, in connection with Lachine Canal, during the past two years, and during that time has given excellent satisfaction. He is a thoroughly reliable man, and I willingly recommend him to any party requiring such a person.

JOHN CONROY,

Superintendent Lachine Canal.

He then went to the superintending engineer, and received the following certificate:—

Montreal, May 1st, 1897.

To whom it may concern:

This is to certify that Michael Behan has been employed during two years, as storeman on the Lachine Canal, and that I have always found him a painstaking, able, steady and reliable man, and I have much pleasure in giving him this testimony.

ERNEST MARCEAU,

Superintending Engineer of Quebec Canals.

Now, what was the offence that this man was guilty of? Both his superior officers declare that he is able, intelligent and a thoroughly reliable man. Why should he be dismissed? It could not be for the purpose of economy: it could not be because they did not require his services any longer, because the very next morning, on the 1st of May, another man took his place. Was it because he had been an offensive partisan? I do not know, no charge of the kind is made, and I am sure that no such a thing could be proven. But what is the fact, Mr. Speaker? I have no hesitation in declaring this from my place in the House of Commons, that there exists in the city of Montreal to-day a committee of the Liberal party into whose hands has been transferred the power of the political or official life and death of every man occupying any position in the public service; into whose hands has been given the right to decree whether any man in that service shall or shall not be dismissed. Furthermore, the superintending engineer of the Quebec canals has received instructions, from whom I know not, but he has received instructions that no matter who or what is recommended by this committee, he must carry it out to the very letter, no matter whose dismissal is asked for, he must make that dismissal at once. Now, Sir, this is a terrible state of affairs. We talk about the spoils system in the United States, we talk about introducing into this country something which they have always possessed in the United States. But has there been the equal of this in the United States? Truth to say, there has been a spoils system, as we call it, in the United States, but it possessed one virtue, it was perfectly honest, it was perfectly open, it was well understood by the public officers; whereas in this country we have been pluming ourselves on possessing a service that was above reproach, upon giving to men employment during their lives; we have led these men to believe that during good behaviour, they would keep the positions in which they have been placed; and yet without a moment's notice, on the report of an irresponsible committee, all the personnel of which is altogether unknown to the men who are effected by it—I say on the report of this irresponsible and utterly unknown committee, a man is ruthlessly dismissed from his position, thrown out upon the world, and not allowed even a word in his own defence. Now, I come to another case which is even more trying, far more harsh indeed than the one to which I have referred, that is the case of Mr. Michael Enright. Mr. Michael Enright was employed upon the Lachine Canal for

thirty-four years, employed regularly. He is a man about fifty-five years of age, a man very well preserved, capable of doing an honest day's work, as lively and as efficient as any officer on the canal to-day. Without one moments warning he too on 30th April received a copy of this letter which I have already read to the House, and which is headed "Circular." Michael Enright in order to establish his qualifications went to the superintending engineer, and received the following testimonial :—

Department of Railways and Canals—Montreal Division.

Superintending Engineer's Office,
Montreal, May 4th, 1897.

To whom it may concern :

This is to certify that Michael Enright has been connected with the Lachine Canal, as lock labourer, bridge-keeper and watchman, for thirty-four years. During that time he has proved himself a steady, sober, reliable man.

I have much pleasure in stating that I have found him very satisfactory during the last four years, or since I have myself had charge of the canal.

ERNEST MARCEAU,
Superintending Engineer.

Yet without one moment's warning this man, who from the fact that he was employed at the beginning of the season was led to believe he would be offered means of sustenance for himself and his large family, was on the order of a secret, irresponsible and unknown committee ruthlessly hurled from his office and literally thrown on the street. I do not think I can find words in the English language of sufficient strength to characterize such conduct as this. There is no pretense on the part of anybody that this man has given any offence, there is not even the pretense put forward that he has been guilty of partisanship either offensive or inoffensive. As a matter of fact, Behan did not exercise the right of the franchise of voting, and in fact Enright never interfered in elections during the last four years and only used that franchise, which is given him by the law of this country, occasionally. But what are the facts in regard to the people who have been put in the places of these men. Both the men put in are well known "heelers" of the Government party in St. Ann's division in Montreal, they are men who have earned reputations as "heelers" for the Liberal party. One I am informed is a jail bird. Not only is he a jail bird ; but at the election on May 11th he proved himself perfectly worthy of the position he occupies as the unworthy successor of Enright, for he was the first to make a declaration before the police magistrate, which I am informed by the man accused is absolute perjury, in order to have the man arrested. So if there is such a thing as offensive partisanship, and that is a reason why a man should be dismissed from office, both of the new applicants are certainly liable to dismissal. I say this standing in my place in this House ; I say they are both offensive partisans, and I have no hesitation in making this statement. Is my word not as good as that of a man who occupies no position in this House ? Can my word that these men are offensive partisans not be accepted, but must the Government only listen to the voices of men who make charges against employees because they were placed in positions by Conservative Governments of long ago ? If so, it is not in keeping with that conduct which I admired so much when displayed by the Minister of Public Works this evening, when he declared it was not his intention to dismiss Mr. Fairlie, that he had not done so, that he felt Mr. Fairlie had acted rightly, and that the only complaint against him was that he had written a scurrilous letter against him. I feel perfectly certain from my knowledge of the hon. Minister that when he comes again to read that letter in the cool, calm light, three, four or six months after the occurrence has passed, he will see there is not such a bitter sting in it as he thought when he first read it after the famous little luncheon he had on the plains. I feel his better nature will assert itself, and instead of dismissing Mr. Fairlie he will say he acted on that occasion as man and preacher of the Gospel, as an honoured member of the Episcopal Church, a gentleman not only by education but by profession, a man who was not afraid even in the face of a Minister of the Crown to deny him privileges he had not the right to allow to the ordinary citizen.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. As a young member, a stranger to the House, a young man not only from the country, but from a far country, I crave your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, and the indulgence of this hon. House while I endeavour to offer a few remarks on the question at issue. I may say, Sir, that it may appear somewhat presumptuous on my part, coming here a stranger, to venture to criticise the proceedings of this House ; but I feel somewhat disappointed at the nature of the debate to which we have been compelled to listen this afternoon and almost the whole of this evening. I have had very little experience in addressing an assembly such as this is, and naturally I feel somewhat perturbed at the stand I have taken in venturing to criticise the proceedings of the House in my first speech ; but really, I think, the people expect more from the representatives in the House of Commons at Ottawa than that we should discuss such a "tempest in a teapot" so elaborately and devote so much attention to it as we have done to-day. What are the facts in regard to this case ? I really fail to see that it is worthy of nearly so much attention as we have given it. We have drifted off on one little line of argument and debate and then another, so that during the whole day we have not arrived at any

definite opinion or conclusion in respect to the matter. It struck me as being particularly strange that this House should discuss this issue with such feeling, vim and vigour, because in Manitoba, where the incident occurred, it really attracted no attention at all. The papers took it up for a day or two, but it soon dropped out of sight and no one gave any more consideration to it. We have the ground taken that Mr. Fairlie was to blame for one thing, then that he was to blame for another thing, and again he was to blame for something else; but we have the word of the hon. Minister, who is principally interested, that as regards Mr. Fairlie's conduct in refusing to admit intoxicating liquors into the building, the Minister of Public Works admitted that Mr. Fairlie was perfectly justified in doing so, and I for my part think so too. In refusing the admission of intoxicating liquors into a Government building in which there were young wards of the nation, Mr. Fairlie was perfectly justified. In regard to other matters I will not discuss them, because in Manitoba we have paid no attention to this incident. The Conservatives suffer the misfortune—they have been having a good many misfortunes lately—of possessing an organ in Winnipeg which uses, in journalistic phrase, "scare heads." The "Nor'-Wester" uses very strong language, and says a great many things which the people of Manitoba have come to take with a grain of salt. We do not believe all the "Nor-Wester" says, and I am here as a living demonstration of that fact. We are accustomed to the exaggerated style of that organ. It is not the fault of the Conservative party, it is the fault of the organ, and in the North-west we give little or no attention to it in general, and in this particular matter we paid very little attention to it indeed. I was much surprised indeed to think that this House should occupy so much time in discussing a question of this character. I quite agree with the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Maxwell) in his desire to see the tone of debate elevated in this House. While I have every respect for the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), I did feel a little pained tonight at the manner in which he alluded to gentlemen on this side of the House. I felt pained at the insinuations which he thought fit to make, and which, from my intimate personal knowledge of that gentleman, I considered beneath him. You know, Mr. Speaker, that we have not all had the great advantage of being born into a society which we could adorn. We have not all had the privilege of being accustomed, as it were, to wearing the purple and fine linen so inseparable from high class society in Ottawa. We of the Liberal party have always been the party of the people, and I for my part am proud to be a member of that party. I must say that while I am always pleased to meet a gentleman in every sense of the word, I am also very glad to meet a gentleman who has raised himself from the lower strata of society. I always feel much more pleasure in the society of a gentleman whose father was a tramp than in the society of a tramp whose father was a gentleman. I must say that I do not think it shows very good taste on the part of a gentleman to make such allusions as the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) indulged in this afternoon.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that there should be in this House so much party. I can quite understand that those old political war-horses who have been sparring across the floor of this House for a great many years, naturally like to have a little canter when the occasion arises. But that is not what we are sent here for. We are not here to discuss paltry matters affecting one party or the other; we are supposed to be here to discuss matters affecting the welfare of the whole Canadian nation. We have all the work we require, and we need all the time at our disposal to perform that work, so that there should be no time wasted in exhibitions such as we have had to-day. I do not believe in this indulgence in invective, particularly of a personal nature, in the legislative halls of the Dominion Even from the last speaker (Mr. Quinn) who delivered an address which was a credit to him, we heard allusions to political "heelers." Well, you know that in sparring exhibitions you must always have heelers, and if the two political parties were not so entirely antagonistic to each other, and if we had not the welfare of the country swallowed up in a desire for the welfare of the party, the "heeler" would disappear from view. The "heeler" is not so necessary on this side of the House as he is on the other, and in that connection, I may remark, that a little depends on the way in which the word is spelled. As I say, Sir, is is very natural for these old politicians, who have been for so many years opposed to each other, to feel sore and to indulge in personal invective and personal allusions. But men like the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Maxwell) and myself, who come here as young politicians and unused to that kind of business, do not appreciate it. I would beg in the most humble and respectful manner to lay our grievances before those older and more experienced gentlemen, and to point out to them, that we would like to see more work done in this Parliament in the interests of the people of Canada.

In regard to the real question before the House, namely, the question of the dismissal of public servants, there is a great deal to be said on both sides. Like my hon. friend from Vancouver, I would not wish to see anybody dismissed, particularly married men, married men with families who have become accustomed to the duties of their positions, who are dependent to a very

large extent upon these positions, and who, many of them, have arrived at an age when it would be very difficult for them to find employment and suitable emolument in other walks of life. But, Sir, we are not altogether to blame. The Liberal party have had eighteen years of exclusion, and have not even had the crumbs which fell from the table. They have been treated with contempt. Of course from the point of view of our friends opposite, the Liberal party deserved it, and perhaps from a worldly point of view they did deserve it. They were foolish enough to stand up for their principles, and for what they believed, during eighteen long years, when all they had to do was to swallow the bait and fall into line. But, there were a great many of these fools in Canada, and they fought battle after battle, and finally after many years of exile they have returned home, and it is but natural that they should feel that they now have a right to share in the fruits of office. I may say, that so far as we in the west are concerned, there have been very few dismissals. I do not know of any in my constituency, and if there should have been one or two, they must be of the most trifling character. There have been very few dismissals as I have said throughout the west, and you know, Sir, it is an old saying: It is time enough to bid a certain gentleman good morning when you meet him. I do not think it is wise for hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to provoke us too far in this matter, and it would perhaps be well for them to use a little discretion and judgment. They have a great many of their political friends and allies now seated in comfortable offices, and I am sure they do not want to see these men, and their wives, and their families turned out. As long as we remain tolerant, as long as we do not attempt to make wholesale dismissals, it would be only wise and reasonable on the part of our friends opposite to treat us with a little courtesy in the matter; God knows we have had little enough of it for the last score of years. I do not wish, Mr. Speaker, to occupy the time of the House at any length, because I believe that our time has been occupied at far greater length in this matter than was necessary or advisable. I feel, like my hon. friend from Vancouver, that it would be in the best interests of the Dominion of Canada as a whole, if we could put our civil servants on some such footing as are the civil servants of Great Britain. If we could have competitive examinations, and if we could have our young men and young women in the civil service, those with brains and energy advancing as they deserve as a result of promotion examinations; if we could have them without fear of the advent to power of one political party or another then we would have a civil service of which we might be proud and in which efficiency would be its own reward. That is the goal which we should strive to attain; but, Mr. Speaker, I trust our friends on the opposite side will not take me too seriously when I say, that before we can possibly arrive at that goal it will be necessary for us to infuse a little Liberal blood into the civil service. If we started in that way at the present time we would have a civil service almost entirely Conservative. It is absolutely necessary that we should get a little Liberal blood into that service before we can begin to make it entirely non-political. There is just one little matter further to which I wish to allude, and it is this: Our friend the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Maxwell) referred to the late Mr. Mercier, and he said what, of course, is perfectly right, and should always be maintained as a principle, that we should let him rest in peace. "De mortuis nil nisi bonum" is a principle which I am sure we all respect in this House. I was somewhat surprised to find the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Quinn), in taking up this part of the speech of the hon. member for Vancouver, alluding to the other individuals to whom that hon. member referred. With reference to them he used the same expression. "requiescat in pace." Well, I have no doubt that there are some incidents and some individuals in the history of the Conservative party, as there are in the history of all parties, that our hon. friends opposite would be very well pleased indeed to leave to rest in peace; they do not like to see them resurrected. Again, I apologize to you, Mr. Speaker, and the House for having taken the great liberty, as a young and new member, of venturing to criticise the proceedings of so august a body; but in what some call "the wild and wooly west" from which I come, and where I have resided a good many years, we have a certain freedom of speech, and a certain absence of restraint, characteristic of the prairie, and I trust that you and the members of this honourable House will take that into consideration, and deal gently with young and tender members like myself.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I certainly can re-echo the sentiment of the last speaker who regretted that the time of this House was taken up with such trivial matters as have engaged our attention this afternoon and this evening; and I think it was a just complaint that the Government party at this busy time of the session should have thrust this very insignificant matter upon the attention of this House. It is not a matter that could fairly come before this House at all. Even if it could come fairly before this House, I claim that it is a matter too trivial and too insignificant to engage the attention of legislators of a country the size of Canada. Before proceeding to do so, however, I must reflect for a moment or two upon the sentiments of the hon. gentleman who repre-

sents Vancouver (Mr. Maxwell). Having been brought up a Presbyterian, I looked with considerable interest upon that hon. gentleman, and was anxious to learn if I could what secret spring it was which directed him to leave the high calling to which, in the providence of God, or in the providence of some other great being, he had been called; and I have had the explanation on the floor of this House to-night. If there ever was an exhibition of the absence of that charity that thinketh no evil, that charity that suffereth long and is kind, it has been manifested on the floor of this House to-night. Not satisfied with attempts to rob the living, who could defend themselves, he would rob the dead of the reputations they left behind them—ghoul-like, re-opening the tomb and desecrating the remains of the departed. When I heard the hon. gentleman reflect on the failings in the character of Sir John Macdonald, and the weakness of his life, I felt that it was but attempting to throw dirt at the sun. The greatness of that man is not only recognized by all Canadians irrespective of party, but it is a subject on which we love to dwell; he was the noblest Roman of us all, and:

> The bright and particular star
> With whose true fixed and certain quality
> There is no fellow in the firmament.

Mr. GIBSON. He never mentioned his name.

Mr. POWELL. It would have been more manly if he had. That enemy is the most to be despised who would stab you in the dark. That enemy is never to be despised who meets you boldly face to face, and throws down the gauntlet and dares you to honourable combat with the sword. The hon. gentleman also resorted to criticism upon the Conservative party generally. With this I have nothing to do. That is a little badinage: we all understand what it means: we can take it at what it is worth. But I was rather amused at the laudatory expressions of the hon. gentleman respecting himself. He was here as an example of all that was pure and lovely and of good report. I could not but think of the verses of his own national poet on a minister of his own church:

> O Thou, wha in the heavens dost dwell,
> Wha, as it pleases best Thysel',
> Sends ane to heaven and ten to hell,
> A' for Thy glory,
> And no for onie goid or ill
> They've done afore Thee!
>
> I bless and praise Thy matchless might,
> Whan thousand Thou has left in night,
> That I am here afore Thy sight!
> For Thy gifts and grace,
> A burnin' and a shinin' light
> To a' this place.

And when, as it were, inheriting a little of that hostility of Jennie Geddes to the episcopacy, he launched out into abuse of Rev. Mr. Fairlie, a clergyman of the Episcopal body in the North-west, I thought of the following verses:—

> Lord, hear my earnest cry and pray'r
> Against that Presbyt'ry o' Ayr;
> Thy strong right hand, Lord, make it bare,
> Upo' their heads;
> Lord, weigh it down, and dinna spare,
> For their misdeeds.
>
> Lord, in the day of vengeance try him;
> Lord, visit them wha did employ him,
> And pass not in Thy mercy by 'em,
> Nor hear their pray'r;
> But for Thy people's sake destroy 'em,
> And dinna spare.
>
> But, Lord, remember me and mine
> Wi' mercies temp'ral and divine,
> That I for gear and grace may shine,
> Excelled by nane,
> An' a' the glory shall be Thine,
> Amen, Amen.

But I will leave that hon. gentleman to the exhibition he made of himself in respect of his Christian virtues on the floor of the House, and shall now pass to the particular matter which provoked this discussion. If there was one thing ever done by a man that I feel proud of as a temperance man, it was the action of the Rev. Mr. Fairlie. I offer no excuse for it, I put forward no apology. I claim that if ever there was an act done by a man in Canada which was worthy of all praise, it was done by the Rev. Mr. Fairlie. Now, what was the act? Here was a gentleman who, in the presence of those who had the power to dismiss him stood fairly and squarely by his principles. This is a question of principle said he, and I will not allow even the Minister of Public Works to violate the law of the land and consume liquor on these premises. Why, it is a consistency in his case which is a perfect jewel, and I was very much astonished that my genial friend from Yarmouth who poses—and I do not use the term offensively—and who is here as the representative of the prohibition party in this country, should have referred to Mr. Fairlie's course in the way he did. While it may have been indiscreet on his part to write the letter he did—I am not going to say anything about that other than it was a well merited rebuke to the editor of the paper who made the scurrilous attack upon him. The rebuke was deserved, although it may have been a little strong, but what did the hon. gentleman from Yarmouth single for comment in the whole affair? Not what was worthy of praise. He did not sound the glory of the man who was true to his temperance principles in the presence of the Minister of Public Works, and refused to admit liquor into the school of which he had charge. No, but he took something that is beside the issue altogether, and pounced down upon Mr. Fairlie as a man who was not worthy of associating with gentlemen and who was himself no gentleman for what forsooth? For not re-

cognizing the fact that some gentlemen do drink, and for refusing to violate his instructions and the law of the land by allowing the party to bring and drink liquor in the school premises.

Let me point to another circumstance worthy of mention. If there is one thing that, as Englishmen and as Frenchmen, we all admire, it is that spirit of chivalry which never displays itself in cowardice. And what have we had here to-day? I think if there is anything despicable on earth it is for a man, when he is protected by his position as member of Parliament, to stand up and asperse the character of another in a way he would not have the manliness to in other places or under circumstances where the law could lay its hands upon him. Why, in the numbers of that paper which were issued after the letter was written and published by the reverend gentleman, what do we find? We find that the man who, on the floor of this House, has stamped Mr. Fairlie as a liar, was as meek as Moses and treated him with the utmost respect. It was left for him, not in the arena in which he could be held responsible for his utterances but in the arena of Parliament where he can speak with impunity, so far as his legal liabilities are concerned, to asperse the character of this gentleman. I know nothing about the Rev. Mr. Fairlie. He may have been a second Ananias, so far as I know.

Mr. FOSTER. The first one started this debate.

Mr. POWELL. The first one started this discussion. The Rev. Mr. Fairlie may be possessed in no way at all of the spirit of truth; but this I will say that if his character for truth is to be judged of in this House by the assertions of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) who wrote those editorials in that paper and dared not say in that paper what he has not hesitated to say here, in the opinion of every honourable and fair thinking gentleman in this House, certainly Mr. Fairlie's character is not going to suffer very much from the attack of that hon. gentleman on the floor of this House to-day. We should remember the position which Mr. Fairlie occupies if he has no respect for himself and not apply the term liar to a minister of the Gospel. I do not accuse my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) of making an assault upon a Protestant clergyman because he is a Protestant clergyman. I entirely exonerate him from that, because he is perfectly willing to hit all round, and it would seem a proper thing that the man who defies the bishops of his own church and stigmatizes them as liars should be perfectly willing to stamp a minister of the Episcopal church as a liar also. But he should remember, in all spirit of charity, that this gentleman never reflected upon him at all and never said that a single member of that company was intoxicated. He should remember that in no way did Mr. Fairlie reflect upon him, but simply, when some member of the company, who was nosing around for congenial dirt, professed in the probably unduly excited condition he was in to hear, smelt a smell in a corner of the building, he said to that gentleman that this smell was, in all probability, the exudation of gentlemen who were filled with the various compounds to which he referred.

I have done with that subject, and shall refer to the dismissals in the county I represent. We have the largest Government railway patronage of probably any county in Canada. I do not believe in dealing in vague generalities. I throw down this challenge to hon. gentlemen opposite, and I make this statement boldly on the floor of this House, knowing it to be true, and knowing that many of the hon. gentlemen who hear me also know it to be true, and that is this, that the hon. Minister of Railways has dismissed since January last, not labouring men but officials, in the city of Moncton more than were dismissed by the Conservative party in the whole term from 1882 to 1886. And I challenge them to produce a solitary instance in which the Conservative party, notwithstanding their immense patronage, ever dismissed one solitary man in that county on the ground of politics. I take exception to the statement that because a man is a strong partisan he should be dismissed. I claim that a man does not sacrifice his manhood and become a slave when he accepts a Government office, and you could not give, to my mind, any greater disqualification for an applicant for an important public office than the fact that he takes no interests in politics. Why, Sir, it is, the noblest work of a citizen to take an interest in politics. The best men of the country take an interest in politics. Every citizen should have the liberty of expressing his views, and so long as a gentleman filling a public office does not debase his office by using it for party purposes, so long as he does not make use of the Government machinery to instal one party in power or turn another out, he should have the same freedom of opinion and action as any other citizen in the land. And nothing will ever be recorded against the present Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) more derogatory to his greatness as a man or his eminence as a statesman, than the fact that he denied the Government officials in Nova Scotia the franchise which should be accorded to every free man in the country.

Mr. ROCHE. It was not my intention to take part in this discussion to-night. In fact the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) and myself had a sort of agreement whereby neither one of us was to

engage in this debate; but since he has seen fit to engage in it, I presume that I must follow suit. One thing that has impressed itself on my mind since I have had a seat in this House is that when any member on this side rises to address the House, the members on the Government side, one by one, leave their seats and do that very act which the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) described, in his not very elegant but characteristic language, as taking to the woods and crawling under the barn. And those who do not leave the Chamber generally get into knots of three and four and engage in running conversations in order to break the force of criticism on this side. On this side, however, when hon. gentlemen opposite rise, we give them a patient hearing; and I have read in the independent press of Canada a compliment paid to the hon. gentleman of the Opposition that we were the most orderly Opposition that has ever graced any Parliament. I am afraid, however, that a similar compliment could not be made to hon. gentlemen opposite, nor can they be congratulated on showing their bravery or valour to any extent, for, almost without exception, when any one rises to speak, who is opposed to them, especially the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), they adopt the tactics I have referred to, and the reason is they fear the castigation which is in store for them.

Now, I think that the discussion which has been brought forward by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron), and the censure for which, if there is any blame to be attached to it at all, must fall upon hon. gentlemen opposite, cannot fail to have some good effect. Had that hon. gentleman to begin over again I think he would have hesitaated before provoking such a discustion. Certainly it has not resulted satisfactory to his own party. Certainly it has not had the result he anticipated. Three or four speakers on the Government side took the floor, in the first place, and put a very plausible case before the House, until the other side was presented by hon. gentlemen on these benches, which entirely changed the aspect of affairs and showed that the object of hon. gentlemen opposite was not so much to vindicate the Minister of Public Works and his party as to destroy the official life of this Rev. Mr. Fairlie. Offices are becoming rather scarce, and office-hunters are very numerous, and even the position of principal of an industrial school is not to be despised. Now, the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) has made very serious accusations against this reverend gentleman. He has spoken with a great deal of violence against this clergyman; but as the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Quinn) has pointed out, the most serious charge he made against him was that this man was a rabid Tory. That explains the discussion this afternoon and evening. If the Rev. Mr. Fairlie had the opoprtunity to give that hon. member a character, probably it would not at all redound to the hon. gentleman's credit. The hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) has declared that he had no fault to find with Mr. Fairlie's reception of himself and party, that Mr. Fairlie did perfectly right in refusing the room for a banquet where liquor was to be dispensed in the presence of the Indian children, the wards of the nation. The hon. member for Lisgar also stated that Mr. Fairlie was right in this respect. When these gentlemen are brought face to face with public opinion, they do not dare take any other stand. They have no fault to find with Mr. Fairlie except for the letter he addressed to the press. They forget what it was that called forth that letter. From their speeches one would suppose that this reverend gentleman had sat down deliberately and designedly, to write something to injure the hon. Minister of Public Works in the eyes of the public. Not so. There was a violent article published in the Winnipeg "Tribune," read here by the hon. member for West Assiniboia, reflecting upon his conduct of the school, and upon the teachers. Is not that reverend gentleman entitled to defend himself? Is the fact that he holds a position, a very subordinate position under the Government, to prevent him from defending the character of the institution over which he presides, and his own character? I do not think any fair-minded man will take that position. He had every right to defend himself. It was to defend himself that he wrote this letter to the press to which such exception is taken. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Jameson) has himself declared that in this letter it was insinuated that members of the party were intoxicated. The hon. member can read that letter from beginniug to end, but he cannot find that it contains any such insinuation. It seems to me that these gentlemen protest too much. The hon. member for Winnipeg has given what he considers the very best evidence of their perfect sobriety, which was that they were able to return to Winnipeg and that that very night they were actually able to eat, and had another banquet. The evidence is not very good, but no person, in the press or out of it, ever accused anybody in the party of being intoxicated. The question has been asked: Was the letter true? The hon. member for Lisgar says: No. With all deference to that hon. gentleman, and not desiring to say anything unpleasant, I would say that he is not the best judge of what is and is not true. As a reason for saying that, I may say that at the banquet that night this gentleman delivered a speech—and he never delivers a speech but the Winnipeg "Tribune" reports it very fully, the great "I" running through it from beginning to end. He made a statement which was greeted by the press of Manitoba with ridicule, and to show that I am right

in saying that you must take what that hon. gentleman says with a considerable discount, let me say that in order to magnify his office as member for Lisgar, to show in fact that he was the only representative of the west, he said that while he was down here attending his sessional duties he had as many as 18,000 applications for office from his own constituency, and the same number from the city of Winnipeg. Now am I not right in stating that this hon. gentleman is constitutionally addicted to extravagant language? If his statement is accurate every man, woman and child in his constituency must be a seeker after public office.

Mr. FOSTER. Was that in the evening after the lunch was held?

Mr. ROCHE. It was that very night. That is the only excuse I can give for the hon. gentleman. It would seem that there are about a thousand applicants for every position which becomes vacant. The hon. member for Huron rather slightingly referred to this "parson of the Episcopalian Church." The hon. gentleman, I think, requires a very severe churching himself in order to cause him to speak more respectfully of the church and the clergy. If he does not believe one clergyman, perhaps he would be inclined to listen when two of them concur in a statement. Surely not all of them are accustomed to speak falsehoods. Let me read a letter to the press which vindicates Mr. Fairlie in what he stated in the letter published over his name:

Sir,—Would you kindly allow me, through the columns of your valuable paper, to draw the attention of the public to a most untruthful and almost libellous account of the condition of the Indian school here, which appeared in the columns of the "Daily Tribune" of October 27? The article in question was an account of the Hon. Mr. Tarte's visit to the St. Andrew's Rapids, and, read by one unacquainted with the true facts of the case, appears indeed a "rather discreditable state of affairs," as the writer puts it, unfortunately. Those who live here and are connected closely with the staff of the school and its admirable discipline, do know the true facts of the case, and, as one of these, I wish to open the eyes of the public to the actual circumstances, as they occurred on the visit of the hon. Minister of Public Works.

Before offering my remarks on the article in question, let me first premise a few facts. First, the principal most courteously offered to entertain the party to lunch, and was, indeed, to my certain knowledge, very disappointed when the other arrangements were effected. Now, the writer of the article carefully concealed from the public the reason why the principal's kind offer was refused. Let me open their eyes. It was quietly intimated to the principal that two cases of liquor would arrive for the luncheon party, and that this would be used at the luncheon. The Rev. J. H. Fairlie, being a conscientious and worthy gentleman, thereupon told his informant that, under no circumstances, could he allow liquor to be brought into the school, as this was contrary to the regulations of the department; but, if the party would forego this luxury, he would do his utmost to give them a good spread. But the party were evidently unwilling to accept this condition, and hence arrangements were made to hold the luncheon in another building. I believe it was solely through the courageous refusal of the principal of the department that produced the spiteful article in the "Tribune." Again, the rev. principal went to great pains in preparing for the visit of the hon. Minister, by having everything in order, and by preparing a short programme of reception, which could not be carried out on account of the "hurried inspection" of Mr. Tarte, too much time having been spent by the illustrious party in the luncheon room to permit of an official inspection.

Let me now refer to the untruthful remarks of the writer in the "Tribune." The first accusation he makes is, that the building was sadly in need of cleaning. Now, sir, I can but give you my word, that at any time you enter that building, it is a model of cleanliness and order. Many Winnipeggers, who have visited the school, can attest to this; and so you can easily verify my statement. The writer next proceeds to compare the conduct of the school teacher to the "discipline extended to Siberian convicts." Mr. McDougall, the teacher in question, has a reputation so far above this imputation, that the writer has here fallen into his own net. Inspector McColl, of Winnipeg, can testify to the fact that this teacher is well known as the most successful and ablest man in his profession. As one who has acted as chaplain, I can indorse this, having myself seen the advance made by the pupils under the able management of Mr. McDougall. The mere fact that all the scholars are devoted to the teacher, proves that they are taught "the graces of life, and what love is." I also have seen many acts of personal kindness to these children by the officers, and those show how the school is run; can affirm that the children are treated with every consideration, kindness and love. In fact, sir, it has been said that the children had "too good a time."

The writer concludes his article with the following pungent statement.—'Even the Minister of Public Works could with difficulty repress the disgust he felt at the way in which the party had been received." It is but necessary for me to say, that when the Minister of Public Works can afford to spend two hours in conviviality, and only ten minutes in "a hurried inspection" of one of the public works, there is something radically wrong.

In conclusion, I must say, that the reverend principal is to be admired for the pluck and courage he exhibited in firmly refusing to break the regulations and rules of the department, even for the honourable Minister of Public Works. The Government may feel assured that they have at least one faithful and conscientious official, who will not "bow the knee to Baal."

This is signed by the Rev. Silva A. White, incumbent of St. Paul's, another clergyman possibly whom hon. gentlemen may believe, if they don't believe Mr. Fairlie. Another gentleman here comes to the defence of the teacher who was so viciously assailed in the article of the Winnipeg "Tribiune":

To the Editor of the "Nor'-Wester":

Sir,—In an issue of the "Tribune," I was more than surprised, coming from such a source, to see an article reflecting upon a teacher at the Indian industrial school, which can be none other than Mr. McDougall. I think, knowing Mr. Mc-

Dougall, as I do, that it was the most unkind and scurrilous article that has been published for some time. I know, and am sure that my assertion would be endorsed by the chief to any other member of the band, that none could be more devoted to the welfare of those people than the said Mr. McDougall, whose ability as a teacher of Indian children is recognized by the department, as well as by the parents of the Indians of St. Peter's Reserve.

O. J. GRAIN,
Mayor of Selkirk.

This is another independent authority, in addition to those given by hon. gentlemen who have spoken this afternoon. Now, the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) has declared that this is a small matter with which to take up so much of the time of the House. I quite agree with him, but he has got to blame the members on his own side of the House for having begun this discussion. He also declares that the headlines of this "Nor'Wester" were such that the people did not take much stock in them, that the "Nor'Wester" is a very unreliable paper, and that he is a living evidence of its untruthfulness. I return the compliment for the paper in which he has so much confidence, the Winnipeg "Tribune," I am a living example of the untruthful charges contained in that journal by my presence in Parliament to-day. That is not only my opinion, but the opinion evidently of other hon. gentlemen who declared that the article contained in that paper was of the most scurrilous kind. Now, I do not know that it is necessary for me to take up any further time of the House. It is a small matter to engage the attention of Parliament for so long a time, especially when there is nothing serious in these charges made. Not a single exception can be taken to that letter, there is not an exaggerated statement in it, there is not a statement in it in regard to which the gentleman who wrote the letter does not court the fullest investigation; and the only explanation that I can give why such a fierce assault has been made on this gentleman is the fact that the Liberals are hungry for office and they want a supply of places for their followers, and this gentleman seems to be doomed.

Mr. TYRWHITT. I have taken more than ordinary interest in this trivial subject which has engaged the attention of the House this afternoon, from the fact that the reverend gentleman whose case has been under review, was formerly a resident of the section of the country which I have the honour to represent. I am also interested in that subject from the fact that I know something of the diocese of Rupert's Land, in which he has been engaged. We have in connection with the Church of England in Canada a body known as the women's auxiliary, who have beer in the habit of extending their work to that portion of the country, and sending articles made by themselves and contributions of clothing and necessaries to the clergy of the Church of England for distribution. Now, it will be interesting to these ladies, as also to the people generally throughout this country, to be told something of the character of the accusers of a worker in that distant field; and I shall deal first with the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron). Those of you who remember the election in which he was engaged. I think in 1887, when he was attacked by one of the leading journals of this country for acts which were certainly infamous; and as allusion has been made during this debate to the odours which existed in the school in the North-west, I may say that they were nothing to the odours which arose in the riding during the election in which that hon. gentleman was engaged. The next hon. gentleman who saw fit to attack him was the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), who has posed in this House from his first entry into it as the embodiment of all that is good and righteous. He has continually reminded the members of the House that he was not as other men were, that he was an abstainer from intoxicants; and yet, Sir, we have this gentleman to-day, professing to hold within his person all the Christian virtues, coming here and attacking a clergyman of the church, a gentleman unable to defend himself, and describing him as not being a gentleman. Well, Sir, I do not know the standard which the hon. member for Yarmouth adopts as that of a gentleman; but, Sir, I should describe the conduct of a member of this House who, by the rules of the House we are obliged to call honourable, as anything but that of a gentleman when he attacks a person absent from the House, and who, by his profession, is unable to defend himself. Now, Sir, another hon. member of the House devoted a portion of his time to ridiculing the member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), and he read us all a moral lecture. He is a gentleman who, as I have read in the journals of the country—I am not prepared to vouch for the veracity of the reports—but I have read of his masquerading, either in this House or in the province of British Columbia, under an assumed name. I am not sufficiently well aware of the facts to state whether the name that he bears in this House is his true name, or whether it is the name that he bears in British Columbia. But, Sir, I have just read from the "Parliamentary Companion" a description that he gives of himself, and which he has placed on record, and I will leave the House and the people of this country to decide how far this reverend gentleman's words are to be believed. He at first described himself as having been educated at a certain school; he goes on further and describes himself as being a graduate of a university, of hav-

ing entered upon the priesthood, and having engaged in church work. At a later stage he describes himself as having descended into the political arena, having given up these good works of attending to the sick and burying the dead, and other works which we are to suppose this pious and good man should engage in; and he descends into the political arena, probably to cross swords with the hon. member for Western Assiniboia, or any other politician that may happen to cross his path. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members how we can respect the man who has forgotten the noble calling in which he was engaged and has gone back on his profession, and has descended to the lower arena which he has described this House to be. I feel I should be wanting in chivalry and also wanting in my duty towards my friend were I not to confess that I too know this rather celebrated widow, the widow McManus. I happened to be in our western country and knew this—shall I so describe her?—virtuous and good woman. This reverend gentleman has seen fit to attack this lady, and endeavour among the members of this House and among the people and in the presence of members of the press to deprive this poor woman of her character, after having deprived her of her office. I can only say that I lived for a short time at the hotel in which she dispensed good cheer, and where she performed the duties of hostess; and, knowing her, I was rather amused when the hon. member for Nanamio described this good woman as marching to and fro behind the wicket handling a revolver. If the widow in the west is the widow McManus I knew, it would not be necessary to take a revolver to enable her to handle two or three such men as the hon. gentleman. I have rather wandered from the subject before the House, but I must allude, I will not say to dismissals that have taken place in my county, but to the way in which the patronage has been dispensed during the time I have had the honour of representing the riding. During fifteen or sixteen years I have been in this House I have seldom or never drawn distinctions between Liberal and Conservative applicants for office. When I first became the representative of the riding I found all the best positions were held by members of the Liberal party. Those gentlemen have never been meddled with in their office; they were there when I was first elected and they are there to-day. I may describe as another instance of the way in which public officials have been treated by the late Government and by the Conservative party generally, and as regards the facts if the hon. Postmaster General were here, he would bear me out—that is the case of the postmaster of Bradford. He is a Liberal. He was editor of a paper which constantly attacked the Conservative party. The Young Men's Liberal-Conservative Association drew up an ultimatum and presented it to Sir John Macdonald, declaring that if this man were not dismissed, the Government need not expect their support at the coming elections. Sir John Macdonald at that time placed in writing a statement, which it was my duty to forward to the association, that his Government did not dismiss officials except for malfeasance in office; and the Postmaster General will bear me out that this Liberal, who had lost no opportunity of attacking the Government and the Conservative party, and the Conservative club, in particular was able to retain his office in spite of the combination of all Conservatives in that village against him. The Postmaster General, who I regret is not present, and who I was going to say had the honour to represent me in the House, as I am one of his constituents, and naturally I know what took place in his riding better than he does in other parts of the country. The hon. gentleman has made wholesale dismissals not only in my riding but throughout the country by cancelling contracts for mail service, which contracts should be equally sacred with bargains made with private individuals. He under the pretense of saving a small sum of money to the country has dismissed contractors by wholesale, and, were he here, I would quote instances of men who have thrown up their contracts, which have been resumed by the former contractors. As to partiality. In the village of Tottenham—I see the hon. member for Wellington, who will know the names, is present—there happened to be two mail contracts open. One was let to a lifelong Reformer named Brown, the other was let to a lifelong Tory named Turner. They were both recommended by me, and they received the different contracts. The Postmaster General in his wisdom saw fit to cancel the contract of my Tory friend, but not the contract of the Reformer, who is also my friend; and I think that the residents of my riding, both Liberals and Conservatives, will bear me out when I say that I have dealt even-handed justice to members of both parties, and in many cases, as I know, we have been obliged to defend Liberal office-holders against the attacks of our own, and in many cases I have lost a number of friends in that manner. I have very great pleasure in expressing my sympathy with Rev. Mr. Fairlie in the very unpleasant position in which he has been placed, and though I can hardly exonerate the Minister of Public Works altogether, from the fact that he insisted that this letter did not contain the whole of the truth, yet I hope he will be prepared to do Mr. Fairlie the justice of withdrawing that statement, from the fact that those of us who know him are prepared to say that he would rather believe Mr. Fairlie than a great many of his accusers.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I heard the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) to-day, and to some extent I must confess I sympathized with him. Whether his charges against this gentleman, Mr. Fairlie, made under the privilege of the House, are true or false, the hon. member in my opinion has a great grievance with the Treasury benches. There has been extraordinary discrimination exhibited in the treatment of that hon. gentleman and of many other hon. gentlemen who sit behind the Treasury benches, and it seems to me quite natural that that hon. gentleman should take an early opportunity, even though he did it in a comparatively mild manner, to resent the way in which he was treated or his word or his statement was received by the Treasury benches in comparison with the importance attached to the words of other hon. gentlemen who sit behind those benches. More than once we have been told, that if an hon. gentleman in the confidence of the Government—no matter what his character may be in the country—should go to a Minister of the Crown and make a serious statement derogatory to the character of a fellow-citizen, that by virtue of this hon. gentleman being in the confidence of the Government, his ex parte statement is to be treated as a statement of solemn fact, which will warrant the action of the Government upon it. We are informed that the Government have acted upon that principle upon several occasions. To my mind—and I think in the end, no matter what the opinion of the country may be for the moment—the people will give a general denunciation to so outrageous a proposition. It is unreasonable to think that the statement of any hon. gentleman in this House, in connection with the fierce conflicts that rage in the different constituencies, and considering the influences brought to bear upon him, it is unreasonable to think that his mere statement should be accepted in so important a matter, and should be followed by consequences so serious to men who, after all, may have a great deal of the argument on their side. I have had several instances brought before me which lead to this conclusion. I know that in the county which I have the honour to represent, statements absolutely fallacious—I do not say wilfully false—absolutely fallacious statements have been accepted by members of the Administration, and Ministers have acted upon these statements and have done grievous wrong to citizens of this country. And, Sir, this debate if it proves anything else, will prove what a dangerous principle has been adopted in many cases by members of the Government, in fact by the Government generally, when they accept the statements of members of this House, supporting them or opposing them, in connection with the conduct of officials, when it is absolutely impossible that these members should have individual knowledge of the facts which they assert. I wish to illustrate that by a case which was brought to the attention of the Minister of Railways; and I am glad that the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaacs) is in the House, because it may interest him. There is a man named Mr. Jas. McLean. I do not know the man and I have never met him; I know nothing about him except the information which he has placed in my hands as a citizen of this country. It seemed to me extraordinary, that when I asked the Minister (Mr. Blair) whether the record of Mr. McLean in that department which he had served for thirteen years was good or bad, the Minister of Railways was absolutely silent on that question. When I asked how it was that Mr. McLean's services had been suddenly dispensed with, the Minister (Mr. Blair) told me that his services were dispensed with, as he put it, at the instance of Mr. McIsaac, M.P., who had represented that of his own knowledge Mr. McLean had taken an active and offensive part in the late Dominion elections. There was no pretense that any inquiry or investigation was made, but because the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac) had stated that to his knowledge this man had taken an offensive part in the elections, the Minister of Railways told us he had instantly dismissed him. Now, judging from the material in my hands at the present moment, I believe that this is a clear illustration of the pernicious and unjustifiable system that has been, from time to time, adopted by Ministers at the head of these departments. It will not be pretended, I take it, that if this man had had the good fortune to occupy a comparatively more important position in the service of the country, if he had been a deputy head, if he had been in the service itself, it will not be pretended that there would have been such summary treatment meted out to him. Without desiring to set class against class or to descend to any unfair or unreasonable argument, I, with the greatest confidence take the position, that the humblest individual in the service of the Government is entitled to the same careful consideration and treatment in regard to any charge which may be brought against him of malfeasance or misconduct, as is the very highest in the service under the Crown. I take that position with confidence, and I believe that in the end it will be considered sound by the people of the country, when they come to consider it. I feel satisfied, holding as I do this information which I propose to give to the House, that the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac) will not dare to do, will not venture to do what Mr. McLean, who has been so seriously affected, has dared to do, and that is to make a solemn declaration with all the consequences attaching to it, as to the facts of this case. Mr. James McLean has put in my hands his solemn declaration, denying abosultely the statements which the Minister of Railways says he acted upon ex parte; the statements of the hon. member for Antigonish

(Mr. McIsaac). I have no doubt that the hon. member for Antigonish, like many other hon. gentlemen supporting the Ministers, being told second-hand, third-hand, indirectly of certain facts regarding this man, in good faith to that extent, did make a complaint, and that is sufficient for me to illustrate the unfair treatment of officials in cases in which Ministers acted upon such statements. Mr. McLean had served the department faithfully, so far as we are able to judge from the Minister of Railways. He had done his duty for thirteen years and when I asked the question as to what was his record, the Minister of Railways was silent. He merely gave as an excuse for his dismissal that the hon. member for Antigonish had undertaken the responsibility of reciting that to his own knowledge Mr. McLean had taken an active and offensive part in the late elections. The hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac) never ventured to make that statement outside of this House or publicly, never dared to charge Mr. McLean in any shape or form in which Mr. McLean could make the hon. member for Antigonish responsible for his statements. Mr. McLean has put in my hands this solemn declaration :

In the matter of the application of Jas. McLean, late foreman carpenter on Eastern Division, Intercolonial Railway, for an investigation re his dismissal from office.

I, James McLean, of Antigonish, in the county of Antigonish, carpenter, do solemnly declare as follows :—

1. That I was foreman carpenter on the Intercolonial Railway for the division extending from Stellarton, in the county of Pictou, to the Strait of Canso, up to March 20th last ;

2. That, on the 5th of March last, I received notice that my services would not be required after the said 20th day of March last—no cause therefor being assigned on said notice ;

3. That, at the general election, in June, 1896, and the campaign therewith, I did not conduct myself in any way as a political partisan. I never canvassed any one in said election or campaign ; I never took the platform at any public or other meeting in said campaign to speak in favour of any candidate or party ; I never disturbed the good order of any public meeting by the disorderly conduct or otherwise howsoever, and never interrupted any one at such meeting in said campaign.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and knowing that it is of the same effect as if made under oath, and by virtue of "The Canada Evidence Act, 1893."

(Sgd.) JAS. McLEAN.

Declared before me, at Antigonish, in the county of Antigonish, province of Nova Scotia, this 19th day of April, A.D. 1897.

(Sgd.) ANGUS McISAAC,
A Justice of the Peace in and for Antigonish County.

He received this letter :

New Glasgow, March 4, 1897.

Jas. McLean, Esq., Foreman Carpenter,
Antigonish.

Dear Sir,—According to instructions I have received from the department, I have to inform you, that your services, as foreman carpenter, will not be required after the 20th of this month, on which date please send me the key of carpenter's shop and list of tools belonging to the railway, now in your charge.

I remain, yours truly
A. B. GRAY.

Mr. Gray being track-master in that division. Mr. McLean writes on April 21st, 1897 :

Antigonish, April 21, 1897.

Dear Sir,—This is to certify and to show my doings during the general elections in June, 1896.

I left Antigonish on the 20th of April for Pictou Landing, to repair wharfs, and worked there till 19th of June ; left there for Pourquet to repair bridge which was destroyed by fire ; worked there on the 20th and made temporary repairs ; on 22nd, selecting timber for the bridge. On 23rd, voted in Antigonish, and left on special train for New Glasgow, and did not appear on the streets of Antigonish that day.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) JAS. McLEAN.

And I am told incidentially by my hon friend the junior member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) that the following dismissals took place without investigation in Antigonish : The baggage-master at Antigonish station, Mr. Kelly, a section foreman, Mr. Mr. McDougall, a section foreman ; Colin McKinnon, section man on the Intercolonial Railway ; and the preventive office at Tracadie. But the immediate case that I wish to bring to the attention of the House was this one, for the reason that this man who held the record without blemish and without taint for that long period in the service of the department, was suddenly dismissed ; and while he takes the responsibility of making a solemn declaration denying that in any shape or form he could be considered a political partisan, apart from having voted —and I have no doubt he voted Conservative, though he does not say how he voted, as he is not bound to say ; and the answer given is that the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac) had represented that to his own knowledge Mr. McLean had taken an active and offensive part in the late Dominion election. I say it is not according to the principles of British justice or the principle of any Parliament under British rule, that the word of a member of Parliament should be taken against the humblest in the land in connection with an office held by the humbler individual. That is a doctrine propounded for the first time in this Parliament, and it is a doctrine that cannot stand investigation. It is an enunciation of a principle against which the sense of fair-play and British justice absolutely revolts ; and even if there be a conflict between a member of Parliament and a man outside of Parliament in connection with the vested interests of the latter, no responsible Minister of the Crown should give the preference to the statement of one of his supporters. Whether you regard the heated statements made on one side of the House

or the other, you have had evidence enough in this House to-day that party feeling runs so high as to induce even the most honest member of this House to come to what might be considered in a calm and partial investigation, prejudiced and biased views. It is easy for a member of Parliament to come within that dangerous principle laid down by some hon. gentlemen, and by none more strongly than the Minister of Railways, and by that principle being enforced, there is an obvious injustice perpetrated. On this occasion, having heard the discussion in reference to the Rev. Mr. Fairlie, I think I can appeal to that discussion and to the strong opinions expressed on both sides—admitting them all to be honest, and every man to have spoken just as he felt—we have a clear and manifest illustration of the danger of taking the statements of partisans; for we are all partisans on either side in regard to the vested interests of parties outside of the House. And so I protest against the treatment of this man or any other man in the service of the Crown on a mere ipsi dixit or statement not under oath, but ex parte, made behind the back of the accused, whether by a member of Parliament or by some person outside of this House. I am certain that the hon. member for Antigonish will not do what in common fairness he ought to have done before he challenged the position of that man in the service of this country—either under oath or by a solemn declaration which is equivalent to an oath, contradict the statements the man makes under a solemn declaration or state that to his knowledge he did take an active and offensive part in the late Dominion election.

Mr. McISAAC. Mr. Speaker, I felt, from the part the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) had taken in my by-election in 1895, and from the inglorious result to him of that election that he would after I came to this House, pursue me with all the malignity in his power; and I have good reason to believe that he has taken every opportunity since that occasion to obtain from his friends in the county of Antigonish any information he could use against me in this House.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to tell him, as I do most sincerely, that I never wrote to an individual in the county of Antigonish, from the time I went into it to this day, asking for the slightest information concerning the member for Antigonish in any shape or form whatever.

Mr. McISAAC. I did not say that the hon. gentleman wrote——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Nor asked?

Mr. McISAAC. But I do know that the hon. gentleman's friends and my enemies in the county have been boasting, since I have been elected, that they would send all the information to the hon. member for Pictou.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is quite a different thing.

Mr. McISAAC. The issue has been raised to-night, for the first time, but I am here to hurl back the insinuations and charges which the hon. gentleman has made. He took up the case of James McLean. Well, Mr. Speaker, in that case he was very unfortunate. He has told the House that I have no personal knowledge of the case and he has also told the House that he himself knows nothing of Mr. McLean. Mr. Speaker, I know Mr. McLean. I have known him for years, and I have personal knowledge of his conduct in the county as an offensive partisan, not for one or two but for ten years. The hon. gentleman read a declaration, but that declaration is confined simply to the month of June last, and even in it Mr. McLean does not make an absolute denial. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that Mr. McLean came to me shortly before I came to Ottawa and admitted that he had attended committee meetings during my campaign last June, and I know myself that he did because I saw him walking in and out of the committee rooms, and I know that he was a most active and offensive partisan during that election. I know further that in the election of 1895, not only did he work against me in the town of Antigonish, but he actually went outside the town, where it was his duty to remain and look after the business to which he had been appointed by the Government, in order to work against me. He went to Mulgrave, where there were some electors working in a ship-yard, and went two or three times to see if they would return to Antigonish and vote against me.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is the hon. gentleman speaking of his own personal knowledge?

Mr. McISAAC. I speak with perfect knowledge. He also in 1895, the day before the election, left his post which it was his bounden duty to attend, and went to the district of Ohio, some twelve or fifteen miles away, for the purpose of canvassing against me and seeing that voters went to the polls. Why, Sir, the Conservatives in Antigonish would laugh if they heard the hon. gentleman's statement here to-night. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that Mr. James McLean has been a notoriously offensive partisan for years. Even after the 23rd of June last, he did not cease his partisanship, because he is constitutionally built that way, as an hon. gentleman opposite remarked a moment ago.

The hon. gentleman referred to some other officials who have been dismissed at my suggestion; but before I leave Mr. Mc-

Lean, let me say again that what I have said about him is very moderate and that I could say ten time more with absolute truth. He was a most active partisan in June last and in all previous elections.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I know nothing of the man and never saw him to my knowledge. Of course what the hon. gentleman says here, I must accept; but I ask him, in common fairness, to tell the House specifically what offensive act the man committed in 1896 ?

Mr. McISAAC. I say that in June, 1896, he was a constant attendant at the committee meetings in the town of Antigonish, night after night.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How could the hon. gentleman know that of his own personal knowledge ?

Mr. McISAAC. I saw him going in and coming out, and he admitted to myself, not two months ago, that he did attend these committee meetings.

The hon. gentleman has also referred to another man, Mr. Angus McDougall a section man, who was dismissed on my recommendation. Let me give you, Sir, a little bit of history in which the hon. member for Pictou was a participant. Does that hon. gentleman remember the by-election in Antigonish ? Does he remember that during that by-election, on a particular occasion, he started from Antigonish to make a trip around by Cape George, and was two or three days away, making the round of the county. Let me recall to the hon. gentleman who it was that travelled with him and who stumped with him against me on that occasion. It was a Dominion official, Dr. Cameron. Does he not remember that while he and Dr. Cameron started in the one sleigh, a second sleigh followed behind with provisions and supplies and with two men, one of whom was Angus McDougall, who was section man on the Intercolonial and whose duty it was to remain at his section and see that the track was kept in good order. Well, Mr. McDougall left the section to which he should have been attending, and in company with a namesake of his, a temporary employee on the Intercolonial, followed my hon. friend as a body guard with the supplies, and were also exceedingly useful in clearing away the snow banks so as to facilitate the passage of my hon. friend, and this they did at the expense of the Government of which the hon. gentleman was then Minister of Justice.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am sorry no one shovelled the snow banks and I had to get through without that.

Mr. McISAAC. The Dominion Government were paying two strong, stalwart employees to facilitate the hon. gentleman's passage. They were there, at any rate, in case there should be any snow banks to be got rid of.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman knows that of his own knowledge.

Mr. McISAAC. I know all about it, but that is not all. The hon. gentleman referred to Mr. McPherson, baggage master in the town of Antigonish. There is not a Conservative in Antigonish who would not admit that if any one should be dismissed for offensive partisanship, it is Mr. McPherson ; and Mr. McPherson himself, when he got his notice, admitted frankly that he never expected anything else and that he had got what he expected, I must say that to the credit of Mr. McPherson.

Then there is the case of Mr. Leydon, a preventive officer. Mr. Leydon came to my office and told me that at the by-election, when my hon. friend was in Antigonish, he had the sole control of the Conservative organization in his district, and that all communications from the central committee were sent to him and he carried out the instructions. Not only that, but at the election last June his horse and carriage were used to convey voters to the poll to vote against me. Is this not active and offensive partisanship ?

The hon. gentleman has also brought up the case of Colin Mackinnon, another section man. Well, Mr. Speaker, there was no more offensive partisan than Mr. Mackinnon. At the election last June and at all elections he has worked as a most active partisan against me.

Mr. McDougall at the last election was the sworn agent at one of the divisions against me. The hon. member for Pictou says that he never saw Mr. McDougall. His memory must be very poor or he could not have been introduced to the Tory committee of the town of Antigonish. In 1895, day after day and night after night, he was rubbing himself in the Tory committee against Mr. James McLean and Mr. Angus McDougall and other Dominion officials and everybody else he has mentioned to-night. But to-night the hon. gentleman seems to know very little about these men, although when he was in Antigonish, these men and some others were the backbone of the Tory organization in that county, and followed my hon. friend around from district to district. But the hon. gentleman, not satisfied with the assistance of the Dominion officials in Antigonish county, he imported them from Quebec and elsewhere, and it was at his instance, I am informed, that my hon. friend, the late Deputy Speaker of this House (Mr. Bergeron), was imported into that county. My friend the late Deputy Speaker of the House of Commons (Mr. Bergeron) was imported to take part in the contest in the county of Antigonish. The hon. gentleman

(Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) the other day actually professed ignorance as to the late Deputy Speaker of the House being down in the county. He hardly remembered the fact until I jogged his memory a second time, and even then he said he never met that hon. gentleman on the platform. I was present and he was present, and the late Deputy Speaker of the House of Commons was present in the court-house in Antigonish, and he knows it. And the hon. gentleman and the late Deputy Speaker spoke on the evening of nomination day. The hon. gentleman shakes his head. I would like him to get up in his place and deny it so that his friends in Antigonish may know how truthful he is. The Deputy Speaker was a Dominion official. I will not say he was an offensive partisan, for he was very gentlemanly. He was brought in to do up the French Canadian Catholic vote against me in the county of Antigonish. He went there to address meetings, one at Pomket, one at Monk's Head, and one at Tracadie; and afterwards he was to go to Harbour Bouche. It is true that he got here before the opening of this House. But the reason for that was that the Tory party found that he was not doing them any more good than the hon. member for Pictou himself, and he was dispensed with at Tracadie. If ever there was a campaign which was conducted from beginning to end entirely almost by the civil servants of this country it was in the by-election that I ran in 1895. Nearly every man in the committee room was the paid official of the Dominion Government. I am surprised that the hon. member for Pictou should denounce me, because I would dare to declare that these men were offensive partisans. For all that I have said in reference to James McLean I am prepared to prove in this House or out of it, and far more. And I will say the same with regard to other officials that have been dismissed on my recommendation. I do not intend to dismiss any man unless he deserves it. There are Conservative officials in Antigonish who will not be dismissed if I can help it. Let me remind the hon. gentleman of the treatment his party meted out to Liberal officeholders in Antigonish. Hon. gentlemen opposite will say that more officials have been dismissed by the Liberals than were dismissed by the Conservatives. That may be true. But why? I do not think that in 1878, when the Conservatives came into power, there were more than three or four Liberal officials in the county. The first of these to be dismissed was the fishery overseer of the county. He was dismissed a few weeks after hon. gentlemen opposite came into power. Was there an investigation? Were charges preferred? No, Sir. The fishery overseer of the county of Antigonish received an epistle one morning saying: Your services are no longer required. And who was appointed in his place? Not even a man from the county of Antigonish, but a man from the adjoining county of Pictou, represented by the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). This gentleman was appointed to succeed the fishery overseer of the county of Antigonish, who was dismissed without a moment's notice and without an investigation, and who does know now what the charges were against him. We did not complain; we never cried over it. The Tories got in and fired our men, and that was the end of it. We have not been eighteen years groaning because they were dismissed from office. We took our medicine like men. Another officer who was dismissed was Colin Chisholm, fishery overseer of the lower South River, and he was dismissed because hon. gentlemen opposite wanted to appoint another man in his place. No investigation was held, nor were charges made of offensive partisanship or anything else. He got notice to go and he went, and never whined over it. A Tory was put in his place and that Tory is there yet. There are Tories in the county of Antigonish whom I do not want to have dismissed because they have behaved themselves. They have voted for the Tory party and are ready to say frankly that they did so, and I respect them for it, and I will never ask for their dismissal. The station agent at Antigonish is a straightforward consistent Tory, Mr. Power. Whose place did he take? The place of Mr. Irish, a Liberal, who was removed to an inferior position without cause and without any charge made against him, simply because his place was required for another. I have no fault to find; I did not find fault at the time. But this was how hon. gentlemen opposite dealt with the civil service when they were in power; and now that we are in power, we must not, forsooth, even dare to remove these offensive and, in many cases, dishonest partisans who, while taking the pay of the Government have worked mainly in the interest of the Tory party. I am quite ready to defend my course in the case of James McLean and the others. Not only Liberals, but Conservatives in Antigonish know well that he deserved dismissal, and he and his friends did not expect anything else. There are many Conservative office-holders in the county against whom I have preferred no charge, against whom I do not intend to prefer any charge. I have preferred charges against some, and may possibly prefer charges against others, but in all cases. I have been and intend to be careful that only offensive or active partisans will be interfered with.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am sure the House will indulge me one moment, not to answer the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac), for I have no right to do that—but to speak a word of explanation. I would be the last man—and I am sure hon. gentlemen opposite will admit

that—to attempt to mislead the House; and I would be the first man, if I had unintentionally done so, to try to set myself right. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McIsaac) has refreshed my memory in regard to one fact, and I wish to make the amende honorable. In the discussion the other day, to which he has referred, speaking of the late Deputy Speaker, I said:

> He was in one section of the county of Antigonish two days. What part he took in the contest the hon. gentleman knows better than I do, because I was not with him. * * * I saw him in the county. He was there doing what he could to vindicate Conservative principles and to assist the party to which he belongs.

Now, I remember for the first time, when the hon. gentleman refreshed my memory, that he did speak on the platform with me in Antigonish, I think now on the night of nomination, and sat on the platform in the court-house when I spoke in the afternoon, when the hon. member for Antigonish spoke also. But after that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) went, I think, to Pomket——

Mr. BERGERON. To Tracadie.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. At any rate, the hon. gentleman went one way and I went the other. So that what I stated was substantially correct, that we were not stumping the county of Antigonish together. The House will see that I did not want to lead hon. members to believe that the hon. gentleman was not working for the Conservative party in the contest, and the only slip I made, which was due to faulty recollection of the facts, was in not stating that he appeared on the platform in the court-house in Antigonish.

Mr. TAYLOR. I regret, as every member on either side must regret, and as the people of this country will regret when they read it in the papers to-morrow, that the Prime Minister of this country has delegated to the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac) the right to dismiss public servants. We have the statement of the Prime Minister made in this House during the last session that no public servant would be dismissed without a fair investigation and a fair trial. Yet here we have the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac) saying, I dismissed so and so. Now, surely, after the pledge that the Prime Minister gave to this House and to the civil servants, what can we think of such conduct as we have heard of to-day—numerous cases being cited of men who have been dismissed without this investigation and this fair trial? Surely it cannot be true, in face of the pledge, not only of the Prime Minister, but of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries sitting beside him, repeating the same pledge; and if the people of this country cannot accept the statements of the Prime Minister and other Ministers of the Crown, what are we to expect of the men occupying subordinate positions? I have heard some other statements made here to-day that I regret, and regret exceedingly, particularly the statement made by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) and the Minister of Public Works, charging a respected and respectable minister of the Church of England with being untruthful, and with not being a gentleman. I resent that statement, I resent the statement made by both these hon. gentlemen. Then we have the general charge made from the other side of the House that when the Conservatives were in power they dismissed a lot of officials of this country for being offensive partisans. Now, I want to refer to one or two cases in my own riding. I am sorry the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) is not here. His father was postmaster in the town of Gananoque when I was elected in 1882. Who was my opponent? The son of the postmaster of Gananoque. After the election was over, the Conservatives there said the postmaster must be dismissed for having taken an active part, and having put his son up to run against me in the county. But I was elected, and the postmaster remained in the position as postmaster at Gananoque until he died. Another postmaster who was appointed in my county took an offensive and active part against me in my election in 1882, in 1886, and in 1891. At the court of revision of the voters' lists previous to the last election, this postmaster was secretary of the Reform Association. I attended the trials before the judge. The president of the Reform Association came forward to prove that he had served summonses on a number of Conservatives to strike them off the list. He produced a notice, stating that he had mailed copies of that notice to each of the parties complained of. I asked, as the law gave me the right to ask, that he produce registration certificates of the letters that he mailed to them. He said, "They are in the hands of the secretary of the Association, the postmaster." The postmaster was called, and I asked him to produce his certificates. He said they were down in the post office. The judge said: I will adjourn the court until you go for them. He went for them and came back in about half an hour with them in his hands; he had been sworn before he went out. I said: Mr. Postmaster, have you not, since you left this place to go down to your office, written out these certificates at your post office, and changed the post office stamp back to the date now represented on these certificates? And he had to admit there before the judge, that he had done so, and the Judge dismissed the whole case because he had taken the liberty to a certain extent, of forging the certificates that he should have given at the time the letters were registered. That gentleman is postmaster yet, and I have never, and never will, prefer a charge against him. He was postmaster when

I was first elected, and is postmaster yet. How many postmasters have been dismissed throughout this country because they only went and recorded their vote? But there were cases like this of offensive partisanship all over my county. It is charged that the late Government dismissed all Liberal officials that were found in office when they came in, but no names can be mentioned. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) made yesterday a wholesale charge, and then named two or three gentlemen who had been superannuated, gentlemen 70 or 80 years of age, and because they were superannuated, he said they had been dismissed. These are the facts. The Conservative Government did not dismiss an official, or if they did dismiss one, they gave him what the Prime Minister of this country promised he would give to civil servants, a fair investigation and trial before they were dismissed.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). Before you leave the Chair, I would like, in justice to an official of my department, to read a telegram which I received to-day from Dr. Watt. He was accused here last night of having neglected to visit and to treat certain small-pox patients in the quarantine at Victoria. This telegram comes to me, I suppose, in consequence of his seeing statements in the Victoria papers, or of some friend here having telegraphed him:

Victoria, B.C., May 14th, 1897.

Those statements made by Colonel Prior, that I have neglected small-pox patients, are absolutely without foundation. I have personally attended all small-pox patients who have come to the station. If required, sworn statements to this effect from patients, and nurses, and guards can be forwarded. Please ask for affidavit to the contrary which Colonel Prior asserts he can furnish.

Now, a statement was made here that Dr. Watt had locked up a small-pox patient in a small room at that station and left him there for several days until he died without any care. I find from the records of the department that the patient in question who came from the ship Victoria, which arrived on the 23rd of June, was taken into the hospital on that day, and that he must have died there that evening or the next morning, because the bill for the coffin, which was taken as the proof of his death, was dated on the 24th. I have an extract from the "Colonist" here which I wish to read to the House. The statement was made that Dr. Watt had neglected fumigating a vessel which had come in with some small-pox patients on board, and the result was that small-pox had been spread through several towns.

Mr. WALLACE. In the case first mentioned by the hon. gentleman, the statement was not made that this person had been there three or four days but that he was there over night, and that is not in conformity with the telegram which has been read.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I understand the leader of the Opposition to declare that this gentleman had neglected this patient for several days.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not profess to have any information myself, but I said that if the statement made by the hon. member for Victoria were true, then the affair was intensely disgraceful.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. As it was not true, the hon. gentleman's sympathy was wasted.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman gather from this telegram that after the doctor locked up this small-pox patient, he visited him?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I gather from this telegram that he attended the patient in the ordinary way a doctor attends to any patent. I have no information to the contrary; I do not believe any information to the contrary can be furnished.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will you read the last telegram?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE—

Personally attended all small-pox patients which have come to station. If required, sworn statements to this effect from patients, and nurses, and guards can be forwarded. Please ask for the affidavit to the contrary which Colonel Prior asserts he can furnish.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is not the one I mean.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is no other telegram. The statement I made was from a memorandum prepared from the records of the department, showing that this man came in on the 23rd and died either that night or on the morning of the 24th.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The statement made by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) was this: That Dr. Watt, the quarantine officer, had a person suffering from small-pox locked up with an attendant, and that he died without his having visited him.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That statement is contradicted by Dr. Watt's statement, that he had personally visited and attended all small-pox patients which had come to the station.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He does not contradict that specific statement.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He says he personally visited all of them and personally attended to them.

Mr. WALLACE. Will the Minister read the memorandum which has been prepared from the records of the department?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE

"Victoria" left Yokohama January 10. Head Chinese fireman developed small-pox rash third day out. Isolated in ship's hospital. Ninety-three steerage passengers. Detaining them at station until 27th inst. Seven cabin passengers not exposed.

On the same day Dr. Watt wired:

Have landed all Chinese crew and passengers. Released "Victoria."

The account for a coffin, which is given as proof that this man died, was dated on 24th. The vessel arrived on the 23rd, and the man was dead and a coffin was asked for on the 24th, showing it could not have been several days afterwards.

Mr. HUGHES. The statement that it was several days afterwards, was not made.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think "Hansard" will show that the statement was made by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am sure the Minister does not want to place the member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) in a false position. My hon. friend only made a statement on information. I have here the statement made by my hon. friend, and in justice to him, I should like to repeat it in connection with that telegram:

The fact is, that the man was afflicted with small-pox, was taken to the hospital and died there. The charge was made to me,—I do not know whether it is true or not—and the man who gave me the information, said he was willing to take affidavit as to the fact, that the doctor never saw the man from the time the ship went into quarantine.

So my hon. friend guarded himself by mentioning that his statement was made on information.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Later in the debate I asked the hon. gentleman to take the responsibility of making the charge, and he said he assumed the responsibility, because he believed the man who made the charge. Now, Dr. Watt asks him to supply the affidavit which he said he had; and if the hon. gentleman does not do so, I think it is very unfair that this official should lie under that charge.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Did the hon. gentleman tell the hon. member for Victoria that he was going to mention this matter in the House?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I only got the statement a little while ago, and I have not seen the hon. member since.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Fisheries, Salaries, &c..... $90,000

Resolutions to be reported.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.20 a.m. (Saturday).

Mr. WALLACE.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 17th May, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved:

That the following members be added to the Select Standing Committees of this House:—

Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines: Messrs. Jameson, Rutherford, Pettet, and Douglas.

Privileges and Elections: Mr. McClure.

Standing Orders: Messrs. Marcotte and Snetsinger.

Miscellaneous Private Bills: Hon. Mr. Davies, Messrs. Pettet, McClure, Jameson, and Marcotte.

Printing: Mr. Perry.

Public Accounts: Messrs. Jameson, McClure, and Bergeron.

Banking and Commerce: Messrs. Perry, Marcotte, and Pettet.

Agriculture and Colonization: Messrs. Rutherford and Marcotte.

THE AUDIT ACT.

Mr. DAVIN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 107) to amend the Audit Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. DAVIN. The object of the Bill is to provide that the spending departments shall call for tenders for supplies, except in cases of great emergency, just as the Public Works Department must call for tenders for contracts except when emergency demands that the contract be given without tender. A general impression prevailed—I know it was my own impression and the same with members of Parliament and even with men employed for years in functions connected with the Government that ought to bring this matter before their attention—that there was legislation compelling every department to call for tenders. But, as a matter of fact, though it has been the practice, the universal practice, for some eighteen years at least to call for tenders, it is not necessary under the existing law. I think it is desirable that we should amend the Audit Act so as to provide that the spending departments should, except in cases of great emergency, call for tenders.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

STATIONARY ENGINEERS.

Mr. SUTHERLAND moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 108) respecting the examination of stationary engineers and for the insepection of steam boilers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Explain.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. This Bill is introduced at the request of the Association of Stationary Engineers. It provides for the examination of the, and issuing of certificates to, persons holding the position of stationary engineers, and also for the inspection of boilers. There has been a great loss of life in different sections of the country through want of knowledge, it is claimed, on the part of those having charge of boilers and engines, and it is desirable that some legislation should be passed which will, as far as practicable, bring about the employment of efficient men in this business, and also for the inspection of boilers, so as to prevent, as much as possible, the loss of life and property.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

POST OFFICE INSPECTOR MERRICK.

Mr. ROGERS (for Mr. Pettet) asked :

1. Was Post Office Inspector Merrick attending solely to the duties of his office during the two weeks previous to the 23rd of June last?
2. Was he in the town of Picton at any time during the same period?
3. Did he attend any Conservative meeting or meetings, public or private, during said period?
4. Was he at any Conservative committee rooms during said period? If so, how often was he at such committee rooms, and for what purpose was he there?
5. Did the said Merrick take any part in procuring the withdrawal of Mr. Williams as a candidate for Parliament at the election held on the 23rd of June last?
6. Where was Inspector Merrick during each day of the said period of two weeks?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). 1. Inspector Merrick was attending to his official duties during the two weeks prior to the 23rd June last, saving two days taken as part of holiday, these being the only holidays taken in two and a half years. 2. Yes. Was in the town of Picton and village of Glenora, and inspected both of these money order offices during that period. 3. Yes. Was at Conservative public meeting in the town hall at Prescott, at a Reform public meeting held in the Opera House, Kingston, and at a Reform public meeting held in the Whig Hall, Kingston. Did not attend any other political meeting during the elections. Took no part whatever at any of the meetings. Was invited and pressed to speak in North Leeds against Mr. Frost, but declined to do so. Did not visit the riding during the period mentioned. Did not canvass one voter. 4. Yes. Was in the Conservative committee room at Picton two or three times. Did not know half a dozen people in the room on one occasion, and not more than two or three on the others. Went in and sat down to have a smoke and a chat. 5. No; never spoke to Mr. Williams in his life. Do not know now, nor did he ever know why Mr. Williams withdrew, nor who procured his withdrawal. 6. Attending to his duties at his office with the exception of the days referred to in preceding questions.

DISMISSALS, LACHINE CANAL.

Mr. GILLIES (for Mr. Monk) asked :

1. How long has Ephrem Picard, lately boom-master, Lachine, been in the employ of the Government?
2. Why was he dismissed on the 30th April last?
3. Was there any complaint against him, and by whom?
4. By whom was he replaced, and who recommended the new nominee?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Ephrem Picard, assistant boom-master on the Lachine Canal, has been employed during each season since September, 1887. His services were dispensed with because the position of assistant boom-master was abolished.

Mr. GILLIES (for Mr. Monk) asked :

1. How long has Joseph Sauvé, lately bridge-master No. 5 bridge, Côte St. Paul, Lachine Canal, been in the employment of the Government ?
2. Why was he dismissed on the 30th April last?
3. Was there any complaint against him, and by whom?
4. Who was named bridgemaster in his place, and by whom was the new nominee recommended ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Joseph Sauvé, lately bridge-master, bridge No. 5, Cote St. Paul, Lachine Canal, has been employed during the season of navigation since the 1st May, 1878. His services were dispensed with at the request and on the representation of the members of Parliament for Montreal districts, the department did not receive any written complaint against Sauvé. Joseph Archebierre was appointed bridgemaster in place of Joseph Sauvé.

Mr. GILLIES (for Mr. Monk) asked :

1. How long has Joseph Deschamps, lately lockmaster No. 4 lock, Côte St. Paul, Lachine Canal, been in the employment of the Government?
2. Why was he dismissed on the 30th April last?
3. Was there any complaint against him, and by whom?
4. Has he been replaced by one Adolphe Fichaud, of St. Henri, brother-in-law of the member for Hochelaga?
5. Who recommended the new lockmaster for nomination?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Joseph Deschamps, lately lock-master at lock No. 4, Cote St. Paul, Lachine Canal, has been employed during season of navigation since the 1st June, 1873. His services were dispensed with at the request and on the representation of the members of Parliament for Montreal districts, no written complaint was lodged in the department. Adolphe Fichaud was appointed lockmaster in his place.

MR. KINNEY, POSTMASTER AT SALEM.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked:

1. Has A. W. Kinney been dismissed from the position of postmaster at Salem, Yarmouth county?
2. How long did Mr. Kinney hold his position as postmaster?
3. If his services were dispensed with, upon what grounds was such action taken?
4. Was any investigation made into this case and was the postmaster given an opportunity to answer or to defend himself?
5. Was a petition received by the Postmaster General from the district signed by forty-five people in the neighbourhood of the post office, thirty thereof being Liberals, asking that Mr. Kinney be left in charge of the district?
6. How many letters have been received by the Postmaster General or by the Deputy Postmaster General since December 31, 1896, from Mr. Kinney?
7. How many have been answered?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). 1. Mr. A. W. Kinney has been dismissed from the postmastership of Salem, county Yormouth. 2. Mr. Kinney had been postmaster since 1st of May, 1886. 3. His services were dispensed with for offensive political partisanship. 4. There was no investigation. Mr. Kinney was removed on representations of Mr. Thos. B. Flint, M.P. 5. Such a petition has been received, but there is no knowledge at the department as to the political opinions of the signers. 6. No letters appear to have been received from Mr. Kinney since 31st December, 1896. 7. Therefore, none have been answered.

CORNWALL AND SOULANGES CANALS.

Mr. BERGERON (for Mr. McLennan, Glengarry) asked:

1. What are the lengths and breadths of the locks in the Cornwall and Soulanges canals?
2. What are the lengths and breadths of the locks to be built by the contracts awarded by the present Government?
3. What is the amount of excavation, and classification of such, in the different contracts which have been advertised by Government?
4. At what time are the contracts to be completed?
5. What was the number of tenders for each of the canal contracts already advertised for, and who were the tenderers?
6. Were they in every case let to the lowest tender? If not, why?
7. What is the total amount of deposit received with tenders for each contract?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. The length and width of the locks in the Cornwall and Soulanges Canal is 270 feet long by 45 feet wide. 2. The department is considering as to the lock at the lower entrance of the Galops Canal whether it shall be 800 feet in length so as to take in a full towage of the lockage or less. 3. For sections 4, 5, 6 and 7 Soulanges Canal, just re-let: Earth excavation, 851,000 cubic yards; earth in water-tight embankments, 125,000 cubic yards; rock excavation, nil. 4. This contract to be completed by 31st October, 1898. 5. There were seventeen tenders received for the works in connection with the re-letting of sections Nos. 4, 5, 6 and 7, Soulanges Canal, as follows:—

1. M. J. Hogan, Montreal.
2. Andrew Onderdonk, Hamilton.
3. E. F. Fauquier, Ottawa.
4. Geo. Dawson and Jos. Battle, St. Catharines.
5. P. Larkin and A. Sangster, St. Catharines.
6. J. W. Munro and William Murray, Pembroke.
7. Charles H. Raynor, Syracuse, N.Y.
8. McNamee and Wm. Mann, Montreal.
9. Randolph McDonald, Toronto.
10. P. Bickerdale, Montreal.
11. Frank Stafford, J. C. O'Neil and G. A. Ferguson, Montreal.
12. Wm. Davis & Sons, Ottawa.
13. Wm. Buckner, Welland.
14. Jas. Rogers and G. A. Taylor, Montreal.
15. John O'Leary, Ottawa.
16. O. Martineau, Montreal.
17. Hugh Ryan, J. Ryan and M. J. Haney, Toronto.

6. The tenders for this work were invited before the Government decided upon the policy of completing the works of enlargement ready for navigation in the spring of 1899—and the tenders were based on completion in October, 1899. Mr. Hogan, who was the lowest tenderer, upon being informed of the policy of the Government said he could not carry out the work within the shorter time, viz.: October, 1898, at his tender price, and when asked how much additional to the amount of his tender he would undertake the work in the shorter time, declined to put in an offer for the work to be completed in the shorter date. Mr. Onderdonk was then called upon and he said he would undertake it for the shorter date at his tender price and the contract was awarded him. 7. The amount of deposit received with each tender was $8,000.

For Section No. 12, Soulanges Canal, Just Re-let.

3. Earth excavation, 327,000 cubic yards; rock excavation, thrown to spoil, 70,000 cubic yards. 4. This contract to be completed by 1st October, 1898. 5. Thirteen tenders were received as follows:—

1. M. J. Hogan, Montreal.
2. A. Onderdonk, Hamilton.
3. Dawson & Connolly, St. Catharines.
4. Lafontaine & Lemoine, Montreal.
5. Guy Campbell, Ottawa.
6. Schultz, Schultz & Phinn, Brantford.
7. Rogers & Taylor, Montreal
8. Kavanagh, Grant & Kavanagh, Ottawa.
9. Randolph McDonald, Toronto.
10. Stafford, O'Neil & Ferguson, Kemptville.
11. Wm. Buckner, Welland.
12. Frechette, Frechette & Co., Montreal.
13. Hugh Ryan & Co., Toronto.

6. The lowest tender was accepted. 7. The total amount of deposit received with each tender was $2,000.

For Deepening and Enlarging Grenville Canal.

3. Earth excavation, 44,500 cubic yards; rock excavation, 25,000 cubic yards. 4. The contract to be completed by 1st May, 1899. 5. Fifteen tenders were received as follows:—

1. M. A. Piggot and J. C. Ingles, Hamilton.
2. R. Brewster and A. McNaughton, Ottawa.
3. G. E. Fauquier, Ottawa.
4. McNamee & Mann, Montreal.
5. Gilbert Blasting and Dredging Company, Montreal.
6. John Heney and Henry Smith, Ottawa.
7. R. Bickerdike, Montreal.
8. T. McLaughlin and Thos. W. Kirby, Ottawa.
9. G. E. Schultz, W. D. Schultz and W. E. Phinn, Brantford.
10. F. Stafford, J. C. O'Neil and Geo. B. Ferguson, Toronto.
11. Jas. Cochrane, Montreal.
12. Hugh Ryan & Co., Toronto.
13. William Stewart, Ottawa.
14. Wm. Buckner, Welland.
15. O. Martineau, Montreal.

6. This contract was let to the lowest tenderer. 7. The total amount of deposit received with each tender was $5,000.

For Cardinal Section of the Galops Canal.

3. Earth excavation from bottom of canal 21 x 50 to level of berme 43·00, including dredging seat for new embankment Gates' and Glasford's Bay cutting through old cribwork and towpath, east and west of lock No. 26 where directed, also all other materials, except solid rock and boulders measuring ¼ of a cubic yard and over, as specified, 900,000 cubic yards; rock excavation from bottom of canal to level of berme, including boulders measuring ¼ of a cubic yard and over, 20,000 cubic yards; earth excavation from level of berme 43·00 to surface of ground, price for which is to include the cost of removal of all old buildings and all other materials, except solid rock and boulders measuring ¼ of a cubic yard and over, 1,630,000 cubic yards; rock excavation from level of berme to surface of ground, including boulders measuring ¼ of a cubic yard and over, 30,000 cubic yards. 4. This contract to be completed by 31st January, 1899. 5. Nine tenders were received as follows:—

1. William Davis & Sons.
2. McKinnon & Garland.
3. O'Neil & Ferguson.
4. Bickerdike, McNamee & Co.
5. Andrew Onderdonk.
6. Canadian Construction Company.
7. Hugh Ryan & Co.
8. Weddell, McAuliffe & Co.
9. M. A. Cleveland.

6. This was let to the lowest tenderer. 7. The total amount of deposit required with each tender, was $75,000.

For Iroquois Section.

3. Earth excavation, lower entrance, east of station 6, including old cribwork and walls, &c., and all kinds of materials, except solid rock and boulders containing ¼ of a cubic yard and over, as specified, 11,000 cubic yards; rock excavation, lower entrance, east of station 6, including boulders, containing ¼ of a cubic yard and over, 4,000 cubic yards; earth excavation in lock pit, from station 6 to station 21, including old cribwork and all kinds of materials, except solid rock and boulders containing ¼ of a cubic yard and over, as specified, the price for which is to include the cost of the removal of old buildings, 34,000 cubic yards; rock excavation in lock pit, from station 6 to station 21, including boulders containing ¼ of a cubic yard and over, 39,000 cubic yards; earth excavation on section west of section 21, including all kinds of materials, except solid rock and boulders containing ¼ of a cubic yard and over, 450,000 cubic yards; rock excavation on section west of station 21, including boulders containing ¼ of a cubic yard and over, as specified, 79,000 cubic yards. 4. This contract is to be completed by the 31st January, 1899. 5. Thirteen tenders were received as follows:—

1. Larkin & Sangster, St. Catharines.
2. William Davis & Sons, Ottawa.
3. Joseph Bourque, Hull.
4. Canadian Construction Company, Montreal.
5. McKinnon & Garland.
6. McNamee & Bickerdike, Montreal.
7. Dawson & Symms.
8. Brown, Love & Aylmer.
9. Andrew Onderdonk, Hamilton.
10. William Buckner, Welland.
11. R. Weddell & Co., Trenton.
12. M. J. Haney, Toronto.
13. M. Cleveland.

6. This contract was let to the lowest tenderer. 7. The total amount of deposit required with each tender, was $50,000.

DANIEL B. STONE

Mr. GILLIES asked:

1. For what period of time was Daniel B. Stone employed as a lockman upon the St. Peter's Canal?
2. Has he been dismissed from his position as lockman?
3. If so, when was he dismissed?
4. By whom has he been replaced?
5. Were any charges or complaints laid against Mr. Stone? If so, by whom, and of what description?
6. If charges or complaints were preferred against Mr. Stone, was any attempt made to have them investigated before dismissing him?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. Mr. D. B. Stone, lockman on the St. Peter's Canal, has been employed since February, 1884. 2. His services were dispensed with on the 31st March ultimo, the staff on the canal having been reduced from eight to five and reorganized. 5. No.

W. J. CASSELMAN.

Mr. BRODER asked :

Why was W. J. Casselman dismissed from his position as lockmaster on lock 24, Williamsburg Canal? Was there any investigation? Is it the intention of the Government to superannuate him?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Mr. W. J. Casselman has been dismissed from the service. The ground of his dismissal was that he had made himself, during the recent elections, very obnoxious by his partisan conduct. It was not considered at all necessary to incur the expense of holding an investigation in his case, there being no doubt as to the fact. The Government is looking into precedents which have taken place or have been established in similar cases and considering this case, with others which have arisen, as to whether the amount contributed to the superannuation fund should be returned with interest or not.

OLD FORT ERIE.

Mr. McCLEARY asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to comply with the memorials of the county council of Welland and the historical societies, praying that the ruins of "Old Fort Erie" in the village of Fort Erie, county of Welland, be placed under the control of the Board of Commissioners for Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Park and be made a portion of said park?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). This matter is now engaging the attention of the Government.

WALTER B. SCOVIL.

Mr. DOMVILLE asked :

Is the Minister of Inland Revenue in possession of the following petition, and if so, what he proposes to do in the premises :—

"We, the undersigned representatives of the Parliament of Canada and Legislative Assembly of the province of New Brunswick, president and executive of the Liberal Association of King's county and province of New Brunswick and voters in and for the said county, do humbly petition you in the premises as set forth hereafter and ask that the same be remedied and the injustice to the county of King's, N.B., be righted by having the office of inspector of weights and measures for the hereafter named counties restored to it.

"In the year 1888, Walter B. Scovil, for many years a member of the Legislative Assembly of the province of New Brunswick, was appointed inspector of weights and measures for the counties of King's, Westmoreland, Albert, Gloucester, Kent, Restigouche and Northumberland and had an office fitted up for him in the public offices at Sussex, K.C. Later on a Mr. Richard was appointed assistant inspector, his residence being in Kent county, N.B. That the said Richard, with some slight exceptions, did little or no work, and about the whole work was devolved on the said Walter B. Scovil, who to the best of his ability performed such faithfully and to the satisfaction of the department.

"That the said Walter B. Scovil has been superannuated contrary to his knowledge and without consultation with the representative in Parliament of the said county of King's, and orders were issued to the inspector of weights and measures in St. John, N.B., to close up the office in Sussex, on Monday, April 20th, 1897.

"That the aforesaid Richard has not been superannuated, and it is alleged that the work formerly performed by Scovil and himself will now devolve on one person, causing the office to be removed from the county of King's.

"That your petitioners say that, if reduction had to be made, Mr. Richard, who has performed little or no service for his years of office (which can be verified by an examination of his accounts), should have been the one to go.

"Furthermore, that the said Richard was an active partisan against the Liberal party and its friends, both in Dominion and local elections, which can be clearly established ; whilst the said Scovil has most carefully been neutral, although all his friends and relations have done all in their power for the success of the Liberal party and yourself, which also can be fully proved.

"That if the work for the counties of King's, Westmoreland, Albert, Restigouche, Gloucester, Kent and Northumberland had been properly carried out, the income would have fully sustained the office of inspector and assistant ; but the assistant performing little or no work, the office had to bear the loss.

"That if the work is properly performed in the future it will produce the expenses of an inspector and an assistant.

"Having laid this before you, we humbly ask that if there is to be only one inspector instead of two, that the appointment shall be made in King's county, which has been loyal and supports your Administration, as it is manifestly unfair that the county of Kent and Mr. Richard, who have been and are still hostile, should be entitled to any benefits accruing from a change of policy in the department.

"Your petitioners ask that you will remove the grievance and give the remedy asked, and in duty bound ever pray.

"(Sgd.) JAMES DOMVILLE, M.P.
"For the county of King's, N.B.,
"And several hundred others."

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). I have received the petition referred to, and it is under consideration.

MAIL SERVICE BETWEEN ASHCROFT AND BARKERVILLE, B.C.

Mr. PRIOR asked :

1. Has the contract for carrying the mails between Ashcroft and Barkerville, B.C., been awarded to Messrs. Ryan & Shields for the sum of $20,000, as stated in the Ottawa "Citizen" of the 12th May?

2. If so, does this contract include any other mail routes except the direct one between Ashcroft and Barkerville?

3. How many tenders were received for the above service?

4. Who were the tenderers, and how much were their tenders?

5. If the contract has been awarded to Messrs. Ryan & Shields, is the Ryan here mentioned, one Peter Ryan, the registrar of titles in Toronto, or his son? Is the Shields mentioned the individual well known in Ontario as "Frozen Whisky Shields" ?

Mr. SPEAKER. In respect to the last line in this question, I would suggest to the hon. member that he should change the wording so as to identify the individual.

Mr. PRIOR. I will alter it so as to read, "John Shields, of Toronto."

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). No contract for the service has yet been executed. The contract was held by the British Columbia Transportation Company, at a very excessive price, $26,000. The contract will expire on the 30th June, 1897. Tenders for the service were advertised for. Some tenders were received. The lowest tender was considered excessive. I applied to the lowest tenderer asking him to reduce the amount of his tender.

Mr. PRIOR. Who was the lowest tenderer?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman must understand that this is not the time when I can give that information. I have failed to obtain a reasonable tender, and I am endeavouring to secure a reasonable tender for this service to be maintained in a state of efficiency and with due regard to economy; and if I can succeed, it will effect a substantial saving to the Government. When the contract is let, there will be no objection whatever to give all the particulars, the tenderers, their names, and all details connected with the negotiations, but the hon. gentleman will agree with me that this is not the time when such information can be given in the public interest.

Mr. PRIOR. Do I understand that the contract has not been awarded?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I made that statement.

PACIFIC POSTAL SERVICE.

Mr. MORRISON asked:

1. Has provisional allowance been made to the railway mail clerks on the Pacific postal division?
2. Have demands been made heretofore by the railway mail clerks on the Pacific postal division for provisional allowance? If so, have their requests in that behalf been complied with?
3. Have the mail clerks on the Manitoba postal division been receiving provisional allowance?
4. Is it the intention of the Government to pay to the railway mail clerks on the Pacific postal division provisional allowance?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I find by an Order in Council of June, 1895, that provision was made for a provisional allowance for railway mail clerks in the Manitoba service, and this has been paid to them; but the Order in Council in question excluded mail clerks in British Columbia. With the exception of the representations made by the hon. gentleman asking for such provisional allowance to be made to mail clerks in British Columbia, no representations have been made to the department.

JOHN WIGGINS—BRITISH COLUMBIA PENITENTIARY.

Mr. MORRISON asked:

Was John Wiggins dismissed from the position of guard of the British Columbia Penitentiary? If so, when? What were the grounds of complaint against him?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick) John Wiggins was dismissed from the position of guard at British Columbia penitentiary in February, 1890, for conduct unbecoming an officer of the penitentiary. He had been reported for having discussed penitentiary business, including alleged personal grievances, with parties outside the prison; and when called upon by direction of the Minister to formulate his grievances in order that they might be considered, he refused to comply with the Minister's request. The Minister thereupon directed that his services be dispensed with.

POSTMASTER AT VALLEYFIELD.

Mr. BERGERON asked:

1. When was Mr. E. Dion appointed postmaster at Valleyfield?
2. By whom was he recommended for the position?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The hon. the Minister of Public Works made the recommendation of Mr. E. Dionne, jr., for the postmastership in question; but it was ascertained that there was no such person as the nominee, and accordingly he had to be appealed to, to give us the name of some person in existence, and did so.

POSTMASTER AT MELOCHEVILLE.

Mr. TAYLOR asked:

Has the Postmaster General exacted from the postmaster at Melocheville the amount of money his predecessor had condemned him to pay for illegal sale of stamps?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Some time ago the department, as a matter of routine, without any direction from the then Postmaster General and, in fact, without his knowledge, called upon the postmaster at Melocheville to recoup certain amounts which he had improperly been allowed as salary. This amount the postmaster had not yet recouped, he being a poor man, but he is discharging the duties of postmaster without being paid salary, the amount so retained going towards liquidation of his debt. Until the question on the Order paper was brought to the attention of the present Postmaster General, he, like his predecessor, had no personal knowledge of the matter.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the amount?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not inquire and do not know ; I think it is some very trifling thing.

MR. S. A. BRODEUR—BEAUHARNOIS CANAL.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

1. When was Mr. S. A. Brodeur, N.P., appointed in place of Mr. A. D. Danis as collector of tolls and collector of customs and excise on Beauharnois Canal?
2. On whose recommendation was Mr. Brodeur appointed to fill all those positions ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Mr. S. A. Brodeur, N.P., was appointed collector of tolls on the Beauharnois Canal on the 21st of April, 1897. As to on whose recommendation he was appointed, I am bound to say to my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) that as the Government takes the full responsibility for the appointment, we do not feel that we are called upon to state upon whose advice we act.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) would pardon me a moment. I may say that it has been the custom for very many years to give the recommendation. Technically, my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) is right, but that has been the custom, and even since this Parliament has met, most of the members of the Government, when asked that question, gave the answer.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) cannot enter into a discussion now.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to draw that to the attention of my hon. friend (Mr. Blair). I know he would like to have the information.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is not any want of courtesy to the hon. member, because I would give the information to him as readily as to anybody. I do not feel that it is a precedent which we ought to establish or recognize in any way. We take all the responsibility, and as to where we get our advice it cannot possibly be a matter of concern.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) is not obliged to answer, and I do not complain. The hon. the Controller of Customs has an answer to give on the same question.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). With reference to the portion of the question that appertains to the Customs Department, I may say, that Mr. Brodeur was appointed in place of Mr. Danis as subcollector of customs at Valleyfield, on the 13th of April, 1897.

Mr. BERGERON. On whose recommendation ?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. They have not furnished me with an answer to that question.

Mr. MULOCK.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinère). The answer to the first question is, on 1st of May, 1897, to collect excise duties on commission. As to the second question, I will follow the example of my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) and beg the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) to excuse me for not answering.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

Who has done the work of collector of tolls, of customs and of excise between the dismissal of Mr. Danis and the appointment of Mr. Brodeur at Valleyfield, P.Q.?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The actual dismissal of Mr. A. D. Danis from the position of sub-collector of customs at Valleyfield and the appointment of Mr. S. A. Brodeur thereto were contemporaneous.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Mr. Henry Lefebvre did the work of collector of tolls at Valleyfield until Mr. Brodeur was appointed.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). Mr. Danis continued to do the work until the first of May, when Mr. Brodeur was appointed.

WESTMINSTER AND BURRARD TELEPHONE COMPANY.

Mr. MORRISON asked :

1. When was the transfer of the Dominion telegraph lines from New Westminster, B.C., made to the Westminster and Burrard Telephone Company?
2. At whose request was said transfer made?
3. What substantially were the terms of the said transfer?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. By an Order in Council of the 15th June, 1887, authority was given to lease to Mr. Laidlaw, and others, for ninety-nine years, at a rental of $1 per year, the Government telegraph line between New Westminster and Ladner's Landing, B.C., the line including half a mile of cable across the Fraser River. On the 19th March, 1895, the executors of J. A. Laidlaw and James Wilson transferred the remainder of their line to the Burrard Inlet Telephone Company, obtaining from the Minister of Public Works under the terms of the said lease, the necessary sanction for such transfer. 2. The request for the original lease was made by Mr. D. Chisholm, M.P., on the 25th May, 1887, reported upon favourably by the then superintendent of Government telegraph service, Mr. Gisborne, and approved by an Order in Council of the 15th June, 1887. The transfer from the original lessees to the company was recommended to the department by Mr. George E. Corbould. 3. The term of lease, ninety-nine years ; line to be kept in perpetuity without cost to Government ; lessees not to sub-let without leave ; line, if abandoned by lessees, to revert to Government in good repair ; rent, $1 per year.

ATHABASCA AND MACKENZIE RIVER MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. OLIVER asked :

1. Is it the desire of the Government to extend mail facilities to the Athabasca and Mackenzie River regions?

2. Is the Government aware that the Hudson's Bay Company's steamer leaves Athabasca Landing for the North about June 1st and that the commissioner of the said company has expressed his willingness to make an arrangement with the Government for the carriage of mails to the far north on this trip?

3. Has the Government entered into negotiations with any person with a view of securing the carriage of a public mail during the summer into the Athabasca and Mackenzie River regions?

4. Have any representations been made to the Government of the desirability and possibility of providing such a service?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). It is the desire of the Government to extend mail facilities to the Athabasca and Mackenzie River region, and the carrying out of that desire is a matter which is at present engaging the attention of the Government. I am not in a position at this moment to give the answers to the second and third questions. With regard to the fourth question, my answer is, representations have been made to the Government of the desirability of such a mail service being provided, and such representations have been made by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver).

PENSION FUND—MR. A. D. DANIS.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

Is it the intention of the Government to refund to Mr. A. D. Danis the sum of $311.16 which he paid to the pension fund as collector of tolls on Beauharnois Canal?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). No decision has yet been reached by the Government as to the repayment of the sum paid by Mr. Danis into the pension fund. It is considering the question whether the amount so paid, with interest, should not, under the circumstances, be made.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

1. How much had Mr. Danis paid to the pension fund as collector of customs at Valleyfield from the day of his appointment down to the 9th February last?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to reimburse him for what he paid to said fund?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. 1. $40.94. 2. It is under consideration.

McCARTHY ACT CLAIMS—PROVENCHER DISTRICT.

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked :

1. Which of the claims existing under the provisions of the Act commonly known as "The McCarthy Act," have been paid to municipal corporations or to persons entitled to the same, in the electoral division of Provencher ?

2. What are the claims remaining unsettled, and why were they not paid?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). I beg to reply as follows :—1. Municipality of St. Boniface, $100 ; municipality of Emerson, $65 ; municipality of Otterburne, $15 ; municipality of Dominion City, $15 ; municipality of Morris, $25 ; as per page 140 of Inland Revenue Report for 1895-96. 2. F. Jean & Co., St. Boniface, $10, whereabouts unknown ; A. Chabot, St. Boniface, $10, whereabouts unknown ; Geo. Brad, Dominion City, $15, claimed more—declines to accept ; G. H. Patterson, Dominion City, $10, claimed more—declines to accept ; Wm. Martin, Emerson, $15, whereabouts unknown ; T. Carney, Emerson, $15, whereabouts unknown ; V. Ruskoff, Emerson, $15, whereabouts unknown ; Robertson & Co., Emerson, $10, whereabouts unknown ; J. L. Delaine, Emerson, $10, whereabouts unknown ; J. P. O. Allaire, St. Boniface, $296, no amount available by the department. Mr. Allaire was inspector of Provencher district and the claim is for services rendered. The payment of this amount was recommended by the department in March, 1896, but was not sanctioned by Council.

APPOINTMENTS IN CUSTOMS DEPARTMENT.

Mr. McDOUGALL (for Mr. Sproule) asked :

Have any persons been appointed to the inside service of the Customs Department since 1st July, 1896, who have not passed the prescribed examination required by the Civil Service Act ? Are any such persons so appointed now employed in this department ?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). I suppose the question is not intended to refer to my private secretary, whose case was covered by the Estimates of last year. With that statement, my reply to both divisions of the question is, no.

COLLECTIONS OF REVENUE AT VALLEYFIELD.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

How much money was collected by A. D. Danis, as collector of excise at Valleyfield, P.Q., since his appointment down to the 30th April, 1897 ?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). The amount collected was $115,491.14.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

How much money was collected by A. D. Danis, as collector of customs at Valleyfield, P.Q., from 1st July, 1888, to the 9th February, 1897 ?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. This question cannot be answered in full, as returns from the ports for the years 1889-90

and 1890-91, were not published in the Trade and Navigation Returns for these years, and there is no record of them in the books of the Customs Department. The collections at Valleyfield for the years included in the question up to the 30th June, 1896, with the exception of the two years heretofore referred to, are as follows :—

1888-89	$ 4,109 34
1891-92	12,261 45
1892-93	21,833 30
1893-94	48,021 29
1894-95	29,340 18
1895-96	20,763 63

It is impossible to state the collections since the 30th June, 1896, as no returns have been received from the outport since that date. Returns of revenue from outports are only made yearly.

IMPROVEMENTS ON THE ST. LAWRENCE CANALS.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER asked :

1. Has any contract been awarded by the Dominion Government for certain improvements on the Galops Canal, Farran's Point Canal, North Channel of the St. Lawrence Canal, and the Iroquois section of the Galops Canal, for which tenders were duly called for by advertisement ?
2. If so, to whom was the contract awarded ?
3. Has a contract been executed, strictly binding the Government to the terms and conditions of the advertisements for tenders ?
4. In the event of non-completion of the contract within the time limited, what penalty, if any, is exacted from the contractors for default ?
5. How long after the work is commenced will the Department of Railways and Canals be informed as to whether or not the contractors have sufficient plant, men and material on the work to complete it within the time specified in the advertisements ?
6. In case the contractors cannot fulfil the contract within the time limited, what is the intention of the Government in respect to the same ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. Yes, several contracts have been awarded for certain improvements on the Galops Canal, north channel of the St. Lawrence Canal, and the Cardinal and Iroquois sections of the Galops Canal for which tenders were duly called for by advertisements. 2. The contract for the Cardinal section of the Galops Canal was awarded to Messrs. William Davis & Son, contractors, for the improvement of the north channel to Mr. M. A. Cleveland, contractor, and for the Iroquois section of the Galops Canal to Messrs. Larkin & Sangster, contractors. 3. Yes, contracts have been executed in each case in accordance with the terms and conditions of the advertisements for tenders. And I imagine the Government is bound strictly as well as the contractor. 4. At any stage in the construction, if the contractor makes default in advancing with the work to the satisfaction of the engineer, or shall not finish any portion within the period ordered by the engineer, the entire work may be taken off the contractor's hands and finished by the Government at the contractor's cost ; all of the plant, the ten per cent drawback and deposit security becoming the property of the Government. 5. As the work progresses, the chief engineer will satisfy himself as to whether or not the contractors have sufficient plant, men and material on the work to complete it within the time specified in the advertisements. 6. If contractors do not fulfil their contract within the time limited, the intention is that the work will be taken out of their hands, and the Government will have it completed by some other means.

FISH ISLAND, P.E.I., LIGHTKEEPER.

Mr. MARTIN asked :

1. Why has Charles E. McDonald (late acting lightkeeper) at Fish Island, in the province of Prince Edward Island, been removed, and when?
2. Was Mr. McDonald one of those recommended on the 6th day of July last for permanent appointment by the late Administration?
3. Did the Government, on the 8th of September last, declare by Order in Council that the recommendation in Mr. McDonald's case was one from which His Excellency the Governor General did not withhold his approval by his memorandum of the 8th of July last ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Mr. C. E. McDonald was not appointed as keeper of Fish Island light, but served as assistant to the widow of the late keeper without the sanction of the department. His services were not required after the appointment of a new keeper on the 8th of March last. Mr. McDonald was recommended for permanent appointment by the late Administration, on the 6th of July last. The recommendation of Mr. McDonald was not included in those from which His Excellency withheld his assent, but he did not officially sign the same. By Order in Council of the 8th of March last, the report of the Council submitting Mr. McDonald's name for the appointment was recommended not to be signed by His Excellency, but cancelled, and Mr. Sinclair was appointed keeper.

P.E.I. DAIRY INSPECTOR.

Mr. MARTIN asked :

1. Why have the services of Thomas J. Dillon, dairy inspector for Prince Edward Island, been dispensed with ?
2. If Mr. Dillon withdrew from the service, what reasons did he give the Minister of Agriculture or any official of his department for doing so ?
3. Who is to succeed Mr. Dillon ?
4. What position is Mr. Woodward to occupy in the dairy service in Prince Edward Island ?
5. What are Mr. Woodward's qualifications and experience in the dairy service ?
6. Is he a relation of the Minister of Agriculture ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). 1. The Government has withdrawn from the management of all the cheese factories and creameries in Prince Edward Island; and consequently the services of Mr. Dillon will not be required. 2. Mr. Dillon withdraws from the service at the end of May; having intimated that he intends to engage in business for himself in the maritime provinces. 3. No one is required; and no one will be appointed. 4. Mr. Woodward is to be one of the two travelling dairy instructors who will visit the cheese factories regularly. 5. Mr. Woodward has a first-class certificate as inspector from the St. Hyacinthe Dairy School. He is a first-class practical cheesemaker, and has acted for several years as instructor for a syndicate of cheese factories in the province of Quebec. He proved himself thoroughly competent in that capacity. 6. No, and in no way connected with the Minister.

CORNWALL AND BEAUHARNOIS CANALS.

Mr. REID asked:

What was the actual amount paid out by the Government for breaking lock No. 17 in Cornwall Canal by propellor "Ocean" in 1895, and also for a similar break in Beauharnois Canal in 1894?

In the amount paid out for damages in the Beauharnois Canal in 1894, was there anything paid for damages to crops of farmers? If so, how much?

Were owners of steamer notified to attend the survey and were they satisfied with the appraisement?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The amount paid out for damages to lock No. 17 on the Cornwall Canal by the propellor "Ocean," in 1895, was $4,208.79. There was paid for similar damages on the Beauharnois Canal in 1894, $1,334.39. There was paid for damages to crops and land on the Beauharnois Canal, in 1894, the sum of $403.25.

CONTRACTS FOR WOOD—KINGSTON AND LONDON BARRACKS.

Mr. TYRWHITT asked:

Have contracts been let during the last twelve months for supply of hard and soft wood for the barracks at Kingston and London? If so, were tenders called for, and who are the successful applicants, and at what prices are the different kinds of wood supplied?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Yes. Contracts have been awarded for Kingston and London for hard and soft wood for the barracks, for the twelve months ending the 30th June, 1897. Tenders were received from three parties for fuel for Kingston. The contract was given to the lowest tenderer, Mr. R. Crawford, of Kingston, at following prices:—Hard wood, $5.23 per cord; soft wood, $3.47 per cord. Public tenders were called for by the Department of Public Works for the supply of fuel wood at London for the heating of their buildings. The contract for the fuel required for the militia at London was given to William Heaman, of London, at the lowest figure obtained by the Public Works, following prices:—Hard wood, $6 per cord; soft wood, $4 per cord.

FAST ATLANTIC STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON moved for:

Copies of all correspondence, tenders asked for and received, Orders in Council, and papers in connection with the fast Atlantic service.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I would ask the hon. gentleman to allow this to stand. I hope to be able to lay the papers before the House some time, but they are not ready just yet.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not see any necessity for the motion standing, if it is merely asking for that which the hon. gentleman says he will furnish as soon as he can.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have no objection to the motion on the understanding that we are not bound to produce the papers immediately.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Certainly.

Motion agreed to.

A NATIONAL MUSEUM AT OTTAWA.

Mr. BELCOURT moved for:

Copies of all petitions, memorials and demands or documents presented to the Government, or to any member thereof, relating to the erection at Ottawa of a national museum.

He said: In presenting this motion, my object is to call the attention of this House, and more particularly of the Government, to a matter which I consider to be of great importance, of national concern and of immediate urgency. Every member of this honourable House, I presume, many visitors and scientists from our country and from abroad, and thousands and thousands of our own citizens, have yearly visited, with interest and profit to themselves, and examined with pride the magnificent collection illustrative of our natural history and natural resources exhibited at the National Museum at Ottawa. There are gathered in that museum the fruits of fifty years of hard-earned experience, of persistent search and inquiry, and of incessant toil and labour, the fruits of our national expeditions during fifty years and of numerous private and individual explorations and adventures. The result of all this is a collection which, for neatness, compactness and utility, is not surpassed anywhere, a collection which has been of

the greatest practical utility not only to the scientist, but to the miner, the manufacturer and the agriculturist as well. It is such a collection that it has attracted the widespread attention of numerous scientists not only of Canada, but also of foreign lands, and it has received from various sources the highest meed of praise and admiration. I would like, without wearying the House to any great extent, to be allowed to read one or two extracts from the opinions expressed by some foreign scientists concerning our Geological Museum. I will first read the opinion of Prof. Valentine Ball, director of the Science and Art Museum, Dublin. He says :

The useful materials of Canada are well illustrated in this museum by admirable series of specimens, and polished slabs of the ornamental stones are displayed on brackets on the walls with good effect.

Though unpretentious and practical, the general effect and appearance of this museum is such as to attract non-scientific as well as scientific visitors, a matter of no light importance in a country where its very existence may be said to depend on the popular vote. Its continuance and development are matters of great importance to the mineral industries of the Dominion, and if on this account alone it is supported liberally by the State, science will not fail to reap a share of the benefit so conferred.

Then, again, Prof. James Hall, State Geologist of New York, in a lengthy letter addressed to the late director of the Geological Museum, Dr. Selwyn, says :

Albany, April 26th, 1890.

Dr. A. R. C. Selwyn, C.M.G., F.R.S., &c.,
Director of the Geological and Natural History Survey of Canada.

Dear Sir,—I have lately had the pleasure and satisfaction of spending several days in the museum of your Geological Survey at Ottawa. My special object was the study of the Brachiopoda, of which class of fossils the late Mr. Billings, palæontologist to the Survey, described so many genera and species from the Canadian rocks.

If I might be allowed to make one suggestion, it would be that you republish in one volume, with their illustrations, all of Mr. Billings's earlier papers which appeared in the "Canadian Journal" and the "Canadian Naturalist" or elsewhere, together with any notes or observations upon the genera and species derived from information brought out by later investigations. I am sure you could not do a better service to students in geological science than by such a publication. I feel that I owe to you and your co-labourers my hearty thanks for having provided such facilities for the study of your fossils and the privilege of having free access to these unequalled and systematically arranged collections.

Your collection in this class of fossils, as well as in several others, is a typical and classical one, and no author can with propriety or safety publish the result of his investigations until he has studied the collections in the museum of the Canadian Geological Survey. It has been to me a great satisfaction to find the types and typical specimens of Mr. Billings's genera and species, not only of the Brachiopoda, but of other classes of fossils, so carefully preserved and labelled, and so systematically arranged, leaving in this respect nothing to be desired. In fact, I do not hesitate to say, more perfectly arranged and authentically labelled than any collection which I have seen in the United States ; while there are few museums anywhere which approach this one in neatness, order and compactness of arrangement. * * *

Permit me, also, to say a few words upon the general character of the museum, especially since I have known it almost from its inception, having worked with Sir William Logan in the first attempt to arrange the geological series with their characteristic fossils during several winters from 1851 to 1855. Of its progress in Montreal after that I know little, but now that I see the original conception so fully realized, I cannot but express my admiration of what you and your co-labourers have accomplished.

Your geological collections in which I have the greatest interest are admirably arranged and adapted for the study of science. You have adopted an excellent system of illustrating the geological structure and the order of succession of your geological formations and their products in their natural association. Together with the systematic arrangement of your rocks, you present the gold and silver ores and follow with the other ores and economic minerals which are derived from the older rocks and from their succeeding geological formations. The marbles, of various character and colour, arranged in connection with their geological horizons and in polished slabs showing their adaptation to economic and ornamental use, the fertilizers, gypsum, marls and phosphates, the products of your coal mines, the peat, and the mineral oils, &c., the materials for use in ornamentation and jewellery.

The first floor of your museum presents the most compact and complete arrangement I have ever seen, for the illustration of the geological formations in their natural sequence, and of their mineral products. Nothing more could be desired except greater space for their more extensive exhibition.

I have already referred to your collections in palæontology, which are arranged on the second floor in the most complete and systematic manner, exhibiting the geological or chronological order of the successive groups and the biological order in the arrangement of their fossils under each geological division.

Without having critically examined your collection of plants, I can see that it is very carefully and systematically arranged, needing only more space and quarters better adapted to the purpose of a grand herbarium. Your collection of birds, mammals, &c., is likewise both systematically and very neatly arranged, and carefully labelled, making a very fine exhibition of these classes of animals representing the Canadian fauna.

Your ethnological collection is one of great interest and value, and, like all the other collections, is carefully arranged and labelled and very neatly kept. No one in the least interested in these studies can fail to appreciate such a collection, and its interest and importance in connection with the aboriginal history of the country.

In so far as system, neatness and order are concerned, nothing further can be desired. In all these the museum and its collections are worthy the great Empire between the two oceans, which they represent. The first regret which one feels is, that these typical and historic collections are not housed in a fire-proof building, for their loss would be an irreparable calamity to science, and no amount of money expended in new collections could fill the place of these, which have been

made the subjects of original studies, and have entered into the literature of geological science over the entire civilized world. The loss of such a museum would be a serious injury to geological science, not only in Canada, but throughout America and Europe.

With a fire-proof building giving four or five times the space of your present building, you would be prepared to represent the growing collections which your continued and extended researches are bringing into the museum, and for which you have now no adequate space. Such a museum at your capital, representing the natural resources of your enormous country, would not only fully vindicate the wisdom and foresight of your statesmen, in its representation of the economic aspects of your Survey, and the various productions of the country; but it would become a nucleus for the establishment of schools of science and finally a grand university of the Dominion of Canada.

I have also before me opinions of such world renowned scientists as Dr. Schmidt, of St. Petersburg, Russia; Dr. Woodward, British Museum; Baron de Geer; Barrois de Lille; Count Marazzi; Prof Cope, of Philadelphia; and numerous others. I have also an opinion which was given very recently and to which I am satisfied hon. members will listen with some interest. It is dated April 28, 1897, and is from the Curator of the Boston Society of Natural History. It is as follows:—

I have made two visits to this collection, one a somewhat prolonged one of three weeks' duration. I knew by the publications of the Geological Survey that it was extremely valuable and that it contained many unique types, but until I had gone thoroughly through its cases I had no idea of the vast number of published and unpublished specimens that it contained. I am well acquainted especially with the fossil cephalopods, and in this department I consider the Museum of the Geological Survey at Ottawa to have more specimens of the highest importance than any other in this country. It is not so much the quantity of these as it is the quality of those that have been gathered together there. There are a number of collections which would exceed it in the multiplicty of specimens, but there is not one that equals it in value. I have recently had proofs of this, and have learned that, since my last visit to Ottawa, a very large number of specimens of very great value have been added to its collections. The destruction of some of these unique specimens or their injury could never, probably, be made good. As a rule, the first collector in any locality obtains certain specimens that are never duplicated, and this is especially true of the collection I am speaking of; since Richardson and other collectors passed over places where I have followed them with much greater advantages for obtaining specimens, and yet they took away some species which I was unable to find. I sincerely hope that the Government of Canada will realize the great importance to science of the precious collections which the Geological Survey has brought together, and they will earn the thanks of the whole scientific world if they put these into a building which is absolutely fire-proof.

Of this magnificent collection, a portion only can be exhibited in the Geological Museum on account of the lack of accommodation of the building. A very large portion of the collection is now stowed away for want of space, some specimens being in the attic—some in the cellar and some in the backyard. Then the building is an antiquated tumbled-down old structure, which is entirely inadequate for and unsuited to the purpose it is assigned. It is a building which every now and then the Minister of Public Works has had to prop up in order to prevent it from falling. Only two or three years ago the Public Works Department was obliged to put in no less than sixty props, and any one who visits the museum and who happens to go into that section where these props are most numerous can hardly escape the somewhat weird sensation of being in a standing forest of dead timber. But there is a worst feature than even this. Not only is the building antiquated and dilapidated, it is moreover from hour to hour and day to day in danger of destruction by fire. It is built of inflammable material, and is surrounded on all sides by tenement houses and wooden structures, so that if a fire occurred it would be practically impossible to save the museum from destruction. Not only would the building be destroyed, but the grand collection it contains would likewise be destroyed, and as many of the specimens are unique they could not be replaced, and thus an irreparable loss would ensue. This is not a question that has been brought forward lately, for the attention of those in power has frequently been called to it. Fifteen or sixteen years ago the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite, who were then in power, was called to it. The want of space and the danger from fire at the museum were pointed out; and yet nothing was done. I do not desire to make political capital out of the matter or to follow the example which is sometimes furnished us by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House who are too prone to take advantage of any and every opportunity to make political capital, but I can in all fairness and justice say that hon. gentlemen opposite entirely failed to realize their duty in this matter. Although this magnificent collection occupies a building lying within a stone's throw of the Parliament buildings, yet nothing has been done to secure it from imminent peril of total destruction. The hon. gentlemen opposite have voted immense, nay, enormous sums of money for the construction of bridges, canals and railways to help friends and supporters, and yet nothing was done to ensure the existence of this most valuable collection and prevent the ever imminent danger of its total destruction by fire. Different learned associations, mining associations, mining publications, municipal councils, and the press generally, have drawn the attention of previous Governments to this matter, and the Royal Society of Canada only a short time ago presented a memorial, which I think hon.

members will be interested in having read. In 1894 the Royal Society memoralized the Government of Canada as follows :—

Among the matters of importance upon which the Royal Society of Canada has ventured to memorialize the Government, and to which it has devoted attention almost from the date of its organization, is that of the provision of a suitable building for a national museum. While other recommendations of the society have been acted upon and have already produced evidences of their utility, the circumstances have been such that the Government has not yet seen its way to complying with this particular suggestion. The want is now, however, more pressing than ever, and the council, therefore, take advantage of this occasion again to urge in the strongest possible manner the almost absolute necessity of taking some immediate step in this direction.

What is immediately and urgently required is a fire-proof building suitable for the proper exhibition and preservation of the collections of the Geological Survey, with contiguous offices. These collections at present constitute the national museum in so far as geology, mineralogy, natural history and ethnology are concerned, but it is to be presumed that other collections relating to different lines of the industrial and artistic work of the Dominion would eventually be included in a general museum, and provision for their addition should be a part of the plan.

The collections of the Geological Survey represent in a concrete form and in a manner which could not be duplicated, the work done in Canadian geology and allied branches during more than fifty years. They are still growing and at an increasing ratio in correspondence with the rapidly developing mineral industries of the country, but even at the present moment their proper display would necessitate nearly twice the floor and wall space afforded by the antiquated and unsafe building in which they are yet housed. The fact that over 26,000 persons visited the collections during the past year, imperfectly exposed as they are at present, shows how great an educational effect might be produced by means of a properly appointed national museum. This effect would not be merely a local one, for Ottawa is visited not only by large numbers of persons from all the provinces of Canada, but also by an increasing number of travellers from all parts of the world.

To the public at large a well-equipped museum in which the natural resources and products generally of the country find orderly and sufficient expression, constitutes the best method of disseminating information on such subjects. It constitutes, if it may be so expressed with propriety, the best possible advertisement.

This memorial which is somewhat lengthy, was followed by a resolution that certain gentlemen be a deputation to wait upon the Government and to urge that it should take immediate steps to afford proper accommodation for the exhibition of this magnificent collection, and that it should put up a building that would be absolutely fire-proof. Now that I have directed attention to this important matter, I trust that the present Government will promptly realize its duty and see the necessity which exists for prompt and energetic action. I trust that the gentlemen now in power will not imitate the masterly inactivity of their predecessors in office, in connection with this subject. I hope that we shall soon see erected in the city of Ottawa, a national museum which shall be a credit to the country and worthy the collection which awaits it. We shall then have a splendid museum of national history, including the geological and mineralogical cabinets which already exist, including also a chemical laboratory, and a library to contain all the works and documents connected with the Geological Museum since its inception, and also the records and transactions of the learned bodies of the old world and the new. This new museum at the capital of the Dominion will stand as a perpetual reminder of the enlightened, progressive and truly patriotic policy inaugurated by the Liberal party on the 23rd of June, 1896. I beg, therefore, to move the resolution, seconded by Mr. Lount.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Government will not consider that the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt), in presenting this question to the House, is speaking merely for the effect he may produce upon his constituents in the city of Ottawa. I trust that the Government will not consider that the hon. gentleman is speaking merely for political effect, but that it will take into consideration the arguments presented by that hon. gentleman, and will have a full appreciation of the importance of the question that has been presented by him to this House. The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) very truly says, that the collection in the Geological Museum in this city is one of great completeness and great importance. I venture to say, Sir, that there is not a more complete geological museum upon the continent ; it is one which reflects credit upon the Geological Department and upon the Government of Canada. I remember some years ago, taking an active part in securing the removal of that museum from Montreal to the capital of the country, and one of the reasons urged for that removal was, that the collection was so creditable to Canada that it should be centered in the capital of the Dominion. The intention at that time, and in fact the practical promise of the Government was, that the museum should be accommodated in this city, amid surroundings that were in keeping with its value. As it is now, it is in an inconvenient part of the city ; it is in a building not adapted to the purpose, and so we fail to realize how great, and how complete, and how valuable this collection is. Should this collection be unhappily destroyed by fire, we would then awaken to the seriousness of the loss which we had sustained. I do not desire to say much upon this question, further than to urge that the arguments presented by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Belcourt) may receive the consideration of the Government ; may receive that consideration which their force warrants the Government in bestowing upon them. I trust that the Government may realize that hardly any duty of more im-

Dominion of Canada. That valuable collection should certainly be moved from its present location. The building is inadequate, it is unsafe, it is badly located, and the country should spend a little money in having proper quarters provided. The loss of this collection would be an irreparable one, and we should take immediate steps to guard against such a calamity.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). There is no objection whatever to bring down the papers which are asked for in this motion. On the contrary, the Government quite realizes that it is advisable that the country at large should be made aware of the numerous representations which have been made from time to time, in days past, and at the present day as well, as to the necessity for having a suitable location for the valuable collection comprised in our Geological Museum. The Government is fully aware of the fact which was brought to their notice by my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), that when the collection was removed from Montreal to Ottawa, it was thought that a suitable place would be then provided for it. The present Government has under its serious consideration now, the question of seeing what can be done in that respect. That something should be done, will go without saying. We cannot be otherwise than alive to the fact, that under existing circumstances, the valuable collection of the Geological Museum which has cost a great deal of labour and money, could be at any moment burned to ashes. There is no protection whatever for it now. If the Government thinks it advisable at some time or other, to ask Parliament for an appropriation to have a suitable building erected, I suppose it can rely upon the concurrence of all parties in this House.

Motion agreed to.

NEWFOUNDLAND AND CANADA.

Mr. MARTIN moved for :

Copies of all correspondence, &c., not already brought down, between the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland, in reference to the admission of Newfoundland into the union of Canada ; also, copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and that of Newfoundland in reference to the establishment of freer trade relations between Newfoundland and Canada.

He said : Before the motion is put, I desire to say a few words on this question, which is one of great importance to Canada. Not many years ago some negotiations were on foot for the admission of Newfoundland into the confederation. It is not necessary that I should detail those negotiations, because hon. members are well aware of the reasons why they failed of their object. We also remember that previous to confederation, at the conference at Quebec in 1864, Newfoundland was represented ; and at the time of the union of the original four provinces, Newfoundland did not think proper to join the confederation. Neither did the province of Prince Edward Island at that time, and substantially for the same reasons. Newfoundland saw that large expenditures were likely to be made by Canada for the extension of its railway and canal system, in which Newfoundland would not benefit directly, like other parts of the Dominion, and on that account it did not consider the general terms offered for its entrance to confederation satisfactory ; and the same reasons held so far as Prince Edward Island was concerned. Since 1867 large additions have been made to the area of the Dominion of Canada by the admission of Prince Edward Island, British Columbia, Manitoba and the North-west Territories. All these additions have been accomplished by the great Liberal-Conservative party, perhaps as a matter of incident. And now the Liberal party have an opportunity of sharing in the glory of adding a great many more square miles to the area of this great Dominion, and it is to be hoped that they will be equal to the occasion. At present the Dominion has on its hands a troublesome question in regard to the seal fisheries of the west, arising from the fact that Alaska, which should have been a part of Canada, is now a part of the United States of America. If there is anything which I think the members of this House and the people of Canada regret, it is that the Liberal-Conservative party did not forestall the United States by taking measures to have Alaska become a part of the Dominion of Canada. If that had been done, we would not to-day have this troublesome seal fishery question on the west ; and I think it behooves the Dominion and Great Britain to see that while they have a fishery trouble on the west, they do not have another fishery trouble on the east. We know that Newfoundland is anxious to-day to secure better trade relations with the United States, and if it succeeds in accomplishing that object, the United States may secure in Newfoundland a footing and privileges which will greatly embarrass Canada. In view of that circumstance, I think the great importance of this question can not be overlooked by this Parliament. A troublesome fishery question on the east and an equally troublesome fishery question on the west may involve not only Canada but Great Britain in very serious difficulties ; and therefore I think this question demands very serious consideration at the hands of this Parliament. Not many years ago we had Newfoundland seeking a treaty with the United States, which hon. members will remember very well as the Bond-Blaine Treaty. The carrying out of that treaty was very nearly getting Canada into trouble, and Canada may have some more trouble of the same kind, as I understand that Newfoundland is now again seeking better trade relations with the United States, and Canada's interests may conflict with those of

Newfoundland. We have in Newfoundland the nearest British colony to Canada, and for that reason we should treat that province friendly and well. I do not by any means say that Canada has not always treated Newfoundland well, but I say that we should extend to her still more friendly relations. In the preferential clauses of the present tariff, I am sorry that a little more consideration has not been given to the interests of Newfoundland. Besides being near to us, Newfoundland is a province from which we import very largely and to which we export very largely to-day; but I am afraid that these preferential or differential duties in the present tariff are not favourable to her. I would not be astonished if under that tariff, Belgium, Germany, France and other European counties should have more friendly terms extended to them without giving Canada any favours in return than the colony of Newfoundland. I do not think that should be so. Newfoundland being the nearest colony to Canada, and being a good customer of Canada, its fish now coming into Canada free, we should go a step further. I do not think that Canada would lose a great deal if we admitted the products of Newfoundland free altogether. If you will look, Sir, over the Trade and Navigation Returns, you will find that the duty collected from Newfoundland is not more than a couple of thousand dollars a year; and hence I think it would be a generous move, a move in the right direction, and a move that would bind Newfoundland's interests with ours, if we opened the ports of Canada free to the products of that country. I have a few figures which I will read to the House regarding the trade of Newfoundland with the Dominion, and vice versa, as well as the trade of Newfoundland with the rest of the world.

The imports of Canada from Newfoundland in the year ending 30th June, 1896, were as follows:—

Dutiable goods	$ 3,536
Free goods	547,876
Total	$551,412
Duty collected	$1,197.81

The principal items of these imports were the following:—

	Value.
*Scrap iron	$ 835
**Firearms	280
Whalebone	200
Fish—	
Cod, haddock, pollock, fresh	92
do do dry or salted	364,988
do do not salted	575
Herring, fresh	13,068
do pickled	43,532
Salmon, fresh	25,164
do pickled	31,900
Fish oil	22,220
	$502,855

*Duty $343.00. **Free.

Thus, our total imports from Newfoundland amounted to $551,412, over $500,000 of which consisted of fish and fish oil.

Now, turning to the exports, I find that in the year ending 30th June, 1896, Canada exported to Newfoundland as follows:—

	Produce of Canada.	Not the Produce of Canada.
Ontario	$ 106,318	$ 371
Quebec	606,109	202,352
Nova Scotia	580,109	119,752
New Brunswick	10,084	.....
Prince Edward Island	156,311	39
	$1,459,765	$322,544

making a total export of $1,782,309. That, I think, is a trade well worthy the attention of the people of Canada. Let me, Mr. Speaker, draw the attention of the House to the export trade which Canada does with some other countries. Canada exported as follows in the year ending 30th June, 1896:—

——	Produce of Canada.	Not the Produce of Canada.	Total.
	$	$	$
Great Britain	62,717,941	3,971,312	66,689,253
Australia	515,697	1,561	517,258
British West Indies	1,627,388	33,412	1,660,800
France	573,835	7,705	581,541
Germany	606,919	150,612	757,531
United States	34,460,428	1,960,740	36,421,168
Spanish West Indies	980,589	10,826	989,415
Argentine Republic	431,097	.....	431,097

From this list you will see that Newfoundland is the fourth best customer that Canada has. First comes Great Britain, then the United States, third the West Indies, and fourth Newfoundland, and she is a good fourth, because she buys from us very nearly as much as do the West Indies. I might point out the various sources in Canada which furnish these exports and the amount from each:

The Mines	$183,080
Fisheries	4,013
Forest	28,557
Animals	233,866
Agriculture	484,500
Manufactures	524,869
Miscellaneous	580

That shows clearly that Newfoundland is a country our trade with which it is very desirable to encourage, and I think there is no doubt our Parliament can take steps in this direction. These exports are further classified as follows:—

Article.		Quantity.	Value.
			$
Coal	Tons.	79,937	180,385
Salt	Galls.	57,749	11,849
Dry codfish	Cwt.	893	2,795
Smoked herring	Lbs.	9,100	172
Oysters, fresh	Brls.	381	852
Deals, spruce, &c.		160	3,700
Plank and boards	M.	454	5,082
Scantling	"	1,659	8,466
Shingles	"	1,417	2,703
Shooks, box	No.	67,584	2,216
Horses, over 1 year	"	92	6,103
Cattle, over 1 year	"	1,990	58,810
Sheep	"	2,806	10,178
Butter	Lbs.	619,023	105,510
Cheese	"	90,059	7,509
Eggs	Doz.	18,818	2,496
Bacon	Lbs.	13,141	1,262
Beef	"	174,215	11,272
Hams	"	51,421	4,527
Mutton		49,877	2,555
Pork		187,466	10,755
Poultry and game			6,782
Bran	Cwt.	6,441	6,342
Apples, dried	Lbs.	6,213	445
do ripe	Brls.	5,959	20,902
Oats	Bush.	179,433	62,173
Pease	"	14,090	12,112
Flour	Brls.	88,430	336,759
Oatmeal	"	2,418	7,916
Hay	Tons.	926	10,237
Malt	Bush.	6,235	5,196
Potatoes	"	39,948	9,108
Vegetables			4,747
Books			3,163
Biscuits and bread	Cwt.	3,415	14,919
Brick	M.	392	2,618
Carriages and vehicles	No.	49	2,512
Clothing, wearing apparel			16,882
Cordage			13,960
Cottons			15,790
Drugs			15,439
Explosives	Lbs.	33,175	3,861
Felt			4,285
Glass			2,357
Household effects			6,499
India-rubber			10,985
Iron—Castings, pig iron and steel			27,717
Iron, manufactures of			17,755
Leather, sole and upper			189,759
Boots and shoes			50,140
Strips	3 No.	Tons 181	5,900
Soap	Lbs.	194,498	7,566
Tin manufactures			2,924
Tobacco	Lbs.	74,822	15,906
Wood and manufactures of			27,631
Woollen manufactures			18,120
Manufactures of other articles			31,594

From this list hon. members will see that the trade of Newfoundland is well worth the attention of this country. Its imports vary a great deal from year to year, and in the year which I have just quoted, 1896, the figures are not by any means the largest. In 1891 the exports of Newfoundland were $7,437,128, while the exports were $6,869,458. To show how the trade varies I will quote the figures for 1894, which were as follows:—Exports, $5,811,169; imports, $7,164,738. Now, while the exports are largely to foreign countries, Newfoundland confines her purchases principally to Great Britain and Canada, influenced, I suppose, by patriotism and the attachment of the colony to British institutions. I have not the figures for a late year, but I will give some of the statistics of the trade of Newfoundland for 1891, showing the exports to and imports from various countries:

	N'fl'd Exp'd to.	N'fl'd Imp'd from.
Portugal	$1,051,830	$ 37,000
Germany	23,429	Nil.
Spain	718,047	194,708

I might continue those statistics as they refer to other countries but I will only summarize the effect of these figures, which is that of the total imports of Newfoundland, more than one-half is from Great Britain and Canada, while Great Britain and Canada do not take one-third of the exports of Newfoundland. The statistical tables for 1894 show the trend of the trade of Newfoundland to be in the same direction—Newfoundland selling largely to foreign countries, while buying mainly from Great Britain and Canada. The facts and figures I have quoted will give the House a pretty fair idea of the trade of this country with Newfoundland. It is a trade worthy of the attention of this House.

There is no British province, I suppose, that has had a more checkered history than Newfoundland. Its allegiance to the Crown and to British institutions under many unfavourable circumstances is worthy of our admiration. Over 300 years ago the importance of the Newfoundland fisheries was known to Great Britain: and Britain's increasing navy, recruited from the hardy toilers of the sea yearly, and returned with crafts laden with fish. I suppose hon. members are aware that early treaties made by Engand bore heavily upon the interests and industries of Newfoundland. One of these has given rise to what is known as the French shore difficulty, which has severely tested the allegiance of Newfoundland to Great Britain. But through all the strife on that question, the people of Newfoundland have shown great patience. They have been met in France by a system of bounties which bore very heavily upon their exports. And this is true not only of France, but of other European countries. We have to-day, if my memory serves me right, trouble in that respect in the case of Portugal, that country having placed differential duties on fish coming from Newfoundland as against Denmark.

It has been said—I have heard it said myself—that before we should admit Newfoundland into the Canadian confedera-

ation, it would be well to have these questions settled. But I do not think that would be a very magnanimous stand for Canada to take. I think that Canada should extend a helping hand to Newfoundland to settle these questions which hinder her progress, as I have shown.

With the consent of the House, I will read a few extracts from the excellent history of Judge Prowse, which bear out some of the statements I have made in regard to that ancient colony:

Both from an imperial and colonial point, the union of the British North American colonies is a consummation devoutly to be wished; it is all a question of terms. There are, however, some objections to union. Since the death of the great Sir John A. Macdonald, there is no statesman in Canada strong enough to guarantee us such terms as we would accept.

This was written a few years ago.

The Dominion is a fish producer and not a fish consumer; our business relations and our future markets lie with the United States; the customers and consumers of our inexhaustible fisheries are the 63,000,000 Americans. Canada's latest move on the Blaine-Bond convention has alienated the feeling of many Newfoundlanders who were formerly confederates.

On page 541, Mr. Prowse writes as follows:—

On the 27th of February, a message had been sent by Sir T. N. O'Brien to the Governor General of Canada on the question of re-opening negotiations for union between the two colonies; a favourable reply having been received, the delegates were appointed on the 17th of March; and on the 4th of April, Honourables R. Bond, E. P. Morris. Geo, H. Emerson and W. H. Horwood, the representatives of Newfoundland, met the Dominion delegates in conference at Ottawa. After many protracted sessions negotiations were finally broken off, the Dominion Government refused to accede to the only honourable terms which the Newfoundland delegates could venture to propose for the acceptance of the colony. The main difficulty was the refusal of Canada to take over the whole debt of the colony.

At this page Judge Prowse has a note at the bottom, regarding a speech delivered by Sir Charles Tupper, which I think, with the permission of the House, I will read

Regarding the admission of Newfoundland as a member of confederation, Sir Charles said he had always attached great importance, and had told Sir John Macdonald when the question first came up, that the rounding off of the confederation by its entrance, was an all-important one. He did not for a moment wish that the island should be brought into confederation unless it be accomplished on terms that would substantially benefit the people of Newfoundland. He believed that union would contribute to the happiness and well-being of that people. He had no desire to see them enter the confederation except with their hearty concurrence, and he deeply regretted the collapse of the recent negotiations. He was vain enough to think that if he had been consulted earlier in those ngotiations, the result would have been different. The stumbling block in the recent negotiations was the financial question—the refusal of the Imperial Government to contribute $5,000,000 towards the colony's indebtedness. Lord Ripon consulted him (Sir Charles), but it was a case of locking the stable door after the horse has been stolen. Lord Ripon pointed out that it was utterly impossible for the Home Government to give the desired aid to Newfoundland because it would create a dangerous precedent, and similar aid could not be given to other colonies in similar financial difficulties. But Sir Charles pointed out to Lord Ripon the peculiar circumstances which surrounded this case, inasmuch as under the old French treaty, Newfoundland had suffered most severely, and that about 600 miles of its coast line was practically in the possession of a foreign power. He also pointed out the difficulty of making France believe that a little island of 200,000 people could override the wish of the Imperial Government. The matter would be entirely different, however, were Newfoundland a portion of half a continent with five millions of a population, and were Newfoundland a portion of the great confederation, the question could be settled without much inconvenience. Equally strong reasons for Imperial assistance could not be given by any other colony.

I find also a paragraph here which may be of some interest to the House, and which I will read:

The consolidation of British North America is an Imperial as well as a colonial question; it was unfortunate that at this particular juncture of affairs both Canada and Newfoundland had to deal with a moribund Liberal Government in England. Had the present enlightened chief of the Colonial Office been at the head of affairs with his large views of Imperial confederation, Mr. Chamberlain would not have allowed such a favourable opportunity to unite British North America to elude his grasp. All the elder statesmen of Canada have repeatedly declared that the Atlantic terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway should be in Newfoundland. In these negotiations the railway across our island should have been considered as part of the great Imperial highway, a Dominion, not a local road. After the Trent affair, the Intercolonial Railway was built through Canadian territory entirely for strategetic and Imperial purposes. The Canadian Pacific Railway is used for Imperial purposes to transport the Imperial forces over English territory to the Pacific. By the completion of the Newfoundland route, English naval and military forces could be landed at Montreal under five days from Plymouth. By fast transports like the "Campania" or "Teutonic," they could be placed on English territory in America in three and one-half days' steaming from Plymouth. Warlike operations in modern days are swift and sudden, and the advantages to England and to Canada of possessing the quickest route across the Atlantic and through their own territory are simply incalculable in case of war. In the two last conflicts between England and America, Newfoundland was the headquarters of the North American squadron. As many as thirty-two British men-of-war were at one time in St. Johns harbour. With abundant coal supply, splendid harbours on her east coast, an English naval force operating from St. Johns or Trepassy, commands within easy range not only the Gulf of St. Lawrence but of the whole trade of

the Atlantic. St. Johns and Cape Race are the most important strategetic points in North America. Newfoundland is the advanced outpost, the guardian and sentinel of Canada. This was Sir John Macdonald's strongly expressed opinion, every naval expert will endorse the view. Our country will be a great outlet for Canadian trade, but to connect the two countries, to make commerce flourish, to promote traffic between the Dominion and Newfoundland, to unite them in real union, the railway to Port-aux-Basque, and the steam ferry across the gulf, are absolutely essential. The connection between the two countries cannot be made either complete or profitable without those new lines of communication.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, that these lines are about to be established, and when that is done I hope that one of the obstacles against the union will disappear. It will be noticed that one of the obstacles that was pointed out in coming to a conclusion in regard to a union with Canada, was that Newfoundland did not find a sufficient outlet in Canada for her exports, though Newfoundland bought largely from the Dominion. I think anything that can be done to-day by this great Dominion in order to remedy that state of affairs, will be a step in the right direction. The great provinces of the west send down to the maritime provinces, out of the wealth of their soil, their coarse grains, their wheat, and their flour; but the maritime provinces and Newfoundland have nothing to give in return except money. Newfoundland, in considering this question of confederation, remembers that the United States is a larger purchaser of her goods than we are. Now, the question for us, I think, is how to remove those barriers to trade. Large expenditures have been made by the Dominion on railways and canals by which to send the produce of the great west down to the east and across the Atlantic; but nothing has been yet done, so far as I know, to bring the produce of the east, consisting principally of fish, back into the west.

It appears to me that if the obstacles were removed, and if facilities were given for the transmission of the products of Newfoundland and the maritime provinces into the heart of this great country—and one way of accomplishing that is by providing cold storage on trains from the east—a valuable trade could be established. I do not think, considering the great importance of doing something that would induce the people of Newfoundland to look with a more friendly eye on Canada, it would be an excessive expenditure to make, so that by means of cold storage on cars going from the east the ocean wealth of the maritime provinces and Newfoundland could be transmitted into the western portion of this Dominion. I have here a statement which goes to show that this Dominion depends to a very large extent on the republic to the south for its supply of fresh fish. This state of affairs, in view of the fact that Canada possesses the most valuable fisheries of the world with which those of the United States cannot compare, is not creditable to this Dominion. The Americans come into our waters, take our fish, return to their own country, and re-ship them to the people of Canada. This, I say, is not creditable to the enterprise of Canadians, or to this Parliament, which should seek to adopt means whereby our fish would be transported to the people of the west. If this step were taken, not only would the maritime provinces be placed in a better position, but an inducement would be offered to Newfoundland to throw in its lot with the Dominion. There is another step that might be taken in connection with this. We are aware that the great agricultural products of Canada have been protected, and in doing so the late Government acted in the interests of the farmers of this country. There has been no legislation within the last five or six years that has done more to benefit the farmers of the Dominion than the protection extended them in the form of increased duties on agricultural products imported into this Dominion. But while protection has been given to the farmer, little protection has been extended to the fisherman. There may be some good reason for this, it may be possible to offer some good explanation; but I am not discussing the reason at the present time. While there is a protective duty of 2 cents per pound on pork, and I think that duty very beneficial to the farmers of all sections of Canada, the duty on mackerel is only 1 cent per pound. The existing duties on fish are as follows:—

Mackerel, one cent per pound.
Herrings, pickled or salted, one-half cent per pound.
Salmon, fresh, n.e.s., one-half cent per pound.
Salmon, pickled or salted, 1 cent per pound.
All other fish, pickled or salted, in barrels, one cent per pound.
Foreign caught fish, imported otherwise than in barrels, whether fresh, dried, salted or pickled, n.e.s., fifty cents per hundred pounds.
Fish, smoked and boneless, one cent per pound.

I do not know whether any measures could be taken to protect the Canadian market for the Canadian fishermen. I am only stating these facts, and leaving them for the consideration of hon. members. The item of imports of fish from the United States, amounting to the value of $386,942 in 1896, is a very large one, in view of the fact that Canada possesses the most valuable fisheries in the world, and has not only the fisheries, but the men and the enterprise to develop them. The following is a statement of the imports of fish into Canada from the United States for the year ending June 30th, 1896:—

STATEMENT of Imports of Fish into Canada from the United States for year ended 30th June, 1896.

Kinds of Fish.		Year.	Quantity.	Value.	Duty.
				$	$ cts.
Fish—					
Cod, haddock, ling and pollock, fresh, not in brls..	lbs.	1896	868,290	21,784	4,341 92
		1894	337,877	35,526	6,689 48
do do salted.....	"	1896	20,968	826	104 84
		1894	46,315	2,120	222 04
do do smoked.....	"	1896	299,133	14,032	2,991 33
		1894	320,607	15,402	3,206 12
Halibut, fresh.....	"	1896	34,140	2,220	171 05
		1894	36,610	3,551	198 06
Herring, fresh.....	"	1896	3,545	188	17 78
		1894	5,421	236	27 12
do pickled.....	"	1896	39,794	1,870	199 07
		1894	22,813	1,043	114 13
Sea fish, preserved.....	"	1896	14,373	1,297	324 25
		1894	16,796	1,506	376 50
do other, fresh.....	"	1896	362,001	13,560	1,820 44
		1894	192,378	7,869	962 34
Mackerel, fresh.....		1896	5,737	637	57 37
		1894	9,107	857	91 07
do pickled.....		1896	48,641	3,046	486 41
		1894	20,129	1,660	201 29
Oysters, fresh, in shell.....	brls.	1896	1,039	5,299	1,326 75
		1894	1,689	9,281	2,320 29
do shelled, in bulk.....	galls.	1896	163,103	171,054	16,311 31
		1894	204,701	205,164	20,470 25
do canned, not over 1 pint.....	cans.	1896	58,974	5,314	1,769 16
		1894	68,511	6,575	2,055 33
do do over 1 pint.....	"	1896	29,786	7,502	1,035 30
		1894	22,183	7,260	1,109 15
do prepared, N.E.S.....	lbs.	1896	134,475	10,687	2,670 84
		1894	98,910	8,401	2,099 64
Lobsters, fresh.....	brls.	1896	321	3,171	792 75
		1894	576	7,897	1,583 00
do canned.....	lbs.	1896	4,185	479	119 75
		1894	983	139	34 75
Bait fish, salted.....	"	1896	12,100	280	121 00
		1894	54,798	1,384	547 98
Salmon, fresh.....	"	1896	4,121	260	20 63
		1894	498	55	2 50
do canned.....	"	1896	1,374	167	41 65
		1894	1,916	205	51 25
Smoked.....	"	1896	44,399	2,662	443 99
		1894	1,224	122	12 24
Anchovies.....		1896	.....	4,000	.....
Not elsewhere specified.....		1896	.....	4,267	.....
Oils.....		1896	.....	19,345	.....

Total imports, 1894 (small amounts not included)..... $ 444,492
do 1896 do do 386,942

Men employed in the fishing industry in Canada, 1896:—Total fishermen, 70,719; vessels, 9,525. Fisheries of the Great Lakes, 75 tugs and schooners, 1,187 boats, 4,155 men, value of fish caught, $1,660,000.

Now, Sir, those figures show that this is trade in the wrong direction. No such large items should be found in our Trade and Navigation Returns for fish imported from a country which has not fishing grounds as wealthy, as extensive, and as fruitful as those of this great Dominion. I know that the feeling btween Newfoundland and Canada is good, but I think that it could be improved: and in view of the small amount of duty we collect on Newfoundland imports, I do not think it would be asking too much, if all Newfoundland products brought into Canada were placed on the free list. It would only involve a loss of a couple of thousand dollars a year to our revenue, and it would tend greatly to establish a still more cordial feeling between Newfoundland and Canada. I believe also that if cold storage could be provided on railway cars, so as to allow fresh fish to be brought into the interior of our country, Newfoundland would find in Canada a market for her fish which might in a few years be as profitable as that which she now finds in the country to the south of us. It is well

worth the while of Canada trying to-day, to see if she cannot win Newfoundland back. If Newfoundland makes a treaty with the United States, we may possibly see the ancient colony drifting further away from us. I trust that some measures will be taken to show that Canada is disposed to do everything that lies in her power to bind Newfoundland in closer union with us, both in commercial and in political respects. I move this motion, seconded by Mr. Macdonald (P.E.I.)

Motion agreed to.

BELLE RIVER BREAKWATER, P.E.I.

Mr. MARTIN moved for :

Copies of all correspondence, telegrams, engineers' reports, &c., relating to the extension of the breakwater at Belle River, in Prince Edward Island.

He said : Mr. Speaker, my remarks on this question will be very brief, and I think I will be able to conclude before 6 o'clock. Last year I brought this to the attention of the House and of the Government. I was told then by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies), that engineers would be sent down and that he hoped some progress would be made. I think the Minister should take energetic action, considering the peculiar position of Prince Edward Island, which is such that the products of the island have to be shipped away in the short space of a month or two, and consequently they want good shipping accommodation. There is no other part of Canada that is so situated as Prince Edward Island in this respect. The shipping season extends principally for only one or two months in the spring and fall, and if the shipping is not attended to then it entails a heavy loss on the producer. When December comes, if the products of the island are not shipped, they have to remain there all winter. It is necessary, therefore, that shipping accommodation should be of the amplest kind, in order that the farmers may be enabled to send their products to the market. This work that I ask for would not involve a very large expenditure, and I trust that it will not be delayed this year again. I hope to have the favourable consideration of the Government. It being now 6 o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I shall conclude.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all correspondence, plans and reports of engineers having reference to making North Harbour, Aspy Bay, Victoria County, N.S., a harbour of refuge.—(Mr. Bethune.)

Return of the non-commissioned officers and men enrolled in the active militia of Canada at the close of last year, distinguishing between permanent corps and others, under the following heads :—

1. Number undergoing a first period of engagement.
2. Number re-enlisted once.
3. Number re-enlisted twice.
4. Number who have not attended annual training.
5. Number who have never attended more than one annual training.
6. Number who have attended only two annual trainings.
7. Number of those who have attended only three annual trainings.
8. Number of those who have attended more than three annual trainings.—(Sir Adolphe Caron.)

Copies of all papers, documents, testimony, reports, correspondence, &c., in connection with the investigation held into the conduct of one Eugene Blanchet about the year 1879 and with the dismissal of the said Eugene Blanchet.—(Mr. Casgrain.)

Copies of all papers and documents connected with the dismissal of Mr. John L. Smith as fishery overseer for the district of New Carlisle, extending from Grand Cascapedia River to Paspebiac East ; also any recommendations made to any member of the Government by letter or otherwise for his dismissal and the recommendation in favour of his successor.—(Sir Adolphe Caron.)

Copies of all depositions, affidavits, sworn declarations, statutory declarations, reports, documents, letters, correspondence, papers, Orders in Council, &c., in relation to the suspension or dismissal of one Castonguay, late station-master or agent on the Intercolonial Railway at St. Charles, county of Bellechasse, in the latter part of the year 1896 or the beginning of the year 1897, to his reinstatement and to his final dismissal from the service.—(Mr. Casgrain.)

Copies of all depositions, declarations, reports, Orders in Council, correspondence, &c., concerning the dismissal of M. P. Laberge, late deputy postmaster at the city of Quebec.—(Mr. Casgrain.)

Copies of all Orders in Council, letters correspondence and documents whatsoever in relation to the proposed arrangement between the Government and the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and any other railway company respecting the extension of the Intercolonial Railway, as announced from the Speech from the Throne.—(Mr. Boisvert.)

Copies of all documents, reports, affidavits, declarations, papers and correspondence in relation to the dismissal of F. X. Smith, late lighthouse keeper at Cape Gaspé.—(Mr. Casgrain.)

Return showing the different mail routes and mail contracts now existing between the town of Annapolis Royal and the town of Liverpool, in the counties of Annapolis and Queen's respectively. The name of each contractor and his bondsmen. The length of each route. The contract price, and whether daily, semi-weekly or tri-weekly.—(Mr. Mills.)

Copies of the report made by Mr. Gourdeau, Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, on the conference held last November between the steamship companies and shippers of cattle and horses.—(Mr. Wallace, for Mr. Maclean.)

Copies of all papers, reports and correspondence respecting the illegal fishing by foreigners in the waters of British Columbia ; and also, all papers, reports and correspondence respecting smuggling on the coast of British Columbia.—(Mr. Prior.)

Reports or correspondence, not already brought down, and the reasons for the dismissal of Roderick McLeod and Robert McKay, bridge-tenders on the Intercolonial Railway bridge, Pictou, Nova Scotia, and the appointment of Thomas Fraser and A. Thomas in their place and stead. —(Mr. Bell, for Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.)

Return showing—under the announced change of organization at the Royal Military College of Canada—

1. A detail of the intended superior and subordinate staffs, their respective emoluments and the conditions of their engagements, inclusive of periods of service and duties to be performed by them respectively.

2. The intended number of classes of cadets in attendance at one time.

3. The allotment and distribution of time to class instruction, drills, military and athletic exercises, meals, recreation, &c., specifying subjects and the professors and instructors respectively employed in the several subjects in each class.

4. The amount of deposit to be made by cadets to meet personal charges for a period of three years respectively under the recognized system and the system hitherto in force.

5. The surplus revenue derived from fees from each cadet, after deduction of messing charges respectively under the reorganized system and the system hitherto in force.

6. A detail of items in the reorganized system and in that hitherto in force in the cases involving either increase or reduction, and the amounts of these differences.

7. The number of eligible applications made prior to the announcement of the reorganization to compete for entrance into the Royal Military College next September.—(Mr. Tyrwhitt.)

Copies of tenders opened the 16th day of March, 1897, for work on section 12 of the Soulanges Canal, showing the prices of different tenderers for each item and the approximate quantities upon which the tenders were extended, also the lump sum of each tender.—(Mr. Clancy.)

Copies of tenders opened the 20th day of March, for works on the Grenville Canal enlargement, showing the prices of different tenderers for each item and the approximate quantities upon which the tenders were extended, also the lump sum of each tender.—(Mr. Clancy.)

Copies of tenders opened the 16th day of March, 1897, for works on sections 4, 5, 6 and 7 of the Soulanges Canal, showing the prices of different tenderers for each item and the approximate quantities upon which the tenders were extended, also the lump sum of each tender.—(Mr. Clancy).

Return showing the names and offices or employment of all persons superannuated, dismissed, superceded in the service of the Canadian Government under the present Administration, giving the reason for superannuation, dismissal, supercession in each case, and the name and age of the officer or employee appointed to the vacancy in each case, and showing whether any inquiry or formal investigation took place in each case and the nature of it, and whether the party affected was given an opportunity of being heard before dismissal or supercession.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)

Copies of all correspondence since the 20th July last between the Department of Marine and Fisheries at Ottawa and the officers thereof or others respecting supplies and repairs of vessels and steamers under the control of that department which are in the habit of visiting the ports of Charlottetown, Georgetown and Pictou, or which are employed either in the protection of the coast fisheries or in the supervision and maintenance of lights, or in the winter service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland.—(Mr. Bell, for Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.)

Return showing a comparative schedule of prices paid in connection with the military camp at Aldershot, King's county, Nova Scotia, for the seasons of 1895 and 1896 respectively; also, all papers, correspondence and instructions respecting the securing of supplies for the said camp in 1897.—(Mr. Bell, for Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.)

Copy of the investigation held in connection with the Postmaster's office in Valleyfield, by Mr. Wilfred Mercier.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

Copies of all papers and correspondence relating in any way to the appointment of John Cameron to the office of Savings Bank agent at New Glasgow, and to his dismissal from said office.—(Mr. Bell, for Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.)

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

After Recess.

LANGENBURG AND SOUTHERN RAILWAY.

Bill (No. 51) respecting the Langenburg and Southern Railway Company was read the third time.

Mr. BAIN (for Mr. Richardson) moved that the Bill do now pass.

Mr. LISTER. There are some amendments to this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is it proposed to refer the Bill back to the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. LISTER. Yes. The Minister of Railways gave notice of some amendments.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member should have moved to refer the Bill back, on the motion for the third reading. With the unanimous consent of the House, however, the proceedings may stand as if this order had not been called.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Perhaps, with the unanimous consent of the House, the first three Bills, which are in the same position, might stand for the present and be taken up when the Minister of Railways comes in.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). That is a good suggestion.

Mr. SPEAKER. They may be passed over at present, and we will consider going back to them further on.

WINNIPEG, DULUTH AND HUDSON BAY RAILWAY.

Bill (No. 17) to incorporate the Winnipeg, Duluth and Hudson Bay Railway Company was considered in committee and reported.

Mr. MACDONELL (Selkirk) moved that the Bill be now read the third time.

Mr. CRAIG. Should not this Bill stand for amendment in the same way as the other Bills ?

Mr. MACDONELL (Selkirk). No notice has been given of any amendment to this Bill.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The amendment proposed by the Minister of Railways was to be general in its application.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I was under the impression that as to all the Bills which had passed the committee which were without the amendment of which I have given notice, that I gave the necessary notice in order that on the motion for their third reading, the Bills might be re-committed, and that the amendment, if agreeable to the House, might be added.

Mr. MACDONELL (Selkirk). I understand that a clause in the line of the amendment of the hon. Minister of Railways was added in the committee.

Mr. HUGHES. It would be a simple matter for the Minister of Railways to see whether or not that Bill has the amendment or not.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It is in the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the Bill carried ?

Mr. SPEAKER. The third reading is carried. The next stage is that the Bill do now pass.

Mr. FOSTER. You had better simply take the regular stage.

Mr. SPEAKER. The amendment concerning which the question was raised is in the Bill, so there is no one raising a substantial objection, unless the hon. gentleman wishes to raises the point of order as to the third reading.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, it might stand over to another day.

Mr. SPEAKER. Then the third reading will stand over.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Would it be in order, Mr. Speaker, to go back to——

Mr. SPEAKER No. we must go on with the paper as it is.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 83) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Mycenian Marble Company of Canada (Limited).—(Mr. Rosamond.)

(In Committee.)

Bill (No. 68) respecting the American Bank Note Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Bill (No. 19) respecting the Manitoba and South-Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Landerkin.)

Bill (No. 49) respecting the Richelieu and Lake Memphremagog Railway Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Bill (No. 55) to incorporate the Minden and North-western Railway Company.—(Mr. McHugh.)

Bill (No. 58) respecting the Temiscouata Railway Company.—(Mr. Domville.)

Bill (No. 71) respecting the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

Bill (No. 73) to incorporate the Kaslo and Lardo-Duncan Railway.—(Mr. Bostock.)

RESTIGOUCHE AND VICTORIA RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton) moved second reading of Bill (No. 99) respecting the Restigouche and Victoria Railway Company. He said : A charter was obtained some years ago in Nova Scotia and has been renewed from time to time. It carried a subsidy from the local government of $2,500 a mile. The company also had the promise of a subsidy of $3,200 a mile from this House, which was also renewed in 1894. The reason we come here for a charter is because we are going out of the province of New Brunswick into the province of Quebec, and it is very well known that in order to finance a railway successfully, we must have a Dominion charter rather than a local charter. For these reasons, we come to this House and ask for a Dominion charter which will enable us to finish the road in a substantial manner. If the hon. gentlemen who blocked the Bill the other night simply because the letter E was not at the end, wish to discuss the matter, I think their best plan would be to discuss it in committee, where all parties interested, including those who have paid their money without realizing what they expected, can appear before the committee and give explanations. I trust that the Minister of Railways and Canals will see that this Bill goes through this reading and is submitted to the Railway Committee, where hon. gentlemen who are opposing it will have every opportunity of giving their reasons for opposing a road which goes through their own province. It seems to me a very strange thing that hon. gentlemen, who should be surely interested in that section of the country, should be opposed to a Bill of this kind. I will not detain the House any further at present, but after the Bill gets a second reading, if further opposition should be offered to it, I may be called upon to offer some explanation in the shape of some ancient history that may not be perhaps as satisfactory to the hon. gentlemen as they ex-

pect. I therefore leave the matter in the hands of the Minister of Railways and Canals for the present.

Mr. COSTIGAN. My objections to this Bill are not based merely upon technical grounds, but they are of a very much more serious character. I object to the Bill because it had no right to be introduced into this Parliament. I do not know what the hon. gentleman means by stating that if I oppose this Bill, along with some other gentlemen from my province, he will be obliged to make statements not very pleasant for us; I may learn later; but in the meantime I do what I consider to be my duty, and that is to declare that this is the first time that I have ever known a Bill of this kind to be introduced into this Parliament. The history that I can give of the transaction, without going into the difficulties between the two companies, is simply this: That some years ago a company obtained a charter from the province of New Brunswick to build a road from Campbellton in New Brunswick, to a point in Victoria or Madawaska, also in New Brunswick. That company made a contract with certain individuals to construct the road, that contract had the approval of the provincial government at the time that it was entered into, but the contractors, as I understand, failed to carry that contract out. With that I have nothing to do. At the last session of the legislature of New Brunswick, that legislature, exercising its perfect right to legislate upon railways within its own province, granted a new charter, the old charter has since expired. It granted a new charter to another company, or set of men. That charter is in existence. That new company negotiated with contractors to construct the road, and the parties who had the contract from the original company, finding that on account of their failure to carry out their contract the New Brunswick legislature passed another charter, come here and ask this Parliament to step in and override the legislation of New Brunswick. I say this Parliament has nothing to do with that, it should not interfere with the local Bill. That is the ground that I take upon this measure, not because it was not printed in English and French—if it was printed in seven different languages it should not come here at all. Therefore, I oppose this Bill for the reasons that I give, that the New Brunswick legislature has passed a charter, has passed two charters, one overriding the other; and as to whether they did right or wrong in that I will not say. I am not called upon to defend the action of the New Brunswick legislature. The hon. gentleman states that we should pass a charter here because this road goes into Quebec. Well, the road begins at Campbellton, and instead of running into Quebec, it runs for a hundred miles away from Quebec until it reaches the county of Victoria. The whole line is entirely within the province of New Brunswick. There is another Bill to follow later on, providing for the construction of a bridge across the Restigouche River to connect this road later on with the Baie des Chaleurs Railway. But that is another enterprise entirely, and can be dealt with by itself. Now the ground I take is that there is already a charter from the province of New Brunswick for the construction of that road, this Parliament is asked to step in and give a Dominion charter to one set of men which will block the New Brunswick legislature from going on with this work. I do not think this Parliament should entertain that proposal.

Mr. LISTER. Let it go to the committee.

Mr. McALISTER. The explanation given by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) who is promoting this Bill, as one of the reasons for asking for Dominion legislation, was that the road was going down into the province of Quebec. Now, the Bill does not say that the road is extended at all. As has been stated by my hon. friend who has just taken his seat, it starts from a point at or near Campbellton on the Intercolonial Railway, and goes westward to a point on the St. John River at or near Grand Falls. This Bill does not ask to extend the road at all, it merely asks to confirm the old charter, so that it may be declared a work for the general advantage of Canada, and to extend the time for commencing the survey and for the completion of the work. Therefore, that part of the explanation of the hon. member for Hamilton is incorrect; I believe the hon. gentleman has stated what he thinks to be correct, but his information is not correct. But there is one reference that the hon. gentleman made that surprised me very much, and that was that if we continued to oppose this Bill, statements of an unpleasant character to us would be made. I defy the hon. member from Hamilton or any other person to make any statements that will be unpleasant to us so far as this road is concerned. That undertaking all through, from beginning to end, so far as we are concerned, and so far as the parties for whom we are acting are concerned, has been straightforward and above-board, everything has been straight and honourable. As to making statements of an unpleasant character, we can make statements of an unpleasant character to the parties to this Bill. A charter was passed in 1885 by the legislature of New Brunswick, to build a road called the Restigouche and Victoria Railroad. A preliminary survey was made in the fall of the same year the charter was granted. Nothing more was done until 1894, when this was amended extending the work. That fall some 15 miles of road were surveyed. In the fall of 1895 this charter was transferred

to a company with the distinct understanding that they were to commence work at once and build the road. In the winter of 1896, when the Minister of Railways and Canals was the leader of the New Brunswick Government, an application was made for a further amendment, practically to confirm the transfer that had been made, and giving the company power to mortgage the road and power with regard to the issuing of stock. Now we find that the amendment of 1894 provides that:

> In order to entitle the said company to the privileges of their said charter, the necessary surveys of the contemplated line from a point on the Intercolonial Railway, in the parish of Addington, at or near Campbellton, in the county of Restigouche, to a point on the St. John River, in either of the counties of Victoria or Madawaska, should be made within three years, and the construction of the said line commenced within six years from the passing of this Act, and the construction bona fide continued from year to year, so that the whole may be completed within ten years from the passing of this Act.

The whole line must be surveyed and completed within three years. That provision was made on 21st April, 1894; accordingly the three years expired on 21st April, 1897. That charter has therefore lapsed. There is no such company as the Restigouche and Victoria Railway Company in existence now, and to pass the legislation now proposed will not revive the charter. The notice merely asks Parliament to declare that this work is for the general advantage of Canada, and to extend the time for surveys in connection with the work. It is plain that the charter is dead, and the present Bill does not revive it, and therefore it is not competent for the House to extend the time for declaring the work to be one for the general benefit of Canada when the company is no longer in existence. The Act of 1896 does not revive it. The Act of 1896 merely confers certain powers on the company; that is, it merely ratifies the transfer that was made in the fall of 1895, and confers certain powers on the company as to the issuing of stock and mortgaging the road and nothing more. There is nothing said as to the extension of time. In the spring of 1896, the company to whom this charter was transferred began to survey the road. They put on a staff of engineers to carry out the surveys. They completed twenty or twenty-five miles. For the first month they paid all their bills, the total amounting to about $2,700. The bills now remaining unpaid amount to upwards of $4,000 or $5,000 for wages, &c. The labouring men are not paid, parties who furnished supplies are not paid, and also those who boarded the engineers and staff. These bills being unpaid, the result was that the work had to be stopped, and the company fell into disrepute. In February, application was made to the local legislature for a new charter. When the facts were made known a new charter was granted to this new company in March. That company is composed of men belonging to the locality who have an interest in the construction of the road and who intend to go on with the work. They entered into an agreement not long ago with Malcolm & Ross to build the railway. These men are well known to the people of New Brunswick and also to the people of Eastern Quebec, and every person who knows them believes they will carry out any work they undertake. If the legislation now asked for is passed by this Parliament, it will interfere with a bona fide company which will carry out the work successfully. Who are the men composing the company referred to in the present Bill? They are men who live outside the county and province. The notice asks merely that Parliament shall declare this work to be one for the general advantage of Canada, and the Bill sets out the same. It is not, therefore, within the province of this Parliament to pass this Bill. When the facts are made known to the House, I am satisfied it will not allow the Bill to be further proceeded with. The technical objections are valid, and moreover the circumstances are such as to justify the House in preventing the Bill being further proceeded with.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I am not altogether unacquainted with the early history of the legislation referred to here, and which it is proposed by this Bill to revive by this Parliament; and from what I know I think it would scarcely be the duty of this House to refuse to allow the Bill to pass the second reading and subsequently be discussed by the Railway Committee. It is scarcely a convenient form, or a very usual way in which to consider the objections to the Bill, to have them stated and discussed on the motion for the second reading, particularly where the matters alleged are of a controversial character. From what knowledge I have of this legislation, so far as it affects the provincial legislature of New Brunswick, there is no very grave reason to blame the conduct either of those who are behind this Bill or those who moved for the new Bill, which I understand passed the legislature of New Brunswick at its last session. I am well satisfied that neither one nor the other of those two companies, if both should be incorporated, would be able to carry out the work unless they received assistance at least from the Federal Government, and I judge also from the Provincial Government—in fact, I think the assistance of both Governments would be absolutely required. If both Bills should become law, the one recently passed by the provincial legislature of New Brunswick and this Bill now under consideration, it would rest with the Gov-

ernments interested to determine, upon inquiry as to all the facts, to which company, if either company, aid should be given. I would not like to undertake to determine the question now, as to what would be the practical effect if we refused to allow the Bill to pass the second reading. There are reasons why, on the face of it, it would be the proper course to pass this Bill. In the first place, it contained the declaration that this work is one for the general advantage of Canada. But there are beyond that reason one or two important facts, to which I would call the attention of hon. members who have objected to the passing of the Bill, and the force of which they will perhaps recognize. It will be seen by reference to the fourth clause that it is proposed to construct this road to a point on the Intercolonial Railway. Another clause authorizes the company to make connections with the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, I think it is an admitted fact, that a railway cannot be connecting with the Intercolonial Railway, without at once thereby divesting the provincial legislature of any jurisdiction over the undertaking, and at once conferring upon the general Parliament the power to legislate in respect to it. I am given to understand, that it is the view entertained by some professional gentlemen, that when it appears upon the face of a Bill, that a company is being incorporated to connect with the Intercolonial Railway, that it is extremely doubtful whether a provincial legislature is competent to pass it. To say the least of it, there would be doubt as to whether that view is not sound.

Mr. McALISTER. Nearly all the branch lines under the New Brunswick Government connect with the Intercolonial Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That does not alter the case. The law is quite clear, that the moment you connect any of these railways in the province with the Intercolonial Railway, that very moment, by virtue of that connection——

Mr. POWELL. This railway does not propose to make a connection at all. It simply gives you a terminus ad quo.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the hon. member on examining into the clause, will find he is in error, because it says, the line is to be constructed from a point on the Intercolonial Railway, and the next clause refers to this connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. The connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, under the law constitutes a work for the general advantage of Canada, and when a provincial legislature is asked to make such a connection, or when it is asked to incorporate a road the object of which is to connect with the Intercolonial Railway; it is certainly a very doubtful question, at least, as to whether any other Parliament can so legislate except the Parliament of Canada. These are reasons which appear to me to justify the House, in not withholding its assent from this motion to allow the Bill to go to the Railway Committee, where I am satisfied, it will be dealt with upon its merits, and where any objections which hon. gentleman may have against its passage, will be fully discussed and determined. I would recommend these gentlemen who are adverse to the passing of the Bill, to allow it to take this course now, because if they are interested in the successful prosecution of this work, and if they desire to have a railway constructed as laid down here, they will certainly not further the undertaking in any respect by placing unnecessary obstacles in the way of this legislation. Though this Bill should pass, it will be open to the Government of New Brunswick, and it will be open to the Government of Canada, and those charged with the duty in connection with those two Governments, to consider the question in all its bearings, and to determine which of the two companies, should, in the public interest, have a subsidy given it, and receive the aid which Parliament may grant.

Mr. POWELL. Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Blair) state what section of the Bill, proposes connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Section 10.

Mr. POWELL. The hon. Minister will pardon me for saying, that I think he is entirely at sea so far as clause 10 is concerned. Clause 10 does not authorize any connection with these roads at all. It simply authorizes this company to enter into an agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway for the lease of the road. It does not authorize a physical connection between the two railways at all. It simply authorizes one company to make an arrangement with the other as to the leasing or sale of the road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman well knows, that this road is proposed to start from a point on the Intercolonial Railway. It is proposed to go to Edmunston a point reached by the Canadian Pacific Railway. The whole purpose and object is to make a connection between these two roads, and although the language of the section is, that this company may enter into an agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway, it is only for the purpose of running, but unquestionably for the purpose of operating it as a part of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. POWELL. I understood the Minister of Railways to say, that one reason why this Bill should be placed before this Parliament is that on the face of it it showed itself clearly to be within the jurisdiction of this Parliament and possibly beyond the jurisdiction of the New Brunswick legislature. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) is going to place before this House extraneous facts which do not appear on the face of the Bill, to show this Parliament has jurisdiction, then he is shifting his ground. So far as the connection between the two companies is concerned, there is no more reason appearing in the Bill to bring it within the jurisdiction of this Parliament, than if the Bill authorized the particular company which is being incorporated to make a business arrangement with the Canada Atlantic, for the running of the road. It is not necessary, as I understand, to make connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway or Intercolonial Railway. One railway may be a terminus a quo and another a terminus ad quam, but it is not necessary that the road should have, what we ordinarily understand as a railway connection with either——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Do I understand the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) to take the position, that a charter which has been granted by the legislature of the province of New Brunswick at its last session, should be overridden and nullified by a charter to be passed in this House? I thought the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) and his colleagues were champions of provincial rights, but this appears to me to be trampling provincial rights under foot. If the legislature of a province goes beyond its powers in passing legislation of this kind, then the constitution provides that such a measure should be dealt with in a particular way, but this is not the way. The constitution provides, that if a provincial legislature passes an Act which is ultra vires, then the Government of Canada have the right to withhold assent from that Bill when it comes before them, on the ground, that the legislature has transgressed its power. Surely the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair), who but yesterday was the Prime Minister of New Brunswick, does not intend to ask this House to use its powers to override an Act of the legislature of his own province. The moment that anything so extreme as that is done, the powers which the constitution concedes to provincial legislatures is altogether nullified. It is practically useless for the provinces to undertake to give effect to their legislation, if friends and supporters of an hon. member of this Government can be induced to trample provincial rights under foot, and to override the Acts of provincial legislatures, by legislation in this Parliament. I regret very much that I was not able to be present when this discussion commenced, but I am told by my hon. friends on this side of the House that this is the position: That the legislature of New Brunswick at its last session passed a Bill to accomplish the construction of a certain work, that that Bill has been assented to and is now law; and that it is now proposed to nullify that provincial law by the Bill now before this House. If the legislature of New Brunswick has exceeded its powers, then the Minister of Railways and his colleagues have their remedy, by disallowing the local Act. But, if on the other hand, the provincial legislature has not exceeded any rights, then it appears to me that there could be no more monstrous invasion of the rights of a province——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh!

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, I say advisedly, that in my judgment there could be no more extreme invasion of the rights of a province, than that when a legislature having passed a Bill which it considered necessary; other parties—not the parties connected with the provincial measure—but that other parties, members of this House of Commons, should promote a measure like this and succeed in getting the Minister of Railways to take it under his powerful patronage. The hon. gentleman occupies a position of great influence and of great power, and I may tell him that though it is well to have the powers of a giant, it is not always well to use the powers of a giant. The hon. gentleman, as Minister of Railways and Canals, controls one of the most important departments in the public service. Only a short time ago he was the Premier of the province of New Brunswick, and he is supporting the leader of this Government, who has taken the strongest possible ground in defence of provincial rights, and against their being overridden by any legislation of this Parliament. I appeal to that hon. gentleman and ask him if he is prepared to reverse the position that he has taken so strongly on this question, and lend his countenance and support and the aid of his Government to a measure that is brought here for the purpose of overriding the legislation of the province of New Brunswick.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Speaker, if I might be permitted to say just one word in answer to the statements the hon. member has made, I would say that if he understood that I was proposing to trample under foot the legislation of the legislature of New Brunswick, he is capable of reaching a very large conclusion upon very slight data indeed. How the hon. gentleman could have listened to what I stated in respect to this matter and have drawn such an inference from it, passes my comprehension entirely. I said nothing which would justify any person who is disposed to exercise a reasonable judgment, or who is disposed to allow his faculties to guide him, in coming to any

such conclusion. I stated to the House that I was satisfied that it would be a desirable thing, rather than continue a controversy here over this question, that the Bill should go to the Railway Committee. As to the course the Railway Committee ought to take, or as to what view I might put before the Railway Committee as my view, after hearing all that is to be said on the subject, I ventured to give no information; and, as for trampling under foot the legislature of the province, the hon. gentleman is evidently talking about something he knows nothing about. It would be well for the hon. gentleman to be in the House and hear what is said before telling me what course I should pursue or before taking me under his august patronage. I am deeply indebted to the hon. gentleman for his consideration for me under the circumstances, and I can assure him that I shall be just as solicitous about the interests of the local legislatures in my legislative course in this Parliament as he has been. There have been two charters granted by the legislature of New Brunswick. That legislature had a perfect right to grant a dozen charters if it saw fit to do so. It granted one several years ago, and a considerable amount of money was expended in connection with that first charter. There was delay, I am satisfied. Perhaps the delay was such as to disentitle the people incorporated to any further consideration. But the charter has not become extinct; that is my opinion from what I know about the matter—that the charter is still in existence as a valid provincial charter. In fact, there are two charters. Perhaps the hon. gentleman suggests that I propose to trample both charters under foot. I do not propose to trample either. This Bill, which has been introduced by the hon. gentleman, I am not proposing to take under my special charge. I knew very little about it until the hon. gentleman came to me and explained it. I am not proposing to take it under my charge; I am only anxious that this House should deal with the Bill in a spirit of fairness, and refer it to the committee, where these matters can be fully discussed; and if there are any good reasons why the committee should not pass it and report it favourably to the House, they will no doubt so decide. But, in the meantime, I have heard no reason showing why the House should not allow the Bill to pass a second reading and go to the committee.

Mr. POWELL. Have the surveys actually been made?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know, but I am informed by one of the members of the provincial government that surveys have been made and plans filed. At all events, it is not fair for us to jump to the conclusion, without information or data, that the charter has become extinct, and I should hope that hon. gentlemen would not think it necessary to press the objection to the second reading any further. Let us hear what they have to say, and let them furnish any evidence which may be in their possession to justify a refusal to allow the Bill to be reported back again to this House.

Mr. McALISTER. Just allow me one word of explanation as to the surveys. The necessary surveys must be made within three years. No surveys have been made since 1894, except twenty or twenty-five miles.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is disputed.

Mr. LISTER. That is a matter for the committee.

Mr. SPEAKER. Unless the House is prepared for the second reading——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hour is past, and we must proceed to the Orders of the Day.

OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY.

The House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 10) to secure the better Observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday, as a day of rest.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Chairman, I deem it but fair that I should bring before the attention of the committee the fact that the Minister of Justice has suggested an amendment or a recasting of this clause, and that the hon. Solicitor General has expressed his opinion that this recasting of the clause would perhaps be preferable to the provision as it now stands. The proposition in amendment is as follows:—

That Section 173 of the Criminal Code—which is the section that provides for the punishment of disturbances of religious assemblies, and so forth—be amended by adding the following section at the end of Part XII, respecting offences against religion:—

Every one is guilty of an offence, and liable, on summary conviction, to a fine not exceeding fifty dollars and costs for the first offence, and not exceeding one hundred dollars and costs for each subsequent offence, and, in default of payment, to one months' imprisonment, who—

(a) Being the proprietor, publisher, or manager of any newspaper, publishes or issues, or prepares for publication or issue, any copy or number of such newspaper for sale on Sunday, or with the intent that such copy or number shall be cold on Sunday; or

(b) Sells, or employs or procures any person to sell any newspaper on Sunday ;

Provided, that the publishing or issuing, or preparing for publication or issue, of any copy or number of a religious newspaper for distribution on Sunday, or with the intent that it shall be distributed on Sunday, shall not be an offence under this section.

2. The word "newspaper" in this section has the same meaning as it has under paragraph (p. I.) of Section 3, in the sections relating to defamatory libel.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I presume my hon. friend does not propose that the committee shall undertake to deal with that amendment now. It is absolutely necessary it should be printed in order that members of both sides shall have it in their hands. It is very elaborate and makes a very serious change in the Bill.

Mr. CHARLTON. I was about to say, when interrupted, that my own preference is for the section of the Bill now before the committee, and I have read the proposed recast of that section in order that the committee may decide whether it will proceed to consider the section now before the committee or the section suggested by the hon. Minister of Justice.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend will see at a glance that having submitted this amendment on such high authority as that of the hon. Minister of Justice and the hon. Solicitor General, the committee would prefer to have it printed and have it before us in such a way as we could form a judgment.

Mr. CHARLTON. I felt myself bound to place the facts before the committee, and I am, of course, in the hands of the committee as to whether it shall prefer to have the proposed recast of this section or proceed to consider the Bill with which it is familiar.

I move the adoption of the first clause, as it is in the Bill printed. This is a clause which once passed this House. It received the sanction of the then leader of the House, the lamented Sir John Thompson, and the Bill was lost in the Senate. I think the hon. leader of the House, the other night, expressed his approval of this, and I felt it my duty, as the hon. Minister of Justice had suggested an alternative proposition, that that should be stated to the House. I now call the attention of the committee to the fact that the section now under consideration was passed by this House, that it received the sanction of the late Sir John Thompson, and that, I understand, it has the sanction of the present leader of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). There was some force in the suggestion made by the hon. leader of the Opposition that it would be advisable to have before us the amendment suggested by the hon. Minister of Justice. So far as I could gather the purport of the amendment, it is to make this offence, not punishable by indictment but simply on summary conviction. I would much prefer this to the proposition in the Bill. I stated the other day that I had no objection to follow the precedent laid down by the late Sir John Thompson and adopt the two first clauses ; but looking at the matter again, it seems to me an extreme case to make the sale of a newspaper by a newsboy on Sunday punishable by indictment. The requirements of justice, I think, would be better met if we made the offence punishable on summary conviction under clause 170 of the Criminal Code.

Amendment negatived.

The PRIME MINISTER. I beg to move that the first clause be replaced by the following :—

That Section 173 of the Criminal Code be amended by adding the following section at the end of Part XII., respecting offences against religion :—

Every one is guilty of an offence, and liable, on summary conviction, to a fine not exceeding fifty dollars and costs for the first offence, and not exceeding one hundred dollars and costs for each subsequent offence, and, in default of payment, to one months' imprisonment, who—

(a) Being the proprietor, publisher, or manager of any newspaper, publishes or issues, or prepares for publication or issue, any copy or number of such newspaper for sale on Sunday, or with the intent that such copy or number shall be sold on Sunday ; or

(b) Sells, or employs or procures any person to sell any newspaper on Sunday ;

Provided, that the publishing or issuing, or preparing for publication or issue, of any copy or number of a religious newspaper for distribution on Sunday, or with the intent that it shall be distributed on Sunday, shall not be an offence under this section.

2. The word "newspaper" in this section has the same meaning as it has under paragraph (p. I.) of Section 3, in the sections relating to defamatory libel.

The understanding between the leader of the Opposition and myself is that we will move that the committee rise and report progress, and the Bill will be reprinted and come again before the House for consideration.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 2,

2. No canal belonging to Canada shall be open for traffic or business on the Lord's Day between the hours of six in the morning and ten in the evening.

The PRIME MINISTER. There can be no objection to this clause, because the same thing is done already by the Government. For years past the Government has been in the habit of passing an Order in Council which practically brings into effect this clause.

Mr. POWELL. Then this legislation is unnecessary.

The PRIME MINISTER. It does neither good nor harm.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Then leave it out.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think it had better been left out.

Mr. PENNY. I undestand that Orders in Council are passed at the beginning and close of every season with respect to barges coming down at those seasons of the year.

Mr. FOSTER. Some provision should be made in case of accident.

The PRIME MINISTER. As far as can be provided for, the canals are already closed on Sunday.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think this matter had better be left in the hands of the Government, because the Government have already adopted the policy of preventing Sunday traffic, and this clause would be violated if, owing to unforeseen circumstances, it became necessary to make a slight deviation from the rule.

The PRIME MINISTER. I stated the other day that I proposed to follow the precedents laid down by Sir John Thompson in this matter. He had given this matter a great deal of attention, and he agreed to this clause, and the reason, I understand——

Mr. HUGHES. But the world has moved on a little since then. We have had another election. I do not think this is a clause in the interest of the community at large. If the Government issue an Order in Council at the beginning of every season that is enough. If such a proposition is placed on the Statute-book, every vessel owner who violated it would be at the mercy of any crank along the line.

The PRIME MINISTER. Without committing the Government at all, I may say that I will take note of the objection that is made. Better let the clause stand, and we will take it up again.

Mr. CHARLTON. If I may be permitted —I can understand, in fact I know, that circumstances arise which render it perhaps not improper to leave this clause unenforced, in fact when it would be difficult and contrary to the public interest to enforce it strictly. For instance, a break might take place in the canal, causing a congestion of traffic, or on the last Sunday of the season, it might be necessary under the provisions respecting works of necessity and mercy, to have the canals opened. I would have no objection to the insertion of the provision—and I believe the provision was once inserted in this clause—that the Government, for sufficient reasons might, by Order in Council, suspend the operation of this clause for one Sabbath, from time to time, as circumstances might render necessary. That would meet the objection, and it would be only reasonable, in view of the objection raised, that such a provision should be made. Though it might not meet the views of extreme Sabbatarians and those who are pressing the recognition of the principle by legislation, I think it would probably be reasonable that the Government should be vested with this power. With this, I would prefer to see this clause on the Statute-book rather than leave the whole matter to the Government. It would be more creditable to the country, and the same purpose would be served.

The PRIME MINISTER. I see no objection to the clause going on the Statute-book. There is no sanction to it—there is no penalty attached; it is merely an expression of opinion by the Parliament of Canada, a command to the Government, that the canals should be closed on Sunday.

Mr. POWELL. There is an implied penalty, and any person who has anything to do with using canals on Sunday would, under this law, be accessory to a crime. I differ from the Government on that point.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). Where is the crime?

Mr. POWELL. The violation of a statute, is by itself, by law, a crime.

Mr. HUGHES. There may be a clause tacked on to the end of the Bill that will provide a penalty. Better wipe out the clause.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The violation of a statute is not a crime.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It appears to me that there is a more serious point and I draw my hon. friend's attention to it. This clause absolutely provides for Sunday traffic on the canals, unless the hon. gentleman says that there is no Sunday before six in the morning or after ten in the evening. That this Bill should authorize Sunday traffic on the canals appears to me to be a very serious matter.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would be willing to accept the opinion of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) and bow to him as a more orthodox supporter of the Sabbath observance movement than myself. I can assure the hon. gentleman that there was a great difference of opinion upon this matter. It was contended that those who were moving for the closing of the canals were giving away the principle that traffic should be prohibited during the twenty-four hours of the Sabbath. But after all the discussions the conclusion was arrived

at that if the canals were kept closed during the time that traffic would interfere with public worship in the morning and evening, that would be a compromise which would, perhaps, satisfy morality, religion and public convenience, and this provision was adopted that the canals should be closed from six o'clock in the morning, thus providing against disturbance of the quiet of the Sabbath during the day and evening until after evening service was held. At ten o'clock, two hours before midnight, traffic might be resumed. So far as my own conscientious scruples are concerned, they are satisfied with this as a compromise to meet the views of different interests and opinions. I am perfectly willing to see the canals closed from midnight to midnight —that would suit me very well. Still, as promoter of the Bill, I recognize the force of the objections that are raised to this extreme application of the principle and accept this proviso as quite sufficient under the circumstances, as it secures the quiet of the Sabbath from early morning until after evening service. I think we had better leave it as it stands because this principle has been accepted before after full discussion by the leader of the late Government. Under all the circumstances, I believe it to be unnecessary to open the question again

Mr. CRAIG. I suppose it is not necessary for me more than for any other member of the House to say that he desires to have Sunday well kept and to have it a day of rest. But the question has come to my mind while listening to this discussion and looking at the clause before us: What is the object of putting this clause in the Bill? Is it necessary? Has it been called for? Does the traffic exist which it is proposed to stop, or does the Government, as the Prime Minister has told us, see to it that this provision is carried into effect? Now, I do not know that we are called upon to put a clause in this Bill just for the sake of putting it there, or to afford my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) the credit of having it passed. I do not say that is the reason he wants it. But I say he should give the committee some good reason for putting it there.

Now, for myself, I am satisfied without this clause. I desire to have Sunday kept on the canal, but I am perfectly satisfied to leave the responsibility of that on the Government of the day, whatever Government may be in power. I think the moral sense of the country is such that they will feel that they ought to do this, and besides in that case they have more liberty, I hold, to relax this Order in Council when absolutely necessary, than they would have under this law. Then there is a point made by the hon. leader of the Opposition, that if we are passing a Bill on account of its being the Lord's Day, or the Sabbath, then that day begins, I suppose, at 12 o'clock on Saturday night and ends at 12 o'clock on Sunday night, and if we are wording it on account of it being a day of 24 hours, then we are bound in consistency to make it 24 hours in this clause. I think it would be expedient to drop the clause altogether, and leave it, as it has been, in the hands of the Government who have always carried it out, and I am satisfied will always carry it out. I think that will be more satisfactory than to leave a clause in this Bill which is not necessary, and which has never been called for.

Mr. PENNY. I quite agree with the last speaker that if we leave this in the hands of the Government it will be perfectly satisfactory to everybody. Take the port of Montreal, for instance. There are certain seasons of the year in the early spring and late autumn when ships are waiting there, and it is necessary, particularly late in the autumn, for ships to have their cargoes as early as possible. I think, therefore, it is far better to leave this to the discretion of the Government, and to strike out the clause altogether.

Mr. FOSTER. This much is true, and I want to call the attention of the Prime Minister to it, if this clause passes the Government has no discretion, no matter how great the necessity may be, for allowing a single hour of Sunday traffic on the canal. But no person or no law forbidding it, they actually do what my hon. friend wish to have done, they keep a quiet Sunday on the canals so much as it is possible unless great occasion arises. Now if you put down a statutory enactment and this Bill becomes law, surely the Government are not going to become violators of the law, they have no opportunity for the exercise of their discretion. Now, I cannot see any reason why, as has been the rule of the former Government and is generally of this Government, what my hon. friend desires may not be practically carried out. My hon. friend admits by his 10 o'clock hour and by his own admission that there may be reasons for traffic on Sunday. Why does he close up the discretion of the Government entirely from having any traffic? There are some occasions when traffic would be necessary. Take the latter part of the season which my hon. friend has spoken of, where parties may have only two or three days to get cargoes out from Montreal and ship them to the east. It becomes absolutely necessary, unless you are to keep large cargoes frozen up on the canals, that they should go through on Sundays, and the Government has always allowed traffic of that kind. But it seems to me that you cannot do that if you make a statutory enactment. I think it would be better to leave that with the Government as it is.

The PRIME MINISTER. The Government upon this matter have no view either

one way or the other. The clause seems to me neither good nor bad, because at the present time, and for a long time back, at the opening of the season for navigation, the Government have been in the habit of passing an Order in Council to prevent canals from being opened on Sunday. Therefore, if this clause becomes law it will not change what already exists. I was disposed to agree to the clause, as I said a moment ago, and I took the view of the late Sir John Thompson on this subject. When the Bill first came up I looked up the debate of 1894, and read the views expressed by the leader of the Government at that time. I may say, moreover, that the clause has been asked for by the association for the Observance of the Lord's Day, that was the only thing which moved me in the matter. But the Government is altogether in the hands of the House. If it be the will of the House to carry that clause, I am quite satisfied; if the House desires to have that clause eliminated from the Bill, I shall be equally willing.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the Government any discretion if the clause passes?

The PRIME MINISTER. The Government will always have discretion. There will be no trouble to the Government, because there is no penalty. If this clause becomes law it is simply a command to the Government to have the locks closed on Sunday.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. As a representative from Montreal I must oppose this clause. If the clause is passed, and if it is necessary to pass an Order in Council permitting traffic on the canals on Sunday, the Government would be responsible to the country for not observing the law. I do not know how, by Order in Council, the Government could override that law. If the law exists on the Statute-book I do not see how the Government can pass an Order in Council contradictory to it. As for myself, I am opposed to the principle of this Bill. Every business man in Montreal knows that at certain seasons of the year the canal must be worked on Sundays. It would affect to a considerable extent the trade, not only in Montreal but in the whole country, if this law is strictly to be observed by the Government. If this law passes, the Government will be bound by it. I have confidence in the present Government. But changes may take place, a change took place not long ago, and others may take place. And if, under that changed condition of affairs, the Government would say that they were bound by that law, where would we be? Therefore, I think the clause should be withdrawn.

Mr. CHARLTON. The religious sentiment of the country calls for some legislative action upon this question of keeping the canals closed upon Sunday, and it is in deference to that strongly expressed religious feeling that this provision has been inserted in the Bill; and it is in deference to the obvious necessities of navigation that the whole 24 hours are not insisted upon. Now, while I believe that the views expressed by the leader of the Government are perfectly correct with regard to this matter where there is no penalty attached to the enforcement of this clause, and the Government may set aside the provision of the clause at pleasure, yet I think it will be well, if it is contemplated as being necessary for the Government at any time to exercise that power, to make provision for its exercise. As I said a little while ago, this was once done, I think done on the occasion before the last when the Bill passed the House with these two clauses; it was done as near as I recollect, in this way, adding to the clause as it now stands the words:

Provided, that by Order in Council the canals may be opened on Sunday during the last two weeks of the season of navigation.

Now, that would meet all the objections that are raised with regard to the plethora of traffic and the necessity of hastening forward cargoes towards the close of the season. If the Government were prepared by Order in Council to set aside the provisions of this clause in the last two Sundays in the season of navigation, these difficulties imagined or apprehended by my hon. friends would be obviated. If it is desired to add that proviso to the clause in view of the expression of opinion on the part of the Government and on the part of members of the House, I see no objection to its being inserted. These words might be added:

Provided, that by Order in Council the canals may be opened on Sundays during the last two weeks of the season of navigation in each year.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That does not cover the point. It is only at the beginning or the end of the season of navigation that it may become necessary to have the canals open on Sunday. It may come at any time during the season, by accident or by congestion of traffic. The promoter of the Bill should withdraw this clause, for which no necessity has been shown. What is the use of passing a law without power behind it to enforce it?

Mr. LOUNT. This clause is a mere declaration; it is not an enactment which can be enforced, no penalty attaches to it, and so there is no way of making it effective. It is simply a declaration, and to pass ineffective legislation is not a very wise course to pursue. The suggestion of the hon. gentleman does not strengthen the clause in any sense. A mere proviso that this clause may at the instance or order of the Government be made effective when necessary, does not make the body of the clause of any advantage unless by some provision there is a penalty attached for a violation of the clause itself.

From what the Premier has stated, there is an effective law at the present time. Under the present law the Government is enabled to pass Orders in Council dealing with the matter. These appear to be effective and to meet all the necessary requirements with respect to the control and management of the canals. Why should legislation be passed for the purpose of enacting laws when laws already exist which are effective. It has been admitted that the law acts as safeguarding Sunday, which is desired by the hon. gentleman promoting the Bill ; and it would be better to leave the law as it is now well understood and as it proves operative, rather than pass legislation which may prevent the law working as successfully as it has done in the past. My views are that it would be better to dispense with this clause and leave the matter as at present.

Mr. DAVIN. I certainly think we must, if we are to preserve our self-respect as a Parliament, go further than this clause goes or not go so far. It is quite true, as the hon. the Premier has indicated, that one of the essential elements in the definition of a law is that there shall be a sanction. But if you put this clause into an Act of Parliament, without any sanction attached what are you doing ? You are trifling with somebody ; you are either trifling with Parliament, or with the country—in fact you are playing at legislation. Therefore, if we are going to meet the religious sentiment of the country in regard to the Sabbath, why not make an effective clause, and not one that will appear as yielding to that religious sentiment when in fact it does nothing of the kind. If this House desires to enact a law that will be effective as regards the Sabbath, make it such and add a sanction. But if the House passes this law, I quite agree with the view presented by the member for Toronto (Mr. Lount) in regard to the effect of it. At the same time I will add this remark : If this law were placed on the Statute-book you might have complications like this. You might, for instance, find an officer who, knowing this law was on the Statute-book, who would go to a lock-keeper and say : Here is the law ; I am going to prevent you opening the lock today. Well, he would reply, I have the command of the Government. But the man would probably say : The Government has no authority ; no Order in Council can override an Act of Parliament, and here is the law on the Statute-book of Canada, that such and such regulations shall apply in regard to the opening of canals on Sunday. Suppose, we will say, that an officer is a strong Sabbatarian, and he ascertains that this Bill has been placed on the Statute-book, he might make the matter very unpleasant. It is not very creditable to Parliament, and not after all very flattering to those whose religious sentiments the hon. gentleman wishes to meet, to place what is confessedly considered to be an academic clause in an Act of Parliament. What I point out is, that this clause does not comply with the definition which a jurist will give of what a law is. If so, surely there is not a layman who will not agree with me that it is not respectful to Parliament nor to the country to ask hon. members to pass this clause. If this Bill does not comply with the essential definition of law according to a jurist, why should this Parliament pass it ? But if Parliament does pass it and there is no sanction, nevertheless complications may arise under it. According to the contention of the hon. the Premier it should go no further than the Order in Council, and if so, where do you meet the religious sentiment of the country ? I hold that the dignity of this Parliament and the dignity of the Dominion of Canada requires what a jurist would demand in law, that is to say, it should meet all essential qualities that are necessary in a law, and one of the essential qualities in a law is the sanction.

Mr. McCLURE. If this clause would promote the observance of the Lord's Day, it should not be left to the discretion of the Government, but, academic statement though it be, it should become part of the Statutes of the country. This would not take away the discretion from the Government. The section states that the canals shall not be open for traffic or business on the Lord's Day. Would that take away the right of the Government in an extreme case, such as the hon. gentlemen have presented, to pass an Order in Council in order to save property and prevent loss ?

Mr. DAVIN. Certainly it would.

Mr. McCLURE. I think not.

Mr. CRAIG. I wish to say a word in regard to the hon. member for North Norfolk and the religious sentiment of the people desiring this section of the Bill. That may be so ; but I do not think the people demand this section, or that the result should be attained in this way. If I go to the people and ask : Do you think it would be a good thing to have the canals closed on Sunday, they would reply, certainly. If I then said, do you want a law passed to that effect, I would receive the reply, yes. But if I then said, this result is attained now, the answer I would receive would be, I am not anxious then to have it put on the Statute-book, if it is done already. As regards the religious sentiment of the country, does the religious sentiment ask to have this clause placed on the Statute-book, and at the same time say the Government may violate it whenever they think it necessary. It is in effect saying that we cannot trust the Government to keep the canals closed, but we are quite willing to trust

the Government to break the existing regulations whenever they wish to do so. That is what it amounts to. I prefer to place the responsibility of carrying out these Orders in Council on the Government of the Day. I want the religious sentiment of the country to hold the Government responsible. Laws are passed by this Parliament not to control the Government in matters of this kind, but individuals, and penalties are imposed if they break the laws. But we are asked to pass a law to which no penalty is attached, and which, according to the declaration of the hon. the Premier, would be neither good nor bad, and I support the Premier in that view. I hold that we do not want to place laws on the Statute-books which are neither good nor bad, which are not necessary, which will not improve things, and which may lead to complications which we do not anticipate. For my part, I am opposed to this clause going in this way, and I am opposed to it because I am in favour of making Sunday as much a day of rest as possible. I believe that the religious sentiment of the country, if the matter is explained to the people, will be perfectly satisfied to let the matter rest as it is now—in the hands of the Government. If the Government should fail in their duty. then it will be time to pass a law like this. If we find that the Government do not conform to the religious sentiment of the country in a matter of this kind over which they have absolute control, then I would favour passing a law like this. So long as the Government do their duty in this matter, I am satisfied to let the responsibility rest upon them as it does now.

Mr. CHARLTON. My hon. friend (Mr. Craig) tells us, that he is satisfied to leave this matter where it is now, to place the responsibility on the Government, and to wait until he sees whether the Government fails to do its duty or not in the premises. Sir, where is the duty of the Government defined in the law? Where do we find on the Statute-book of Canada, a line or a word to say, that the Government shall close the canals for one hour, or for one moment, on Sunday or on any other day?

Mr. CLANCY. Do they close the canals on Sunday now?

Mr. CHARLTON. I suppose they do, but it is a matter entirely in the discretion of the Government whether they do or not. This Government may do it, but a Government which might succeed them may not close the canals on Sunday. There is no mandate in the Statute-books that they shall close the canals, and the assumption made by my hon. friend (Mr. Craig) is without foundation, and totally baseless, because there is no duty resting on the Government at all. The Government closes the canals on Sunday, and it is entitled to the respect of the public for doing so. It does what, in our opinion, is a duty, but it may refuse to-morrow to do it, and it can by Order in Council open the entire canal system throughout Canada on the Sabbath day. The Government cannot be said to have failed in discharging its duty; but the Government merely acts in its discretion in that case as it does in other cases. The object of placing this law on the Statute-book is, that this Parliament may express the opinion that this is a Christian nation; express the opinion, that the Government of this country should close the canals upon Sunday, that the Government of this country should not be allowed to exercise its discretion in doing anything else except to respect the scruples and the obligations that rest upon a Christian people. That is the reason that it is proposed to put this clause upon the Statute-book. It is not, perhaps, that it is absolutely necessary, or that it is intended to prevent an evil which exists today; but that it is intended to affirm the principle, that this Christian nation should be arrayed on the side of what the great mass of the people believe to be right, and all these objections to putting this law on the statute are academic and peurile. The object of putting this clause on the Statute-book, is to affirm, that in the opinion of this Parliament it is the duty of this Government to observe the wishes of the people of this country, to the requirements resting upon a Christian people. For that reason I have moved in this direction. I have moved in this direction in obedience to the wishes and the desires of the people of Canada; moved in this direction, not that it is necessary to constrain my hon. friend the leader of the Government, not that he is opposed to the principle of this clause, not at all; but that he may have the sanction of this Parliament supporting him in the action he is taking with regard to the closing of the canals on the Lord's Day.

Mr. DAVIN. The English law already exists here in regard to Sabbath desecration, and if my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) wants to assert the principle, he must make it wider than is provided for in this clause of the Bill. I understand that he wants to assert the principle of the sacredness of the Sabbath, but this only asserts the principle of the sacredness of the Sabbath in regard to the canals, and that being the case, it would allow a riot of Sabbath breaking in this country with regard to every other particular. My hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) cannot, in my opinion, go too far in guarding a day of rest, and guarding the sacredness of the Lord's Day. I was not objecting to this clause, what I wanted was to make it thoroughly effective. But I do not care for a clause that holds up before the religious sentiment of the country a mere sham. I would like to give them a clause that would be a genuine guarding of the Sabbath.

The PRIME MINISTER. Better put a sanction on it then.

Mr. CLANCY. It would seem that the only object of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) is to place an Act upon the Statute-book. It does seem to me, that if we legislate here, our legislation should be for the purpose of curing some evil. The hon. gentleman is attempting to put upon the Statute-book a provision that is recognized now as a moral obligation upon the Government, and which is strictly carried out by the Government. No greater tribute could be paid to present and past Governments than, that in the absence of any such legislation they felt the moral obligation to perform their duty in this respect, and they have always done so. Surely the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) would not care to narrow that. I am quite sure that the public must come to the conclusion, that we should not place a single line to encumber the statute-books of Canada, unless it has a direct object and is intended to correct an evil. In this case there is no evil to meet. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) is able to point out that in the past the Government have failed, or that they have permitted wrong-doing in this respect, then I quite think they should be bound by law ; but the hon. gentleman has failed to point out that. He says, that he wants to prove that the people of Canada are a Christian people. I think, Sir, that the most substantial proof that Canada is a Christian country, is found in the fact, that our canals have been closed on Sunday and that the object of the hon. gentleman has always been carried out without a formal law on the Statute-book.

Section negatived.

On section 3,

Mr. CHARLTON. It was understood that the first two clauses of this Bill only should be acted upon. An arrangement was arrived at by which the Government would accept the first two clauses, and the balance of the Bill would be dropped for this session at least. It would be useless to proceed with the balance of the Bill at this stage of the session, as it would merely endanger the portion of it which has been accepted.

The PRIME MINISTER. Sections 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 ought to be dropped, and section 8 ought to be maintained.

Sections 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 negatived.

On section 8,

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). The phraseology of that section is very ambiguous, and it would be better, perhaps, to put it in a different form. I would suggest these words for the clause, if they will be agreed to.

No proceeding shall be taken under this Act unless commenced within one month after the commission of the offence charged.

Section 1, as amended, agreed to.

Committee rose and reported progress.

PUNISHMENT OF SEDUCTION AND ABDUCTION.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 13) to amend the Criminal Code, 1892, for the purpose of making more effectual provision for the punishment of seduction and abduction.—(Mr. Charlton.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. CHARLTON. The Bill contains three clauses. The first is an amendment of section 181 of the Criminal Code, and provides for the raising of the age of consent from sixteen years to eighteen years. The section in the Criminal Code reads as follows :—

Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to two years' imprisonment who seduces, or has illicit connection with, any girl of previously chaste character of, or above, the age of fourteen years and under the age of sixteen years.

It is proposed to substitute the word "eighteen" for the word "sixteen," in the last line of this section. I may say in connection with this matter that the evidences of public sentiment throughout the country favouring this change in the law are very pronounced. I have received hundreds of letters, and the House has had placed before it a great number of petitions, asking for this change and it is unnecessary for me to detain the committee by enlarging on the desirability of making it. The members of the committee are as fully seized of the facts bearing on the question as I am myself, and I refrain from urging the measure further than to make the assertion that the evidences of popular demand for this measure are overwhelming and unmistakable. I move that the first section be adopted.

Mr. CRAIG. I fancy that there will be no objection to this. I am in favour of it, but I rise for the purpose of asking a question. I think I saw it stated in the press that the Minister of Justice is having an amendment like this inserted in the Criminal Code, and if that is so, I suppose it would answer the purpose. I just wish to know if that is the fact.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I think it is, but there is no objection to sending this Bill to the Senate, and the two can be considered together.

Section 1 agreed to.

Section 2 dropped.

On section 3,

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to call the attention of the leader of the Government to the purport of this clause. It is aimed at the crime of abduction—drawing females into

houses of ill-fame, and inducing them to leave the country, perhaps for immoral purposes. Section 283 of the Criminal Code is as follows :—

Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to five years' imprisonment who unlawfully takes, or causes to be taken, any unmarried girl, being under the age of sixteen years, out of the possession and against the will of her father and mother, or of any other person having the lawful care or charge of her.

It is immaterial whether the girl is taken with her own consent, or at her own suggestion, or not.

It is immaterial whether or not the offender believed the girl to be of or above the age of sixteen.

I propose to substitute the words "twenty one" for "sixteen." The crime which it is propose to punish here is a much more serious crime than the mere crime of seduction It is a crime of abduction as well, inducing the girl to leave home for immoral purposes and consigning her to a life of shame. I submit that this clause is better worthy the favourable consideration of the committee than any other section of the Bill.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). My hon. friend should be satisfied with the two first clauses. We should not favour amending a law without due cause and consideration. I have received some communications on the subject of the third clause, but have not the same weight of evidence as with regard to the first. The first clause partly covers the object my hon. friend has in view. If the girl is abducted before the age of eighteen, the consequences will be the same to the offender, and therefore I do not see any reason why we should proceed with this clause.

Mr. CHARLTON. The wish of the hon. leader of the House is law to me. I have simply to say that reforms move slowly, but that in this case reform is moving at a pace which, taking everything into consideration, is not unsatisfactory.

Bill reported.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 18th May, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 109) respecting the Ottawa and Gatineau Railway Company.—(Mr. Bourassa.)

Mr. CHARLTON.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved that Mr. Perry's name be added to the Joint Committee on Printing.

Motion agreed to.

THE TARIFF.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Perhaps it might facilitate the business of the House if I should make an announcement with respect to the tariff resolutions. The House no doubt will desire that some particular day be named on which to proceed with these resolutions. I am afraid it will not be convenient to name a day during the present week—perhaps they might be taken up on Thursday or Friday, but it would be more convenient to name a definite day. Monday next will be a holiday, and we shall, therefore, be unable to proceed on that day, and so I propose that at the first sitting next week, Tuesday, the tariff resolutions be taken up, and I anticipate by that time we shall be able to proceed.

SUPPLY—THE TARIFF RESOLUTIONS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. FOSTER. Before this motion is carried, and apropos of what the hon. gentleman has just stated, I wish to say a word or two. I am exceedingly sorry, and I know the country will hear it with regret, that the hon. gentleman is not able to take up the tariff resolutions this week. The hon. gentleman knows, as well as I do, that business is very sensitive to disturbed and uncertain conditions. The hon. gentleman knows also, as well as I do, that ever since the general elections, now nearly a year ago, the business of the country has been in a state of uncertainty with respect to the conditions which would prevail. Those conditions have not been made definite, in fact there is no certainty with regard to them, and this is felt by business men the country through. Pressing as the matter was, the Government did not see fit to call the House together until a very late date, and even though the House was called at so late a date, the Government was not ready to bring down the tariff resolutions until nearly a month had passed. The tariff resolutions were brought down in connection with the Budget, and a very short debate ensued, and from that time to this the Government has done nothing. The Government laid the tariff resolutions before the House, presumably as they wish them to be considered in committee, but the whole country knows as well as Parliament knows, and Parliament knows because it has been advised of the fact, that the Government itself has no certain views with respect to these tariff items brought down, as to whether they

will remain as they were submitted to the House or not, and if changes should be made what would be the tenor and degree of those changes. More than that, the Government interjected into those tariff resolutions a clause about which uncertainty exists, and may exist for a long time, that is in regard to what is called or miscalled the preference clause. That clause opens up a subject of doubt to some minds, of no doubt to my mind, and I think of very little doubt to most hon. members on this side of the House. It opens up to business men doubt as to what countries would participate in the trade of Canada under that clause if it were passed. It opens up the whole question of the most-favoured nation clause and the treaties in connection therewith and this one item itself, supposing the other conditions of the tariff were thoroughly known, inasmuch as the range of competition which may be opened up with other countries which are our competitors is unknown, and presumably will remain unknown for some length of time, it may be for a great length of time, adds an element of uncertainty, even when all other items of the tariff as to rates of duty are finally fixed, which they to-day are not. Under these conditions, the Government having brought down the tariff resolutions simply do nothing with them, and having up to the present time virtually wasted two weeks, for everybody knows the House will not take up the items of the Estimates until they know pretty well what the measures of the Government are and members have a chance to discuss the larger and more important proposals of the Government. What measures of the Government are before this House? Nothing but the tariff resolutions. The Franshise Bill was introduced, but all is quite now along that disputed boundary line, and it is possible it will remain quite during the other days of the session. The Government is not pressing its other Bills, and it is not pressing the tariff, and in fact the House is simply marking time, doing a little only with the Estimates; but if hon. gentlemen opposite expect to pass the Estimates before the principal measures they have under consideration are known, they are entertaining expectations which no other Government have ever held, and expectations which I do not think they will find realized. So what the House and what the country wants is the tariff, in order to reduce trade to a state of certainty, if the Government has reduced itself to a state of certainty. This is not a partisan matter. Hon. gentlemen cannot read the public press without observing how the state of uncertainty is acting on the country. It is affecting all business interests and industries. Certain business interests will be able to exist or not according to the conditions of the tariff, and the daily papers chronicle from time to time forced closures of industries, and stringency and stress in very many if not all the industries of the country. In fact business men tell me that so far as regards production and sale of goods manufactured in Canada there is simply a hand to mouth business being done, and that the uncertainty as to the future shuts out anything except the hand to mouth species of business. I want to enter my protest and the protest of business men against this further postponement of the tariff issue, the further postponement of taking up the tariff resolutions and arriving at a definite conclusion as what the conditions of business are to be for the succeeding year, or perhaps for succeeding years. I thought it only right to voice that opinion on the motion to go into Supply to-day, more particularly as the Finance Minister held out no hope of taking up the tariff resolutions during the present week. In that, he is disappointing not only the business men of the country but his own political friends. So astute an observer, and one so close to the ear, to both ears in fact of the Government, as the correspondent of the Toronto "Globe"; such an astute observer and one in so intimate relationship with the Government as that correspondent is, fully believed that the tariff was to come down this week, and heading his Saturday's special, he says:

> The coming week will bring a renewal of interest in the work of Parliament, which has lagged greatly during the past few days. The debate on the tariff will doubtless be resumed.

That was the general impression, and there is a feeling of disappointment all over the country that the Government has not been able to put an end to this uncertainty and doubt. The only conclusion we can reach is, that the Government have not issued from that state of uncertainty and doubt themselves. It is bad for the business of the country, and the business of the country must be reckoned with.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). From the observations of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) as to the evils of uncertainty, we might venture to hope that at the present time he and his colleagues have recovered from their uncertainty and have discovered where they stand on the tariff question. If it is a fact that there has not been a protracted debate on the tariff, certainly that is not a matter of which the Government can complain. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House were pleased to allow the debate to close at an early date, and we are certainly not disposed to complain of it. We do not think either that they should complain, because it was abundantly evident that these hon. gentlemen were in a very great state of uncertainty, and that they were not in a position to venture to challenge a vote on the tariff. But, Sir, if the object of the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is to urge that there should be the least possible uncertainty, that the tariff resolutions should be com-

pleted and proceeded with as speedily as possible, then I entirely concur in that view. I do not for a moment claim that any advantage is going to come to the country by any unnecessary delay. But, if my hon. friend wishes to convey the impression that there has been unusual delay, unusual uncertainty, unusual embarrassment to business by reason of that delay, then I am unable to agree with him, because, if any comparisons are made in the matter, they will not be to the advantage of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) as to the manner in which he handled his own tariff. He is on record as stating that he began his own tariff inquiry in the year 1893; uncertainty therefore began at that time.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My authority is that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) himself stated in his speech in 1893 that they had the subject of tariff revision under consideration during the recess, but they were not prepared to proceed at that time. And he further said, that they intended, during the coming recess, to go into the matter more fully. Therefore, uncertainty began in 1893 and it continued down to the session of 1894. Then what happened? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) brought down his Budget on the 27th March, 1894, and as my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) pointed out the other day, he did not finish his tariff until the 12th July. Therefore, according to the public records, there was a period of uncertainty from the summer of 1893 down to the 12th July, 1894. During all that time business was in a state of uncertainty; gentlemen whose business interests depended upon the tariff were looking with great anxiety as to what might happen; and so, if uncertainty is to be charged as crime against the present Government, then my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is doubly guilty.

But, Sir, we quite realize the fact, that there can be no tariff changes without uncertainty; and it is one of the misfortunes of a high tariff that there is always more uncertainty when that tariff exists, than when the tariff is low, because, so long as you have a high tariff there will always be the temptation for an agitation in favour of its reduction. I entirely agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) that there should be no unnecessary delay, but I am not prepared to admit that there has been unusual delay. I am not prepared to admit that my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is right when he undertakes to speak in the name of the business men of the country, and to say that they are anxious to have this matter settled at once. The business men are anxious to have the tariff settled, but they are also anxious that the matter shall be fairly considered, and that any representations they may wish to make on the tariff question shall be heard by the Ministers and shall receive all consideration. And, on every occasion during the present session that my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has undertaken to speak in the name of the business men, and to say they were demanding that the tariff should be at once brought down, we were in a position to know otherwise, for we were being daily brought into contact with the leading business men, who did not press to have the tariff brought down at once, but who pressed that the matter might be fairly and carefully considered. I therefore dissent entirely from the view of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) when he conveys the impression that he has a right to speak in the name of the business men of the country.

Mr. hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has not always been reasonable on this point. We must not forget that in the summer session of 1896, almost before the Government were firmly in their seats, at a time when some hon. gentlemen had not even taken their seats as Ministers in this House, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) demanded that we should produce our tariff at once. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has been unreasonable from the beginning, and he has no right to speak in the name of the business men of Canada. I believe the business men of this country are satisfied that the Government are dealing with this question prudently, and cautionsly, and with due regard to the public interest, and instead of demanding that the tariff shall be brought down as the hon. gentleman demands, their chief desire is that the Government shall give careful consideration to all representations that are made, in order that in the end justice may be done.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I hardly think that the explanation of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is either definite or satisfactory. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) says that in connection with these tariff changes there is, of necessity, uncertainty; but one could go further and say that that uncertainty is always to be deplored, that that uncertainty produces great financial distress and disturbance; and that—as the hon. gentleman himself admits—whether these changes be in the direction of protection, or revenue tariff, or free trade, or what you will, the uncertainty ought to be of as short duration as possible. My hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) would naturally have some warrant in speaking for the business men who are affected primarily by the uncertainty, which all admit exists while a question of this kind is under consideration. We complain, whether right or wrong—representing, as we believe we do, the vast business interests of this country in this particular instance—we complain not merely of the extraordinary delay which is now occurring during the present session in this House, but of the long delay and of the long uncertainty which the Minister of Finance must not forget has existed since June

last. Almost a year has elapsed since the business of this country has been submitted to this unprecedented distress and disturbance in connection with the time that it has taken under a change of Government for the enunciation and the settlement of their new policy. Mr. Speaker, I need not argue at any length to prove that the delay which has occurred for nearly a year in the adjustment of the financial policy of this country has been followed by very serious consequences, indeed. Take, for instance, the information that has been given to me by business men. I am told that commercial travellers from United States houses are appearing in the different commercial centres of Canada, particularly just now in the city of Toronto, in great force. It is natural that they should take advantage of any distress or any disturbance that may exist in Canada. I am told that no less than twenty-four car-loads of iron and steel goods went into Winnipeg on Friday. I believe these are exceptional circumstances, not due to the conditions that would obtain if everything were settled, and not due even to the proposed tariff changes, so much as to the uncertainty of our own commercial people, as to the extent they can carry on their business, and as to what extent they can continue their enterprise. It seems to me to require no argument to satisfy the House that business is in an exceptional condition of distress, so long as a matter of this kind is delayed. It is not the case, as the hon. Minister of Finance tried to make this House believe a moment ago, that the Conservative party are in a state of doubt as to their policy or as to their view of the effect of the proposed tariff. The principle of our tariff policy has been understood for more than eighteen years; we are united in favour of the principle of protection. Every man speaking from the Conservative ranks has not hesitated to avow himself a protectionist up to the handle; and the changes made in the tariff in 1893, as every one in the country knew, and as the Minister of Finance announced, were to proceed on the principle of protection. Who on the other side of the House can tell us whether in this tariff hon. gentlemen are going on the principle of protection or on the principle of free trade? Who among them can say with any decency or reason whether there is either the one principle or the other in their tariff from beginning to end? This is one of the reasons why there is this exceptional trouble and uncertainty in regard to the fiscal policy of the country; and it is an extraordinary commentary on the boast, made chiefly by hon. members on the Treasury benches, that they have formed a Cabinet composed of the ablest men this country has ever seen gathered together upon the Treasury benches, and yet have taken a longer time than has ever been taken by any previous Cabinet in Canada or in any other part of the British Empire to found and put upon the Statute-book a fiscal policy.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to occupy the attention of the House for more than a few minutes; but I think it only right that I should say a few words on this question. I was very much amused the other day to read in the "Globe" some comments in regard to the policy of obstruction of the Opposition, referring to the debate of last Friday, I think. It was rather amusing, when we know how that debate arose and how it was continued by hon. gentlemen on the other side. The correspondent of the "Globe" seemed rather to see the amusing side of the matter himself; for, while blaming the Opposition for obstructing, he went on to say: "Neither are the members on the Government side of the House altogether blameless in this matter, because they continually reply to the remarks made by the members of the Opposition. Now, I want to ask, what are we obstructing? We are not obstructing the tariff. We have been waiting for that a long while. It may be said we are obstructing the passage of the Estimates; but I think there is a good deal of force in what was said by the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), that it cannot be expected that the Estimates will go through in their entirety until the members of this House and the country know the complete tariff policy of the Government. The hon. Finance Minister, I suppose, used the best argument he could use when he pointed out that when the Conservative Government were making changes in the tariff they took a long time as well, and the country was subject to some uncertainty; but I think he forgot, what has been suggested by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), that the principle upon which our tariff changes were based was well known, while the principle on which this Government are framing their tariff is not so well known. I did expect, when the Finance Minister rose, that he would have taken the House and the country into his confidence, and would have told them the reason of this delay in going on with their tariff changes. He did hint that deputations have been waiting on the Government, and that some changes will have to be made. I have heard it hinted that some difficulty has arisen in regard to the preferential clause of the tariff. I do not know whether that is so or not; and I think it would have been very satisfactory to the House to be assured by the Finance Minister whether or not there is any truth in this report. I suppose the real reason of the delay is what the hon. Finance Minister hinted at, that a great many of the changes made in this tariff have been found to work unfavourably to the industries of this country. Well, that is a testimony to the tariff as it stood before, under the Conservative party. I saw in the "Mail" of yesterday an article

in regard to a large industry in Toronto, which, if the new tariff remains as brought down originally, will have to close down, throwing some hundreds of operatives out of employment. The article went on to say that representations had been made to the Government, and that it was hoped that the Government would give relief. All I have to say is that if the Government are taking this time in order to make changes in the new tariff and to put it back where it was before in a great many cases, I am satisfied that they should have that time; but I think they ought to let us know that. If that is the case, however, what becomes of their criticism when the tariff was being changed by the Conservative Government? They then ridiculed the idea of bringing down a tariff and afterwards receiving deputations and making changes in it. They said that was a most absurd way to do business; and we have seen it stated over and over again by the organs of hon. gentlemen opposite that they were not going to do anything of that kind; but they were going to find out what the country wanted before they framed their tariff, and then, when it was framed, it was going to stand. I hope they are not going to persist in that view, and I take it that they are not, but are going to make changes where they find them necessary in the interest of the country—that where they find that industries are being injured by their tariff as originally brought down, they will restore it in those particulars to what it was before. I take it that the delay means that this is what they are going to do; but if so, it would have been more satisfactory if the hon. Finance Minister had let us know it. At the time the tariff changes were made by the Conservative party, hon. gentlemen opposite talked as if it was the most easy thing in the world to make changes in the tariff. When they would change the tariff there would be no difficulty; they would not go around the country with a travelling menagerie, as I think the hon. Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson) called it, to find out what changes should be made; but they would have a principle on which to revise the tariff, and they would do it immediately. All this just shows the difference between having responsibility and having no responsibility. I, for one, am glad that the Government are realizing this, and are taking this time. I offer the Government my sympathy on this occasion. I am satisfied that they have a most difficult task to perform. I believe that if they could only recall some of the changes they have made in the tariff, they would not make them at all, but would leave the tariff to a great extent where it was. But, Sir, I hope they will make any changes necessary for the protection of our industries. I hope that where they find changes have been made which affect injuriously any of the industries of the country, they will reconsider them, and that they will put their party and all their free trade theories out of sight, and do what is best in the interests of the country. If they do, I will give them my support.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. I merely rose to say that I did not intend to deal with this question, but now I will deal with it. I rose to say a few words to the Controller of Inland Revenue (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière), but I shall endeavour to gratify my hon. friend opposite by dealing with the question, and not only deal with this question but also with the triumphant and dignified party which confronts me at this moment. I am glad, as my hon. friend who has just taken his seat has said, to find that the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), is hesitating, and that the hon. Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson) is hesitating, and that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) is hesitating, because they have all demonstrated, since the short time they have been in office, that they are a parcel of quacks who have come into power; and I much prefer, when the country's interests and health are placed in the hands of political quacks, that these quacks should hesitate and listen to the advice of people who know better how to deal with the country's affairs. The peculiar style of reply of the hon. Minister of Finance is edifying. We have heard him several times in this House, and on each occasion, when anything he does has been the subject of criticism from this side, his style of reply is to hint that something of the same character attaches to somebody on this side. Is that any defence of the position taken up by gentlemen, all of whom have been brought into power in Canada in the peculiar way so much boasted of? First and foremost we have three or four Premiers—three or four of the leading men from the provinces from which they come—and who, we are told, have all been successful business men, although the statement is not true. By-and-by, I suppose we are going to have several changes in this tariff; and then when the hon. Minister of Finance will be twitted about them, he will turn round and say to his predecessor, the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster): Oh, you remember, you have had moments of weakness too. Well, if the ex-Finance Minister had moments of weakness, I am afraid the present Finance Minister has had a succession of fainting fits. Now, I cannot understand, unless it be the carrying out deliberately of the policy of double, which has characterized this Government, why it is they are hesitating so much. Sir, in everything this Government has taken up, we have had this policy of double displayed. Why, we have

an article in the "Réveil," written by a great admirer of the leader of the House and the Government, who has no doubt at all about the character of this tariff, which, he says, is a free trade tariff; on the other hand we have up in Winnipeg a German paper saying there is not a vestige of free trade in it; and then we have the "Globe," the organ of the party, declaring that there is still a strong element of protection in the tariff. Thus in the tariff, as in other matters, this policy of double is being carried out. On the one side we are told that there are strong protectionist elements in it, and on the other hand, the free traders give the assurance that it is a long step towards free trade. Sir, this whole tariff is constructed on the principle of cross fishing. It whispers to the free trader: I am going to carry out your views by-and-by; it whispers to the protectionist: Never mind the free traders, I am going to stand by you. How long will such a policy be successful in Canada? Now, I want to call the attention of the House to what we are told by "Vieux Rouge" in "Le Réveil," who is a great admirer of the successor of the Holtons, the Huntingtons, and the Dorions, who now adorns the Premiership. After three changes, he predicts that we shall have free trade. He says of the tariff:

Il est conçu de façon à inclure non pas l'Angleterre seulement, mais le monde entier, comme le montre le texte des résolutions.

Which translated means: "It is constructed so as to include not England alone but the entire world, as is evident from the text of the resolutions." This is the way a writer in the confidence of, speaking the language, and with the same blood in his veins as the First Minister, speaks of this two-faced tariff, this Janus measure, which looks with one face to the manufacturer and smiles on him, and with another face on the free trader and smiles equally on him, and which has bamboozled poor John Bull. Even the humour of "Punch" has been taken in, and John Bull is drawn in "Punch" as being delighted with Miss Canada, who is giving him a special favour. The young lady is represented as pinning a rose on to Mr. John Bull's coat, and from beneath the rose depends a riband on which runs the phrase "Preferential Tariff." Under the picture is written: "A Decided Preference: John Bull (to Miss Canada)—"Thank you, my dear! Your favour is as welcome as the flowers of May." What will John Bull, when he understands that the Miss Canada, as embodied by hon. gentlemen opposite, is not the constant virgin he takes her for, but is going to open her doors to every one, and to favour equally the German frock, and the French blouse and the Austrian cap. Instead of being the devoted young lady that John Bull has had her represented by hon. gentlemen opposite, she is a sort of Phryne and you remember the description of that courteous person:—

To all obliging she'd appear.
'Twas "Si, Signor," 'twas "Yah, Meinheer,"
'Twas "S'il vous plaît, monsieur."

So that this tariff which was to be entirely for John Bull says "oui, Monsieur" to the Frenchman, "yah, Meinheer" to the German, and "si, Signor," to the Italian, and is equally complaisant to many others.

I come now to the North-west Territories and I think we ought to be taken into the confidence of the Government as to what is to be done in that country. I tried to influence the Government here, as I have tried to influence—the hon. Prime Minister will bear me out in that—the Government of my own party. I did not think that the proper course for a member of Parliament was to creep into Minister's offices and seek to influence through ministerial whispers; but to speak his sentiments and his opinions in Parliament, and there endeavour to influence the Government. That is the course to take in a constitutionally governed country, and that was the course I took. But, Sir, the "Globe" correspondent has let the secret out. He has let out his conception and the conception which certain people want to force on hon. members opposite, that they should constitute themselves mere machines for the Whips to use just as they please. The correspondent of the "Globe" complains of the "people on our own side"—that is the Government side stooping for the unconstitutional course of answering any member on this side. Do the young men who have just come into Parliament know what must be the ideas of parliamentary government, and parliamentary life represented by such an utterance and how it affects their interests individually and collectively, as politicians with natural and laudable ambitions and as citizens of a great constitutional country? I can assure them that no greater blow could be dealt to parliamentary government than the carrying out of such an idea to its logical conclusion. Last session and this session we have seen one of the Whips, when an hon. member rose on this side, go and drive out the members on the other side just as a shepherd would drive a flock of sheep. And this session, when an hon. gentleman rose in his place, we even saw a Minister of the Crown—I will name him—the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) go up and drive out the political muttons into the lobby or into room 16. I ask the young men: Do you suppose that any Government can be so strong as not to need the respect of the Opposition? And with all due respect I would say to the Prime Minister himself, because by-and-by he will be held responsible for his party, does he suppose that any Prime Minister, however strong, can rule and lead this Parliament as it ought to be led and with

the dignity that ought to belong to the Prime Minister, if it is found that under his leadership a prominent member of his Government, when an hon. member rises on this side, can go and drum out the members? And what is the object of following such a course? To fly from debate sometimes? To fly from expected attack? If it is to shut down on debate, does it succeed in that? What Mr. Justin McCarthy says of the Parliament of England is true of this Parliament. This is not merely a deliberative assembly where we come to discuss and debate; this is the greatest and grandest platform of the nation. And as long as that Press Gallery is there we can get to the country, and when we get to the country we reach the source of power. Some hon. gentlemen opposite, it seems, do not approve of my method of speaking in this Parliament as to what should be done. They have discovered a better method. They, it seems, slink around corners and into cabooses with the Ministers and collogue with them, get at their ears, and, in that way, accomplish great things. And those of us who dare to address the Ministers in this House are accused of wasting time. I never did that of which they approve with the Ministers of my own party. And it may be that if none of us spoke in this House, these hon. gentlemen would not have had the courage to go to the Minister in private. Perhaps they would not have thought of doing anything had not some members spoken publicly in the House. We have a member in this House who is very fresh—a tremendous fellow of his inches. He writes to the Winnipeg "Daily Tribune," his own paper. This, be it remembered, is a member of the House writing about himself and his colleagues and about me and others, but mainly about himself. And, Sir, you will remember what Byron said when referring to what Wordsworth had sung of the donkey—that he who saw the poet in his glory—well, I have rather missed line——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. It is not often I miss a quotation, so take what comfort you can out of it when I do. But I will give you the sense of it, that—

> He that saw the poet in his glory,
> Conceived the bard the hero of the story.

Here we have an article headed "Davin sat on" which goes on as follows:—

> If ever a man got a severe sitting on in Parliament, Davin got it yesterday. He always was a nuisance in the House, but in view of his protest and the prospect of losing his seat, he seems to have lost what head he had, and has developed into a perfect bore. It is safe to say, he costs the country an average of six thousand dollars a day, blathering away on every conceivable subject, and monopolizing the time of the House. If he accomplished anything, no one would complain, but he has developed into such an unsufferable nuisance that members on both sides curse him, and it is a usual spectacle to see the House empty rapidly when he rises to speak.

It was indeed a spectacle we saw twice last session and this session, the spectacle of the Postmaster General getting up and drubbing out the members on his own side, and among them some members of the delegation that has just entered Parliament. I was sorry to see them so far forget their duty to themselves and to the Parliament of Canada as to go meekly out.

> Nobody has any personal feeling against him, the prevailing sentiment being that he wastes the time of the House. Nothing would do him but he must, notwithstanding his stultifying record on the question, make a motion censuring the Government for not placing agricultural implements and lumber on the free list. Failing to get a division on Tuesday, he moved the motion again yesterday, the result being that he was given such a drubbing all round and his record so thoroughly exposed, that he will doubtless take to the tall timber for a time through sheer shame. A lively scene occurred between him and Mr. R. L. Richardson——

The gentleman who writes this article—

> —during the debate, the latter charging Davin with being very valiant in the past, when talking, but when the vote came on, it was his custom to take to the woods or crawl under the barn. The Speaker ruled that, if Davin would say he did not crawl under the barn,——

I call your attention to this; it is in the interest of the House that I should call your attention to it:

> —if Davin would say he did not crawl under the barn, Richardson must withdraw.

That is exactly what the Speaker ruled.

> And then Richardson offered to withdraw if Davin assured the House he had never taken to the woods or crawled under the barn.
>
> Douglas, Richardson, Oliver and the Patrons pointed out that, while they were all disappointed that agricultural implements, coal oil and lumber were not placed on the free list, or greatly reduced, still they had been pressing the Government very strongly lately for concessions on these matters, which, if granted, would bring a great measure of relief to the west. While Davin talked, they were working for their constituents, and had done more for the west in the present Parliament than their predecessors did in fifteen years.

They were working for their constituents! While I was talking they were dining—these farmers and Patrons. With roses in their button-holes they were sitting round the champagne-crowned board, while I was fighting the battle of the farmers.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Was it in the schoolhouse?

Mr. DAVIN. No, it was in a far grander place—in the Rideau Club where vice-royalties have been dined. And, most appropriately, they were dining with the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), who is not only a farmer, but as we know, a perfect Apicius.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, because it is in your own beautiful language, the words of Moliere:

Le véritable Amphytrion
Est l'Amphytrion où l'on dîne.

Let them tell us, Sir, what they have done for the west. I proclaim the utterance of this paper, which I have just quoted, a monstrous falsehood. Let them speak and show what they have done that transcended what my colleagues and myself have done for the last fifteen years. When we came in here in 1887 there were great difficulties and grievances in the North-west. There were grievances in the Dominion Lands Act; there were grievances in the North-west Territories Act. One by one we eliminated and swept them away. And the records of Parliament, "Hansard," and our statute-books show what we have done. Some of the legislation passed at our instance does not appear in our name. And why? Because Minister after Minister took up as Government measures Bills that we introduced. Just as the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) is about to do this session. I have a Bill on the paper to amend the Dominion Lands Act. Our ideas will be embodied in a Bill to which the Minister will add a clause of his own, and this will be carried. And it has been the same way with important Bills in the past. They say the statement in this paper is true; I pronounce it a monstrous falsehood.

They were not going to cast a vote the sequence of which would be turning from power a Government which had granted a large measure of relief already, and promised more, and place in power a party which immediately restores high duties.

That being the effect of Mr. Davin's motion, they will pass it.

Hear how he sings of his own achievements:

Mr. Richardson added, that if the motion, instead of being a want of confidence, declared that it was in the interests of the farmer that implements and lumber is reduced in duty, or made free, he would vote for it.

Why, I declared in commencing my speech that it was not a vote of want of confidence, and the motion itself said it was in the interest of the farmers, and yet this man, in order to blind the eyes of the farmers of Lisgar, in order to blind the eyes of these bamboozled people who trusted in him and sent him here when he declared that he was in favour of free implements, free coal oil and free lumber, and ran his election on that—that deluded people are to be bamboozled by false statements like these. Last session he said that he would vote against the Government if they did not do the very things that I asked them to do, and they are not yet ready with their resolutions. The Minister of Trade and Commerce told us they would not be ashamed to alter their tariff, and I am doing my best to get them to revise their work:

The result was a terrible blow to Davin, for only nine or ten, out of a House of over 130, voted for the motion, nearly all the Conservatives opposing. The result was greeted with laughter at the expense of Davin.

Mr. Speaker, if that were true it would not awe me an iota. I am familiar with the history of Parliament. Take the history of free trade in England. When Mr. Villiers first rose in 1841 to move the very resolution that five years afterwards Sir Robert Peel carried, he was voted down, as this man would say, "ignominiously." When Mr. Grote, the great historian, first proposed his measure for the ballot in England, he was voted down ignominiously; and when Mr. Berkeley took up the mantle of Mr. Grote, and annually proposed the motion in favour of vote by ballot, he was voted down ignominiously. Mr. Grote was laughed at and quizzed by Tom Moore; and Lord Palmerston quizzed Mr. Berkeley and hoped that when he passed from this world he would have a coffin shaped like a ballot box, and that he would drop into it as quietly as a ballot would be dropped into his desired electoral urn. But the ballot was adopted in England. In past years when one of the greatest men in Canada was sitting where the Minister of Public Works sits now, and I was sitting where the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) sits now, I was advocating a second homestead, and that justice be done to those who were entitled to it. I said to my right hon. friend: I know the map of Canada as well as any one, and I know the course I am taking did not lead to preferment. But I added: I am here to do my duty; you are all opposed to me on both sides of this House, but I have justice on my side, and with justice on my side I am strong against this Parliament. In 1891 I carried my point, and not only that, but I carried several other points in 1891. Now, to show that I have not misrepresented this gentleman from Lisgar as having run his election on those matters, let me point out what a paper who knows him very well, says in regard to that. The "Free Press," in an article on my motion, points out the very extraordinary position taken by Mr. Richardson, as they call him—we call him the hon. member for Lisgar. The paper points out the extraordinary position taken by Mr. Richardson and the Patrons, because the member for Lisgar had run his election on these very things that he had professed he was determined to get, implements free, coal oil free, and a number of other things free. Now, this paper points out that he has attacked Mr. Davin because he brings these matters forward in the House:

Mr. Davin's motion expressing regret that the Government did not place agricultural implements on the free list, created something of a parliamentary breeze, though it did not receive a very large support. It was, probably, not expected that it would receive much support. It was

offered by the mover for another purpose, which had very little reference to the duty on agricultural implements. To what extent his motion will square Mr. Davin——

I do not mind these misrepresentations. When I had no constituency to square, I took the same course.

—with his constituents, when he appears before them, we do not know, and we are not much interested to know ; but, as to how it affected such of his western colleagues as the members for Lisgar and East Assiniboia, we do feel a little interest, and also some amusement. These gentlemen resented the motion as useless, in which they were quite right ; and they were indignant at the necessity it imposed upon them of voting against it, and explaining at the same time why they did so. The result was an acrimonious discussion, in which both Messrs. Davin and Richardson were "called down" by Mr. Speaker ; and Mr. Speaker himself gave utterance to the remarkable threat that, "If he (Mr. Davin) cannot learn to respect the Chair, I shall take means to make him do so."

The anxiety shown by Messrs. Richardson and Douglas regarding this useless and awkward motion was amusing, even if well founded. No one really expected that Mr. Laurier's Government would risk commercial disaster by revolutionary changes in the tariff ; but both these gentlemen entered Parliament almost solely upon the stand they took, that nothing short of a complete removal of the farmers' burdens would satisfy them. Failing that, they find themselves compelled to explain their position anew ; and they have a well-grounded apprehension that their rural constituents may fail to distinguish the niceties of the logic required to meet the case. The most amusing part of it is, that the position to be explained is almost identical with that of their predecessors in Parliament, whom they held up to the world as insincere, hide-bound party men, who sacrificed the North-west to their party attachment. It is a position of their own making, and the world will probably continue to revolve while they are wriggling out of it.

Regarding Mr. Speaker's rather unusual threat, it must be remembered, in extenuation, that he is new to the office, and not accustomed to the amenities affected by some western men ; and he was put temporarily off his balance. But the expression is not calculated to win respect from the House, which a Speaker, above all others, must have. To gain courtesy he must give courtesy, even under trying circumstances.

But that is not true merely of an official, it is true of every man on that side. I say to those gentlemen, whom I greatly respect, and amongst whom there are men of first-rate talent, who have come in within two years, I say to them it is not to their interest to fall into weak notions and machine plans that would destroy the respect of this House for them, and militate against their usefulness and success in this House, and also greatly lower their usefulness as members of this Parliament. Now, I did not rise to say anything on this subject, but I found it necessary to do so in consequence of certain tactics which are, at all events, not in the line of the best parliamentary methods.

I rose to call the attention of my hon. friend the Controller of Inland Revenue to a certain matter. Last session I called his attention to the undesirable condition in which the grain standards are, and to the undesirable condition in which the buying of grain is ; and I rather thought that I had some assurance from him that during the recess he would take up the question that I brought before him, of the possibility and the reality of the frauds to which the farmer was subjected in consequence of the undesirable condition regarding the purchase of grain. He will remember that my hon. friend who used to be Controller of Inland Revenue, and also Controller of Customs, the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood), than whom we never had a more efficient manager of that or a cognate department, or an abler man in dealing with matters of that kind—he also called his attention to that question last session. Now, some steps were taken by my hon. friend the Controller of Inland Revenue. He may remember that what I called his attention to, was this : That there was a feeling throughout the west that permanent grain standards would be the true solution of the difficulty, and I read letters and resolutions of Patrons, in which they advocated, not a too high standard, but for No. 1 hard, one resolution proposed a standard of sixty pounds to the bushel. Action was taken by the department while Parliament was in session, and the result led to a heated controversy in the newspapers, which must have been brought before the attention of the Minister. That correspondence revealed a state of great uncertainty and a large amount of dissatisfaction existing. I do not want now, nor did I when I rose, to take up the time of the House in regard to this matter, for we discussed it last session and the session before, and in that session I had the able assistance of the late member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin), and my hon. friend will remember how powerfully he came to my aid in that debate, and I quoted his remarks last session. Of course, I could move for a committee, but I do not wish to do so ; I want, to point out that there is this discontent and dissatisfaction that the arrangements made have not proved entirely efficient, and to ask the Minister to name a committee to inquire into this question, which is one of so much importance to the farmers of the west.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Salaries of officers and inspectors of excise, and to provide for increases depending upon the result of the excise examinations $305,974

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Will the hon. Minister explain the cause of the decrease, amounting to $5,107 ?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). I

remember that we superannuated an officer in New Brunswick, no collections having been made in his district. I am, however, unable, at present, to furnish the details respecting this reduction.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I suggest that this item be allowed to stand. I would remind the hon. gentleman that during the last four or five years the total average decreases in the Inland Revenue Department were much greater than those he has been able to effect for the coming year. I wish, however, to know in what direction reductions have been made. I would infer that the increases dependent upon this special examination have not been dispensed with, although the statutory increases of officers of the inside service have been abolished.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. Let the item stand, and I will furnish the information desired.

To provide for extra duty pay at large distilleries and other factories..... $6,000

Mr. WALLACE. How much was expended last year ?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. The total expenditure amounted to $6,147.21.

Preventive Service $10,000

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. This is $1,500 more than last year, and I am afraid that even that will not be enough. We find much difficulty in preventing illegal distillation, laying aside the difficulties that my hon. friend the Controller of Customs experiences in preventing smuggling. We find that the amount voted for the preventive service is not sufficient. To give you an idea of the illicit distillation in certain parts of the Dominion, I may say that during last year, in the province of Ontario, only two illicit distills were discovered ; but I am sorry to say that in the province of Quebec fifty-five illicit stills were found; none in New Brunswick; seven in Nova Scotia; none in Prince Edward Island ; and none in the other provinces. It really appears as if this illicit distillation was increasing in the most dangerous manner, and I believe we should exert every effort in order to stamp it out. If we compare the number of illicit stills discovered last year with those of the preceding years, we see that never have so many been found before. In 1895 there were in the province of Quebec only eighteen ; in 1894, twenty ; in 1893, twenty-eight ; in 1892, twenty-four ; and in 1891, ten. There was nearly as many illicit stills discovered last year as in the whole of the ten years preceding. I have done my best to put down this, what I consider to be a plague. In fact, I sent circulars to all the clergy of the province of Quebec, nearly 700 or 800 to the different parish priests.

Mr. HUGHES. What have they to do with illicit whisky ?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. Well, I sent circulars asking them to draw the attention of their parishioners to the danger of indulging in that illicit distillation, showing the severity of the law and the penalties, and trying to make the people understand that it was a sin against religion, against morality, and against their material prospects. In one word, I have done everything I could in order to remove any excuse that the people were ignorant of the law. From the time that I have sent out these circulars I have proceeded vigorously against any man who was found in possession of an illicit still. I think it will be easy to understand, under the circumstances, why we ask this $1,500 additional in order to try and protect the revenue.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I am sorry we cannot agree with the Controller of Inland Revenue when he says that he has done everything in his power to stamp out illicit distillation, especially in the province of Quebec. Some weeks ago my hon. friend from Montcalm (Mr. Dugas) put a series of questions to my hon. friend (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière), about two persons in the province of Quebec who had been found guilty of illicit distillation. One was a man from the county of Portneuf which my hon. friend the Controller represents, who had been put into jail, and another was a gentleman from the city of Quebec—I use the word gentleman advisedly—a man by the name of George Vezina, and he was not put in jail. My hon. friend (Mr. Dugas) put the question to know why the distinction was made between this poor man who lived in the county of Portneuf, and who was put in jail, and this gentleman who resides in the city of Quebec. The latter had been convicted of illicit distilling, and had been found in possession of a large quantity of whisky and an illicit still in the province of Quebec, but he was not put in jail. After a good deal of skirmishing we found out that one had been jailed and the other had not. The hon. gentleman pursued the inquiry a little further, and he asked this question :

Is it not a fact that the present Controller of Inland Revenue gave orders to have George Vézina, of Quebec, imprisoned under conviction of having infringed the Inland Revenue law. If he did not, why did he not give the necessary instructions to carry out the sentence of the court? If he did give the instructions, why were they not carried out?

It was the Premier himself who gave the answer ; my hon friend the Controller of Inland Revenue being absent. The answer of the Prime Minister was, and I call the attention of the House to it :

When the present Government came into office, they found the case had been disposed of by their predecessors in office, and they did not deem it at

all advisable to disturb the disposition of that case.

It was therefore stated in the House, that when my hon. friend the Controller of Inland Revenue took office, he found this case settled; he found that the old Government had passed upon this question, and he did not want to disturb it. But my hon. friend (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) says now that he did everything he could to stamp out illicit stills in the country, and especially in the province of Quebec. He has taken a course which seems to be extraordinary. He has been writing to the curés, and I do not believe that the curés distill illicit whisky in that province.

But, Sir, why did not the Controller of Inland Revenue apply the law? I am sorry to say that the answer given by the Government in the Vezina case is unfounded. As a matter of fact, this case was not settled when my hon. friend entered the department, and, as a matter of fact, the only thing which had been done by the Controller of Inland Revenue in the late Government was to give this man George Vezina delay. I will prove this to the satisfaction of the House. On the 21st October, 1896, the following letter was addressed to the agent of the Minister of Justice in Quebec:—

Sir,—Queen against Vézina—I have the honour to inform you, that I am to-day in receipt of a letter from the Department of Inland Revenue, stating that the delay granted in this matter has expired. The department would be glad if you would now enforce the judgment.

(Sgd.) E. L. NEWCOMBE,
Deputy Minister of Justice.

In face of the answer which was given to the House the other day that this matter had been settled by the former Government I think it well to read this letter which points out that the Controller of Inland Revenue himself had stated on the 21st October, 1896, that the delay in the case had expired, and that the judgment against George Vezina should be executed. But that is not all. On the 26th October, 1896, the agent of the Minister of Justice in Quebec received the following letter:—

Queen vs. Vézina.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your communication of the 23rd instant, and to ask that you will have every effort made to have Vézina arrested.

Here, then, in a second letter addressed to the agent of the Minister of Justice in Quebec, asking the agent to have this man Vezina arrested. This is a second proof that this case had not been settled by the late Government, that it was still under the consideration of my hon. friend the Controller (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) and that he then had it in his power to imprison this man or let him go. Now, it is well known that George Vezina goes around in the streets of Quebec free, while another poor man, Jobin, who has fallen under the severe discipline of the law, has gone to jail. Here is a man who belongs to another class of society walking the streets, while my hon. friend addresses letters to the curés of Quebec. This case shows, first of all, that the hon. Premier, when he answered in the House the other day that this case had been settled by the Government which he had succeeded, said what was not founded in fact, and, no doubt unwittingly, misled the House; and my hon. friend, when he says that he has done everything in his power to put down illicit distilling in Canada, has not taken the steps that he should have taken to deal with this man Vezina, who was caught with an expensive still, manufacturing illicit whisky in the city of Quebec.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. Perhaps you will remember that two or three weeks ago—I have not been able to ascertain the date—my hon. friend asked a question, which I answered in such a way that even his own friends could not help laughing, in regard to this same man Vizena, and this same poor man Jobin, who he says was sent to jail. The first question put by my hon. friend, so far as I can remember it, was this: "When was Jobin condemned for illicit distilling?" I answered: "Somewhere about January or February, 1896;" that is to say, when my hon. friends opposite were in power. His next question was: "When was Jobin sent to jail?" The answer was: "He was sent to jail by the late Government about April, 1896." The second question was: "When was Vezina condemned to jail?" The answer was: "Somewhere about March, 1896." At the moment when hon. gentlemen opposite were sending that poor man Jobin to jail, they got a conviction against Vezina. The last question, which was certainly a most amusing one, was: "Why was Vezina not sent to jail?" And I was obliged to answer: "It is impossible for me to say why the late Government did not send him to jail." Afterwards, in the month of October, I think, I received a letter from Mrs. Jobin, complaining that her husband was still in jail, while Vezina was not in jail. If my hon. friend will ask for all the papers, he will at once see the position I took. I appealed to His Excellency the Governor General to let out Jobin before his term of imprisonment had expired, and at the same time I took proceedings to send Vezina to jail; and if my hon. friend will only ask for the papers, I shall be obliged to submit all the papers to the House, including certain confidential letters which I found among them, which will explain why Vezina was not sent to jail. I have always refused to mention those letters, and I do not wish to take advantage of my hon. friend's imprudence; but if my hon. friend will ask for the papers, I will bring them down, and they

will show exactly what took place, and why the late Government did not send Vezina to jail. When I thought it was my duty to send him to jail, I did everything I could. I ordered him to be arrested, and then I got representations from his counsel, who told me that he had actually been sued for the same offence under four different heads, and had been fined $100, which he had paid. If I had been here on the 3rd of May, when the hon. leader of the Government answered the question in my absence, I would have explained exactly what had taken place. I would have explained why the Minister of Justice, in April or May last, stopped the proceedings against Vezina. If the papers are produced before the House, it will be seen exactly why Vezina was not sent to jail.

Mr. CASGRAIN. My hon. friend has not answered the gravamen of the accusation, if it is an accusation, which is that the House was misled by the hon. the Premier. I have no doubt that if my hon. friend had been here, he would not have given the same answer, because it is absolutely unfounded in fact, and contrary to the fact; and if I had not followed up the matter, probably the House would not have been informed of the true state of the case. My hon. friend has tried to make a comparison between the case of Vezina and the case of Jobin; but he has not answered at all what I said. Jobin was convicted in January, 1896, and was imprisoned in April, 1896. As in all these cases, a certain delay was granted to him to pay his fine or to see whether he could get some respite by petitions presented to the Governor in Council. Vezina was convicted at the end of March, and he obtained a delay. My hon. friend asks: Why was he not put in jail immediately? Because he had obtained the same delay that Jobin had obtained. My hon. friend knows that in the month of May the Ministers were engaged in the general elections, and he probably knows, or if not, he will find it out by the records, that Vezina was then hiding and the officers of the law could not lay their hands on him. But my hon. friend came into office in July, 1896, and with his well-known desire to have everything clean and fresh around him, he should then have taken up the case of George Vezina and have seen whether or not the sentence of the court could be carried out. It was not carried out, however, even after my hon. friend had been a long while in office. It was only after the matter was brought to his notice that he woke up and said that Vezina must be put in jail. Now, he tells us that a member telegraphed to the Minister of Justice to suspend proceedings and not carry out the sentence of the court. My hon. friend had written two letters to the Minister of Justice, assuming that the sentence would be carried out, and properly so, because if there is one thing which should be put down it is the manufacture of illicit whisky—not only because it is in contravention of the law but because the stuff itself is poisonous. There have been cases around Quebec of people who have become crazy through this vile compound. It was the bounden duty of my hon. friend to have the sentence of the law carried out. He says that he could produce letters marked "Confidential" which he has found in the records, and by which the House would see why the sentence is not carried out. I know the hon. gentleman well enough to believe that if he found confidential letters left in the records by mistake by one of his predecessors, his chivalrous nature would not allow him to lay them before Parliament.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASGRAIN. However he may put any letters, confidential or otherwise before the House, he cannot get out of the predicament that he has not done what the law says must be done. He has not had the sentence of the court carried out, and to-day this man walks the streets of Quebec freely, while poor men who have been convicted of the same offence are languishing in jail. He has not met the charge either that the answer given by the hon. First Minister is in direct contradiction with the facts found in the record.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I am perfectly convinced that when the hon. First Minister made that answer he made it to the best of his knowledge.

Mr. CASGRAIN. That is what I said. I do not mean to imply the contrary at all.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. No doubt he was led to give it by the replies I had given to some other questions, in which I referred to the conduct of the preceding Government.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). If my memory serves me rightly, I think that the item in question was reduced during the last three or four years of the late Administration from $17,000 down to $8,500. I am very much afraid that the extraordinary increase in the excise duties upon tobacco has alarmed the Controller and his colleagues, and that consequently they deem it necessary to increase the vote for this service. My own opinion is that the changes made in the excise regulations will not only fail to increase the revenue but will add to the increase in the cost of the preventive service, the first intimation of which we have in the item under discussion. Is this increase made for the purpose of employing new officials? Does the hon. gentleman intend to add to the preventive service?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I am not prepared exactly to

say what we will do. It will depend on the circumstances. That amount of $1,500 is, after all, a very small amount compared to the increase of the duties, and we must expect that the temptation to smuggle will be increased by the higher excise. We are simply asking the House to vote us this additional amount, in case we should find it necessary to use it.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I quite appreciate the danger, which the hon. gentleman mentions, of increased smuggling, owing to the greater temptation caused by the recent changes in the tariff. But I would point out that if he sees fit to employ any more officials, I would recommend a very good man whom he dismissed, for what purpose I do not know. I refer to Capt. Clark, who has done very good service as a preventive officer. The late Government were of opinion that the officers of the Inland Revenue Department, in every district, ought to undertake a large part of this preventive service work. We sent out circulars three or four years in succession to the collectors and inspectors in every inland revenue district, enjoining them to do the work of preventive officers. It is well known that the regulations regarding the sale of tobacco are very often more honoured in the breach than in the observance, and we pointed out to the officials of the department that it would be very easy for them, in the towns and villages of their districts, to occasionally visit the tobacco stores as a part of their ordinary work. We were thus enabled to reduce that item for preventive service from $17,000 in 1891 to $8,250 in 1896. I would impress upon the hon. Controller that instead of increasing this item, he should enjoin his officials to show greater vigilance in the exercise of their work throughout their various districts. So far as my personal recollection goes, I can only speak in the highest terms of the officers of the Inland Revenue Department, both in the inside and outside services. They did do the greater part of the work, and consequently the average amount of smuggling during the past ten or fifteen years has not increased very much. In fact I do not think there were half a dozen convictions for illicit distillation in Ontario during that many years.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I do not think the committee under the circumstances will refuse this increase of $1,500, especially as last year we ran short in the preventive service. When I took charge of the department I was very much struck with the number of officers I found there, especially temporary officers. When the Supplementary Estimates come down, it will be my duty to explain this matter. Perhaps it might have been wiser on my part to have said to these temporary officers whom I found in the department: It will be impossible for me to retain your services. If their services were wanted, they ought to have been made permanent officers. But I wished to spare them as much as possible, and did not want to disturb one of them so long as it could be avoided. I kept them as long as I could—too long, in fact. There were many of these temporary officers who were appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite, some a few weeks, some a month or two, before the last election. But I kept them longer than I ought to have done until I found that I ran short of the funds necessary to pay them. When the supplementaries come down, it will be my duty to read a list of names and explain who they are. I hope that the committee will not refuse the $1,500, because that would hurt the service. While hon. gentlemen opposite reduced the preventive service from $17,000 to $8,500, it must not be forgotten that a result of this was an increase in the illicit distilling, until we had no less than fifty-five illicit stills in the province of Quebec alone. An increase in the preventive service is necessary in order to check illicit distilling.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I do not think the hon. gentleman should ask for this increase on that ground alone, because I think the officers who are now engaged in the preventive service are sufficient for the work. Still, if he does think it necessary to increase the number of officials, I would like to call his attention to the case of one or two men who were dismissed on the ground of economy, and I would ask him to reinstate them in their old places.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. Who are they?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I refer particularly to Captain Clark. I ask the hon. gentleman to take his case into consideration. In view of the number of illicit distillations that have taken place in the province of Quebec, it is possible that the hon. Controller may have some justification for the increase. At the same time, I may tell the hon. gentleman, I will watch with curiosity the appointments made, it having already been stated that his other officers were dismissed on the ground of economy.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. They have not been dismissed, but I have been obliged to notify them that I had no more money to pay them. Some of them I should be glad to take back. On the question of dismissals I am ready to meet my hon. friend (Mr. Wood). During the long discussions that we have had on the question of dismissals, I have not opened my lips. If any one finds fault with my dealings with the officers of my department, I am ready to meet him and to account for every act I have performed.

Mr. BERGERON. I would ask the hon. Controller of Inland Revenue where is Ve-

zina now, and is it the intention of the department to see that the law follows its course in his case ?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I suppose Vezina is in Quebec.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to know if the hon. gentleman intends to see that the law takes its course in his case ?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I may say to the hon. gentleman that if he wishes to get the papers in this case, he can do so ; and he will then understand more about the case than he does now.

Mr. BERGERON. It seems to me the hon. gentleman grows impatient. In listening to what has been said in the debate, I have learned that two men were accused of violating the inland revenue law—Jobin, who was condemned to jail and who is now in jail, and in whose favour my hon. friend (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) was kind enough to send a petition to the Governor General asking for his relief at the solicitation of his wife, and Vezina, who is not in jail, but on the streets of Quebec. I want to know if the Department of Inland Revenue intends that the law is to be carried out and Vezina treated like Jobin ; and if not, why not ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Why did you not carry out the law ?

Mr. BERGERON. I never was a Minister, I never had the administration of law in my hands.

An hon. MEMBER. Shortis case.

Mr. BERGERON. I have seen enough of the Shortis business.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. Do I understand that my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) is asking me a question ?

Mr. BERGERON. I have asked a question, but it appears I have not been understood. I have not asked for all the papers in the case. My hon. friend the Controller of Inland Revenue can answer the question with a "yes" or "no." Is it the hon. gentleman's intention to see to it that the law is carried out in the case of Vezina as in the case of Jobin ?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. Will the hon. gentleman tell me why his friends did not punish Vezina ? If he will answer that, I will try to give him an answer to his question.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not understand——

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. Will the hon. gentleman say why the former Government did not punish Vezina ?

Mr. BERGERON. That is not an answer to my question. The hon. gentleman (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) is now in charge of the Department of Inland Revenue, and he, and not the ex-Minister, is accountable for the administration of the department. There is a man named Vezina. So we have learned since this discussion began. For my part, I know nothing about Vezina. We are told that he was accused of committing some act in contravention of the inland revenue law, and that he was found guilty. But instead of being punished, he is on the streets of Quebec a free man. Another man named Jobin committed the same offence, and was sent to jail. I want to know why Vezina is not punished the same as the other man who committed the same offence. It seems to me that that is a reasonable question, and the hon. Controller should be ready to tell us whether the law will be allowed to take its course or not. The old Government has nothing to do with the case.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I do not know that the old Government have nothing to do with it. They may have had some good reason for not sending Vezina to jail. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) wants to find out the reasons, he can ask for the papers.

Mr. FOSTER. I really think that my hon. friend the Controller of Inland Revenue does not treat questioners on this side of the House entirely right. It is a well known fact that when Ministers are putting through their estimates, they are likely to have questions put to them, and when plain questions are put to them it is always a matter of rule and courtesy to answer. But to give an evasive answer as my hon. friend has done, and instead of saying whether he proposes to carry out the law against Vezina, to ask my hon. friend why it was not carried out by some one else, is not an answer to the question, and is not treating the questioner fairly. My hon. friend is now the executive head, he is responsible for carrying out the law, and the simple question that was put to him, was this : Vezina having been condemned for transgressing the law, does my hon. friend intend to carry out the penalty against him ? That is a question which is certainly proper to ask, and a fair one to answer. Then with reference to another point. My hon. friend is asking for $1,500 additional to his Estimates. Now, no Minister ever comes down to the House and asks for an addition to the Estimates, unless he has really some grounds for asking it, and the question is put as to whether this $1,500 was for the employment of new men, or was to increase the salaries of old men ; and I tried to get an answer to that, but I did not hear that my hon. friend answered it. Why, the simplest and plainest duty of a Minister is to give at least the general reasons why he asks for a vote. Surely he knows whether he wants it for additional help or to

increase the salaries of old employees, or he would not ask for the vote, but neither of these questions have been answered. I put it to my hon. friend if he does not think that he ought to answer those questions, especially the one as to what course he intends to pursue. If the hon. Minister is not going to carry out the law against those who violated it, there is the best of reasons why the House should not give him the money that he asks ; if he is going to carry out the law, that is a good reason for the House to vote him the money. But surely it is a simple question to ask, whether Vezina, having transgressed, is still within the toils, and whether my hon. friend proposes to put the clappers on him.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. If the House chooses to blame me for the way in which I have dealt with Vezina, I am quite willing to submit to its decision. That is the answer I give now. As to what I will do in the future, I will take my own counsel on the subject and do what I consider best.

Mr. FOSTER. Then will my hon. friend kindly answer as to what he has done with Vezina ?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I have already said what I have done, the explanation has already been given, and I do not see why I should go over the same grounds again.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has one good reason for going over the ground, and that is that I did not hear him answer that question. I would like to have that question answered. It is a mere matter of courtesy between the hon. gentleman and the hon. member on this side of the House.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. Vezina and Jobin were both condemned last winter, when my hon. friend was a member of the Government, and when he ought to be answerable as well as his colleagues for the action of the Government in not sending Vezina to jail, whilst Jobin was sent to jail. In October last my attention was drawn to the fact that Jobin was still in jail, and that Vezina was not. Jobin was in jail because he had been convicted, and had not paid the fine to which he was condemned. I thought it was my duty to punish Vezina as Jobin had been punished, and I therefore took such measures as would bring Vezina to jail. When the order was given to arrest him, I received a letter from the legal gentleman who had defended Vezina, and who drew my attention to the fact—I wish I had the letter here that I might read it—that Vezina had been condemned on four different heads for the same offence. He had been condemned to one month's imprisonment and a fine of $500, and again to an imprisonment, I think, of six months, and to a fine of $500. I did not believe, at first, that these sentences were for one and the same offence, I thought there had been a new violation of the law which had brought about all these condemnations against Vezina. When I found that Vezina had been condemned to those four penalties for the same act, and when I found that he had paid the $100 fine, then for the moment I stopped proceedings. When I found that he had been sued on four different heads for the same offence, that he had paid his fine of $100, and when I found it was a custom in the excise district of Quebec, when a fine was paid, not to insist upon imprisonment, then I thought there must have been some persecutions connected with it. I could not understand how four different convictions could be obtained against one man for the same offence, and that is why I stopped the proceedings. My hon. friend wants to know what I mean to do with these $1,500. I think I have frankly said that I do not know exactly whether I shall require it or not. As for increasing the salaries of public officers, my hon. friend is always afraid that I shall do that, he showed the other day his objection to my giving an increased salary to an officer who certainly deserved it. If I find officers who deserve to have their salaries increased in the preventive service, then I will come before the House and ask for leave to increase those salaries. For the present I am not ready to say what we are going to do with this $1,500 ; I only ask the committee to show sufficient confidence in my purpose to administer this department with economy, and to reduce the expenditure as much as possible, and at the same time to give me credit for $1,500, with my assurance that it will certainly not be wasted if it should not be wanted.

Mr. BERGERON. I am glad the hon. gentleman has given us this information, if he had done so at first this matter would have been settled long ago. Now I understand the Vezina matter well, and I have no doubt that what the hon. gentleman says is absolutely correct. I am ready, even, to support what he has done, and to say that so far as I am concerned I have no more information to ask on that subject. The hon. gentleman said a moment ago that he had not said much about dismissals. That is true ; we have not heard much from him about dismissals since that matter has been discussed in this House. I may ask my hon. friend, however, if he will allow me, and if he will take it good-naturedly why he has dismissed this officer in Valleyfield, a gentleman of whom I think he will get very good reports from his department. I would be very glad if he would tell me. I imagine that in doing so he has followed the course taken by two of his colleagues, because this gentleman was an employee of the three departments. I would be very glad if the hon. gentleman would tell me why he has dismissed Mr. Danis. He was

a good employee, and was doing his work well.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I said that I was ready to explain every dismissal that I have made since I took charge of this department, this as well as all the others. My hon. friend will understand at once why I was obliged to dispense with the services of Mr. Danis. He is not an officer of my department, he has not been appointed to my department by an Order in Council, he is only a temporary officer of the department. But Mr. Danis is one of those men who have been appointed according to law to collect our dues on commission, in cases where we do not think it proper to appoint an officer on purpose to represent the excise department. I may say we have got perhaps fifteen or twenty cases like this, in which we give to a collector of customs the collection of dues for the Inland Revenue Department. The law allows us to do that, but it only allows us to give that collection on commission to the customs-house officers. The moment that Mr. Danis ceased to be collector of customs, according to law, I had to withdraw from him the collection of our dues on commission. The law did not allow me to leave in his hands the collection of dues the moment he ceased to be an officer of the department.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand, then, from the hon. Minister that the officer who will do this work in the future will be the new appointee of the Department of Customs ?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am of the opinion, after listening to the statements made by the hon. Controller of Inland Revenue, that the staff under his charge can be reduced. I believe it will be found, when the hon. Minister makes a personal investigation, that the department is over-manned. I do not think it will be necessary to increase the staff even if there is increased work owing to changes in the tariff. The staff of the Inland Revenue Department at present numbers 335 officers, who receive annually $324,232, or very nearly $1,000 for each man. The entire collections are $7,959,446. Of these officers, there are in Ontario, 191, Quebec, 78, New Brunswick, 11, Nova Scotia, 14, Prince Edward Island, 2, Manitoba, 13, North-west Territories, 4, British Columbia, 15, Cape Breton, 1. There are, in addition, nine inspectors. After the hon. Minister has spent some time in thoroughly investigating his department, I earnestly hope he will be able to make recommendations in the direction of reductions next session, and that hon. gentlemen opposite will not come down with insinuations that such officers have been dismissed for political purposes.

Mr. FOSTER. I have been waiting for some remarks from the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). Three or four days ago when referring to the Inland Revenue Department, he declared war against it. His war is of a very mild type indeed. However, he has been a little better than the hon. member for Huron, who also made a declaration of war against this department the other day and announced what he was prepared to do when the Estimates came up, but so soon as the House got into Committee of Supply the hon. gentleman left the Chamber. I wish to say to the hon. Controller that I thank him very much for the information he gave in regard to the case in Quebec. I certainly did not understand it until he explained it to me. The explanation is, that although this man was condemned on four counts—and it seems strange he could be condemned on four counts unless he were guilty—he was let off on payment of a fine, which was the penalty on one of the counts. That may be a sufficient penalty ; I am willing to leave to the Controller the exercise of his discretion in regard to the amount. With respect to the $1,500 increase, I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he would not use any of this sum for the purpose of increasing the salaries of his officers without coming down to the House and stating the amount required.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. My hon. friend will excuse me. I said I did not propose to increase the salaries of any of the present staff without asking the House to agree to those increases.

Mr. FOSTER. The trouble is that the hon. gentleman takes a lump vote, and not one of his officers is named here, and so the hon. gentleman has power to increase the salaries by Order in Council. However, I have no doubt that as the hon. gentleman has made that statement, he will not increase any salary without notifying the House of it, and I am quite willing to trust my hon. friend, although I received a shock by the action of a Minister—which I will bring up in due time—where he made Parliament a solemn promise and violated it. The Minister of Public Works went back on a promise he made, but I will give him notice before I bring up the matter. There is one point on which the House is inexorable, it does not trust any Minister simply on the ground of good-will. The items must be explained and the reasons for increases given. The hon. Minister has in his own mind some plan for using the $1,500 increase. No doubt he will use it rightly, but the House asks for the items to be explained before they are passed. The hon. gentleman's explanation, I understand is, that there will be greater inducements probably for smuggling under the proposed tariff, and therefore he may have to use a certain amount extra. So far as that explanation

goes, I am willing to accept it on this occasion.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I desire now to offer an explanation respecting the decrease of $5,107 in salaries of officers and inspectors of excise. Several officers, whose names I can give the committee if hon. gentlemen require them, have been retired and some have died. The reductions in this way amounted to $18,320. The new appointments to replace those officers involve an expenditure of $9,100, leaving a decrease of $9,220. Then there are the following allowances to be made: Changes in classification, $222; regular increases of salaries, $3,216; appointments made in 1896-97, not provided for in the Estimates, $673. These amounts make up a total of $4,112, which deducted from $9,220, leaves a net decrease of $5,107.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). In what particular branch of the work of the department have these decreases been made?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. In the excise branch.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). In view of the new appointments and superannuations, it is evident that this is simply a reduction for this year.

Travelling, rent, fuel, &c..... $48,000

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I observe there is an increase of $400. While the increase is small, I hold that this is an item which should be kept down to the lowest point. There should not be an increase in the cost of collecting the revenue in this department. A careful examination will show that during the last three or four years, apart from the statutory increases of officials in the inside service, there was no substantial increase made. That was the policy of the department in reference to this item about which so much discussion has taken place, and which the hon. the Controller has asked to be increased for the coming year. We brought it down from $17,500 to $8,000, because I felt that that was an item, which of all others, might be abused; and so long as the Minister has more on hand than is necessary, there is always an excuse for appointing some person. That is why I would urge on the hon. gentleman not to ask for any greater amount than usual.

Mr. FOSTER. Did I understand my hon. friend the Controller to say, that he had made a saving of $18,000 by dismissals in this branch?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. Not by dismissals. I do not think there are any dismissals in the whole of that list.

Mr. FOSTER. Are they superannuations?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. No. In the case of Mr. Borrodaile who was inspector for Nova Scotia, hon. gentlemen opposite superannuated him before I came to the department. His salary was $2,500 and I recommended that this inspectorship should be abolished, and that the inspector for New Brunswick should have charge of the three maritime provinces with an increase of $200 a year, thus effecting a saving of $2,300. There were also several retirements such as Mr. Devine and Mr. Lavallee of Joliette.

Mr. BERGERON. Who replaced Mr. Lavallee?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I cannot say for the moment. In the case of Mr. Lawlor at Chatham whose salary was $1,200 a year, his office was abolished because we found that all the collections were made at Newcastle, and it was perfectly useless to have a collector at Chatham who collected nothing.

Mr. BERGERON. What was the salary of Mr. Lavallee?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. $300. The toal amount in these cases is $12,770, plus $5,550 the salaries of those who were removed, and altogether that makes a sum of $18,320. The officers who were paid that total salary of $18,320 were replaced by officers who only received $9,100, so that made a decrease of $9,220. But this sum of $9,220 is not the accurate diminution of our expenditure, and for this reason. We had on account of changes in classification, $222; for regular increases, $3,260, and for appointments made in 1896-97, $673. That made altogether $4,112, which deducted from $9,220, leaves a balance of $5,107, which is the lesser amount which we are now asking for.

Mr. BERGERON. Who replaced Mr. Lavallee at Joliette, and what salary does he get?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. Mr. St. Michel replaced Mr. Lavallee and he gets $100 less, or $200 a year.

Mr. DUGAS. I think the man who replaces Mr. Lavallee is not Mr. St. Michel, but Mr. Bazinet who is a brother of the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Bazinet).

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I do not think Mr. Bazinet replaced Mr. Lavallee. He may have replaced somebody else. Mr. St. Michel replaced Mr. Lavallee. You know it is rather hard, with over 400 employees to be able to account exactly at once for every one of them, and to tell the changes that have been made.

Mr. DUGAS. I only want to know about this one. I know that Mr. Bazinet did replace Mr. Lavallee.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). What was the income with reference to methylated spirits last year, was it an increase of a decrease?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. The net income was about $16,000. That is to say, over the $70,000 we have cleared $16,000.

Culling Timber..... ..... $16,750

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to have an explanation of this increase of $50 in the salary of the book-keeper.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. This is an officer who appeared to deserve the increase. He rendered excellent service in the department, and the supervisor has advised the increase. Besides, I may say he is doing the work of a man who had $2,000 a year.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is following the bad example of the Controller of Customs, and is making holes through this general policy of the Government not to grant any statutory increases.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. This is not a statutory increase.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not a statutory increase, but it is better than a statutory increase. There are some persons who get this increase, while the great masses of deserving clerks get nothing.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. All those who have got the increase have been appointed by our hon. friends opposite.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is controlling his own Estimates.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Strike it out.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I would be sorry to strike it out. If there are serious objections to it, I shall have to strike it out, but we are trying to render justice to these men.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I would like to ask if the Government are giving any attention to the question of abolishing this branch. In pursuance of what I believed to be the duty of the Government in that behalf, I recommended two years ago a very substantial decrease in the Estimates for this branch—nearly $10,000 less than my hon. friend is asking this year. There is a feeling pervading the minds of the public in the province of Ontario, that we ought not to pay out of the general funds of this country any money for the inspection of timber, which now goes to Quebec; and while the late Government did not see their way clear to the entire abolition of this branch, they did reduce the cost two years ago about 35 per cent from the cost of previous years. The diminution my hon. friend has been able to make this year has been very little.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. The decrease is $950; but I am happy to say the revenue will be increased by nearly one-third. Last year the lumber merchants made an offer to the Government to pay 25 per cent more in the fees for culling. For some reason or other that offer was not taken advantage of; but we are going to take advantage of it, so that we shall have over $3,000 in excess of what we had last year. Nevertheless, I agree with my hon. friend, and I will be very glad to consider the question of abolishing that branch altogether.

It being Six o'clock, the Committee rose for recess.

After Recess.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I would like to ask the Controller of Inland Revenue for the names of the cullers who were superannuated?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I did not superannuate them. They were superannuated by my hon. friend. I am sorry to say I have not the list with me.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I think I had the word of my hon. friend this afternoon that he would consider the question of abolishing this branch altogether. The late Government went as far as possible to reduce the expenditure. The item is a very exceptional one. The reason that existed for this provision several years ago, when square timber was sent in large quantities to Quebec, has disappeared almost altogether under the altered condition of things; and we are really keeping it for the benefit of a particular class. I realize how difficult it is for the Government to do at once any more than we have done. Still, it may be possible to make some further reduction before another year comes round.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. It was proposed to make the culling optional, and leave the cullers to be paid by fees, like other classes of inspectors. I certainly think that would be the wisest course to adopt, for this reason, that the timber merchants in Quebec are willing to pay the fees. We have no difficulty in Quebec; but we have a difficulty in Montreal, where, I have to admit we have not found the means of carrying out the law so easily as in Quebec, and my hon. friend can perhaps understand why. When the raft reaches Quebec in cribs, it is taken to pieces, and then it is easy to measure the timber, and everybody is satisfied to pay the fees. But in Montreal there are no coves as in Quebec where the timber can be counted; but it arrives on cars, which are run along the wharfs, and the timber is at once put on the ships The ships will not wait until the timber can be measured, and consequently we find the greatest difficulty in getting it measured. I cannot help

thinking that it would be much wiser to make the culling optional, and leave those who choose to avail themselves of it, the buyer and the seller, to arrange among themselves to pay the cullers by fees, as in the case of the inspection of fish and other things.

Mr. McMULLEN. I went carefully over the accounts during ten years of the previous Government, and I found that in those ten years we paid out over $165,000 for salaries and collected $101,000, so that we lost $64,000 by keeping the staff of cullers at Montreal and Quebec. It is time the whole system was abolished or else put in such a position that those who do the work simply get the fees. The staff should have been cut down years ago, and I am glad to hear the hon. Controller say he intends taking the whole matter into his consideration.

Salaries of officers, inspectors and assistant inspectors of weights and measures $49,010

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to give a few explanations to the committee. It will be noticed that last year the sum of $56,850 was asked for this service, which is now reduced to $49,010, making a reduction of $7,840. This is only the beginning of the reductions I propose to make in this service, and it has been accomplished by amalgamating a certain number of districts of weights and measures, one with another, and by reducing the number. For instance, the division of King's, N.B., has been amalgamated with St. John, that of London and Ontario has been amalgamated with that of Windsor, and one of the inspectors superannuated and not replaced, which makes a saving of $1,200. The division of Kingston has been amalgamated with Belgium, and an inspector superannuated and not replaced, making a saving of $1,300. Orillia has been amalgamated with Toronto, making a saving of $1,000. Edmonton and Calgary have been amalgamated with Winnipeg, making only one division, and effecting a saving of $500. Prince Albert has been amalgamated with Assiniboia, making a saving of $600. The reason why I say that I hope to be able to make much greater reductions in the future is this: The expenditure on the branch of weights and measures in the last year was $70,359, and the revenue only $36,869, leaving a deficit of $33,490. If I can effect a shrinkage in the expenditure so as to make it meet the revenue, I would then say to the House: If you choose to continue and assume the responsibility of working this department, provided it does not entail any expenditure, there cannot be very much objection. But there is certainly great objection to it in its present condition. In England this question of weights and measures is entrusted to the county council, and it would be perfectly fair to do the same thing here. I have the latest regulations adopted in England, under which the important duty of verifying and inspecting weights and measures is carried on by the local authorities. The objection will be made that we cannot allow every municipality to have different weights and measures, and you must reserve to the Government the custody of the standards, so as to ensure uniformity all over the Dominion, as otherwise we would return to that condition which used to exist, not so much in Canada as in Europe, where every county had a different set of weights and measures. I am not going to ask the House to consider any measure this session, but I think it is right to express the views which the experience of a few months has given me. I consider that there are two applications of the system of weights and measures. I would like to classify the work which so far has been carried on by the central Government by dividing it into two classes. On one side I would place what I consider the enforced and on the other what I consider the optional way, and I would like to diminish what I consider the optional way. There are some things which I look upon as inevitable. For instance, in the case of the large elevators, as in the North-west, we must keep in our hands the responsibility of standing between the farmers on the one side and those corporations which own the elevators on the other. A farmer arrives with a load of wheat. It is dumped at once into the elevator, and he has not the remotest chance of checking the weight given to him on a piece of paper, and no wonder that the system engenders a certain amount of suspicion and complaint in his mind which it is very difficult to allay without a system of inspection of the scales. It is ridiculous that scales that are put to such work as are those of the grain elevators should be inspected only once in two years. Nevertheless, that is the law. But if I am allowed, as I hope to be, to alter this system, I should like to take a part of the money we spend more or less uselessly and spend it more usefully in having an inspection in these cases every six months or every three months, or even oftener as experience shows that it is required. There are certain cases in which it is compulsory upon the producer to have his produce weighed, and to have no control of the weighing. It is in such cases that we must stand between the seller and the buyer—for instance, between the farmers of the North-west and the great corporation that own the elevators. Then, as to the coal mines in Nova Scotia, I would like the committee to understand how childish it is to suppose that an inspection once every twenty-four months can assure the correctness of scales subject to such heavy work as these in the coal mines. I have heard of complaints among coal miners. Workmen paid by the weight, not unnaturally, have a suspicion of their employers.

They complain of the scales, and say that they are not justly treated. A couple of months ago, I sent an inspector especially to inspect the scales of the coal mines of Nova Scotia. I received his report, and from that report I can see how indispensable it is, if we want to remove suspicion among a large class of coal miners, just as if we wish to remove in the case of the farmers of the west, we must provide that the inspection shall take place oftener than once in two years. Then, again, there are the platform scales in railway stations. I look upon this as one of the cases in which it is compulsory upon the producer to weigh his goods without being able to control the weighing. It would be very easy for us to inspect the scales at the railway stations, as they would all be so easily accessible to the inspectors travelling by train. There are other inspections that it is indispensable we should keep in our own hands. The inspection of electric light meters is one of these and the inspection of gas meters is another. We have beautiful apparatus all over the Dominion used for the purpose of making inspections of gas and electric light meters. In this case also it is not possible for the consumer to protect himself. How can a consumer know whether a meter measures correctly the amount of gas or electric light that is consumed. On the other side, it appears to me, such inspections as are not necessarily compulsory might be handed over to the municipal authorities. For instance, the inspection of scales of grocers, butchers, confectioners, and all that class of retailers, the correctness of which is more or less within the control of the purchaser. Any one who goes to buy a pound of tea or five or six pounds of sugar, if he has any observation or common sense can soon discover whether he is getting proper measure. He can protect himself, if only by going to another store. A man is not at the mercy of the retailer. It must be well understood that while I classify this inspection of weights and measures in two classes, while I would like to retain the most important ones, particularly that connected with the farming operation, which form the greatest trade, at the same time, it must be well understood that I would propose—because I am not asking this session that the law should be changed, but merely outline what I think is desirable—the Government should maintain control of the inspection of primary scales so as to secure uniformity throughout the country. For instance, every electoral division, if we chose to manage it in that way, might have a standard scale which would be inspected and stamped as correct and in conformity with the standards we have here in Ottawa. I do not see why the system that prevails in England should not prevail here. I do not see why we should saddle ourselves with a responsibility which brings such a heavy deficit every year, especially for such a system as we have. What is the advantage of an inspection made once in two years? Any dishonest retailer can change his balance the moment the inspector's back is turned.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How is the period of two years fixed, by statute or by Order in Council?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. By statute. I need hardly tell my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) that in a number of cases we found that inspections had not been made for four or five or even six years. It is very easy to understand why this is so. The weights and measures inspectors are paid, not by the amount they do, not by fees. And those whose scales they inspect and who are obliged to pay them certain fees—making up the amount of $36.000 of revenue—are not anxious to get the inspectors of weights and measures for the very reason that they are compelled to pay a fee when they come, which fee is returned to the exchequer. There is not profit in it for the inspectors either, as they are paid by the year. I think the inspection of such scales should be left to the municipal authorities as in England. In this connection I would like to refer to market scales. I have not been able to find what profit they bring to all our cities, but I have the figures in a few cases. In Quebec the market scales were rented last year for $1,227; in Toronto this privilege brought $6,230; I find that in Montreal the weighing by market scales brought $10,927. I think it is perfectly clear that we should try to find means of bringing under the municipal authorities that part of the inspection which can be done much better under those authorities, and which they already do to a certain degree. We can scarcely open a paper without seeing that a batch of a certain baker's loaves have been confiscated because they are of light weight. It was not our officers who ascertained that, it was a municipal officer. I may say the same thing of a good many other items, which show how much better the service would be performed if it was performed in some other way than at present, that is, to put it in charge of those who are directly interested in seeing it well administered. I have now given you my views of the service, formed after the comparatively short experience that I have had in this department; and I shall be very glad to hear what can be said by my hon. friend from Brockville, and others who have had experience.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I do not think I shall attempt to follow my hon. friend in all the points which he has no doubt carefully examined. I will point out, in the first place, that which I think has escaped his notice, that in passing the law relative to weights and measures, Parliament had in mind this very important fact, that to a

certain extent the public had to be guarded against themselves as a result of their own ignorance. In the first place the weights and measures branch of that department never was intended to be self-sustaining, at least for many years. I cannot say at this moment whether, under the system that has been in vogue in England, the amounts received from fees in the weights and measures branch are equal to the expenditure. I imagine, however, that even in England my hon. friend will find, if he further investigates the subject, which he has undoubtedly studied to a considerable extent, that very accurate reports must be made to Parliament by that branch of the public service in which this information could be ascertained. But if he expects that he is ever going to get the receipts from weights and measures to equal the expenditure, I am bound to say that he will be mistaken, because I do not think that can take place for many years to come. I speak within the hearing of the Commissioner of Inland Revenue, who is himself an authority on the subject, and I think I speak in accordance with his own views upon that matter. My hon. friend must bear in mind that in legislating upon subjects of this kind, you cannot expect, and it never was in the mind of Parliament, that your income should be equal to the expenditure when the object of legislation is the protection of the public against themselves. Now there is a valid reason made by the Controller to-night in favour of what he calls municipal inspection, that does not make with equal force to any legislation which we might have in regard to the inspection of electric lights and gas. If anything, there is much more reason why any legislation pertaining to the weights and measures, which in itself is a subject closely connected with trade and commerce, should be a subject of legislation here, and that gas and electric lights should rather be relegated to the municipal authorities. That is my opinion. Parliament, in undertaking any legislation, should not separate the jurisdiction, leaving a portion within the purview of this legislature, and relegating the rest of it to the municipal authorities. I point out, also, one effect, I think, of the system which he has outlined as possibly containing his policy for the future upon this branch of the subject, and that is that there is no doubt at all but that if you divested this Parliament of its jurisdiction over inspection of gas and electric light, you make it optional to the municipalities to perform that inspection, and you will find gas and electric lights inspected in one municipality and not in another. The very object which you are seeking for, that is uniformity in legislation of this kind, would be defeated by thus dividing the jurisdiction in this Federal Parliament and relegating a portion of it to the municipalities. Now, that briefly is my comment upon what my hon. friend has said. If, however, he seeks to find by analogy a law which he would like to adopt, then I must point out to him what I have done on previous occasions to this Parliament, and ask him whether it would not be better on his part to adopt the metrical system of measurement in preference to the system now in vogue, and which is in force in England. If he chooses to take up legislation on the subject he has outlined to-night, of course that could only be done in the way of a Bill, and would be fruitful of much discussion. Now one of the objects of the late Government in enacting the legislation which the Controller has alluded to respecting the inspection of electric lights and establishments for measuring, was that the deficiency on the revenue obtained might be made up. I am glad to learn from the information that I have received from the department, that the expectations of the late Government in that respect are being very nearly met, and it can only be a matter of a year or two until, under the wise legislation, I must say, of the late Government, the expenditure and revenue in that important branch, will be equalized, as they are already nearly so. I cannot, however, hold out any hope for attaining any such results in connection with any such legislation as exists in England in regard to weights and measures. I think on the whole it would be much better to retain in the hands of this Parliament the sole jurisdiction in regard to that matter. Now let me point out further to the Controller of Inland Revenue, that in making combinations uniting the weights and measures inspection districts, I think he has only followed an Order in Council passed by the late Government requiring that that should be done in certain inspection districts. I think the Controller will find that I am right in this statement, and that he is taking the first opportunity of uniting those districts where it is possible. I was somewhat surprised to find that notwithstanding there has been a union of the different districts and a lessening of the number of inspectors as a result, we find that the salaries in the next item for rents and expenses of those offices, are increased by $50.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. We put that in to make the total a round number.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). If you have lessened the number of inspectors, you must have of necessity lessened the occasion for so much expenditure.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How many less are there ?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. Eight less.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Can the hon. Controller tell me the amount that has been added to the superannuation allowance in

consequence of the union of those districts and the lessening of the number of inspectors? You have already pointed out that you have made a saving of $7,840, and that appears in the Estimates, but we cannot get at the actual saving until we know how much the hon. gentleman has assigned to the superannuation fund.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I am not able at this moment to say exactly what has been added to the superannuation fund. Of course this is not exactly in our department. It is one of those items in regard to which it is impossible for me to say at this moment how much has been added to the superannuation fund. But I can say that it has caused a diminution in the actual expenditure of $7,840, and whatever has been added to the superannuation fund must be very much less than that. The ages of some of those officers are 75, 72, and so on, so that I am afraid they cannot continue a great many years to enjoy that fund.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The hon. gentleman appears to be under the impression that the inspection was continuous. Inspectors of weights and measures can be called upon at any time.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. Then an extra amount will be needed.

Mr. DOMVILLE. The hon. Controller has stated that a radical change is now being brought about throughout the country in the way of inspection. I am not prepared to blame him in regard to this matter, because I think he has been advised by those whose duty it is to advise him, and who come under the denomination "departmental." No doubt, in Ottawa there is an officialdom that runs the country. If anything is said in regard to these officials, the reply is made that you are attacking members of the department and seeking to ruin them and their families; and yet these men, when perhaps the Minister has not been very long in office, tell him something that he believes, in the innocence of his heart, to be correct and should be carried out. I do not blame the present Minister, because I do not think that he has looked into this matter at all. There is a power behind the throne. The doctrine now put forward is that the inspection of weights and measures should be a municipal matter. But how could this be carried out in the country without the consent of the people and without proper municipal laws? It would be an impossibility. If this view be correct, we are going to do away altogether with the inspection. Then why not abolish this branch of the department? This might as well be done as that the head of the department—I am not blaming the Minister, I am not talking politics—should declare that this work is not necessary. The department has been carrying out this work for a great number of years, and yet now the chief of that staff at Ottawa comes forward and says that he does not consider this work is needed. I repeat that I am not referring to the Minister or blaming him in any way whatever, because I think he has been badly advised, but I say that two officers in St. John cannot do the work. We have the fact that with inspectors in Kent, King's, York, Albert and various other counties under the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, the work was not carried out, and now it is argued that because those officers do not do their work properly, no inspection is needed by the farmers and consumers, that the whole system of weights and measures should go by the board. Why did not the hon. Minister who was then in charge of the department make these officers do their duty. Now, because it suits them to come here with a new-fangled idea, they recommend the Minister to do away with the weights and measures inspectors, except two officers in St. John. If there was a staff of officers in past days who did not perform their duty, how can it be argued that two officers are going to do the work when twenty men failed to perform it? I am sent to this House to represent my constituents. I believe when we pay our taxes we should receive pound for pound. We find to-day that a man who never did a hand's turn is kept on at the work of inspection, and the man who did the work is put out. Is that common sense? This involves no reflection on the Minister—I absolve the Minister—he cannot know all the country, he has been in office only a very short time and he knows I have kindly feelings towards him; but I contend that his staff has acted wrongly, that his advisers are wrong, and I speak for New Brunswick when I say that in the arrangement made the Minister and the officials acted wrongly. There was a sinister motive under it. They superannuated the man who did the work, giving him next to nothing, $288 a year, and they left in office the man who had never done a hand's turn in connection with the department. Who so advised the Minister? Could the Minister know the counties of Kent and King's and the circumstances and conditions of the case? No. He was simply advised, and he was wrongly advised. I have nothing more to say except that the consumer should receive a pound when he buys a pound; that the Government should place the buyer in a position so that when he purchases his goods he will be protected; or do away altogether with the branch of this department and save the taxpayers the expense, and let them look out for themselves. There is a great deal of force in the argument that the buyer should look out for himself. I have never had very much faith in weights and measures inspection or in the inspection of gas. They have

beautiful instruments—they have a dark room and a flash-light. But the man who sells gas can always show eleven candle power if he works the matter rightly. We must consider the question whether it would not be better to abolish the whole branch. I think the hon. gentleman himself has given the best argument for its abolition, namely, that the different counties in the province do not need inspectors, but that two officers in St. John can do the work. This, of course, would be a farce; if the work is to be carried on at all, it should be carried out completely and in its entirety. Let us go back to the common-sense principle, and whatever the cost may be to the country, let us have the principle established on the basis of inspecting what the consumer uses. As I said before, I do not attach any blame to my hon. friend the Controller, but I think that he has been very badly advised by his officers. Neither am I finding any fault with the former Controller, but I am saying, that if the officers in the Department of Weights and Measures had done their duty properly they would have work enough done in King's county and Kent and other counties to pay all the expenses of the inspection. But if they allow one man to go on and do all the work, and the other man to sit there and do nothing, what can they expect but that the country does not derive sufficient revenue on account of the inspection. I again repeat that it is not the fault of the Controller of Customs in the late or in the present Government, but it is the fault of the officers of the department. I think, however, that the Controller of Inland Revenue (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) before he took this move, might have at least consulted some of his supporters and asked them what they thought of it.

Mr. McINERNEY. It is quite evident to anybody that the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) has a grievance against the Controller of Inland Revenue; and that that grievance arises very largely, if not altogether, from the fact that a gentleman in the county of King's, Mr. Walter B. Scovil—a very decent man and in his time a very efficient officer—has been superannuated. Upon that fact, the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) has built up a grievance which has very little foundation. In order to straighten the whole matter out, if the Controller of Inland Revenue would simply answer two or three very short questions that I am going to put to him, I think that he will completely dispose of the grievance that the member for King's (Mr. Domville) thinks he has.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I beg to interrupt the hon. member (Mr. McInerney). I made no grievance; I was talking to the question, whether we should have inspection or not.

Mr. McINERNEY. Then, if the hon. member (Mr. Domville) has not expressed a grievance, it is hard for one to know when the hon. gentleman has a grievance and when he is serious, and when he is in fun. But, I think it strikes the most opaque mind, that the hon. gentleman from King's (Mr. Domville) thinks he has a very serious grievance indeed. The first question which I shall ask the hon. the Controller of Inland Revenue is this: What is the age of Mr. Walter B. Scovil?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. He is seventy-two years of age.

Mr. McINERNEY. Then, I would ask the Controller of Inland Revenue, is it true or is it not true, that Mr. Scovil has done all the work lately, and that Mr. Richard, of Kent, has done none?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. Oh, no. I was going to answer the hon. gentleman from King's (Mr. Domville). I will answer my hon. friend by-and-by.

Mr. McINERNEY. I wish to have these questions answered now, and I wish to ask the Controller of Inland Revenue further: if by the change he has made he does not bring about a saving of $800 a year.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes.

Mr. DOMVILLE. We all admit that.

Mr. McINERNEY. Then, in the first place, we have it, that Mr. Scovil is seventy-two years of age, a very old man and should be superannuated; in the second place, that Mr. Scovil has not done the work lately, but that it has been done almost entirely by Mr. Richard; and, in the third place, that the change proposed and brought about already, I believe, by the Controller of Inland Revenue, has effected a saving of $800 a year. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that these three reasons afford sufficient justification for the course that the hon. Controller of Inland Revenue has taken in this matter. But, Sir, we have here what the Montreal "Gazette" heads "A most peculiar petition."—brought into this House the other day by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville), and which is printed in full in the "Gazette." That petition I wish to tell the committee, is from the first to the last a tissue of statements that have no foundation whatever in fact. It represents itself as being signed by "James Domville, M.P. for the county of King's, N.B., and several hundred others."

Mr. DOMVILLE. I rise to a question of order. The hon. member has no right to quote from a paper—will the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McInerney) sit down if he pleases. When an hon. member of this House signs a paper he places himself in the hands of the House, and the hon. member (Mr. McInerney) has no right to quote from that paper, and state that the matter is without foundation in fact. He has no

right to state that unless he has some better authority than a newspaper statement to sanction it.

Mr. McINERNEY. Where is the point of order ?

Mr. DOMVILLE. I wish him to withdraw that statement "without foundation in fact."

Mr. McINERNEY. I do not think the Chairman will rule against me on that very important point of order which has been raised by the hon. gentleman from King's (Mr. Domville). It is almost too absurd to require a ruling. I am now quoting from the Montreal "Gazette," a petition which was presented to this House and signed by James Domville, M.P., and——

Mr. DOMVILLE. I rise to a point of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Has the hon. member a right to say in this House——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Has the hon. gentleman a right to say that a statement made by myself as a member of this House is without foundation in fact; has he a right to say it by simply reading a newspaper ? I ask you to make your ruling on that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McINERNEY. This is a petition that is signed and sent in here by James Domville, M.P., and several hundred others.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I want your ruling, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Bain). I think there is no doubt that an hon. member has the right to quote from the newspapers of the day, any statement that is in public print, and which may bear on the question before the House. It would be better, perhaps, for an hon. member not to use the expression "no foundation in fact" as applied to an hon. member of this House.

Mr. McINERNEY. Mr. Chairman, this is a petition that is printed in the Montreal "Gazette." It is not only signed by James Domville, M,P., but by several hundred others, and I do not know of any better or more polite way of saying that the thing is untrue than by saying that it has no foundation in fact. If there are any other words which would more politely express the idea I have in my mind, and which would meet with the approval of the Chairman and of the House, I would be only too glad to use them.

Mr. DOMVILLE. The newspaper does not say that. It is you who said it.

Mr. McINERNEY. If I did say that a statement by an hon. member in this House had no foundation in fact, I do not think that that even would be unparliamentary: but I am reading from a petition published in the Montreal "Gazette," and signed by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville), and several hundred others. Now, in this petition the hon. gentleman (Mr. Domville) alleges that Mr. Richard has done no work at all, that he has lazed around, and that Mr. Scovil has done all the work. In that statement the hon. member (Mr. Domville) is flatly denied by the hon. Controller of Inland Revenue who says, that Mr. Scovil, for some time has been unable to perform his duty, and that is a fact which every one in the province of New Brunswick knows. I would be the last man to say a single harsh word against Mr. Scovil, who is my personal friend, and who has been a very efficient officer; but that statement that Mr. Scovil has done all the work while Mr. Richard has done none of it, is certainly without foundation. Imagine a man 72 years of age travelling around the country. Those who know Mr. Scovil will bear me out in the statement that he is, by reason of his infirmities, unfitted for the duties of the office. But the hon. gentleman does not rest there. In trying to make a case against Mr. Richard, he said :

> Furthermore, that the said Richard was an active partisan against the Liberal party and its friends, both in Dominion and local elections, which can be clearly established ; whilst the said Scovil has most carefully been neutral, although all his friends and relations have done all in their power for the success of the Liberal party and yourself, which also can be fully proved.

That is a strange statement to appear in a petition presented to this House. The hon. member for King's ought to know, what many members from the province of New Brunswick in this House do know, that there is no such thing in the province of New Brunswick as a Liberal party and a Conservative party in provincial politics. I appeal to the hon. member for the city of St. John (Mr. Ellis), who for some time past, in the "Globe" newspaper which he controls and edits, has been trying to bring about the running of provincial politics on federal party lines, but he has been unable to do so; and the boast of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) has been for years that while he was Premier of the province his government was not run on Dominion party lines at all, but was a composite government composed of both Liberals and Conservatives. At the present time, the Premier of the province, Mr. Mitchell, is a Conservative, and his cabinet is about equally composed of Liberals and Conservatives. So that the statement made by the hon. member for King's that in local elections as well as federal Mr. Richard has been an active partisan and opposed to the Liberal party, is shown to be absurd; and that one statement is a sample of the statements in the whole

petition. Now, I want to deny most flatly —not because I hold any brief to defend Mr. Richard or am interested in his welfare, but simply in justice to the truth—I want to deny most flatly the statement made in that petition that Mr. Richard was an active partisan in the last election. It is not true. Mr. Richard took no part in the last federal election, or in any election, so far as I know, in Kent county since 1878; and I ought to know, because I have been in every contest from that date to the present time. He has taken no active part in politics, either federal or provincial. On the contrary, he was in the last election a deputy returning officer in the town of Richibucto, and held a poll in a part of the building in which was his own office, and in that capacity his conduct was most impartial. Nobody had anything to say against it; he performed his duties faithfully and honestly. As an instance of his impartiality, I may mention that there was in the town a man of the name of Edward Lawson, who was strongly in my favour, and who happened to have his name on two lists in the parish of Richibucto—one at the court-house and one at the polling place over which Mr. Richard presided. When he came to Mr. Richard's poll to vote, Mr. Richard told him that he must go to the other division, that he could not poll his vote in that division. I cite that case to show Mr. Richard's impartiality. So I deny the statement contained in this petition. I will assume that the hon. member for King's was not perhaps acquainted with the facts when he signed this petition. I will suppose that it was manufactured in King's county by some of the red-hot partisans of the hon. gentleman, who thought that if this office were to be taken away from his party, a grievous wrong would be done to them. I acquit the hon. gentleman of signing this petition knowing that what it contained was not true; I do not believe he would be guilty of that. But if he knew that these things were not true, I do not know what I would have to say about the hon. gentleman, because the statement to which I have called attention is on a par with every statement in the petition. Mr. Richard has been, I think, in the service since 1878, when he was appointed to take the place of the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Blanchard) now sitting in this House. He was appointed about the same time that Mr. Scovil was appointed. He is a much younger man, he has performed his duties faithfully ever since, and he has taken no active part in politics. Now, I can see no reason why Kent county should not have this position as well as the county of King's. The county of King's is situated at the very end of the group of counties served by this office. There are the counties of King's, Albert, Westmoreland, Kent, Northumberland, Gloucester, and Restigouche. Kent is in the centre of the group while King's is at one end of it.

Mr. McINERNEY.

Mr. DOMVILLE. King's has the intelligence.

Mr. McINERNEY. Yes, it has, and it has proved it on many occasions. Kent county has a larger population than King's county.

Mr. DOMVILLE. No.

Mr. McINERNEY. Well, the hon. gentleman had better look up the census returns of 1891, and he will find that what I state is correct. On that account Kent is entitled to some consideration. I do not say that Kent should absolutely have this position, but I do say that so far as the two counties are concerned, I can see no reason why Kent should not have it and King's should have it. One very peculiar reason which the hon. member for King's puts forward is that King's has been loyal to the Liberal party. That is a most peculiar statement for him to make. Was King's loyal to the Liberal party from 1882 to 1896, when it refused to elect the hon. gentleman every time he offered, and when it elected the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) on every occasion against him? The hon. gentleman himself was a member of the old guard of Conservatives. All you have to do is to go to one of the rooms here and you will see a beautiful picture on the wall in which you will find the beaming countenance of the hon. member for King's as one of the old guard at that time. But I find no fault with the hon. gentleman for changing his political opinions if he has a reason for doing so; I am simply discussing the statement he makes that King's has been loyal to the Liberal party. Is it not plain to any man that it is for political reasons alone that the hon. gentleman has had this fling at a non-partisan, efficient and well-qualified officer, in favour of some friend for whom he wants the position, whether qualified or not? I have the figures of the last census, which a friend has given me, and I find that the population of Kent is 23,845, and the population of King's 23,087. So that I have proved what the hon. gentleman denied with regard to the population of the county of Kent and King's.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I did not catch the figures from the hon. member. What is the decimal difference of figures between the two?

Mr. McINERNEY. There is a difference of 758. I merely rose for the purpose of calling attention to the fact that it is well known in this House and out of it, that the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) has a grievance against the Controller of Inland Revenue. And I merely wished to justify the course which the hon. Controller of Inland Revenue has taken in this matter, not from a political standpoint, but on the three grounds, namely, that Mr. Richard has done nearly all the work of late years and Mr. Scovil very little; that there is a sav-

ing of $800 effected by the change; and that Mr. Scovil is over seventy-two years of age, and his infirmity and age call for his superannuation. There is thus no excuse for cavilling at the change effected by the hon. Controller, and I hope the hon. Controller will not be influenced by any declaration made to him by the hon. member for King's, nor do I believe he will. Let the hon. member kick, he is well able to, and if he has not any just ground for kicking, he cannot do much harm to the venerable gentleman and honest man who at present fills the position of Controller of Inland Revenue.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I am somewhat amused at the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McInerney) talking about changing sides. I think he changed six times. He accuses me of supporting the Liberal party to-day. Why should I not support it? What do I owe to him or his political party. I was never tethered, like the Scotchman's cow, by the mouth, and am free to go where I like. I am responsible to the grand old county of King's, and if that grand old county had the discrimination and the good sense to send me here, why should my hon. friend find fault? The hon. gentleman knows that he was right ready to go with the Government of the day if they would take him. When he talks about Mr. Richard not taking part in politics, I hold a letter from Mr. Ferguson, J.P., of the county of Kent, who says he was a most active partisan. The petition I sent him was based on the facts, and the hon. Controller knows that when I spoke to-night, I spoke, not personally of himself, but of the department under him, which was the cause of the mistake made, and I said that if he would bring down to the House the papers, on which the petition was based, they would prove that in eighteen years of service Mr. Richard did little or no work. The hon. gentleman rings the changes on Mr. Scovil being seventy-two years of age. Has he not a right to be seventy-two years old? Who is going to stop him? There is not a scratch against Walter B. Scovil's name in the whole of New Brunswick. If the hon. gentleman accuses me of turning my coat or if I accuse him of turning his coat twenty times, Walter Scovil never turned his. I appeal to Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, who, I think, knows something about him, whether if ever there was a man who did his work well, that man was Walter B. Scovil. What point is my hon. friend trying to make? Does he want to make the point that he did not join us in time and that it is too late now. I see some of my friends over there who have, perhaps, a little more ability than ordinary men, clever fellows, and they drew the wool over his head and said to him: Hold on to us, wait until the school question is settled, it will get us into power, and we will put you in the Cabinet. And the hon. gentleman put the weights into each scale. On the one side he could not get anything, and on the other he stood a chance if his party came in, and the latter had the greatest weight. My hon. friend may find some fault with my criticism, but I am simply following his lead. I am not here to fight the battle of Mr. Scovil, but the battle of principle. The hon. gentleman begged the question, when he said that King's county was at one end of the string and Kent at the other. If that be the case, the string should be cut in the middle and neither should exist.

Mr. McINERNEY. I said that Kent was in the centre of the string.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Then it should be at the other end. Now, my hon. friend claims that Kent county has 758 more population than King's. It is not fair to bring that up against me. He knows that while I was representing King's county and while King's county was supporting the Government, and until that county changed its representative, its populaiton never fell off, but when it did it is a singular fact that there was a decrease in population of over 2,000: and if we retained our normal increase, we would have 6,000 more there to-day. When the hon. gentleman talked of King's county not being loyal to the Liberal party, he touches not me but my county. King's county was loyal to that party. Whatever King's county may have thought of me, the people of that county, in their better judgment, thought that they should displace somebody who was representing them and in whom they had not faith, and they elected me. That had nothing to do with politics. King's county, from one end to the other, was tired of the late Government, and I think it comes with very bad grace from the hon. gentleman to attack us with regard to our Liberalism. My hon. friend has charged that I turned for what I could get. Well, I never had anything out of any party.

Mr. BENNETT. You have a trip to England ahead of you.

Mr. DOMVILLE. You might have a trip to Kingston ahead of you, and a free trip.

Mr. BENNETT. I think the hon. gentleman will probably be going to Beauport soon—there is an asylum there.

Mr. DOMVILLE. We are all driving towards Quebec, I think. My hon. friend has made a great mistake, and I think that if he will come down to New Brunswick and contrast his own position with my position he will see that he has made a great mistake. My hon. friend has gone about in fear and trembling lest a protest should be entered against him. He got through in some way by the law courts. I, unfortunately, am in.

Mr. McINERNEY. I heard that you had got through yesterday.

Mr. DOMVILLE. My hon. friend makes most rash and extravagant statements. He stated that the petition which has been referred to was without any foundation, but now he admits that there are things which justify it. He says that this officer should not be in King's county but in Kent county, because it is in the middle of the district. But in some respects, his county is at the end of the string and not in the middle. I am very sorry that this matter should have come up. I do not know why the hon. gentleman should have made this attack upon me. I have never uttered a word against him. I could say a great deal against him in a political or a parliamentary sense. If the hon. gentleman thinks that anything he can say against me in recrimination is going to hurt me in my county he is entirely mistaken. My county is with me. I can state, as I have stated before to the House and to the country, that I have the greatest pride in supporting Mr. Laurier and his policy. Let that policy be continued and it will be of incalculable benefit to the people. I do not think the hon. gentleman makes a charge against me that it is necessary to meet when he says that I have changed my mind upon political matters. I act here with many gentlemen on this side who seek to recognize public opinion, not to bamboozle the country, but to do their duty. I am sure I spoke to my hon. friend (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) in a courteous manner. I found fault with his department and, I think, justly. It is a department that should be overhauled. I am thankful to my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. McInerney) for an opportunity to show that while I have changed my opinion once he has changed his, I think, six times.

Mr. McINERNEY. I do not intend to get into any altercations with the hon. gentleman from King's. I do not know that any person in this House has much to gain by such a course. There are certain characters that belong to every circus. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman thinks he is in a circus, but he certainly acts as if he thought he was not in a House of Parliament. He seems to think that I brought this matter up. His memory must be failing him. It was not until he attacked the Controller of Inland Revenue that I said a word. He spoke of a certain official who had lazed around and had performed no work, and he spoke of Mr. Scovil, and so forth, before I said a word. But he tries to make the House believe that I brought this matter up and made an attack upon him. I would contemn making an attack upon the hon. gentleman. I have higher duties to perform in this House than that. But, if I were to take up the political record of the hon. gentleman in New Brunswick and lay it bare to gentlemen in this House who do not know it, they would not continue to associate with him either in public or in private life. His character is well known in our part of the country. He boasts because he was elected last election. No doubt the hon. gentleman thinks that he has a great deal to boast about. He has tried to be elected very frequently. When I alluded to his change of politics, I was careful to add that I had no fault to find with him for that change. I have no fault to find with any man who changes his views. The greatest answer that Disraeli ever made was to those who charged that he had not been consistent in his political views. But the hon. gentleman is always lauding the Prime Minister and stating that he is prepared to follow him in darkness and in daylight. Still, I find him, every now and again, getting his knife into some member of the Administration. Is it not known that the ambition lurked in the hon. gentleman's mind that he might be a Minister of the Crown. He took a trip to Ottawa and was told by the Prime Minister that such a thing was altogether out of the question. The hon. gentleman then said: Then let me go to England with you. He is satisfied with that—satisfied to go down Piccadilly and the Strand in a brand new uniform, and doing credit and honour to Canada as well as to the mounted infantry.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Oh, give us a rest.

Mr. McINERNEY. The corps to which the hon. gentleman belongs is very well known, no doubt; but I do not know at this moment whether the hon. gentleman belongs to cavalry or the infantry. But he will be dressed up in his best bib and tucker, and, instead of being a Minister, he will be one of the guards of the Prime Minister when he goes down Piccadilly in the great procession. Some hon. gentlemen beside me say that this is too much. No; I wish to see just such honours heaped upon the hon. gentleman. The county of King's sent him here for a purpose; but he finds now that he cannot control the Controller of Inland Revenue by making such speeches to him, and that the Minister is prepared to do justice to any and all counties, notwithstanding the threats of the hon. member for King's.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I was sorry that my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Domville) did not understand, or, at least, did not appreciate the explanations I gave in the department the other day, when we met in the most kindly manner. I expressed my regret, that anything I had done should have caused him disappointment. Friends are not so plentiful that we can take pleasure in offending them. What I did, I did for the best interests of the public service. If I may be allowed, I should like to summarize the reasons I gave my hon. friend. I have been trying to remodel the department of weights and measures from one end of the Dominion

to the other. Superannuations have taken place, not merely in New Brunswick, but in many other parts of the country. This appeared to be a plan which will result at last in economy for the country. I explained to my hon. friend that in the division of King's there were two men, Mr. Scovil against whom I have nothing absolutely in the world to say, and Mr. Richard. I knew neither of these gentlemen, and I have no political leanings to either. I knew they were appointed by my hon. friends opposite, and I respect them for having done their duty. But when I had to choose between the two and saw that I could dispense with one, what did I do? First of all in that division, there are seven counties, and everybody acquainted with New Brunswick knows how they are situated. They are King's, Westmoreland, Albert, Gloucester, Kent, Restigouche and Northumberland. Now, the county of King's is exactly at the lower end of that division, while Kent is as nearly as possible in the middle of it, and that is one of the reasons why I chose from among the two officers, the one who resided in the centre. Secondly, the officer that I chose had a smaller salary by $200 than the other, and that was a gain to economy, although a small one. In the third place, Mr. Richard who, my hon. friend is under the impression is a worthless officer and is not to be compared with Mr. Scovil, collected last year $354, against $120 collected by Mr. Scovil.

Mr. DOMVILLE. That was only one year.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I think I have explained to the House that I had the greatest respect for Mr. Scovil, and I never found any fault with him. I do not say he did not try to do his duty, but I have given the result of the collections made by these two officers. There was a fourth reason, and that is that Mr. Scovil had attained the age of 72 years. Now, my hon. friend is not satisfied with my action in that matter, and I am very sorry for it. As I said a moment ago, nothing is more painful to me than to have to give offence to a friend, but I have to perform my duty in the department.

Mr. McMULLEN. I compliment the hon. gentleman on the reduction that he has made in his outside officers, and I think there is ample room in the department in Ottawa where considerable reductions should be made also.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. If my hon. friend will allow me —I would like to say further, in allusion to what was said by my hon. friend from Brockville (Mr. Wood) in recommending the adoption of the metrical system——

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I suggested to the Controller that if he succeeded in carrying out these changes, he had better consider whether it would not be wise to follow the example of England in the adoption of the metrical system. I did not pledge myself beyond that expression.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. Now, if anybody in this House understands the metrical system, I claim that I understand it, because I was brought up in a country where the metrical system is in use. It is certainly the best system in every possible way, as it reduces every measure of length, weight and capacity, in both liquids and solids, to one single unit, and adopts furthermore the decimal system. It is impossible to find a more rational system than that one. Now, the reason why I have not recommended its adoption to our Government is that it takes the people a long time to change from one system to another. This is shown by the history of the metrical system in France. It was introduced in 1793, and Napoleon himself, notwithstanding all his power, was unable to force the people to adopt it. It took more than half a century, and it was only in 1845, under the most severe and stringent laws passed under Louis Philippe, that the government ultimately succeeded in bringing the metrical system into use. They had to make it compulsory by heavy fines decreed against every trader who employed any other measure. Now, if it took more than half a century to force its adoption in France, we must be content to work patiently here. I am not in favour of making the metrical system compulsory in this country at once. I want to make it first known here, and I think I have adopted the right way of doing so by sending to France and getting something which I will be glad to show to any hon. gentleman who wishes to see it, and which I mean to distribute among the universities. I have procured a box of models of the different measures of the metrical system, which are placed in every primary school throughout the length and breadth of France so that the children have before them an object lesson showing what the metre is, and what the decimeter is, and the centimetre. I received this box from France about a week ago, and I would like to show these models to the hon. members. I mean to do everything that I can to make the advantage of the metrical system well understood in this country before trying to make it compulsory. The hon. member for Brockville said that in making these reductions, I had only done what the Government of which he was a member, proposed to do years ago. That is very true. In 1881 a strong recommendation was made by the commissioner of the department to reduce the staff of officers of the weights and measures branch, from seventy or fifty. Did my hon. friends reduce it to fifty? During the fifteen years of Conservative Government did any hon. gentleman supporting that Government

make any effort to effect that reduction? No, Sir, but when I came in we began to reduce the staff, and I hope we will be able to reduce it still lower than that. My hon. friend speaks of the amalgamation of the different districts so as to make one district out of two or three adjacent districts. An Order in Council was passed by the late Government in 1889, but did they carry it into execution? No, they did not, but they left that for this Government to do.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The discussion has taken a wider range than I supposed it would take, but that is largely owing to the lengthy remarks made by the Controller, and the wide ground he covered. Now, I admit that the hon. gentleman has by amalgamation of some of the different districts, made a saving by superannuating all the persons whose names he read over, but that saving is not shown by the amount of $7,840. You cannot get at the actual amount of saving until we know the actual amount you charge the superannuation fund. The hon. gentleman has taken a good deal of credit to himself for the saving he has made. I repeat that if you take the Estimates in the department for the last four or five years, you will find that the average savings on the inside and the outside service, in taking into account the statutory increases, have exceeded the amount of savings made by the hon. gentleman, which consist largely in the item under discussion. I will only add that it was the intention of the late Government to follow up the Order in Council to which allusion has been made, and the chances are that by this time a few of those changes, at all events, would have been made. Possibly my hon. friend found much less difficulty this year in making changes where the selections were amongst Conservatives and where there were no Liberals. It is possible that if these men had belonged to his political faith, we would not have had this domestic row to-night between the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) and the Controller. So that when he takes credit for his activity in carrying out these changes and, by contrast, reflects upon the late Administration in not following up that Order in Council sooner, I wish to tell him that the Administration for the last three or four years went in the direction he has gone, and that he approves of, although there was not the same activity the hon. gentleman has displayed in amalgamating these different districts. Let me ask how, in view of the fact that there has been so much activity in the matter of superannuation of so many officers and the amalgamation of their districts, the hon. gentleman expects to run the present system and at the same time have the inspections made more frequently than before? The hon. gentleman has not explained how half the officials can do this increased inspection. The hon. gentleman has complained that it has been found utterly impossible to make the inspection required by statute. How then can this be done when he reduces the number of officers one-half? If the interest of the service requires that a reduction should be made—and I doubt that the superannuations are justifiable—I should like the hon. gentleman to explain why there is an actual increase in the Estimates under this head for the present year. Why does the hon. gentleman ask for $16,000 instead of $15,000, and at the same time takes credit for having reduced the staff?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I am sorry to be obliged to remind the hon. gentleman of one of the greatest acts of injustice ever committed by a party, and it was committed by the Conservative party. The hon. gentleman said the saving made by the Government by superannuations was not a genuine saving because the country has to pay these superannuation allowances. Let me remind my hon. friend that he and his party appear to understand how to economise better than we do. The Mackenzie Government organized the Department of Weights and Measures. When Mr. Mackenzie resigned and hon. gentlemen opposite came into power, the first act they did was to abolish the department, in order to get rid of the officers who had been appointed. But finding they had made a mistake, or at all events they had lost so much patronage, they introduced a new law re-establishing the Department of Weights and Measures. They appointed 67 officers, and of those they reappointed from the whole staff collected by the Mackenzie Government only seven. The hon. gentleman charges me with unnecessarily superannuating officers. Does the hon. gentleman want me to turn out these men as was done by his own party, and treat them with the same injustice as was dealt out to those officers appointed by the Mackenzie Government? No, we are not going to do so. Those men tried to do their duty when they were in office, and we have dealt fairly by them; we have superannuated them, and have given them all the benefit of their contributions to the superannuation fund. The hon. gentleman said that if more of them had been Liberals they would not have been so anxious to superannuate them. I scorn that imputation. If the hon. gentleman says that I have abused my position in order to do an injustice to men in my department, it is a calumny. I do not deserve to be treated in that way, and I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite to treat me with justice and to admit that I would not deal harshly with Conservative officials.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I would be the last member in this House to cast any reflection on the hon. the Controller of Inland Revenue.

I have held various positions of trust in this House. I have occupied the position of Chairman of Committees, also as Chairman of the Railway Committee and other committees, and I do not think that in discharging the important duties connected with them, I have ever allowed any injustice to be done or reflection to be cast on an hon. member. In stating that the hon. Controller might not have acted as hastily if some of those officers had been Liberals, I was speaking in a political sense. When Ministers are putting through Estimates they must be subjected to the widest range of criticism. It is in accordance with precedent and practice that the minority should be allowed a wide range of discussion when the Crown comes down and asks Parliament for money. We are discharging our duty in that respect, and the remark I made was not uttered in any offensive sense to the Controller. I hope the hon. gentleman will acquit me of having said anything offensive. I am afraid the hon. gentleman misconstrued the freedom of discussion permitted in discussing Estimates, and it is a somewhat new role for me to act as a critic in opposition. I now ask the Controller if there is not some mistake in regard to the item of $1,500.

Mr. McMULLEN. I congratulate the Minister of Inland Revenue on the reduction made by him, but I contend there is ample room for reduction in the department as a whole. While a number of officers in the outside service have been put out, for which I commend the hon. gentleman, that reduction appears to be confined to the outside service. There is a great discrepancy between the Department of Customs and the Department of Inland Revenue. The Commissioner of Customs receives $2,800; the Commissioner of Inland Revenue receives $3,200, and in addition he gets $800 as Commissioner of Standards. The Assistant Commissioner of Inland Revenue receives $3,000, while the Chief Clerk of Customs receives $1,800, the Chief Clerk of Inland Revenue receives $2,400. There is another chief clerk at $2,000. So in the Inland Revenue there are four clerks, including the commissioners, receiving salaries aggregating $11,400. Take the entire service of the Inland Revenue Department, and it will be found there are 26 clerks receiving aggregate salaries of $38,542; in the Customs there are 31 clerks, five more than in the Inland Revenue Department, receiving a gross amount of $38,600. That clearly shows that there is very considerable room for the application of the pruning knife.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) should have discussed that when the Civil Government Estimates were before the House. If we go over that again we will be at this item for a week.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to ask the Controller of Inland Revenue (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) if this vote includes the additional sum which is paid to the Commissioner of Inland Revenue as commissioner of standards?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. In that case, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. McLennan (Inverness):

That the item of $49,010 be reduced by $800, the amount paid to the Deputy Minister as Commissioner of Standards.

I cannot see why we should pay the Deputy Commissioner of Inland Revenue $4,000, when the Commissioner of Customs gets only $2,800, and the other Deputy Ministers $3,200. As far as I can learn, this commissioner of standards is a mere honourary position to which there is $800 a year attached.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I desire to say a word or two generally with regard to this item. The Controller of Inland Revenue has spoken of dismissals in his department, and while I have no disposition at all to say anything harsh or discourteous to the hon. gentleman, I would like to bring to his attention the matter of the dismissal of two officers in Halifax, namely, the late inspector of weights and measures and the assistant inspector of weights and measures. They were dismissed, I think, in or about the month of November last, and their successors have been appointed. Mr. Frame has been appointed as inspector, and I do not know who has been appointed assistant inspector. I have seen some of the correspondence which has been addressed to these gentlemen, and I understand that they were dismissed without any investigation, and upon the recommendation of my hon. colleague from Halifax (Mr. Russell), on the ground that they were guilty of active and offensive partisanship. I desire to say to the hon. Controller of Inland Revenue, that I regret that he should have taken that course. These gentlemen, I know both of them, were Conservatives. As to how active a part they took in the late elections, I do not know. As far as one of them is concerned I did not speak to him nor he to me during that election, but I believe that it is alleged that he attended a joint political meeting at Dartmouth, and that he made some interruptions. I do not know about that personally I did not notice it if he did. As far as that is concerned I do not know in what way he was active or offensive. The term "offensive" of course is a somewhat vague word; a word which can be used in one sense or another according to the particular ideas of the person who happens to be using it. So far as these gentlemen are concerned, I desire to say to the hon. the Controller this: That however active their partisanship may have been, I am sure it was not more active than

that of many officials, Liberals, in the county of Halifax, during the past eighteen years, who have held office during those eighteen years and who have not been disturbed during the Conservative Administration. I can assure the hon. the Controller that that is the fact, and I do not think that my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Russell) would dispute that fact; because if he should do so, I can give him the names of Liberal office holders in the county of Halifax who have been quite as active, if not more active, than either of these gentlemen, and against whom no charge was made on that account, or, if any charge was made it was not acted upon.

However, the principle has been laid down by this Administration: that active participation in any political contest shall be a ground for dismissing an official. I desire to call the attention of the Controller of Inland Revenue to the fact, that he himself during the last session of this Parliament, laid down the principle, that none of these officials should be dismissed without an investigation. I suppose an investigation means, an opportunity to the party to defend himself. I understand from both these gentlemen that they asked for an opportunity to defend themselves from these charges, and that both alleged that these charges could be disproved by them, if they had a chance of doing so. Now, the language of the hon. gentleman (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) was very significant. I am quoting from his words used in this House on the 28th August, 1896; and the hon. the Controller of Inland Revenue then said:

> Now, I should consider it my duty to give a careful investigation to every one of these accusations, and if a public officer is found guilty of neglecting his official duties, or whether he is found guilty of taking such a partisan part in elections as his common sense and his feeling of justice should tell him not to take. If he is found guilty, after having had a fair chance of defending himself, he should be discharged, and I believe that on both sides of the House such an act would be upheld.

Now if we assume that the hon. gentleman laid down the correct rule to be followed in his department, it seems to me (unless he has seen fit to change his opinion in the meantime) that he should now grant to these gentlemen the investigation which they have asked for. These dismissed officials have stated that these charges cannot be sustained against them. My hon. friend and colleague (Mr. Russell) thinks that the charges are correct, and possibly he may think that he has personal knowledge, but even if my colleague from Halifax (Mr. Russell) says he has personal knowledge of any of these offences, still, these men have not a fair chance unless they are given an opportunity of putting forward their side of the case. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Russell) is no more infallible than I am, or than any other gentleman in this House, and he may be mistaken, or he may be relying on evidence which is not correct. Surely, it is only the simplest justice to these men, that they should have an opportunity of showing, if they can, that the charges which have been made against them are not true.

There is another fact which I wish to bring to the attention of the Controller. These officials have not only been deprived of the positions which they held in the civil service of this country, but they have applied to the department in vain for an answer to the question: as to whether any allowance is to be made to them in respect to their contributions to the superannuation fund. Both of these men have, I understand, contributed for more than ten years to the superannuation fund. As far back as the 21st of November last, Mr. Ryan addressed a letter to the department on this subject, to which he received an answer in December, stating that that question would receive the attention of the hon. Controller and an answer would be given to him. From that time to the present, as I am instructed—if I am in error, the hon. gentleman will correct me—he has received no answer whatever; and if it is competent to the hon. gentleman, following his later policy, to deprive these men of their position without giving them an opportunity to disprove the charges made against them, surely the hon. Controller will not deprive them of their right to these contributions to the superannuation fund. It would certainly be doing a very great injustice to them. I rely on the sense of justice which I know the hon. Controller possesses in an eminent degree, to see that he will not deprive these men of the money they have paid into the superannuation fund without at least giving them an opportunity of disproving the charges made against them. If the hon. gentleman is not in a position to give an answer on that part of the matter to-night, I would be very glad indeed if he would be good enough to take it into his consideration at his earliest opportunity. I believe it has been under the consideration of some of the other departments as to what will be done in such cases; but I certainly think that, where a party has been dismissed without an investigation, either one of two things should be done—either he should have the benefit of the contributions he has made to the fund, or before he is deprived of them, he should have the benefit of an investigation, which he should have had in the first instance.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I have, of course, no disposition to interfere with the discussion which the hon. gentleman chooses to raise on this subject. I would just call his attention, however, to the fact that the question he now formally

raises, was asked of the Government the other day, and my hon. friend who sits next to me told the House that the question of the disposition of the moneys paid to the superannuation fund by persons who had been dismissed was at present being seriously considered by the Government, and that in a short time we would be able to make a pronouncement upon it. Under the circumstances, I think the House will see that it will be as well at the present stage to let the matter rest.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It appears to me that, where officials have been dismissed without investigation, two questions would arise: First, the general policy, of which the hon. gentleman has just spoken, and second, if the policy is laid down that no benefit should be received by persons guilty of offensive partisanship, whether there should not be an investigation before they are deprived of their contributions to the fund. I think that course would appeal to the hon. gentleman's sense of justice. You are depriving a party of what a very eminent gentleman, some years ago, spoke of in this House, as the vested rights of civil servants. They do have some vested rights in this superannuation fund, if they contribute to it. Let us grant for the sake of argument that you have the right to dismiss them without investigation, upon the statement of an honourable member supporting the Government; their rights to the contributions which they have made to the superannuation fund are being taken away ex parte, if you decide without investigation that they shall not get any benefit from the moneys they paid in.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I wish to repeat the statement I made, perhaps broader than I made it before. Not only in cases where the head of the department exercises his power to make a dismissal on the representations of a member, but in cases where there has been an investigation, and the charges have been proved, inasmuch as there may be a political offence which, in the opinion of this side of the House, does justify a removal from office, there is no moral offence, it is argued, which justifies the taking from those who are dismissed the moneys they have paid into the superannuation fund; and that matter is at present receiving serious and, I may say, very sympathetic consideration from the Government; and the reason is the relation it may have to past dismissals, because it has a wider-reaching effect than appears at the present moment. With regard to the motion which my hon. friend has made, I assume that he does not propose to force this matter to a division, for several reasons. He is perfectly within his right, as a member of this House, in moving a reduction of any vote. We are at this stage in the discussion of our money matters when any hon. member has the right to bring before the House his views on any vote, and in order to do so he has a right to move a reduction in the vote. To that extent, I find no fault whatever. The hon. gentleman is also within his right in expressing his opinion that this salary is larger than it ought to be. On that point I have no doubt the head of the department will say something. But there are one or two points which I think the hon. gentleman has not considered with that care which he generally brings to bear on matters of this kind.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have sat beside my hon. friend for many years, both in this House and in the Public Accounts Committee, and I have found very few of the members of this House who have given that attentive search and care to the Public Accounts and the Auditor General's Report which my hon. friend has given; and, when I use this language, it is not a mere passing compliment, but is based on many years' experience of my hon. friend as a colleague. I think that in this instance, in his zeal to save the public money, he has, perhaps, a little hastily jumped to a conclusion. I notice that by way of comparison, he referred to the salary of the Commissioner of Customs as only $2,800, and asked why this gentleman should receive more. There are several reasons why that analogy cannot be held to be conclusive. In the first place, the present Commissioner of Customs though a very good and competent officer, has very lately been appointed to that office; and, in the second place, he receives not only $2,800, but $800 in addition as chairman of the Board of Customs Commissioners, making $3,600. I do not think that is too much. But the Commissioner of Inland Revenue is a very old, and I may say, a very competent and distinguished member of the service. It has been my pleasure to know him for many years. He was selected by the Government of Mr. Mackenzie, as far back as 1876, to occupy the distinguished position of financial adviser to the counsel of the British Government before the Halifax Fishery Commission, and he distinguished himself on that occasion in a way which called forth the encomiums of the home Government, and also the approval of the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I know that the counsel who were engaged in that commission acknowledged openly and frankly the value of the services which they received from Mr. Miall. From that time, he has been in the public service, and it is incredible that a man should go on twenty or thirty years with the same salary which he had when he started. I hope there will be no objection to this vote. It would be a most invidious distinction to draw against a man who fills one of the most responsible offices under the Government to refuse to

vote him the amount called for. It is not known, perhaps, that the amount of money collected by the Inland Revenue Department almost equals that collected by the Customs Department. Some seven or eight million dollars are collected in that department every year. It is a department, the management of which requires great technical and skilled knowledge. I doubt if there are many gentlemen to-day, clever as they may be in the ordinary affairs of life, who are competent to go in and discharge the duties of this office, to discharge which properly requires a great deal of technical skill that can only be acquired by experience.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have drawn attention to the fact that the salaries in the Inland Revenue Department are higher than in any other. The twenty-six clerks in that department are drawing as much salary as thirty-one in the Department of Customs. My hon. friend says that the Commissioner of Customs gets $800 as chairman of the Customs Board in addition to his $2,800 salary. Well, I venture to say that if either of those positions were vacant to-morrow, you could easily get them filled with competent men at a salary of $3,200 per year, without the $800 addition in either case. At present the commodities of life may be bought at 25 per cent less than they could be ten years ago, and it behooves us to cut down this annual expenditure. I am not at all disposed to underrate the services of Mr. Miall, but I believe that he is well paid for them when he gets $3,200 a year. With regard to the motion, I would say this, that if the hon. the Hon. Minister of Inland Revenue would agree to give this matter his serious consideration——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, Oh!

Mr. McMULLEN. Hon. gentleman had better keep quiet until I get through.

Mr. HUGHES. Back down.

Mr. McMULLEN. I shall do as I please. If my hon. friend the Controller of Inland Revenue will agree to recast the whole service of his office during recess and bring it fairly within the rate of wages paid in other departments, I am willing to grant him the recess to do that, but unless we have some understanding to that effect, I will not withdraw my motion.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The motion of the hon. member for Wellington is somewhat of a surprise to me. I can speak with some degree of knowledge not possessed by ordinary members with regard to the duties performed by Mr. Miall. The Department of Inland Revenue is certainly the most important in the entire service. The work done there is analogus to that done at Somerset House, in England. We are living in an age of shams, in which almost everything is adulterated, not only what we read, but what we eat; and as the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has said, there are but few men in this country who would be able to take up the work which Mr. Miall has done, and done so efficiently. It is a work which requires great technical and scientific knowledge, which can only be learned by experience. There is a vast difference between the work of the Inland Revenue Department and that of the Department of Customs, and a comparison between the two is not a fair one. Be that as it may, we should not lose sight of the important fact, not mentioned by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that when Mr. Johnston was superannuated two years ago, as chief commissioner, I decided that if Mr. Miall would perform that work, I would do what I could to secure his getting the additional $400 a year which he had previously been in receipt of. The centre of the administration of the weights and measures branch, of course, is here at Ottawa. Mr. Miall is the head of this branch. He is the head also of the branch under which comes the inspection of the units of measures in connection with electric light and matters of that kind. In relation to the inspection of grain standards I can refer hon. gentlemen opposite to the members of the boards of trade of Quebec, Montreal, Toronto and Winnipeg, and by all these they will be told that not only has Mr. Miall's connection with this matter been of the utmost benefit to those large bodies to whom it is of the most vital interest that the department should keep in touch with them, but that they would deplore his departure from his position. I cannot say too much for a gentleman whom I so highly respect and for whose great ability I have such admiration. Therefore, I trust that the hon. gentleman who made the motion will withdraw it. And, before he makes any comparison between the expenditure of the inside services of this and other branches, I trust the hon. gentleman will make a more careful examination of the methods of work in the departments. Having said so much for Mr. Miall I can say the same for the assistant commissioner, for I think that the department is most fortunate in having secured the services of two honest, painstaking, and efficient men.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I need not tell the House, after hearing my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies) and my hon. friend from Brockville (Mr. Wood), with what satisfaction I have heard them render justice to a man for whom I have so much consideration as I have for Mr. Miall. I need not say with what satisfaction I would see my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) withdraw his motion and not divide the House. But my hon. friend has attached a condition to the withdrawal of his motion to which I cannot give my consent. The value of Mr. Miall's service has been clearly established. I know the value of those services, and, much as I regret the

division which may take place at this moment. I am not going to pledge myself to reduce in any way the salary of Mr. Miall, to which I think he is fairly entitled. Now, as comparisons have been made, I may say that the Deputy Minister of Justice gets $3,600, and also $400 as the solicitor of the Indian Department—a total of $4,000, the same salary as that received by Mr. Miall. The Auditor General receives $4,000, the Deputy Minister of Finance receives $4,200. The Commissioner of Customs, as has been explained, has been appointed quite lately. He only gets $3,600, which is $400 less than Mr. Miall's salary. The Chief Engineer of Public Works—and I do not say at all that his salary is too high—gets, if I am not mistaken, $6,000. The Deputy Minister of Railways has a salary of $4,000. The Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce gets $3,200, and $800 in addition as Chief Commissioner of Chinese Immigration—a total of $4,000 But, furthermore, we have the law which settles this, and as long as the law remains on our Statute-book, I do not see why we should not follow it. Anybody who will look at 49 Victoria, chap. 104, will see the following :—

All comparisons, verifications, and other operations with reference to standards of length, weight, and capacity, shall be conducted under the supervision of the Commissioner of Inland Revenue, and generally he shall have such powers and duties in relation thereto as are assigned to him by the Governor in Council. The Commissioner of Inland Revenue shall also conduct all such comparisons, verifications and other operations with reference to standards of measure and weight in aid of scientific researches, or otherwise, as the Minister of Inland Revenue deems expedient ; and in consideration of the special qualifications and knowledge necessary for the proper discharge of such duties, the said commissioner may be paid, in addition to his salary as commissioner, such further allowance, out of any moneys voted by Parliament for the purpose of this Act, as is directed by the Governor in Council.

Now what did the Governor General in Council direct ?

The board had before them a memorandum from the Hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, recommending under the provisions of 42 Vic., chap. 16, sec. 35 and sec. 52, of the Civil Service Act of 1882, the allowance of $800 per annum to the Controller of Inland Revenue, in consideration of his special qualifications and services as Commisioner of Standards, under the Act 42 Vic., chap. 16, sec. 35, such payment to date from 1st January, 1883, and to be paid out of any moneys voted for the inspection of weights and measures as directed in the said Act.

The board recommend the payment of the allowance of $800 per annum from 1st of July, 1883, and that for the previous six months, i.e., from 1st January, 1893, parliamentary appropriations having elapsed, a sum be placed in the Supplementary Estimates to cover the same.

So the law establishes the salary and says how it is to be paid. Now my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) says that if I pledge myself to bring about reductions in my department he will withdraw his amendment. Am I going to be so unfair to himself and to Mr. Miall as to let him believe that I contemplate reducing the salary of Mr. Miall. No. And if the motion must be put, under these conditions, let it be put.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Act the hon. Controller has read is not compulsory : it is entirely within the power of this House and must come before this House for the appropriation of the money. The Act clearly says that the salary is to be paid out of moneys to be voted by Parliament. I say we have a perfect right to deal with the excessive salaries of officials. When these officers get a good round salary of $3,200, that should be enough, and I am opposed to additions to that amount. In many cases officials receive salaries greater than their services to this country are worth. That is my humble opinion. If any of these positions were vacated, you would have no difficulty in finding men who are faithful and efficient to fill them and who would be glad to get them. I do not mean to say that, the new man coming in would be at first as efficient as Mr. Miall or the Deputy Commissioner of Customs. I contend that this vote is entirely in the hands of this House.

Mr. ELLIS. If I were my hon. friend, I would withdraw the resolution. It appears to me that it is not only the duty of the Controller of Inland Revenue but of the whole Government to take hold of these matters. These salaries are too high. This country is paying too much to its officers, not only to deputy heads of the departments but to everybody from the Governor General down. It is time the matter should be grappled with by a strong and firm hand. What would be the effect of this resolution to-night if lost as it is sure to be ? It would be such that the Government would be in a position to say that the House of Commons would not consent to a reduction of this salary, and it would be an argument in favour of the continuance of these salaries at the full rate in future. Under all the circumstances I think my hon. friend would do well to withdraw the resolution.

Mr. McMULLEN. What I said was that I would withdraw it if the hon. gentleman agreed to recast his department, and pay his best attention towards the reductions. As I have pointed out 26 clerks in his department are getting as much salary as 31 clerks in the Department of Customs. I contend there is room for reduction, and if he is willing in the interval to devote his attention in the direction of reducing the charges, I am willing to withdraw the motion.

Mr. GANONG. I do not propose to take issue either with the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) who endeavoured to get rid of some of his exuberant wit, or

with the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), who wishes to obtain some personal prestige over this matter, failing all the time to bring up that old chestnut that he might have roasted in regard to the Governor General's salary. I wish, however, to take issue with the hon. the Controller of Inland Revenue in regard to two matters that came up in this discussion, as I believe they affect the country to a greater extent than some of the issues that have come in since. I object in the first place to his characterisation of what he calls the great trades of this country, the grain trade and the coal trade. As I understand he proposes, some time in the future, to remodel this system and divide it into two classes, concerning these two trades. I believe myself, and I think every member of the House must admit, that the grocery business is the great trade in so far as the use of scales is concerned.

Mr. DOMVILLE. You might as well drop your own business.

Mr. GANONG. I am amply able to take care of my own as well as of some other people's business. If I need any assistance, I won't go to the hon. member for King's for it, in view of his past commercial or political record. As far as this matter is concerned, any one must recognize the value of the goods that are handled by these weights and measures, and when you take grain and coal as compared with the value handled by the grocery business, there is no comparison as to their relative value. If there is any class in Canada that needs scale inspection it is the grocery men. The hon. member for King's explains beautifully how little he knew about this business by saying that if he wanted half a pound, he did not want three quarters of a pound. If that hon. gentleman knows as much as he ought to after his business experience, he knows that there is no scale but that, after it is used two years, will give more weight instead of less weight. I have had enough to do with the scale business to know that every grocer throughout the United States changes his scales every one or two years at least simply because he knows that these fine agate or steel pivots on which the scales turn are gradually either accumulating a certain amount of dust around them, or they will gradually work off until the bearing becomes less sharp, and the more it is rounded off the greater amount it takes to turn them. Any hon. gentleman who has any wholesale business in this country, should insist that grocers' scales should be examined, because I take it is just as bad for a man to cheat himself and his family, and particularly his creditors, as it is to cheat his friends. The grocery business, as I understand, is in the same category with the cheese and the butter business, even the hay business and all such classes; so that I trust the Minister, when he looks into this matter, will be careful that he does not cut down the Estimates that are necessary to provide that the grocery trade of this country is put in a proper condition. I believe that a large number of the failures in this country can be attributed to the very fact that the grocery men are peddling out anywhere from one to five and ten per cent more goods than they are actually called upon to deliver for the amount of money that they receive. You can ask the best scale manufacturer in Canada, and I will guarantee that he will bear out my statement from his own experience; and I would also appeal to my hon. friend who lives in Brantford to verify my statement, or any other man in this House who handles groceries. I trust the Minister will consider this matter very carefully before he cuts down the Estimates, so that he may be able to give due regard to that class of trade.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have listened with a good deal of interest to this discussion, and I have heard the tribute paid to Mr. Miall by the Controller of Inland Revenue and likewise by the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood). Now, I would like to ask the hon. member for Brockville if he will kindly inform me when Mr. Miall's salary was increased. Has he been drawing the same salary as other deputy Ministers all along, or when was the change made, and when was the increase given to Mr. Miall? The member for Brockville speaks of his ability and of the technical character of the work in which he has discharged his duties while at the head of that department. Will the hon. member for Brockville tell the House if, during all those years, he was drawing the same salary that he is drawing now, or when was the salary increased? I think the hon. member for Brockville is in a position to let us know. If he did not draw the same salary all those years when his services were so much appreciated by the hon. member for Brockville, will he also kindly tell the House why he did not give him that higher salary to which his eminent services and qualifications and capacity entitled him? Will the hon. gentleman tell us that, and tell us when the increase was made, and when he was placed on the same scale of salary as that accorded to other Deputy Ministers?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Any inquiry of that kind may properly be addressed to the Minister in charge of the department at the present time. However, I do not hesitate to answer the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin), although the tone of his language would seem to indicate that he suspects there was something hidden. Now, every one knows that I have always been in favour of increasing the salary of Mr. Miall to what it formerly was. I think every person knows that he was in receipt of a salary of $4,200, that is, $3,400 as Deputy Minister, and $800 as Commissioner

of Standards, for a great many years, almost from the time of his first appointment.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. Since 1883.

Mr. McMULLEN. The latter part was taken away by Mr. Costigan.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I do not remember who was the Minister at the time. You are asking me about something that you ought to know as well as I do, although my communications with Mr. Miall in conversation would make me familiar with some circumstances attending the taking away of that $800. I only know that it was put back by the Government of Sir Mackenzie Bowell some time ago, a year or two ago.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I understood you to say that it was granted in 1883 and had been continued ever since.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I never said it had been continued ever since, and I shall be very much surprised if "Hansard" says anything of the kind. All I know is that it was continued for years. It was dropped when I was not a member of the late Government, and I was always in favour of its restoration. I was glad it was restored, and I shall vote for the continuance of its restoration.

Mr. HENDERSON. I heartily agree with what has fallen from the lips of the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Ganong) with respect to the pleasure with which merchants throughout the country will hail the visit of the inspectors. I have been engaged in mercantile pursuits for over twenty years, and I have been pleased to have the inspector make his visit and inspect the scales. We are just as much afraid that our scales may err against us as against our customers, and it is always a pleasure to receive the visit of the inspector and pay him the fee. I am sure it would be a matter of regret if this inspection were withdrawn, and people in trade had not the opportunity of having their scales regularly inspected. But I should like to draw the attention of the Controller to a matter connected with the inspection of scales whereby the work could be made more agreeable, and it is this: While the merchants are perfectly willing to pay the inspection fee, they do not like the idea of being charged even a small sum for the cartage of the standards of the inspectors from place to place. If some regulations were made by which the inspector would be paid this charge, considerable friction would be removed and the service made more acceptable, agreeable and satisfactory. I hope this little matter will receive attention, because the charge is always looked upon as being somewhat unfair.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Of course, I have no right to ask the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) to state anything which he desires to withhold. The hon. member was, however, in the Government at the time this restoration of salary was made to Mr. Miall, although I do not remember whether the hon. gentleman was Controller of Inland Revenue or not. From the manner in which the hon. gentleman has spoken on this subject and has given information to the House, he may, perhaps, be willing to make some statements not covered by his oath of office. Of course, if the hon. gentleman declines to do so, I have no right to insist. He has, however, taken part in the debate and has spoken of the qualifications of Mr. Miall, and this part of Mr. Miall's salary was taken from him and restored during that period, and perhaps the hon. member for Brockville may be considered to be the proper man to give information on the point, as he was a member of the Government.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I do not wish any hon. member to sit down with the idea that I am not willing to give all the information in my power. I have answered everything that is in my power as clearly as I could.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I declare the amendment lost.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I declared the amendment was lost, before any one got up to ask for a vote.

Mr. DAVIN. I saw members standing, and I entirely object to the Chairman blocking business.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think that the members of this House have some rights. I do not think the action of the Chairman is commendable.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have a right to express my opinion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has not the right to condemn the ruling which I made. He has the right to appeal from that ruling. I put the question, and I thought by the yeas and nays that the amendment was lost, and, as nobody asked for a vote, I declared the amendment lost.

Mr. HUGHES. I beg the Chairman's pardon: there were a dozen members standing on their feet at the time. This is the second time this sort of thing has occurred.

Mr. DEPUTR SPEAKER. Order. Shall this item be adopted?

Mr. HUGHES. I insist that the question be put. We are now on the amendment

moved by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The amendment has been declared lost

Mr. HENDERSON. There is no use in proceeding with business in this way, and I do not think the House will permit it.

Mr. CASEY. I rise to a point of order. There is only one means by which an appeal can be taken.

Mr. HENDERSON. I wish to say, further.——

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman must sit down when I rise to a point of order.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman is talking to a point of order himself.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman can only question the ruling of the Chair in one way, and that is by appealing from the ruling by methods well known, and this must be done without discussion. We have been through that often enough to know how it is done. There is a regular way of taking an appeal from the ruling of the Chair; but the House will not permit any hon. member to say that the Chairman's ruling is not right, when the course is open to him to appeal from the ruling, without discussion.

Mr. MACDONALD. I appeal from the ruling of the Chair, and I should like a vote on it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The question is now on the main item.

Mr. DAVIN. The question is, that we appeal from your ruling, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is a regular way of making an appeal. The motion is now on the item of $49,010. Is it the wish of the Committee to adopt this item?

Mr. DAVIN. I move that the ruling of the Chair be not sustained.

Mr. HUGHES. I second the motion.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). You are too late.

Mr. DAVIN. If that is the way the business is to be conducted, you will have no items go through to-night.

Mr. HUGHES. Not one.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I hope the committee will not get into a state of disorder over this. It is more a question of fact than anything else. It is in the interest of the Opposition as well as of the Government that the Chair should have proper respect paid to it, and the Chair must be sustained in its ruling. In all cases where a difference of opinion arises about the ruling of the Chair, there is only one mode of testing it, as my hon. friends opposite know very well.

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a point of order. The ruling of the Chair has been appealed from and the hon. Minister has no right to debate it. It must go without debate.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) is entirely wrong. This is not a question you can put to the committee. That motion is entirely out of order, and it cannot be received or put by the Chair. The only question before the committee now is, shall the item be adopted. If the Chairman ruled, I am quite sure he ruled believing that he was right, and he rules in accordance with my own judgment as far as I could see. When he put the question, a sufficient number of members did not rise, and it was only afterwards they did so. But, if any hon. member wants to test the question again, all he has got to do is to move that the item be reduced by $799. There is no occasion whatever for getting into a rumpus about it. I appeal to the House to support the Chair in its ruling, and we all know that the ruling was given in good faith.

Mr. HUGHES. The proper way for the House to maintain the dignity of the Chair is for the Chair to maintain its own dignity, and it is not for the Chair——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. As a way of getting out of the difficulty, I move:

That the item of $49,010 be reduced by $799, the amount paid the Deputy Commissioner of Standards.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the amendment?

The Committee divided: Yeas, 37; nays, 52.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. SPROULE. Before that item is carried, I would like to say a word or two in regard to this question which is under consideration. The inspector of weights and measures in our part of the country was superannuated, I think, by the late Government, and a new man has been appointed in his place. I have no fault to find with what has been done beyond this: I think the gentleman who was appointed is really too old to efficiently do the work. The gentleman who was appointed to the position is, in my opinion, a man of sixty years of age or over, and without any technical knowledge, so far as I am aware, that would enable him to discharge the duties of the office efficiently; although he is a very nice man and a very respectable man. He was engaged up to that time in agricultural life and could not be an ex-

pert in this line. Now, it seems to me, that it would be much better if a younger man had been appointed. So far as I know, this gentleman stood no examination, nor was he subjected to any test to ascertain his fitness to discharge his duties. However, the hon. Minister may have other information than I have on this subject.

In regard to the question of doing away with the inspection of weights and measure, I am decidedly against it. I have always regarded it as one of the duties that the Government owes to the country, to see that we have honest weights and measures, and that they should be inspected from time to time, so that not only the buyer but the seller may know that justice was being done. I also approve of the system of inspection of gas and electric light, because often injustice is done to the purchaser of these as well as other commodities. Were I in the position, I would be inclined to go further, and appoint public weighers throughout the country, to weigh grain and cattle and everything else that is sold. If this were done you would establish confidence between buyer and seller, and do away with a great deal of bickering that takes place under present circumstances. It is not so much that people do not get their rights, as it is that they are suspicious that they do not get their rights, and so long as that exists they will not be satisfied. I hope that the time will come in the history of Canada when our products will all be weighed by men appointed for that special purpose, and who take an oath to do justice between man and man. I am not at all in favour of the principle of giving this work over to the municipalities, as I do not think it will be efficiently done by them. We had that system in the province of Ontario for a long time, and so far as my knowledge goes, it was a perfect farce. It was only a name and there was nothing in reality. The present system of government inspection is much better, gives greater satisfaction, and I think ought to be continued.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) tell me what inspector he was speaking of; I did not catch the name.

Mr. SPROULE. I was speaking of that gentleman from Egremont; what is his name? Mr. McNichol or Mr. Murdoch.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to say for the information of the House, that Mr. Murdoch has passed a civil service examination, that Mr. Murdoch has not only a great deal of general knowledge, but that he has, as well, a great deal of technical knowledge for this position. He was in one of the largest wholesale establishments in Canada for two years, where it was his duty to verify the scales, and was well qualified for the position. He is a man who has held positions of trust and responsibility in the township where he lives; he has also been warden of the large county of Grey, in which the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) lives; he is well known there and highly respected, and is a man of good abilities and admirably adapted for the position. As to his age, he is somewhat up in years, but he is mature in his judgment and kindly in his disposition, and I am informed by the department that he is a very competent officer and has complied with the law as laid down in the Civil Service Act, and he has the support of the people generally throughout that country. Every day I am told that a more capable and acceptable officer could not have been appointed.

Mr. SPROULE. I was not aware that he had passed the civil service examination, nor that a man of his age could come under the Civil Service Act, because he is beyond the limit of thirty-five years. With regard to his respectability, that is all that can be desired; I have nothing to say against him. I was not aware that he had occupied the position the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) says he did. I would be very sorry to say a word against him, because I have known him to be a respectable man, but I have also known him to be a farmer for thirty or thirty-five years, and I did feel that a man who has reached the age of sixty years or over is hardly the man to put in a position of that kind, because he would be under the Superannuation Act, though not properly under the Civil Service Act. These are the reasons I gave, and not any question of his respectability or general intelligence or kindly dispostion, because I have nothing to say against him in these respects. But I really question the wisdom of appointing a man who has reached that time of life to a position which he cannot in the nature of things occupy very long.

Mr. LANDERKIN. There is a Civil Service Act for the outside service as well as for the inside service, and he has complied with that Act. The hon. gentleman spoke of him as only a farmer. I can tell the hon. gentleman that there are any number of farmers in my county who are fit to occupy any position in this country. When anything was to be done for the farmers, I have always heard the hon. gentleman say that it was not practicable or advisable to do it. Hon. gentlemen opposite were always saying that when on this side, and they are always saying it now.

Mr. SPROULE. That is a gratuitous assumption of the hon. gentleman, which has no foundation in fact.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would recommend the hon. gentleman to read the Civil Service Act, and he will find that age is not a disqualification for the outside service. It is capacity that is looked for, and as this gentleman has that capacity, and also respecta-

bility and honesty, and the confidence of the people, and is a farmer, he is well qualified for the place.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not want the hon. gentleman to attribute to me language which I did not use. I never said anything against the intelligence or respectability of the farmers or as to their not being qualified to fill public positions. I think I am quite as familiar with the Civil Service Act as the hon. gentleman is, and I know that a man must pass an examination for either the inside or the outside service. I claim that I have a perfect right to criticise the appointment of a man at his time of life to that position.

Salaries of Inspectors of Gas..... $15,150

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). After the reduction the hon. Controller has explained, why do the salaries remain the same ?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. It is impossible for me to say what reduction will be made in the number of officers, or what diminution will be made in the expenditure, so far as travelling expenses are concerned, because if the officers do their duty, and go to the same places, they will have to do the same amount of travelling and inspection, whether there are two officers or three.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The item of office rent must, of course, be reduced.

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. My hon. friend will see that the Order in Council was only passed two or three weeks ago.

Rent, fuel, travelling expenses, postage, stationery, &c., for gas and electric light inspection $8,000

Mr. SPROULE. I would like the Minister to say what rate is charged now for the inspection of electric lights ?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. It has been reduced from $25 to $10 for any number of lights up to 1,000.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Was not that reduction made in the time of the previous Government ?

The CONTROLLER OF INLAND REVENUE. I think so.

Oyster culture $7,000

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). This is the same as last year, except $500 reduction, which Mr. Kemp intimated might be taken off.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How are you succeeding at Shediac ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Very well. The only question now is, how to allow the beds to be fished. If we let everybody go, they will soon be cleaned out. We are trying to have the oysters taken out in a reasonable way which will be fair all round.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I hope that something will be done in the direction of fishing by rotation. For instance, dividing the whole into three parts, and then fishing one division one season, and another the following season, and so on. That seems to be the plan tried in France, with great success. When the scheme was undertaken, it was contemplated that some such plan would be adopted.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Certainly.

Salaries and contingent expenses of Customs in the province of Nova Scotia... $108,915

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). There is a decrease here, owing to some changes in the officers and some reductions in salary.

Nova Scotia.... .... $91,385

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. There is an increase here, because it is proposed to advance the salaries of some deserving officers at the port of St. John, and perhaps one or two other ports. The increase is proposed to old and very faithful officers, whose merits have been recommended to me strongly by those who are competent to judge.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not think the explanation satisfactory. In Nova Scotia we can fairly ask for a decrease in the estimates. The hon. gentleman is comparing these with the estimates of last year, which were very much larger than those of previous years. Take the city of St. John; there is a very large staff in that port, larger, I think, than the necessity requires. As vacancies occur, the department ought not to fill them, because the staff is quite large enough to perform the duties. The expenditure should be cut down, instead of increased.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. The position which the hon. gentleman speaks of as being vacant I have not dealt with yet. Whether it will be possible to carry out the business of the port without filling it, I do not know. That subject will receive consideration.

Customs—Salaries and contingent expenses of the several Ports—Prince Edward Island $18,200

Mr. SPROULE. There is a slight increase here. Will the hon. Controller please explain ?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. It is proposed to give increases to a few of the officers who have served for a long time and have been recommended for increases. The total increase is very slight. While I appreciate the views expressed by hon. gentlemen opposite, they will agree with me

that officers who have performed their duty faithfully for a long time without any advance in salaries, should, not only as a matter of fairness, but in the public interest, receive some increase.

Customs—Salaries and contingent expenses of the several ports, Quebec.. $215,185

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to ask the hon. Controller if he has provided to pay the allowance to Mr. O'Hara, assistant collector of customs in Montreal, who acted as collector during the three years between the death of Mr. Ryan and the appointment of Mr. White. I think Mr. O'Hara sent accounts to the department, which is a usual thing, and last year, if I understood well, the matter was considered, but some technicalities stood in the way and it was left over. I would ask if this year something will be done in the matter. I think that, in justice, this account should be paid, as Mr. O'Hara served faithfully during the three years he acted as collector.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I may say that the account referred to has not been fully considered. There are several officers who are in the same condition as Mr. O'Hara. This year, Mr. O'Hara, as far as I remember, has not renewed his request. I am very sorry to hear that he is ill at the present time. Some of the other officers who are placed in a similar position have renewed their request, but I have not been able to make up my mind to recommend any payment, though having sympathy with the cases that have been brought before me. But the idea of the head of the department before I came in seems to be that while such accounts had been allowed in previous years, it was the duty of an officer to discharge whatever duties he might have to perform. All these cases will have to be considered together. I was not sure whether the House would be prepared to sanction a vote for this purpose. There are two cases in Hamilton, one at the port of Windsor, and there were others besides. It was not want of sympathy with Mr. O'Hara and the other gentlemen that prevented me from allowing these accounts, but I thought, perhaps, it would be well not to introduce it at this time. It would require a special resolution at any rate.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I understand that the case still stands, and the hon. Controller has not yet dealt with it.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. It is still open for consideration.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think the hon. Controller appreciates the strong features of this case, which might remove it from the class of the other cases that come before him. Mr. O'Hara was for a long time acting as collector, and there is a great disparity, as I understand, between his regular salary and the salary of the collector. The duties are very important. I think the points of the case appeal to the hon. Controller. Personally I should be very glad if the rule which has been recognized in previous cases were to be applied in Mr. O'Hara's case, as it is a very strong case and one in which exceptional circumstances exist.

Mr. WALLACE. I see that the expenditure for the port of Montreal has increased to $141,000. That seems very high.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. There are some increases proposed in the port of Montreal. One is an addition of $250 to the salary (now $750) of Mr. Dawson. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) will agree with me that Mr. Dawson is a very efficient appraiser and was receiving a lower salary than should be given to a man occupying such a responsible position as he does. Fewer hands are employed in Montreal than last year. I think if I were to show the comparative expenditures for the first six months of the current year, the hon. gentleman would see that they are about the same as for the first six months of the previous year.

Mr. BERGERON. Concerning this demand for increased salary on the part of Mr. O'Hara, I understood the hon. gentleman to say that some of those who had spoken in his behalf last year have repeated their application this year, but that Mr. O'Hara had not asked for any more. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman would make such a distinction. The demand was made last year in the regular way, and I suppose the Government would not take advantage of the fact that he had not renewed his application. The demand has been made, and is supported by vouchers which are still before the hon. gentleman, and I hope that when he does consider the matter, he will look upon it in the light of a renewed application.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I would certainly be very sorry if I gave the impression that simply because M. O'Hara had not asked for it, I did not consider it. If the other cases are dealt with, Mr. O'Hara's case will be considered also.

Ontario—Salaries and contingent expenses for Customs..... $302,395

Mr. BRODER. Is it the intention to make the present officer at Morrisburg a permanent officer? He is paid out of another fund altogether, as supply officer, I understand. There is a rumour current around Morrisburg that it is the intention of the Government to make that town an outport of Cornwall, and to reduce the salary.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I have not considered that. We take the Estimate because the office is there, and it is being filled in the meanwhile.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is it the intention to close the outport at Burlington in the county of Halton? The collector died some time ago, and I understand no appointment has yet been made.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. The port was closed, the late incumbent was superannuated, and I think he died just about the same time. He was superannuated at his own request. I am in correspondence now with reference to the matter, as to whether, without establishing that outport again, accommodation can be offered or convenience given by an officer from the port of Hamilton. As the hon. gentleman knows, it is an outport of Hamilton. What may be eventually arrived at, I cannot say now.

Mr. HENDERSON. In the event of closing the outport of Burlington, I hope the hon. gentleman will see his way clear to open an outport at some other place in the county of Halton. If he decides, owing to Burlington being so near to Hamilton that it is not necessary to reopen an outport there he might establish an outport either in Milton or in Georgetown. There is considerable necessity in both places for an outport, and I hope that, as no additional expense will be incurred beyond what was heretofore incurred in collecting the revenue in the county of Halton, we will not be left without an additional port, either re-opening in Burlington or establishing one in Milton or in Georgetown, or some place along the line of the Hamilton and Northwestern Railway.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman don't expect me to make any promise, but I will not forget that he has spoken to me, at any rate.

Mr. WALLACE. There is a large increase in the port of Berlin.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. There is an extra officer being appointed at Berlin. The hon. gentleman knows that there is a great deal of work at Berlin, it is a large port, and there is a large town adjacent to it.

Mr. WALLACE. I understood the hon. gentleman had dispensed with the services of one of the officers there.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Yes. There was a temporary officer there, but another one has been engaged in his place.

Mr. WALLACE. That makes two now, and you propose engaging a third one.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. There is a third one there temporarily appointed within the last ten days. The officer at Berlin has gone to Brantford for a time, the collector of Brantford having been taken ill.

Mr. WALLACE. You are appointing two new officers at Berlin?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. If this one was to remain there permanently, there would be two new officers. I am asking provision for salaries for three. I want to give more attention to that town and to Waterloo.

Mr. REID. Has an extra officer been appointed at Prescott? There was a temporary officer there, as I understand, paid out of the extra funds collected, but he resigned, and I understand there has been no other officer appointed permanently.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Would that be Mr. Leahy? Yes, he was appointed there, but he simply replaced another officer.

Mr. WALLACE. As regards this increase of $400 in the vote for Bowmanville, I think it is unjustifiable. What are the collections at that port?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. At Bowmanville a new appointment has been made at a salary of $1,000.

Mr. WALLACE. The whole service of the port does not require an expenditure of $1,000, for one officer could do the work. What were the collections last year?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. The collections were $5,898.

Mr. WALLACE. Here is a port that requires 27 or 28 per cent of its collections to pay the salary of the officers taking the money. I can recall another port where $5,800 is taken every month, and there is only one officer employed.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. There are no preventive duties to perform there.

Mr. WALLACE. There are preventive duties, but there are no preventive duties at Bowmanville.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. There are certain duties in connection with Newcastle that are performed through Bowmanville.

Mr. WALLACE. There is absolutely no business at Newcastle except when a vessel comes in there once or twice a year. What is the necessity of having two men at a port like Bowmanville? I sent one of the officers to other ports where a man was needed. It is quite true that the salary of the collector was $1,200 a year, but that was an old appointment, and perhaps the hon. gentleman knows the history of it, as I do. It was an appointment made by Sir Francis Hincks, who got this gentleman to retire in his favour and appointed him collector at $1,200 a year. One man undoubtedly can perform the duties. At points of similar importance, such as Brampton, only one man is employed and at less salary. Do I un-

derstand that the collector is to get $1,200 a year ?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. No, he will receive $200 less than the former collector.

Mr. WALLACE. I intended to superannuate that officer, and to appoint a man at $600 a year, who would have been able to perform the duties.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I think the hon. gentleman had two officers at Bowmanville during his term of office, one receiving $1,200 and another $500.

Mr. WALLACE. The appropriation last year was $1,220, including office rent and contingencies. This year the amount is $1,620, or an increase of $400. There is no excuse for appointing a man at a salary of $1,000 a year, because the officers at Barrie, Brampton and Orangeville do more business and show more collections, and yet the duties are performed by one officer at a salary of $600 or $700.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. The fact remains that while the hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace) was in office there were two officers at Bowmanville, a collector at $1,200 and an assistant at $500. The collector was superannuated, and the new appointee was given a salary $200 less, and no extra clerk has been appointed.

Mr. WALLACE. Why could not the salary have been reduced by $600 instead of $200 ?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I did not feel warranted in doing so.

Mr. REID. What is the reason of the increase in the permanent salaries at Prescott ?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. The amount is to provide for Mr. Leahy's salary, which had been under-estimated last year

Mr. REID. It has been stated in the papers that the port of Morrisburg had been reduced to an outport. Is that a fact ?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. We made no change in Morrisburg.

Mr. REID. It has not been reduced to an outport?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. No.

Mr. KLOEPFER. There is a decrease of $375 in the port of Guelph. How does that occur?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. One of the officers resigned, and there was a new appointment made, with a less salary.

Mr. WALLACE. There is an increase in the port of Brantford. Does that mean appointing another officer?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, an acting landing waiter, not a permanent official, has been appointed. As the hon. gentleman knows, the receipts of the port would fully justify it, as they amount to $130,944. There were three officers there, and we appointed another officer at $400.

Mr. WALLACE. The newspapers report that the Controller has superannuated three officers at the port of London. What were the officers superannuated for?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. There were not three superannuated. One of our officers at London died, and two officers there will be superannuated ; the notice has not been sent out to them yet. The inspector reported that it was in the public interest that they should be placed upon the retired list.

Mr. WALLACE. Too old, or what?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Unfortunately, not only too old, but I am sorry to say, rather disabled. I think they had a stroke of paralysis.

Mr. WALLACE. I see that one of these officers was born in 1832, and the collector, Mr. Reid, was born in 1822, but the collector is not disturbed, and the appraiser, although ten years younger, was dismissed on account of being too old.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. If the thought is in the mind of the hon. gentleman, that they were superannuated in order to make room for other persons, I can assure him that he is entirely wrong in that. There was no such thought in my mind. They were superannuated on the report of the chief inspector, which was so worded that I felt it my duty to do so. I can assure the hon. gentleman that there was not the first thought in my mind to remove them to make way for others.

Mr. WALLACE. I would again call attention to the fact that the collector of the port, who is seventy-five years old, and a good Grit, is continued in his office ; while Mr. Siddons, who I know to be a most competent man, and Mr. Sutherland, both appraisers, both very competent men, and many years younger than the collector, have their heads taken off, while Mr. Reid remains in office.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I do not think the hon. gentleman should say that, as if I had done something which I should not have done.

Mr. WALLACE. These men are very competent men.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Does the hon. gentleman know the affliction of these gentlemen, that has been reported to me.

Mr. WALLACE. I do, in the case of only one.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I speak subject to correction, but I think they both suffered a paralytic stroke.

Mr. WALLACE. No, just one; and I think I am safe in saying that a slight paralytic stroke did not interfere with his ability to perform his duties. I make the statement, that the papers said that three officers were superannuated. The names are: Mr. Siddons, Mr. Sutherland and Mr. Williams.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. The papers, contrary to their usual custom, have made a mistake this time. Mr. Williams has not been superannuated, that I know of. Mr. Callet died, and two appraisers have been superannuated, and only two.

Mr. WALLACE. I see the hon. the Controller is asking for just about as much money as before, so, of course, he intends to fill these offices.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Oh, yes, they must be filled. The hon. gentleman knows—no one knows it better—that the position of appraiser requires a very capable and able man. He knows that the port of London is a very important port. I wish to make no reflection upon the officers who have been superannuated. The report that I received in reference to them was that they were good men, but, unfortunately, their state of health was such that they had become partially disabled, one at least—I am not sure whether it refers to the other. It was reported that they were unable to discharge their duties as efficiently as they had done in the past.

Mr. WALLACE. Did they apply for superannuation?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I think they did not apply. I acted on the report of the inspector in reference to the matter.

Mr. SEAGRAM. I would like to ask the Controller of Customs, why Mr. Scully, who was appointed collector by the late Government at the port of Berlin, and whose appointment was assented to by the Governor General, was dismissed and another appointed in his place?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. If I remember aright, that was one of the positions which was included in the list to which His Excellency did not give his assent.

Mr. SEAGRAM. It was assented to, and he was on the published list.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I think the office was one of those that had been vacant for more than a year.

Mr. SEAGRAM. I beg the Controller's pardon; it did not exist for a year.

Mr. WALLACE.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. That is my impression.

Mr. SEAGRAM. I beg your pardon, sir; the vacancy did not exist for a year. Mr. Scully was appointed by the late Government, and he was one of those that the Governor General assented to, and his name is on the list.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. However it may have appeared, I think the records of the department prove that the vacancy had existed for more than a year.

Mr. SEAGRAM. It was less than a year; I have personal knowledge of that. The collector was short in his accounts, and left the country, and the vacancy did not occur till then.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Can the hon. gentleman tell me the date when he left the country?

Mr. SEAGRAM. It was about the 20th of July.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I am informed that he received no pay during July.

Mr. SEAGRAM. I would like to know why that officer was dismissed, because I am positive that he was appointed within the year, and it even appeared in the "Globe" newspaper that this position was filled by J. M. Scully.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. My colleague says his name is not in the list of those whose papers were intended to be signed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). Let the hon. gentleman bring the matter up on concurrence, and in the meantime we will look into the facts.

Mr. REID. The Minister will remember the case of the collector appointed at Morrisburg.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. That is Mr. Halliday. He comes in list B, if I remember rightly, but he has not been appointed to the position as yet, and the office is being filled temporarily by an officer from the port of Montreal.

Mr. REID. I understand that the Governor General assented to his appointment, and I would like to know if there is any reason why he should not receive it?

Customs, North-west Territories..... $12,050

Mr. SPROULE. What explanation has the hon. gentleman to give of this increase of $3,000?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. That is accounted for in part by the establishment of an office at Calgary, and an office at Fort Cudahy, and there is an officer appointed in the Yukon District, Mr. Davis, who used to sit in this House.

Customs—British Columbia $71,285

Mr. SPROULE. There is an increase here of $3,535. What is the explanation of that?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I do not know whether that is enough or not. We have to have more officers there, owing to the number of people going into the country. The cost of living is very high, and I have increased the salary of one of our officers by an amount which he has been allowed for board.

Mr. WALLACE. What officer?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. Mr. Johnson. We have appointed some extra officers in that country, more particularly in the Kootenay district, which the hon. gentleman will agree with me are absolutely necessary.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman asked last session for an increase of $4,000 to $5,000 for an increased force of officers in British Columbia to which I gave my assent, and now he is asking for an increase of $3,700, but he has not increased the number of officers. At Kaslo the customs collector acts as landing waiter as well, and is kept at work from eight in the morning until twelve at night. He has no assistance. The hon. gentleman got an appropriation last year to give assistance in those places where one man was doing the work of two, but he has not made the appointment.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I have sent one there.

Mr. WALLACE. That is not correct unless he went within the last eight or ten days.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I am providing for his salary at any rate.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman provided for his salary last year, and there was no appointment. He is providing now for two salaries and still there is no appointment. Although the collections at Kaslo are more in a month than they are at Bowmanville in a year, he has appointed two men at the latter place.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I appointed only one man.

Mr. WALLACE. There was another there already. Last Parliament the hon. gentleman asked for an appropriation to appoint new officers in British Columbia and Parliament voted the amount, and now he asks for $3,700 more than last year, and does not tell the committee where he is making the appointment or what appointment he is making for the $4,000 or $5,000 additional which he got last year, besides the $3,700 which he is asking for this year.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I propose to appoint a new officer at Medway and a preventive officer at Stevenson. I am making provisions for the appointment of other officers in the Estimates, and hon. gentlemen who know the work that is being done there will agree on the necessity for additional assistance. $3,700 more does not cover a great many officers, if paid commensurate for their services in that country, where the cost of living is very high.

Mr. WALLACE. I would advise the hon. gentleman that places like Rossland and Kaslo, where the collections are much larger than at Nelson, should be made ports and not be continued as outports tributary to Nelson. The principle of establishing outports, except at small preventive stations, should not be encouraged.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. I have followed out the suggestion of the hon. gentleman and have made ports of Kaslo and Rossland ports of entry.

Miscellaneous—Day books, &c., printing and stationery, &c., &c., for various ports of entry, and for legal expenses.. $20,000

Mr. SPROULE. How do you include legal expenses in this?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. We have to pay legal expenses in connection with suits entered against the department.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). It is the same form of vote as last year.

Mr. SPROULE. There is an increase of $2,000.

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS. That increase is to be accounted for by the fact that blank forms are now given free to those making entries at the Customs. It used to be the rule to charge for these forms. It was a small matter, and irritating and annoying to those doing business with the Customs. Then we will have to provide a new set of books, because of the new tariff.

Resolutions to be reported.

Mr. DAVIES moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.35 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 19th May, 1897.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MINING DEVELOPMENT AND ADVISORY CORPORATION OF BRITISH AMERICA.

Mr. MORRISON moved :

That that part of the Fifth Report of the Select Committee on Standing Orders which refers to the petition of the Mining Development and Advisory Corporation of British America, be referred back to said committee for further consideration.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. MORRISON. This Bill came before the House, and in due course was submitted to the Committee on Standing Orders. Inadvertently and unavoidably there was no person present to explain the Bill when the committee met, especially in regard to the second section which the committee did not understand, and reported adversely, and in the report made to the House by the chairman of the committee it was stated that the committee reported against that section. To-day the Bill again came before the committee, and to our surprise we found the second clause has been reported against, and of course the committee did not wish to proceed further at that time. So on the suggestion of the chairman of the committee, this motion is made that the matter may be referred back to the committee.

Mr. WILSON. What is the reason given : is it that proper notice has not been given ?

Mr. MORRISON. The objection raised was that the clause contained provisions which were not covered by the petition. In my opinion this is not quite correct, and the clause does not contain any provision inconsistent with the petition. We are, however, ready to argue that point before the committee to-morrow, and we are confident we shall be able to show that there has been no evasion of the rules.

Motion agreed to.

EMPLOYEES ON CORNWALL CANAL.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry) asked :

1. Has A. P. Ross, superintendent of Cornwall Canal, been dismissed? If so, when, and for what cause?
2. Has there been any complaint against him, and by whom? And if so, what was the nature of the complaint?
3. Has there been any investigation held previous to his dismissal?
4. Why was A. Mulancy dismissed without notice? Was an investigation held, and by whom ?
5. What were the complaints against Roderick McKinnon, who was dismissed from the Cornwall Canal? Has an investigation been held, and by whom?
6. Why was T. Shields, who has been twenty-seven years in the service of the Government on the Cornwall Canal, and who contributed to the superannuation fund all that time, been dismissed without notice or investigation? Do the Government intend to grant him superannuation?
7. Why was W. Mea dismissed from the bridge across the canal at Cornwall? Were there any complaints against him, and has an investigation been held?
8. How long has J. Graves been employed on the Cornwall Canal? Has he been dismissed ? What are the complaints against him? Has there been an investigation held?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. Yes, the services of Mr. A. P. Ross, superintendent of the Cornwall Canal, have been dispensed with. His services ended on the 31st March ultimo, on account of the office being abolished. 2. There were no complaints against him. 3. There was no occasion for an investigation. 4. The services of Mr. Mulaney were dispensed with on account of reduction of staff. No occasion for an investigation. 5. Mr. Roderick McKinnon has not been dismissed from the Cornwall Canal. 6. Mr. T. Shields was recommended to be retired by the superintending engineer under the Superannuation Act as he is not competent to perform the duties of lockmaster efficiently. 7. Mr. John Mea was removed from office on recommendation of the superintending engineer, he not being a suitable person for the service. 8. Mr. J. Greaves was employed on the Cornwall Canal for thirteen years. His services were dispensed with on account of reduction of staff. No need for an investigation.

CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATIONS.

Mr. TAYLOR (for Mr. Sproule) asked :

Have any persons, and how many, been appointed to the inside service of the Post Office Department since 1st July, 1896, who have not passed the prescribed examination required by the Civil Service Act? Are any such persons so appointed now engaged in the department?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). No.

MICHAEL ENRIGHT.

Mr. QUINN asked :

1. Is it true that Michael Enright, an employee at Montreal on Lachine Canal, was dismissed on 3rd April last without notice?
2. Was he so dismissed by order of the Minister of Railways and Canals?
3. On whose recommendation was he so dismissed?
4. Why was he so dismissed?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. The services of

Michael Enright, employed at Montreal on the Lachine Canal, were dispensed with. 2. Yes. 3. At the request and upon the representation of the members of Parliament for Montreal districts. 4. No written complaint was lodged in the department.

LACHINE CANAL—MICHAEL BEHAN.

Mr. GANONG asked:

1. Is it true that Michael Behan, storeman on Lachine Canal at Montreal, was dismissed on 30th April without any previous notice?
2. Was he so dismissed by order of the Minister of Railways and Canals?
3. On whose recommendation was he so dismissed?
4. Why was he so dismissed?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. 1. The services of Michael Behan, storeman on the Lachine Canal, were dispensed with on the 30th of April last. 2. Yes. 3. At the request and upon the representation of the members of Parliament for Montreal districts. 4. No written complaint was lodged in the department.

Mr. GANONG. The hon. gentleman has not answered the last portion of the question.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes; I have given the information.

BREAKWATER—CAMPOBELLO, N.B.

Mr. GANONG asked:

Is it the intention of the Government to repair and extend the Government breakwater at Wilson's Beach, Campobello, New Brunswick, during the coming summer and fall?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). That matter is now under consideration by the Government.

ANTIGONISH —INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked:

(A.) Have the following, or any of them, and which of them, if any, been dismissed from the service of the Intercolonial Railway:—
(1) Alexander Stewart, section foreman at Linwood, Antigonish?
(2) John Chisholm, section man at Heatherton, Antigonish?
(3) Finlay Chisholm, section foreman, James River, Antigonish?
(B.) If dismissed was any investigation made prior to dismissal, and what was its nature?
(C.) How long were these men in the service of the Government, and what was the record of each for efficiency and conduct?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The services of Alexander Stewart, section foreman at Linwood, Antigonish, were dispensed with on the 7th of January last. (B.) No investigation was considered necessary, as it was explicitly and positively affirmed by Mr. McIsaac, M.P., that Alex. Stewart had infringed the rule laid down in respect to Government employees. (C.) He had been in the service since September, 1880. Nothing recorded against him. 2. The services of John Chisholm, section man at Heatherton, Antigonish, were dispensed with on the 12th of November last on the personal statement and representation of Mr. McIsaac, M.P., that Chisholm had been guilty of active and offensive partisanship in the last general elections. There was no investigation. He had been in the service since August, 1884. Nothing recorded against him. 3. The services of Finlay Chisholm, section foreman at James River, Antigonish, were dispensed with on the 18th November last, on the statement and representation of Mr. McIsaac, M.P., that he had been guilty of active and offensive partisanship in the last general elections. There was no investigation. He had been in the service since June, 1879.

POST OFFICE—ST. VALERIEN DE RIMOUSKI.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON asked:

Has the Postmaster General made any change in the post office at St. Valerien de Rimouski, and if so, who is now in charge of that office?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). A change was made in the month of March last in the postmastership at St. Valerien de Rimouski, and as the office is reported as having been transferred to the new postmaster, it is assumed that he is in charge of it; no information to the contrary having been received at the department.

RIMOUSKI—INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON asked:

For what causes and on whose recommendation have the following employees on the Intercolonial Railway at St. Flavie Station been dismissed:—Hormisdas Ouellet, Nicéphore Tremblay, Joseph Gagnon, Jean Baptiste Levêque, J. Alphonse Le Brun, Marcel LeBrun, Cyprien Thibault?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The services of Hormisdas Ouellet, Nicéphore Tremblay, Joseph Gagnon, Jean Baptiste Leveque, J. Alphonse LeBrun, Marcel LeBrun and Cyprien Thibault, employees on the Intercolonial Railway, were dispensed with on the 3rd May, 1897, at the request and on the representation of Dr. Fiset, M.P., that these persons had taken an active and offensive partisan course in the late Dominion elections.

VALLEYFIELD POSTMASTER.

Mr. BERGERON asked:

1. Who has been appointed postmaster at Valleyfield in place of Mr. D. Pitre?

2. On whose recommendation was the new postmaster appointed?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. Mr. Ephrem Desparois has been nominated to the postmastership of Valleyfield. 2. This was done on the recommendation of the Hon. J. I. Tarte.

BRITISH COLUMBIA TELEGRAPH LINES.

Mr. RICHARDSON (for Mr. Bostock) asked:

1. What is the arrangement between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway as to the keeping up and repairing of the telegraph line between Ashcroft and Barkerville and Ashcroft and Lillooet, and how long does this arrangement last?
2. What is the arrangement with regard to the appointing of operators?
3. Who decided at what point instruments are to be installed along the line?
4. Can the Minister of Public Works give any reasons why the instruments were put in the present offices?
5. In the event of the receipts not being equal to the expenditure, who pays the difference?
6. Is there any way of knowing whether messages are sent between points on this line and not paid for?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. Since 1st October, 1886, the line from Ashcroft to Barkerville has been operated in conjunction with the Canadian Pacific telegraph system. The branch to Lillooet from Ashcroft was added in January, 1896. The expense for maintenance and operation of the whole is chargeable to the Government, less the amount of revenue collected. This arrangement is terminable at any time at the pleasure of the Minister. 2. The appointment of operators is made by the Minister of Public Works, or by his sanction given to the local superintendent of the Canadian Pacific telegraphs in British Columbia, who also acts as district superintendent for the Government in respect to these two lines. In cases where the office happens to be one of merely passing requirement or where rendered desirable through line maintenance considerations involving no outlay on the part of the Government, the district superintendent exercises his discretion in providing the needful service. 3. All of the older services were established prior to British Columbia entering into confederation and have been continuously maintained. Some later offices have been rendered desirable to meet growing requirements and have been provided for as in the preceding clause. 4. Yes, in every instance to meet the requirements of traffic or to increase facilities for maintaining the line in order. 5. The excess of expenditure over revenue is paid by the Government. 6. The returns of the offices are rendered monthly and the statements signed by the agents in each instance represent the whole of the traffic. The figures are in due course checked one against the other and discrepancies inquired into and adjusted. The rules of the service provide for certain free messages between or on personal account of employees, of which no account is taken in the statements. It is estimated that were these lines worked apart from the railway company's system, the charges (for supervision and accounting) would increase the Government outlay by at least $1.200 per year.

ABITTIBI AND GRAND LAC INDIANS.

Mr. KLOCK (for Mr. Poupore) asked:

1. Are the Indians who live in the Abittibi and Grand Lac districts in the province of Quebec, treaty Indians?
2. Have their claims been extinguished?
3. Are they subject to any game laws of the province of Quebec, and do such laws restrain them from killing beaver and other fur-bearing animals?
4. Is the Government aware that beaver and other fur-bearing animals are their only or principal means of subsistence?
5. Is the Government aware that these Indians are likely to suffer from distress and famine during the autumn and winter if they are restrained from killing or taking those animals for their subsistence?
6. Does the Government propose to take any, and what means to relieve them?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). 1. They are not treaty Indians. 2. There has never been any formal extinguishment of territorial claims in the province of Quebec. As to the Indians in question, a reserve was set aside at Lake Temiscamingue for the nomadic tribes inhabiting that part of the country watered by the Ottawa River, which is adjacent to Hudson's Bay territory, and a reserve was set aside at Maniwaki for the tribes whose hunting grounds extended over the territory between St. Maurice and Gatineau Rivers, and the Indians who live in the Abittibi and Grand Lac districts are taken to be of the tribes for whom these reserves were set aside. 3. They are subject to the game laws of the province of Quebec, under which the hunting of fur-bearing animals is restricted to certain months in the year, and the killing of beaver entirely prohibited until the 1st November, 1900. 4. The Government is aware that beaver and other fur-bearing animals are their principal means of subsistence. 5. The Government fears that these Indians are likely to suffer destitution as a result of the operation of the Quebec game laws. 6. The Department of Indian Affairs has been in communication with the provincial authorities with a view to obtaining some exceptional treatment for these Indians under the game laws. Up to the present, however, no concession has been made in the matter by the provincial authorities, further than an intimation that a special permit might be given to any Indian whose poverty was well established, but it

is the intention of the department to continue to urge that a general exception should be made in favour of these Indians. The Government does not propose taking any special measures for the relief of these Indians, but will be prepared, in the event of the occasion arising, to extend some assistance to them out of the ordinary appropriation for the relief of Indians in the province of Quebec.

INLAND REVENUE DEPARTMENT—GEORGE VEZINA.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked:

1. Was the following letter addressed to the agent of the Minister of Justice at Quebec by E. L. Newcombe, Deputy Minister of Justice:—

"Ottawa, 21st October, 1896.

"Sir,—Queen vs. Vezina—I have the honour to inform you that I am to-day in receipt of a letter from the Department of Inland Revenue, stating that as the delay granted in this matter has expired, the department would be glad if you would now enforce the judgment."

2. Was the following letter addressed to the agent of the Minister of Justice at Quebec by E. L. Newcombe, Deputy Minister of Justice:—

"Ottawa, 26th October, 1896.

"Sir,—Queen vs. Vezina—I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your communication of the 23rd instant, and to ask that you will have every effort made to have Vezina arrested."

3. Was the following telegram addressed to the said agent by the Hon. H. G. Joly de Lotbinière, Controller of Inland Revenue, on the 3rd November, 1896:—

"Please suspend proceedings against Vezina until further instructed. I believe he was several times condemned to pay fines. Has he paid any of them, does he owe any more and what sum?

4. Is it not true that the Vezina referred to in the foregoing is George Vezina, of Quebec, convicted of having violated the provisions of the Inland Revenue laws?

5. If so, the following questions:—(1.) "Is it not a fact that the present Controller of Inland Revenue gave orders to have George Vezina, of Quebec, imprisoned under conviction of having infringed the inland revenue laws? (2.) If he did not, why did he not give the necessary instructions to carry out sentence of the court? (3.) If he did give instructions, why were they not carried out?" Why did the Government on the 3rd of May instant, as appears in "Hansard," p. 1964, answer as follows:—"When the present Government came into office they found the case had been disposed of by their predecessors in office and they did not deem it at all advisable to disturb the disposition of that case"?

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). The answer to the first question is in the affirmative; the answer to the second question is also in the affirmative; and the answer to the third question is also in the affirmative. The reason why the sentence was not carried out against Mr. Vezina was this: That, after the Controller of Inland Revenue had looked into the matter, he thought the matter had been disposed of by the late Government, and he thought it advisable not to reopen it.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that he has not answered the fifth question at all.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, I have.

Mr. CASGRAIN. The hon. the Premier may say that is an answer, but I respectfully submit it is not.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. the Prime Minister has given his answer.

BEHRING SEA SEAL REGULATIONS.

Mr. PRIOR. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the Minister of Marine, if he, or any other member of the Government has received a copy of the resolutions passed by the provincial legislature of British Columbia in regard to sealing matters. On the 3rd of May, the legislature sitting at Victoria, B.C., unanimously passed a resolution in regard to the regulations at present in force for sealing in the Behring Sea. It seems that the regulations which were agreed to by the tribunal of arbitration which sat in Paris in August, 1893, did not give satisfaction to a large number of the sealers. Knowing that these regulations might be altered, the Dominion Government pressed upon the Imperial Government the advisability of doing so, and a resolution to the same effect was passed in the local House, to be forwarded to the Dominion Government. I would therefore ask the hon. gentleman if he has seen that resolution, or if it has been forwarded.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The hon. gentleman was kind enough to send across the House to me yesterday a copy of the Votes and Proceedings of the British Columbia legislature, which contained the resolution he refers to. That was the first intimation I had of the passage of the resolution. It has not yet been received by the Government, though I assume that it will come in the due course of the mail. There is no immediate occasion for hurry. The regulations made under the Paris award were made in the year 1893, and are to be continued for a period of five years. I understand from the resolution which my hon. friend gave to me yesterday to read, that dissatisfaction exists among the Canadian sealers with respect to the regulations. The hon. gentleman is aware, of course, that dissatisfaction also exists, and has been diplomatically expressed, on behalf of the United States with those regulations. In fact, they went so far as to urge Her Majesty's Government, I believe, to consent to some amendment being made in them before the five years expired. The matter was very courteously communicated to the Canadian Government for its information, and the opinion of the Canadian Government has been transmitted to Her Majesty's

Government. We see no reason at the present moment for advising any alteration in the existing regulations before the expiration of the five years for which they were made.

Mr. PRIOR. The sealers seem to fear that the Americans are going to urge that the present season be made a close season.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I may say to the hon. gentleman, that the Canadian Government were very careful to press upon Her Majesty's Government the views which we believe to be held by a majority, in fact, by the whole of the Canadian public, and the Canadian sealers in particular; and at the present moment Her Majesty's Government are in full possession of those views. I may say frankly that our views do not differ at all from the views of our predecessors, which they also expressed to Her Majesty's Government.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. DAVIN. I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General whether the return which was ordered by the House, of the evidence taken in the inquiry as to the postmaster at Northfield, B.C., will soon be brought down.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I will make inquiry in regard to the matter without delay.

Mr. McALISTER. I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if the papers and correspondence which I asked for some days ago with regard to the dismissal of Mr. Verge, fishery officer for the River Restigouche, will soon be brought down.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). I have not been informed that the order has yet reached my department, but as soon as it does, there will not be any delay in bringing it down, as the papers are very few. I will see that the matter is at once attended to.

Mr. McALISTER. On the same day, about two weeks ago, I also asked for correspondence in regard to the closing of the post office at Oak Bay Mills, in the county of Bonaventure.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I would like to ask the hon. leader of the House, in the absence of the Controller of Customs and the Controller of Inland Revenue, at what time I may expect a return, which was asked for some time ago, of the number of officials appointed to office since the 30th of July, 1896, in those two departments; also the number of officials who had been dismissed, and the cause of their dismissal since the same date. I understood that we were to have the discussion on the Estimates for these two departments postponed until that information had been obtained, because I think that is the proper time for a discussion of the dismissal of officials who in the opinion of this side of the House have been improperly dismissed. Last night, I regret to say, the Customs Estimates were brought up in my absence and passed, though I had the word of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that the Fishery Estimates were to be taken up. I trust that before concurrence we may have the return, which I think by this time should have been laid on the Table of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). I have taken a note of the matter, and I may say to my hon. friend that very strict and urgent orders have been issued this very day to have all these returns brought down with the least possible delay.

Mr. FOSTER. I said the other day that I would not ask again for certain returns which were ordered by the House. Fifteen minutes would be sufficient to make up some of those returns; others are more voluminous. I do not propose to ask for them again. I will take the constitutional course open to me to obtain them.

The PRIME MINISTER. This very day I had the matter in hand, and gave orders to have the returns prepared without delay.

BANK NOTE PRINTING CONTRACT.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to give notice to my hon. friend that to-morrow I will bring up the Burland bank note contract.

SUPPLY—DISMISSALS IN MONTREAL.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, before this motion is put, I would like to draw the attention of the House, and particularly the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), to the questions which were put in my name to-day, and the answers which were given to them. The first question was concerning Michael Enright, an employee on the Lachine Canal at Montreal. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, in answering this question, said that it was quite true that Michael Enright had been dismissed on the 30th of April last, and that he had been dismissed on the order of the Minister of Railways and Canals and on the recommendation of the members for the city of Montreal. Now, I wish to draw his attention to the fact that my hon. friend from St. Antoine, Montreal, (Mr. Roddick), and myself, who are both members for a portion of the city of Montreal, made no such recommendation, nor did we recommend the dismissal of Michael Behan, who is mentioned in the next question.

The Minister also said that there was no written complaint against these men. Now, I do not think that is an answer to the question why these men were dismissed. The object of the questions was to find out what system had been adopted by the Government in the dismissal of employees on the canal and in other departments. We knew as a matter of fact that these men had been dismissed on the recommendation of some persons who supported the Government but were not members of this House. We had ample proof of that in one case which was brought before the House some time ago, when it was shown that one of the hon. members of this House had handed over to a committee in his riding the right to dismiss employees and to select those who should replace them. We have the same thing existing in Montreal, and it was in order to show this that I asked why men enjoying the good character these two men do, as is proven by the certificates of their superiors, should have been dismissed from the employ of the Government. I was answered that they were dismissed on the recommendations of hon. members from Montreal. This is disproved by the statement I now make that no such recommendation came from me, and by a similar statement which my hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Roddick) no doubt will make, that neither did he make any such recommendations. I would ask the hon. Minister who has particular charge of this matter, whether it is not absolutely correct that no such recommendations were made. The House, and I think the country, will see at once that the reply of the Government was not correct, and that these men were not dismissed on the recommendations of hon. members for Montreal. The Government also replied that they were dismissed without any written complaints. But, I ask, why were they so dismissed? Were they dismissed because they were entitled to the certificates which were given them and which I shall now read to the House? To Mr. Enright this certificate was given:

This is to certify that Michael Enright has been connected with the Lachine Canal as lock labourer, bridge-keeper and watchman for thirty-four years, and that during that time he has proved himself a steady, sober and reliable man. I have much pleasure in stating that I have found him very satisfactory during the last four years, or since I have myself had charge of the canal.

ERNEST MARCEAU,
Supt. Engineer.

Was it because of his good conduct and because of this certificate that he was dismissed? If not, what was the reason? There is nothing against his character, there was nothing against his conduct as an employee, there is nothing against him in any way. Why, then, was he dismissed? We are told he was dismissed without any written complaint, but that does not give the reason for his dismissal. What I should like to find out is what system was adopted by the Government in the case of dismissals of men of this kind.

The next certificate concerns Mr. Behan, who was dismissed at the same time. In this case I have two certificates, one from the superintendent of Lachine Canal, and the other from the superintending engineer of canals generally in the province of Quebec. The first certificate is from Mr. Conway, superintendent of Lachine Canal:

Montreal, 1st May, 1897.

To all whom it may concern.

This is to certify that Mr. Behan has been employed as storeman in connection with the Lachine Canal during the past two years, and during that time has given excellent satisfaction. He is a thoroughly reliable man, and I willingly recommend him to any party requiring such a person.

J. CONWAY,
Supt. Lachine Canal.

The second certificate is from Mr. Marceau, the superintending engineer of Quebec canals:

Montreal, 1st May, 1897.

To whom it may concern:

This is to certify that Michael Behan has been employed during two years as storeman on the Lachine Canal. I have always found him a painstaking, steady and reliable man. I have much pleasure in giving him this testimonial.

ERNEST MARCEAU,
Superintending Engineer Quebec Canals.

I was not at all curious to know from the Government the fact that these men were dismissed. We know that ourselves, and these men know it very much to their own regret and sorrow. We know it, I think, to the shame of the administration of public affairs and the distribution of public offices in this country. But what we want to know is why they were dismissed and how they were dismissed. They were certainly not dismissed on the recommendation of any member of this House from Montreal, and they were certainly not dismissed for misconduct. Is it not true that they were dismissed on the recommendation of men who hold no position in this House? Is it not true that they were dismissed at the behest of a committee occupied in Montreal at present in cutting off the heads of public officers there? Is it not true that these men were dismissed without any reason whatever, but simply because their friends were supporters of the Conservative party and they were appointed during the regime of the Conservative party? If these things be true, should not the country know it? Is it not proper that true answers should be given to the questions put, so that the country may judge whether or not public officers are to be dismissed in this way? I hold that whatever this Government has done, it certainly must assume the full re-

sponsibility for this before the country. If they do not, if they have not the courage to assume the responsibility, why do they permit themselves to be coerced into a line of action for which they will not become responsible before the country in a manly and straightforward manner.

Mr. PENNY. In reply to the hon. member for Montreal Centre, I regret very much that my hon. friend and colleague, the hon. member for Hochelaga, is not in his seat at present. So far as I know, there is no committee in Montreal for cutting off heads. I never heard of any such committee, but I have heard that a great many of the former employees on the Lachine Canal were simply tools in the hands of the late Government, and were used as political machines to work against the Liberal party. In the absence of my hon. friend from Hochelaga, that is all I propose to say.

Mr. MONK. It is a matter of great regret both to me and those interested in my county, that there is not a properly organized committee of the Liberal party in Montreal who might dispose of the patronage, at least with some show of justice. In the county of Jacques Cartier, there is a bridgemaster at Cote St. Paul, who held his position over seventeen years. He obtained it through the influence of the late Hon. Mr. Laflamme, formerly Minister of Justice in the Mackenzie Administration, so that he owed his position to the Liberal party. Presumably he was a Liberal, but I never saw him before his dismissal. At any rate, he fulfilled his duties perfectly well. But what happened? On the 30th of April at nine o'clock in the evening, this man, who was lodged at the expense of the Government, who had never dreamt of having to seek another position or even another house, to shelter himself and his large family, received notice to quit the very next day. This man occupied his position in the county of Jacques Cartier, where there is a large Liberal contingent, among which surely could have been found some one to replace him, if the Government were bound to dismiss him. But what do we find? Why, a man from Hochelaga was sent in his place. The same thing happened in the case of the lockmaster, a man who was twenty-five years in his position, who was placed there without any political influence whatever, but solely by the influence of his father, who had been in the employ of the Government for many years, and who never meddled in politics. The same treatment was given him. At nine o'clock in the evening of the 30th April, he was given notice to quit his house and occupation the next morning. He, too, was replaced by some one from the neighbouring county of St. Henri. Something similar happened in Lachine. I believe that if these dismissals must take place, the very least that could be done would be to replace these men by other men from the same county, taken from the Liberal ranks, and not take them from the neighbouring counties. I heard the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) say the other day that in his own county he had not seen fit to advise any dismissals. It is a matter of regret to me that our neighbours in Montreal have not adopted that humane policy. We had the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) stating that, in his opinion, when the member representing a county declared that such and such a man, for reasons he might or might not give, was unworthy to fill his position, he should be dismissed. This is going pretty far. I think it is contrary to the principle of British justice that a man should be dismissed without even being told for what reason he is dismissed, wholly without opportunity to answer the accusation which the member for the county may make against him. But to say that members from neighbouring counties, utterly irresponsible to the electors of the county affected, can, by some means, get men out of their positions and replace them by men from their own counties is a phase of this much worn question of dismissals which has not, thus far, been before the House. In the county of Jacques Cartier we have had to suffer considerably from that evil, men being dismissed against whom no accusation could be brought and being replaced by men from neighbouring counties. In this the Government is not doing me an injury but it is doing itself a great injury and committing a great injustice against the people of the county.

Motion agreed to, and the House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Public Works—River St. Lawrence Channel $200,000

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Will the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) tell us exactly what this money is to be used for? Of course I understand the scope of the work generally, but would like to know for what particular purpose this money is to be spent.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). As my hon. friend (Sir Adolphe Caron) sees by the Estimates before him, last year we asked for $78,101. The reason why we are asking more this year is because we need new dredging plant. My hon. friend knows of the great importance of the St. Lawrence. We have two or three dredges which are out of order and we have found it necessary to ask for enough to get new plant. Except for this, the item is to enable us to carry on the usual work.

Mr. HAGGART. If I remember correctly, only one or two years ago the statement was made in this House, respecting the

dredges used in Lake St. Peter, that the department had a supply in excess of what was required.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know what may have been said in the past, but I know very well that we are short of dredges everywhere. We have now five dredges working on the St. Lawrence channel, the "Laurier," the "Laval," the "No. 8," the "No. 11," and the "No. 12." Two or three of these dredges are getting old and do not do very satisfactory work, and we need $80,000 to construct a new dredge as well as $20,000 to pay for a tug. We have calls for dredges for every part of the Dominion which we cannot comply with.

Harbours and Rivers—River Kaministiquia $18,000

Mr. SPROULE. Is this to continue the dredging there?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is to complete the dredging of the turning basin, opposite the elevator of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. BERGERON. That is at Fort William?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Public Works and Buildings—chargeable to income—Quebec immigration building on Louise Embankment, and breakwater and Queen's wharf buildings..... $5,000

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. What does the Minister intend doing on these buildings?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have painting to complete and general repairs.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if there has not been a request made by the corporation of Valleyfield for public building for customs and excise offices, and post office? I know such a request was made, and I understand that it has been renewed. I would like to ask if it is the intention of the hon. Minister to construct such a building.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not remember such a request having been made.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand that such a request was made, and that it has been renewed. The hon. gentleman knows that Valleyfield is a town of 8,000 inhabitants, where a great deal of business is done for the size of the town, and it is important that a building should be erected such as I have indicated. If this matter has been brought to the attention of the hon. Minister, I hope he will not forget it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Hear, hear.

Public Works and Buildings—Ontario..... $30,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would take this opportunity of asking my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works what he proposes doing in regard to restoring the portion of the western block, destroyed by fire, and when he expects that the work will be completed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). I may say that we have proceeded as rapidly as possible with the repair of those parts of the building which had only been gutted by the fire, and that portion of the work will be completed in about ten days. That is to say, that portion of the building which is now covered, and which has not been destroyed but only injured by water, will be completed in a few days As to the roof of the building, my chief architect advises me that it would be dangerous to give a contract for the flooring to outside men. The hon. gentleman is aware that there are a great many people working in the building all the time now, and my chief architect thinks it would be safer for us to make the flooring ourselves. This part of the work will cost, I suppose, about $17,000 or $20,000. As to rebuilding the part destroyed by fire, I may say that this matter has given me a great deal of anxiety. It has been suggested that it might be well to add another story to the building, but upon careful consideration I have come to the conclusion that it would not be wise to do so, as it might injure the aspect of the other buildings by comparison. I have therefore decided to rebuild according to the old plan. For that work, of course, we will ask for tenders immediately, and the plans are now being prepared. We have ordered materials for the flooring from the United States, and we expect them in a few days and the work will then be proceeded with.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. How soon do you expect to ask for tenders?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In a few days, as soon as our plans are ready.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I take it for granted that the hon. gentleman means to make that building as perfectly fire-proof as possible. I am speaking from some little knowledge which I acquired the other day when I was in New York, about some timber which is made perfectly fire-proof through some chemical process. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman is acquainted with that or not, but now that the matter is under consideration, I would draw his attention to this material, as I think it is of the greatest importance that all the public buildings in Ottawa should be made as perfectly fire-proof as it is possible to make them. Even the shelves for books in the rooms, I am told, can be made

fire-proof by this new process ; and if that be so, I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman having had his attention drawn to the matter, will look into it, and see whether the suggestion I make to him now, can be utilized.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend may rest assured that I am very thankful to him for the suggestion he has made to me. I will take note of it ; and at the same time I can assure him that I will take every possible step to make the portion to be rebuilt fire-proof.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the hon. gentleman tell us whether he has come to any decision about putting an additional story on this building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will leave it as before.

Mr. BENNETT. I would take advantage of this opportunity to compliment the Minister of Public Works on the line of economy that he has instituted in the town of Orillia relative to the public building there ; and at the same time, if he is not going to carry out the same line of economy throughout the Dominion, to ask him to recede from the position he has taken in regard to the public building at that point. A few years ago, at an expense of about $20,000, a large public building was erected in the town of Orillia, which serves the purposes of a commodious post office, and offices for the collector of customs and for the inland revenue. To my astonishment a few weeks ago, without any intimation beforehand, the caretaker of that public building was summarily dismissed ; and upon making inquiries of the Minister of Public Works, I was assured by him that it was simply with a view of economy that he had dismissed the official who had discharged the duties of caretaker. The hon. gentleman also stated that he had made an arrangement by which the postmaster was to take charge of the building at an annual charge of $120 a year. Now, if the hon. Minister of Public Works proposes to follow out that line of conduct throughout the Dominion, I have no demur and no complaint to make ; but if he intends simply to make fish of one and flesh of another, then I think it is grossly unfair for him to do so. Now, I recall to recollection a debate in this House a little time ago, when complaint was made by the member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), that the caretaker of the public building at Regina had been dismissed, and I would like to ask the Minister now if he was replaced by another official. I understand from the member for Western Assiniboia that an official has been appointed. Now, if the hon. gentleman proposes to carry out this line of conduct, why does he not apply the same principle in the other case ? I can glance about me and see hon. gentlemen in whose ridings these public buildings are situated in the province of Ontario, and I am bound to say that the Minister has not yet interfered in a single case, but in the case of the caretaker of the post office at Orillia, he seems to have made some discrimination. The postmaster at Orillia receives a large salary, some $2,500, and there was a small allowance of $350 paid to this official caretaker, and yet at a single stroke he wiped out the official existence of that caretaker, and adds $120 to the already large salary of the postmaster in that town. Now, I would ask the Minister if he will give me this assurance : That the line of conduct he has instituted there, he proposes to carry out in every public building in the province of Ontario ; in the next place, if he does not intend to carry out that line of economy, does he intend to restore the caretaker to the position that he formerly held ; and lastly, if he will give his word now that no appointment will be made to the position of caretaker at Orillia at the old salary that was formerly paid, $350.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am very glad my hon. friend has called my attention to the case of the caretaker at Orillia. If my hon. friend will look at item 158, he will find that instead of asking for the sum of $73,000, I am only asking for $70,000. The policy I have tried to follow is this : Every time a case has come to my knowledge in which I found it possible to entrust the care of the post office to the postmaster himself, I have done so. We have found that it was better that the postmaster himself be responsible for the building. At Orillia an offer was made to take charge of the building for $10 per month. The department was paying a caretaker $400 a year for this service. I wrote to the postmaster and asked if he would take care of the building, and, if so, for what remuneration. He said he was ready to take care of it for $10 per month. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken if he thinks I singled out one of his friends, for I did not even know his politics.

An hon. MEMBER. He is a Conservative, of course.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is no crime. I have applied the same rule in other cases, at Truro, at St. Jérome, and in many other constituencies. If I am able to dispense with the services of these men and promote economy, and, at the same time, maintain the efficiency of the public service, I shall continue to do so.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. Minister has not answered my question. He has stated that he received an intimation from Orillia that the duties of caretaker could be discharged for $10 per month. How was it that the Minister became so informed ? It must follow that the hon. Minister singled

out the postmaster of Orillia as the first man in regard to whom he should apply the rule as to dual duties, postmaster and caretaker. If this had been a matter of routine, the first case would have occurred at Barrie, where there is a large public building, and where the official appointed in office was appointed practically under the regime of the present Minister of Public Works. How does it occur that the hon. Minister does not interfere with Barrie? On looking round the House I see hon. members representing different constituencies, but in no case have officers been dealt with as in the case of Orillia. I ask the Minister to give the House an assurance that he will not appoint a successor, when the Government get rid of the present incumbent.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have dispensed with the services of the caretaker because they were not wanted, and because my attention was called to the fact that by dispensing with his services I could promote economy.

An hon. MEMBER. By whom was this suggested?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think I have acted rightly in the matter. My hon. friend has called attention to some other cases. I shall be very glad to look into every case presented to me, and if I am able to promote economy, I shall do so.

Mr. HUGHES. I hope the hon. Minister is not going to apply that rule to other places in Ontario, as it will be very dangerous to establish the rule that a postmaster has control of the caretaker. I hope the hon. gentleman will not take that course.

Mr. BENNETT. I understand the hon. Minister has taken this position simply and solely on the ground of economy?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. If so, surely he is prepared to state to the House that he will not make another appointment to that position. Will the hon. gentleman give an assurance that he will not appoint another caretaker in Orillia?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Certainly—I will not.

Mr. BENNETT. Then the hon. gentleman will disappoint many of his friends.

Mr. DAVIN. I think the Minister rather glided around the illustration used by my hon. friend. My hon. friend used an illustration which applies to the administration in Regina. Last year it will be remembered when I asked the Minister of Public Works in regard to the fireman of the court-house of Regina, the Minister told me that he dismissed the fireman because there was nothing for him to do. The hon. gentleman, however, appointed somebody in his place. The hon. gentleman told me from his place in this House that there was no charge whatever as to lack of efficiency, but that the man was dismissed because there was nothing for him to do. I rather think the hon. Minister has not carried out his promise in regard to that matter. He gave me to understand that if there was no charge preferred against this man, he would be reinstated. What happened was this. In the summer time this man was not paid.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He was not caretaker, he was only fireman. The caretaker has not been dismissed.

Mr. DAVIN. The name makes no difference as regards the principle. Change the name and the principle yet remains the same. What I want to point out is this, that the hon. Minister stated that the fireman was dismissed because he had nothing to do. I rather think that the hon. gentleman, in this matter is not following the strict principle that has been guiding him in other cases.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When I stated that the fireman had nothing to do, I was quite correct, and my statement was true. Later on, when the weather became cold, there was something for the fireman to do, and I thought it proper to hire one, and I did so. Unfortunately, the name of the man was not the same, but the public buildings were heated thoroughly well.

Mr. LISTER. Does the Minister employ for the public buildings in Regina, a caretaker and also a fireman?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I employ a caretaker. I may say that very great pressure has been brought to bear on me to dismiss the caretaker, but I think he is a good caretaker.

Mr. LISTER. This is not a question of public buildings at Regina, or any other point, but it is a question as to whether this is not unjustifiable extravagance, not only as regards employing a caretaker at $350 or $450, but also in having a man employed during the winter to keep up the fires in those public buildings. We can point to public buildings throughout the country which have cost $15,000 to $30,000, where $2,000 or $3,000 are expended in maintaining a caretaker, which is out of all proportion to the revenue obtained. We find public buildings in small towns with a few hundred inhabitants which entail an expenditure of $2,000 or $3,000, and even in some cases this expenditure reaches three or four times the revenue. Sometimes there is an expenditure of $1,200 or $2,000 in the case of post offices and the revenue of those offices sometimes does not equal the expenditure. When we also find that we are constructing public buildings for the purpose of satisfying the voters in

certain constituencies, and having an interest charge for all time of many hundreds of dollars per annum; and besides all that, we have officers in the shape of firemen and caretakers receiving very considerable salaries. I say it is a waste of public money and if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) goes through this country and weeds out all the small post office and public buildings, he will be doing something that the country will applaud him for. I know perfectly well, that in the large cities, Toronto, Hamilton, Montreal, Quebec, and many others, these officers are necessary as the buildings are large. But, go out to Aylmer if you will, and there the Government has spent $30,000 for a public building, and we are paying at the present time somebody three or four hundred dollars a year for taking care of it. The charge on the public treasury in that instance is probably $1,500 a year for all time, and I venture to say that the receipts of the office do not amount to much more than that sum altogether. If the Minister of Public Works puts the pruning knife well into all cases such as I have spoken of, he will be doing a meritorious work. The system leads simply to a multiplication of offices. If the postmaster were not in a public building, he would have to fire and sweep out for himself, or get somebody to do it for him. It is a waste of public money, and instead of blaming the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) for doing what he has done in Orillia, he is entitled to be praised for it.

Mr. DAVIN. I am sorry to hear the contemptuous way in which my hon. friend (Mr. Lister) speaks of the capital of the North-west Territories. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) does full justice to the building that is there. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) was not speaking about the post office, but about the court-house, and the court-house at Regina cannot be cared for by a fireman only. My hon. friend (Mr. Lister) must have often observed in court—I do not know if he has ever experienced it himself—but he must have seen a man in court speaking to a brief that he had not time to read. My hon. friend (Mr. Lister) is now in that position. He was not acquainted with the facts, for I cannot believe that a man of his judgment and experience could speak in the manner he did in respect to the court-house and public buildings in Regina, and the claims of Regina, if he knew anything about the matter. We have in Regina a court-house which is a credit to the Dominion, and it is not one bit too large for the purpose, because the Supreme Court sits there periodically to hear all the appeals from the North-west Territories, and the district judges court is held there from time to time. Neither is my hon. friend (Mr. Lister) acquainted with the conditions of climate that exist in the North-west Territories. That building cost $40,000, and if you had only one man to attend to the fire and the caretaking, the building would be greatly damaged after one winter. I fear that there is in the breast of hon. gentlemen opposite, the same animosity to Regina that used to inspire them when they were in Opposition. Then, Regina, the capital of the Territories, acted on them like a red rag to a bull, and now we have the Minister of the Interior taking the Indian office down to Winnipeg, and from Regina near to which most Indians are, and from a territory where the Indians are who require most supervision. My hon. friend (Mr. Lister) would, I suppose, like to tear down the court-house and transport it somewhere else. There is talk of other denudations being extended to the capital of the North-west Territories. I must say, Mr Chairman, that any disparagement of that kind to the capital of Regina and any girding at it, so long as I have a seat in this House, will not go without reply. As to what my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) says, there is no use crying over spilt milk, we cannot undo what is done; but I am sure that he knows well, to put it mildly, that he dismissed Lambert under a misapprehension, and I am perfectly certain, if pressure had not been placed upon him and if he could have taken his own judgment as to what should have been done, he would have reinstated Lambert.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. member for West Lambton (Mr Lister) entirely misunderstood the tenor of my remarks. I was not at all blaming the Minister for introducing an era of economy; I was rather endeavouring to inculcate upon him the duty of the principle, and to solicit him to go a little further in that direction. I instanced the case of the town of Barrie, immediately adjoining, in the riding of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and I will be bound to say that he will not interfere there. The Minister made a statement, that by some means or other he had become acquainted with the fact that the postmaster would discharge the duties for $120. I cannot believe that the postmaster of his own action, ever undertook to write the Minister to that effect, and it must therefore have been, that the party machine was set to work. The fact of the matter is this: They wanted to get rid of the caretaker and they could not get rid of him by an investigation, because nothing could be shown against him either as to the manner in which he conducted the duties of the office, or as to his having taken any part in the elections, and so, the Minister introduced a game of "freeze out" against the caretaker, and that is practically what it amounts to. The Minister has assured me that he will not appoint another caretaker to the position——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT. Would the Minister make this further assurance, that he will

not appoint a fireman to the position either? Whether you call him a fireman or a caretaker it is all the same, because the one man discharges both duties. Do I understand the Minister to say that there will not be a fireman appointed?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Surely my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) ought not expect me to go into all these details. What I meant to say, and what I will do is this: I will not appoint any other officer to take the place of the man I have dispensed with. I cannot say more than that.

Mr. BENNETT. Very well.

Mr. TAYLOR. I wish to inquire from the Minister (Mr. Tarte) whether in this item "public buildings, Ont., renewals, improvements, &c.," there is any sum included for the repair and renewal of the drill shed at Gananoque. I am glad to see the acting Minister of Militia (Sir Richard Cartwright) in his place, for I want to draw the attention of both hon. gentlemen to this matter. The drill shed at Gananoque was erected on a portion of the market square adjoining the Roman Catholic church. The armoury of the old drill shed was within six feet of the church. It was thought desirable to have the drill shed removed. The corporation of Gananoque approached the Government and offered one thousand dollars for the site on which the old drill shed was erected. The Government accepted the $1,000, and agreed to remove the building within a reasonable time. They gave the corporation permission to remove a sufficient portion of the drill shed to enable them to build the high school, and the school board went on and built the high school. The rear end of the high school building abuts upon the drill shed. At the east end is the Roman Catholic church, a new building, having been erected a year or two ago, after this arrangement was made. About three-fourths of the drill shed and the armoury remain there, to the inconvenience of both the church and the school building, and the Government, having accepted the corporation's money, are under obligations to remove the building to another site, and provision should be made in these Estimates for doing so. I want to know if any portion of this vote is intended to be used for that purpose, or if it will be provided for in the Supplementary Estimates, and if the Government will take steps to remove the building to another site.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I will make inquiry; but my impression is that there is an appropriation for that purpose in the Supplementary Estimates which are likely to be brought down for the current year.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not see any item here for the building of a post office at Owen Sound. During the memorable election which we passed through some time ago, an implied promise was given—and I think it was intimated that the sanction of the Minister of Public Works and the Postmaster General had been obtained—that there would be more than cold justice meted out to the North Riding of Grey if a supporter of the Government were elected. He was elected. I noticed only the other day in one of the Owen Sound papers that a gentleman, supposed to be sent by the Government, had been up there to look at a suitable site for a post office or a post office and custom-house. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if it is his intention to go on and build one.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am glad my hon. friend takes so much interest in the thriving town of Owen Sound. In reply to his question, I may say that my attention has been called to the great importance of that town, and the great pleasure the public would have in having a building erected. At the same time, I think our friends and our opponents too, are alive to the fact that we have constructed pretty large works at Owen Sound. I have met a good many of the people. They do not expect us to spend millions this year. We must economize a little, being fair at the same time.

Mr. SPROULE. I am quite sure the people of Owen Sound will be disappointed if a new building is not erected, because in that campaign, the Postmaster General looked over two or three sites and gave his view as to their eligibility for a public building, and I had no doubt that a substantial building would be erected.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It will come out right, I have no doubt.

Mr. SPROULE. Where are these repairs and renewals, for which this money is asked, being made?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is quite impossible to state positively where all these repairs will take place, as accidents may take place here and there, and we must provide for them. The Estimates mention Amherstburg, Barrie, Berlin, Brantford, Brockville, Belleville, Cayuga, Clinton, Goderich, Hamilton, Kingston, London post office, London custom-house, Port Colborne, Port Hope, Peterborough, Prescott, St. Catharines. There may be other places, of course, where we may have to make repairs.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it the intention of the hon. gentleman to have the work done by public tender?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is quite impossible to do all these works by public tender. At times they may cost only $50; but when they cost a certain amount of money, we always ask for tenders.

Mr. BRITTON. As the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has referred to the absence of a drill shed at Gananoque, I again call the attention of the Government to the omission from the Estimates of any sum for a drill shed at Kingston, which was promised. One of the acts of the late Government of which no one complained, and praised which every one who knew the circumstances, was to put in their Estimates for 1895-96 a vote of $15,000 for a drill shed there. The drill shed we had, which was a comparatively poor structure, was upon land owned by the Government. The Government sold the land to Queen's College. Queen's College allowed the Government to use the drill shed until it became out of repair and finally fell owing to an accumulation of snow on the roof. The Government received the money that was paid for the drill shed and the land, and they have it yet. There is no place in the Dominion that I know of where there is more urgent need of a building of that kind, and I mention the matter now because it seems the proper time to do so, and I express the hope that the Minister of Public Works will provide for it in the Supplementary Estimates, as the hon. Minister of Militia admits the necessity for it. While on my feet, I wish to say a word or two in regard to the caretakers and the engineers employed in the different public buildings throughout the country. If there is any opportunity for economy anywhere, it is certainly in some of these buildings, where two persons are employed to do one man's work, and I think this Government are fully alive to the necessity of economizing in that particular. But the fact is, as I think nobody in this House will deny, that the moment the Government attempt to practice any economy by the dismissal of any one, the time of this House is taken up by hon. gentlemen opposite rising and complaining that the dismissal of that particular person is because of his political stripe. Of course, all these men were appointed by the late Government, who took good care not to appoint any one on the Liberal side, that I know of; therefore, in telling these men that their services are no longer required, even though actuated by the best possible motives, the Government are accused of wrong motives, and we on this side of the House are all blamed because of the action they have taken. But I say without fear of successful contradiction, that in many cases in the province of Ontario there are two persons employed in public buildings to do what is not more than a fair amount of work for one man, and there is room for economy of that kind in many places.

Mr. McCLEARY. As the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) has thought fit to go back to this question of dismissals, which I thought had been dealt with, I would call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that he is not treating all the caretakers of public buildings as in the case referred to by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett). No one on this side will find fault with the hon. gentleman for practising economy and for taking out of the public service individuals who are there just to fill places, but when he makes vacancies for political purposes only, we have the right to find fault. At Niagara Falls, the caretaker of the post office and custom-house had been in the employ of the Government since 1885 and was a most efficient man. He had rooms in the building for himself and family. In the middle of the winter he got a letter from Ottawa, dated 8th of January, 1897, which he received three days later, notifying him that his services would not be required after the 15th of January instant, and to make up a list of all the articles in his possession belonging to the Government, and hand over the building and these articles to Mr. Sheppard, who had been appointed caretaker in his place. The letter is as follows:—

Ref. 178032.

Ottawa, January 8th, 1897.

To Mr. G. Campbell,
Niagara Falls, Ont.

I am directed to inform you that your services are not required after the 15th January, inst. You will please therefore make out a list of all the articles and things in your possession belonging to Government and hand it to Wm. J. Sheppard, who has been appointed caretaker in your place and vacate the premises on that date. Hand over to him also any letters of authority which you have recently received for works that are not yet completed.

(Sgd.) D. EWART,
For Chief Architect.

I do not know whether the hon. gentleman made any inquiry at Niagara Falls as to whether he could have that building cared for at $120 a year or not, or whether any complaints were made against Mr. Campbell or not; but I do think it was very cruel to drive this man out of his home in the middle of winter, without having given him time to find a place for his family to move into. Only for the assistance of friends who came to his relief, he would have been destitute. It seems to me that he was inhumanly dealt with.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it the intention of the Minister of Public Works to have the sidewalks around these buildings renewed? Those in front of the House were laid down, under the late Government, in asphalt, and the work has turned out very well, but all the other sidewalks are in a disgraceful condition.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Tenders will be called for to-morrow morning.

Mr. ROSAMOND. Does the hon. gentleman propose to do anything with regard to the lighting of the public buildings in Almonte? Application was made some time ago to have electric light substituted for coal oil.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Many applications have come from nearly every part of Canada to replace either oil or gas by electricity, and it will require a very large sum to meet them all. The whole question is being considered by the officers of my department.

Portage la Prairie Post Office..... $20,000

Mr. SPROULE. Has the hon. Minister decided to change the site of the post office?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Since last year I made up my mind that it was my duty to change the site. Petitions were sent to the Government and to myself specially, by the board of trade and the town council and the citizens generally, asking for a change of site, and after giving the matter every consideration, I decided to accede to their wishes. The new site has been given us free of charge, and I entered into a new contract, by which I consented to give $5,000 additional to the contractors, on their agreeing to remove the building, which they had begun on the old site, to the new one.

Mr. SPROULE. From the information we had last year this new site would not be any more convenient, and you are paying $5,000 more.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have a letter from the agent of the Department of Public Works of Winnipeg, of the 15th August, 1894, to Mr. Fuller, chief architect, in which the agent there says he declined to recommend the site which had been chosen and recommended the site adopted. That site, it appears, was so far from being the best that the town council, the board of trade and a majority of the citizens petitioned my department to change the site. At the same time, as a free site was offered me, I thought it was my duty to accept it, though, I must say, I did not wish to make a change. Public sentiment asserted itself so strongly that I could not but recognize it.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask if the site chosen was that recommended by the board of trade and the town council?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Public Works—chargeable to Income—
N.W.T. $8,500

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to ask the Minister whether Mr. S. A. Clark was clerk of works at Regina, and whether his services have been dispensed with, and if so, why?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Clark was clerk of works at Regina. I do not consider that this Government is bound to employ for all time to come men who happen to occupy positions of that kind, temporary employees, and so I dispensed with his services. We employ a man who had previously been dismissed, Mr. Henderson. Mr. Henderson had been sent up from my department, and without any cause that I know of he had been dismissed and his position given to Mr. Clark. When I came into office, these facts were laid before me, and I thought it was only fair and just that Mr. Henderson should be given back the position from which he had been dismissed without any cause known to me.

Mr. DAVIN. I understand, then, that Mr. Clark, who had been doing the work acceptably and well, and who is a most efficient man, a highly certificated man, was dismissed really without any cause whatever, there being no charge against him. I do not wish to say anything against Mr. Henderson, but I hope that the Department of Public Works did not dismiss him without cause. I know that I never asked to have him dismissed on political grounds and was not the means of his dismissal. Did my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) answer why Mr. Henderson was dismissed?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I said he had been employed by the Department of Public Works and that he was dismissed by the late Administration.

Mr. DAVIN. I understand that what happened in the case of Mr. Henderson was this: That a number of persons in Regina and elsewhere in the North-west Territories sent a petition to the department, and in consequence of that petition, the then Minister of Public Works (Sir Hector Langevin) ordered an investigation; that that investigation revealed not that the charges made against him by the petitioners were true, but that he had been guilty of some irregularity in connection with some building outside my constituency; that in consequence of this Sir Hector Langevin terminated Mr. Henderson's connection with the department. I do not think he was dismissed like thunder out of a blue sky, and I know that I did not press for his dismissal on political grounds or any other grounds. I believe that it was established that Mr. Henderson gave out some contracts in connection with the Fort Qu'Appelle Industrial School without being authorized by the department, and Sir Hector Langevin resented this and dismissed him and I understood the Minister said he had other grounds. But I think it is rather hard that a man like Mr. Clark, who has been employed for a number of years and has been doing his work in a most satisfactory manner, as the Department of Public Works will bear witness, should be dismissed merely, I infer, because he was supposed to be a Conservative. He was no

"offensive partisan;" he took no part in politics. Now, in connection with this subject, there is another thing which I have been asked to bring to the attention of the Minister. I have seen it stated in the Grenfel "Sun" that Mr. Henderson, while clerk of the works, takes private contracts. I would like to know whether that is considered right. The following is from the Grenfel "Sun":—

Last week, I referred rather sarcastically to some plans which Mr. Henderson had prepared for some new building. This week he completed plans for the new Hudson Bay store at Fort Qu'Appelle. In all fairness, I think that any Government employee receiving the salary that Mr. Henderson does as clerk of public works, should withdraw from competition with the outside world and confine himself to the duties for which he is paid. He receives about the largest salary paid by the Government to any official in Regina, in fact, the salary of the office he holds was increased a short time ago, because of the amount of work he had to do. Any man in receipt of a Government salary can afford to work for a less amount than an ordinary man can, and it is not doing justice to the ordinary tradesman to compete with them.

The statement has been made, and it is my duty to bring it before the Minister, that Mr. Henderson has taken a contract to put up a building, a Methodist church at Lumsden, as well as this Hudson Bay store. I would like to ask the Minister if it is the fact that Mr. Henderson receives a salary larger than that paid to Mr. Clark. Has his salary been increased since he took office? I would like to ask also whether Mr. Henderson, while clerk of works, is allowed to engage in private practice. I am not here complaining of Mr. Henderson. My complaint is that Mr. Clark, a man against whom there was absolutely no charge, a most efficient man and one holding a high certificate as a scientific man, and ideal officer as clerk of works—being, above all, a man of unimpeachable integrity—should be dismissed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am glad to give my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) the information he seeks. No increase of salary has been given Mr. Henderson; he receives the same salary that Mr. Clark received. As to his being allowed to take outside contracts, this is the first time that the fact has been brought to my knowledge. Mr. Henderson is bound to give to my department all his time. So far, he has proved to be a very good officer. As a matter of fact, all the officers of my department who know him tell me he is a very capable man.

Public Buildings, British Columbia—New Post Office at Victoria..... $53,000

Mr. PRIOR. Will the hon. Minister say whether that is sufficient to complete the building?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That sum of money will complete the work.

Mr. DAVIN.

Mr. MONK. What is the total cost?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. For the building itself, $198,000. The whole work will cost $312,000.

Public Buildings generally $5,000

Mr. BERGERON. What is that for?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. To provide for unforeseen cases. Accidents will occur sometimes, and then we will have this money to use.

Mr. CASGRAIN. When an election takes place, as for instance in the county of Champlain, and 50 or 60 electors are sent to chop ice on the St. Maurice River, is that one of the unforeseen accidents which may happen, and for which my hon. friend is providing?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. In Champlain we were very glad indeed to use the money that was placed at our disposal to protect the village. My hon. friend knows that the floods always come in the spring, and we could not delay that work any longer.

Mr. CASGRAIN. It is very surprising that it happened that my hon. friend wanted to protect the village—I don't know what village he is speaking of—just about two or three days before the election. The election and the flood did not come at the same time.

Mr. SCRIVER. The flood came anyway, there is no doubt about the flood.

Rideau Hall, including grounds and renewals $18,000

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to see the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen in his place. If he were here, I am quite sure that he would ask for an explanation, but as he is not here, I will ask why this sum has been increased. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) ought also to be here to make inquiries, because it is a plank in the platform of the Patrons that the expenses of Rideau Hall should be decreased. But I see that those hon. gentlemen have quietly left, knowing that this item was coming up. I want to know from the Minister of Public Works why the item has been increased this year from $14,000 to $18,000.

Mr. McCLEARY. I suggest that the item stand over until the hon. member for North Wellington is present.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am quite ready to give all the information. I am sure that hon. gentlemen acquainted with the circumstances know very well that the sum I am now asking is not excessive. If you look into the past you will find that the expenditure on Rideau Hall has been as follows:—In 1887, $29,550: in 1888, $22,270; in 1889, $21,418; in 1890,

$18,007 ; in 1891, $20,150 ; in 1892, $11,000 ; in 1893, $15,000 ; in 1894, $14,000 ; in 1895, $17,997 ; in 1896, $13,861. There were accounts in arrears, and supplementary estimates had to be asked nearly every year. Now it is no use beating about the bush. We have to spend that sum of money, and I thought it was better to come straight to Parliament and state the facts as they are. That sum of money is absolutely necessary, and I am asking for it.

Mr. TAYLOR. While the hon. gentleman is on his feet, I would like him to give us the figures of the expenditure upon Rideau Hall, so that they may appear on the "Hansard" at the same time, for 1873-74-75-76-77.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not these figures under my hand. That is going pretty far back.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think the item ought to stand until the hon. member for North Wellington and the hon. member for Frontenac come in.

Mr. BENNETT. Does that item include fuel or heating ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, that is a special item which is provided for every year. We are asking for $8,000.

Mr. BENNETT. How is that $18,000 made up ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The largest item is wages, which amounted last year to $8,018.21. Then there is furniture, a pretty large sum, $763 ; maintenance, $2,987 ; lumber, $318; painting in 1896, $4,000; hardware, $1,390. That was for roofing and plumbing. These are the largest items.

Mr. SPROULE. I see there is an item of $780 for furniture. Was that purchased by public tender, or how ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Furniture is purchased when we receive an order from Rideau Hall for a chair or a dozen chairs. It is impossible to ask for tenders.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it covered by this item ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We buy furniture in this way every year.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this item to cover an expenditure already made, or to be made ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That amount of money has been paid.

Mr. BENNETT. In the absence of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), whose absence is probably due to the fact that he strained himself in endeavouring to kick against the Government, I think it only fair to place before the House some of the ideas which that hon. gentleman has presented to the House in regard to reforming the expenditure on Rideau Hall. I also wish to say a few words on behalf of the Patrons in this House whose bashfulness and innocence prevent them saying anything.

An hon. MEMBER. They are not in the House.

Mr. BENNETT. This item shows a considerable increase as compared with last year. The amount asked last year was $14,000 and the Government now ask for about $18,000. I have never gone closely into the details of the expenditures at Rideau Hall, but considering that we have the high authority of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) on this subject, I am willing to accept his statements as to the facts. I find in "Hansard," that at a time he was only referring to an item of $8,000, while the item now under discussion amounts to $18,000 for furniture, wages and other matters, the hon. gentleman said :

> I think we should go back to the first principle of giving the Governor General $50,000, and let him find his own light, and so on. I think it is extravagant for us to give him $5,000 for travelling expenses, $8,000 for fuel and light, and $50,000 for salary, and, in addition to that, to keep up the furniture in the place. The expenses run up from $90,000 to $100,000 a year for the salary of the Governor General, and keeping the building in repair, and supplying additional furniture, and so on. I think we should cut it all off, come down to $50,000 a year salary, and let him do for himself. That is more than he is worth to us.

I do not know whether the hon. gentleman feels more friendly disposed towards the present Governor than towards Lord Stanley, because, to-day he exhibits golden silence, whether it is due to the strain he received last night from his futile kick, I do not know, but I do know that the Patrons to-day are a party of humbugs, because if there ever was a body of political charlatans they are the Patrons, and every one of them went around after last session with a $40 trunk. It must be disgusting to Liberals and Conservatives alike to see the manner in which they have acted, and I hope to be able to provoke some members of that body to rise in their defence. If so, I shall be well pleased at having addressed the House to-day. I am pleased the hon. member for North Wellington has returned to his seat, because I will now refer him to an hon. gentleman who is higher than himself and is a very distinguished member of this House, who said :

> It may seem plain talking, but when very serious matters are under consideration here, and Parliament is in session, I understand that the duties of his office have not required His Excellency to be in attendance at the seat of Government ; but he is able, I suppose, with due regard to the public interest, to occupy his time in perhaps more agreeable duties than attending to public affairs here.

I do not know whether the hon. gentleman would apply that remark to the Gov-

ernor General, but it was applied to Lord Stanley.

Further on, the hon. gentleman said:

> I am of the opinion that we hedge around the representative of royalty here with too much of the odour of sanctity, and that we avoid criticising the expenditure of public money in connection with that branch of the service, when it demands criticism. * * * We are being ridden to death by officials.

These remarks were made by the Postmaster General. Not having made a study of the quantity of napkins laundried at Rideau Hall, as the hon. member for North Wellington has done, and not having taken a close inventory of the furniture between one session and another, lest inferior furniture should be substituted, I am incapable of doing that justice to the subject, as the hon. member for North Wellington would do; and I therefore resume my seat, and will allow him to denounce this extravagant expenditure at Rideau Hall.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Perhaps I may be permitted to say a word or two in further explanation of the item now before the committee. The average expenditure on Rideau Hall from 1887 up to the present time has been $24,500. I hope to be able to reduce this amount to $18,000. There have been in the past supplementary estimates containing items for the service. I consider it is better to ask for a total amount that is necessary. My hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) has made an attack on Rideau Hall and declared that these expenditures are uncalled for. The hon. gentleman has also made an attack on the Patrons, which I do not think is called for. They have proved themselves to be a very useful body of men, but they have not always found it possible to vote with hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. BENNETT. They never will.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think my hon. friend has acted wrongly in attacking the Patrons as he has done.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Minister has just stated that the average expenditure on Rideau Hall from 1887 to the present time has been $24,500. I should like to know the expenditures for the years 1873-74-75-76 and 1877, as I do not happen to have the figures with me. I know the hon. member for North Wellington has these figures, because in past years he has given them to the House.

Mr. BENNETT. Napkins.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman is asking this year for about $33,000. He asks for $18,000; immediately afterwards there is an item for $8,000 for fuel and light, and further down there is an item of $2,000 for clearing snow, and then there is an item of $16,500 for water for public buildings, including Rideau Hall, and I suppose $5,000 should be allotted to Rideau Hall. Adding these sums together it will be found that the hon. gentleman is practically asking for $33,000, and he says that, on the average, the late Government spent $24,500 a year. Now, I do not want the Minister's reply to this extraordinary state of affairs. I want the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) and I want the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) to explain, why they ask Parliament for $33,000 for Rideau Hall when the Minister (Mr. Tarte) has explained to us already that, on the average, the late Government only spent $24,500. This item will likely stand over until after eight o'clock, and I would like the hon. gentleman to give me the expenditure on this account for the years from 1873 to 1878, when the former Liberal Government was in power.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Surely my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) is accustomed to be a little fairer than he is now. I am asking this year, $18,000 for Rideau Hall, including grounds, renewals, improvements, repairs, furniture and maintenance. What I said was that the average expenditure for the years mentioned on account of the same item was $24,500. That is altogether outside of the last item which the hon. gentleman has mentioned, and which has always been found in the former Estimates. For instance, for years and years, fuel and light at Rideau Hall has always been $8,000 added to the $24,000. The removal of snow, and so on, including Rideau Hall, has been the same vote as it is now.

Mr. McINERNEY. I took down the figures that the hon. Minister gave for the years from 1887 down to 1896 inclusive, and I make his totals, $192,983. Now, if you take 1887 to 1896 inclusive, you have ten years, and ten divided into $192,983 will give you $19,298 a year, and not $24,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I admit at once that I made a mistake for one year or two. The expenditure for the years from 1887 to 1892 was $24,500 a year. Since that time the figures were as my hon. friend (Mr. McInerney) states.

Mr. BENNETT. Did I understand the Minister to say that the wages account at Rideau Hall was $8,000 a year?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. In order that the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) may not be put to the trouble of making the computation, I may tell him, that at an average of about $60 a year for each servant and their keep, that would mean about 130 servants in the employ of Rideau Hall who are paid for by the Government. I know it will shock the Patrons to discover that they are paying for 130 servants at Rideau Hall.

Mr. McMULLEN. I consider it my duty to congratulate hon. gentlemen opposite on evincing, this afternoon, the first evidence of an efficient Opposition. They are evidently developing into an efficient Opposition. I was somewhat struck at the commencement of this session with the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite were not accustomed to the duties of their new position, but if they keep on in their new career they will be of considerable service to the country in scrutinizing public expenditure. In regard to Rideau Hall, I frankly confess that the expenditure in past years has been excessive. I took the opportunity of drawing the attention of the House to it, from time to time, but I have got to say, that the present Government can hardly be held responsible for the entire amount of the present estimate. I have the utmost confidence in my esteemed friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) and I believe when he has time to pay that attention which I am certain he will pay, to this, as to every other item in the department over which he so ably presides, he will secure a reduction in that as in everything else, and he will teach hon. gentlemen opposite and the country that he is capable of making reductions. There is room for reductions. I do believe that when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) comes to deal with this, as with many other items, the Estimates in coming years will show reductions, and will show that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) is a perfect master of the department which he has been called upon to preside over.

Mr. MONK. What sum is reserved for improvements, out of this item, and what are the improvements ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As I have said, we have over $8,000 for wages, and we have got a contract of $2,200 for caring the grounds. Outside of that, there are general repairs, and maintenance, the details of which I have given. There are many changes and improvements to be made. I may say that before giving my assent to this estimate I made a personal visit to Rideau Hall, and I inspected it with all care, and tried to reduce the expenditure. So far, I am sorry to say that I have not been able to do so.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, I have looked very carefully into the matter, and if I had been able to reduce the expenditure I would gladly have done so. I say again that I have not been able to accomplish that task.

Mr. BERGERON. Is the renewal of that dancing room at Rideau Hall comprised in the $18,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. This amount of $18,000 is purely for maintenance and improvements during next year. The other will have to be paid by the Supplementary Estimates which I will have to ask Parliament for.

Mr. BERGERON. At the commencement of the session I had the honour to be at Rideau Hall, and I know that a great many persons complimented the hon. gentleman who presides over the Department of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) for his great generosity in having that dancing hall fixed up in the best way it had ever been fixed before. I am not complaining of it, but I wish to point out that after this long discussion on Rideau Hall, every hon. gentleman understands, as the Minister himself has admitted, that he cannot make any economies in connection with it. I want it to be known through the press and through the country, that there are some of these expenditures which are necessary, and it is a pity that during the eighteen years the Conservative party were in power, some hon. gentlemen now supporting the Government should have brought forward so prominently this fad of complaining about Rideau Hall. Hon. gentleman like the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) and my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) seemed to take Rideau Hall greatly to heart in those days. The Patrons spoke about it in the country and made as much fuss as they could over the matter ; but we understand their silence here to-day when they have heard their own Minister telling them that he cannot cut down the expenditure of the Conservative Government. We have had all these fads coming from the Opposition when the Conservatives were in power. I need not speak about prohibition, for we will have that up in a few days, and it will be nice to see how the Government will get out of it. The Patrons tried to get root in Quebec, but I am glad to say for the honour of that province that they failed. I hope that it will now go to the country that some of these expenditures which were condemned by the Government when in Opposition, are found by the present Government to be absolutely necessary. Such conduct on the part of the former Opposition was not politics, but it was purely faddism, and the sooner we get rid of it in the country and get down to serious business, the better.

Mr. DAVIN. I understood the hon. Minister of Public Works to say that the Patrons had come to him about these items and had conferred with him.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I never said anything of the kind. I will be glad to see them any day, however.

Mr. TALBOT. It is a joke.

Mr. DAVIN. No, it is not a joke. I may say I misapprehended the Minister. He defended the Patrons against the very pertinent criticism of my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), and said, as I under-

stood him, that that criticism was not just, because the Patrons had been to see him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. DAVIN. Then, we are in this position. Here is a large item of $18,000 for maintenance and repairs at Rideau Hall, and the Patrons have not been to the Minister in private remonstrance against it; and to-day their places are vacant here. The Patrons made vehement efforts to get Patrons into this House, and when questions arise in which the Patrons are interested, there is not a Patron to be seen. I did not understand that the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) was a Patron; I understood him to be a Liberal. The hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) told us he was a Patron. He told us the other night that he was a Patron-Grit-Liberal-Conservative-Grit Patron. There is one of the Patrons—ah, there is another—just come in, since we called attention to the fact that they were conspicuous by their absence. No juster criticism was ever made than that made by my hon. friend a moment ago, when he said that those men had on platform after platform denounced the expenditure on Rideau Hall, and yet when the Rideau Hall item is before the committee, they are absent, some of them, and others, if present, are discreetly silent.

Mr. FOSTER. There is another.

Mr. DAVIN. We are bringing them in. An hon. friend near me says they have been out consulting. They have had a powwow as to what course they will take in regard to this item, and I hope they have arrived at a policy, and will state it in this House. I was about to say that if I had understood my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works rightly, and if the Patrons had remonstrated with him in private, that is not what they were sent here for. What they were sent here for was to lift up the banner of their principles in this House. I have not myself talked much on platforms about the expenditure at Rideau Hall; but I say here that when gentlemen talk outside about the expenditure at Rideau Hall, they are bound when they come to this House either to declare that they have abandoned the principle on which they went to the country, or else to press their views on Parliament and the Government. And can anybody suppose that an item of $18,000 for repairs is not something to make us pause? We have to spend $18,000. $20,000, or even $24,000 every year merely for repairing, renewing and maintenance. I think that is a large sum, and I cannot but think the expenditure could be brought within narrower limits. I hope we shall hear from our Patron friends on this subject.

Mr. McINERNEY. There is one thing I wish to call the attention of the committee to. The hon. Minister of Public Works made a comparison between this estimate and the estimates for the ten years from 1887 to 1896, and stated that the average expenditure for those years was $24,500 a year. When his attention was called to the fact that the expenditure averaged only $19,298 a year, he had to admit that he had made a mistake, and that his average was only for the years 1887 to 1892 inclusive. If you take the figures for the five years from 1892 to 1896, inclusive, you will find that the total amount was $72,000, or an average for each of those years of only $14,400, whereas the present Minister asks for a vote of $18,000 for the same purpose. I appeal to all advocates of economy in this House to support me in the motion I now make, seconded by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach), that this vote be reduced by $3,000, to $15,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend is wrong. The amount voted in the main Estimates for 1896 was $14,107; but if he will look at the Supplementary Estimates of the same year, he will find that there was a further vote of $4,000, bringing the amount up to $18,100.

Mr. McINERNEY. The Supplementary Estimates for this year are not yet down. We are dealing with what we have before us, and comparing this main estimate with the main estimate of the Conservative Government. For the ten years from 1887 to 1896 the average estimate of the Conservative Government was $19,000, and for their last five years their average was only $14,400 a year. If that was too high, as was claimed by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) and other members, I say that $18,000 is too much for the present Minister to ask for this purpose. That is why I move that the amount be reduced to $15,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Hon. gentlemen opposite have not, I think, been fair. The facts of the case are these. The amount that was asked in the main Estimates by the late Government for 1896 was $14,100, but a supplementary vote of $4,000 was asked for and obtained. What is the use of coming twice before Parliament for the same thing? I am asking for $18,000 this year in my Estimates, and I pledge myself not to ask for a cent more. Every one will admit that it is straighter to ask at once just what is wanted than come here and deceive Parliament—I do not say that hon. gentlemen opposite did so willingly—by asking for an insufficient sum, and later on requiring an additional amount in the supplementaries. I may add that the officers of my department informed me that from year to year accounts have remained unpaid because sufficient money was not voted.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. Minister has again shirked the question. To the state-

ment that the average expenditure was $14,000 per annum for the last five years. he has made no reply, but repeats the statement that in some years an additional $4,000 was asked in the supplementaries.

Mr. McMILLAN. I have the Auditor General's report, and according to that, $21,861 was spent to the 1st of July, 1896, so that the statement that the average is $14,000 per year is all nonsense.

Mr. REID. The item for $8,000 for wages is surely too large, and if $21,000 was spent for repairs in 1896, surely $18,000 is not required for the same purpose this coming year. We spent $4,000 for painting the building last year, and ought not to have to spend that amount this year for the same purpose. Then if Rideau Hall was supplied with furniture last year, why should we spend $3,000 on furniture this year ? We ought to hear from the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) on this question. One of the planks in the Patrons' platform was the reduction of expenditure on Rideau Hall. Are the Patron representatives going to remain silent when these items are being passed ? Surely these men who claim to represent the farmers particularly are not going to allow important items like this to pass without letting us hear something from them. I believe that the farmers of Frontenac will look to see what part their representative has taken in the question of reducing the expenses of this Dominion.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat has asked that the Patrons should record their opinion with reference to this vote. I think we can go for even higher game in one respect than the Patrons. I myself would like to hear the opinion of the present Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock). For several years he had a strong grudge against expenditure at Rideau Hall, and went so far as to express himself in favour of reducing the Governor General's salary. Everything about Rideau Hall was extravagant, and how eloquent both he and the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) were over the money wasted. Where are they to-night? We do not hear a word from them, and yet $3,000 are added to last year's vote.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to say a few words in reply to some of the statements made by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) who, it seems, has taken the Patrons under his special care. On the 23rd of June he professed that the Patron cause was a burning issue with him. It was the Patrons who gave him the returning officer's vote, and to day he is taking special charge of them, hence is very much exercised as to what position they are going to take in this debate. I wish simply to say this, that as a Patron, I defy my hon. friend from West Assiniboia to point to any speech of mine in which I criticised the expenditure at Rideau Hall, and, more than that, I would call his attention to this fact, that I never advocated the placing of articles on the free list. If I am here, it is not to represent what the hon. gentleman may suppose to be Patron principles, but the principles I advocated during the campaign in East Assiniboia. Everywhere my platform was this, to study economy, and where cause has been shown in this House, I have voted in the line of economy, both with and against the Government. If the Opposition can make out a case in reference to Rideau Hall, I am still prepared to carry out my pledge to the people and vote for economy, but I have not yet seen that a case of extravagance is made out or that the present Government desire to spend more money on Rideau Hall than did the late Government. I am here to represent the Patrons of the riding of East Assiniboia on the principle of economy, and I desire now still further to say that I do not believe in putting articles on the free list.

It being Six o'clock, the Committee rose for recess.

After Recess.

LANGENBURG AND SOUTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. OLIVER (for Mr. Richardson) moved third reading of Bill (No. 51) respecting the Langenburg and Southern Railway Company.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I move the amendment of which I gave notice :

That the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of adding the following as an additional section to the Bill, viz.:—

Any Act which may hereafter be passed for the purpose of controlling railway companies incorporated by or subject to this Parliament as to the issuing of its stock or bonds, and as to its rates or tolls and the regulation thereof, and as to running powers over or other rights in connection with the railway of any company by any other company and the exercise of powers conferred upon railway companies shall apply to the company hereby incorporated from the time such Act goes into effect, but this clause shall not be construed to imply that such general subsequent legislation would not apply to the company hereby incorporated without its enactment.

Motion agreed to, and the House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. TISDALE. If the Minister presses this amendment, I cannot say that I shall be prepared to divide the committee upon it. But I would ask the Minister to reconsider it, and for this reason—this will

be the first time in the history of the legislation of this House in which we have allowed such an amendment to be inserted in a case where there is no reasonable doubt that amendments of the general laws relating to these subjects, such as the Railway Act, the Companies Act, and so on, must apply. Expressing my own opinion, there is no doubt of the applicability to these companies of any amendments made in these general Acts. That being so, it seems to me very undesirable to add such a clause, which seems to imply that there might be doubts in cases of charters not containing such a clause as this, and to suggest such a doubt with regard to the Railway Act is to suggest the same also with regard to the Companies Act, the Companies Clauses Act, and all these general Acts which we have heretofore considered very carefully and upon which no doubt has been thrown. If my opinion on this subject is correct, it may be argued that a clause of this kind will do no harm. But it is a well established principle, and one that cannot be too carefully guarded, that where you put any conditional clauses to protect against future legislation, when they are unnecessary, you are unsettling the general principle upon which all these Acts are based. Suppose we pass this clause on the ground that it is harmless. Then the Railway Committee and other committees of this House upon which rests the responsibility of keeping legislation to consistent lines will no longer be able to object to any proposed clause on the ground that the general law covers it. I feel very strongly on this subject. Not that I am opposed to the improvement of the law upon the lines of the hon. Minister's motion. But I think the proper time to consider it will be when his proposal is brought in to change the Railway Act, and I would be quite prepared to go with him any reasonable distance on the line he has indicated. But to add such a clause as this will bring about changes in the principles upon which we have legislated, and I therefore appeal to the hon. Minister not to press this amendment, but to let it stand until he is prepared with his general proposals; and when that time comes, I am quite sure that in every reasonable change that he can suggest on the line he proposes he will find gentlemen on both sides of the House supporting him.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I entirely agree with the view which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tisdale) has expressed, that there is no doubt but that this Parliament has the right and power by amendment to the existing Railway Act, to make any changes or impose any additional restrictions which it may in its judgment approve upon all corporations, whether they are in existence at the time that the Act passed, or whether they may be subsequently created. There is, therefore, no dispute between us on that point.

Mr. TISDALE.

I further agree with the hon. gentleman that, on general principles, it is objectionable for Parliament to put in clauses in assertion of a right when there is no question of its power to exercise that right. But the clause that is now proposed as an amendment to this Bill was suggested out of deference to the sentiment which seemed to exist in the committee that it was desirable that something should be done at the earliest possible date to provide additional safeguards to the general public who might be investing in enterprises of this kind, for furnishing further facilities for securing the rights of the public in every way with respect to railway undertakings. It was not possible, this session, to prepare a Bill in amendment to the Railway Act, or to give the necessary attention to the amending of its provisions. But it was thought that it might not be undesirable to give notice, as it were, to all persons who would accept railway legislation during the present session that they must, in point of fact, understand that it was in the contemplation of Parliament to amend the Railway Act in important principles, which, in a general way, are pointed out in this proposed clause. Now, as a notice it may be useful, it will not have any prejudicial effect upon bona fide undertakings. It will not be likely to prevent any persons who are desirous of going into a meritorious work in a proper way from doing so. It will, I think be understood by everybody to be an expression of the intention of Parliament to amend the General Railway Act, and to enact any provisions which may be considered necessary in the public interest. We know very well from past experience that the facility with which the issue of bonds is made, passing from the companies in many cases without consideration, and going upon the market for a trifling sum, and the facility with which watered stock has been issued by railway companies, have been very prejudicial to enterprises of that kind, and we are to-day suffering from the injurious consequences of such a system. I do not think that we can take too early steps in order to prevent a continuation or repetition of proceedings of this kind. If it is the sense of the committee that it is undesirable to add such a notice as is embraced in this clause, and for which the clause is intended, I have no strong desire in the matter, and I shall not press the clause against the judgment of the committee in any way. But I think it is only fair to say that it cannot be understood or interpreted in any other way than as a notice of the intention of Parliament, because I believe that I am expressing the desire and intention of Parliament at the earliest possible date to improve upon existing legislation and amend the general railway law, and to afford a greater measure of protection to the public than the law as it now stands does.

Mr. SPROULE. I confess that I entirely agree with the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), and the explanation he has given seems to me a very important one, that it raises a doubt about how far the Railway Act will have control over railway Bills in the future. If it could be done, and it seems to me quite as easy to do it as to introduce this clause to each Bill, it would be much more desirable to amend the Railway Act, or to introduce a single Bill to govern all cases, because then it would apply to all legislation and would be retroactive as well as applying to railways that are incorporated in future. Unless it is provided for in every Bill in future, any Bills that escape having this clause attached, will certainly be outside our province. Then, as the hon. member for South Norfolk says, a doubt is thrown upon the Railway Act controlling these Bills, and by reason of the failure to do what it was thought it provided for, every member will be disposed to have special clauses in a Bill to provide for it, and I think it would lead to interminable confusion, and a great deal of trouble and uncertainty as to the true interpretation of the Railway Act.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the hon. member has not had in his mind the chief consideration which has prompted the proposal of this clause; he seems to be under the impression that the same object could be attained by proposing an amendment or amendments to the Railway Act.

Mr. SPROULE. Make a special Bill.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was because it was utterly impossible during the present session of Parliament to recast and revise the Railway Act and to introduce these provisions and submit them to Parliament, that it has been thought well to put the proposal in this form. I realize to the fullest extent that in amending the Railway Act and in introducing new provisions, if these safeguards are to be provided, a good deal of study and consideration will be required for their preparation, and I think it would be impossible to find the time during this session to give them that study they require. Therefore, not being able to propose an amendment at present to the Railway Act, the result will be that the whole matter will have to lie over until the next session of Parliament; and it was with the view of giving notice to the persons who might be proceeding to act under these Bills which are now going through, with the intention of Parliament notified to the incorporators, that the present clause is proposed. Hon. members may think, and I can see that there is something in it, that possibly an inference might be drawn that Parliament thought at first that it had not power hereafter to legislate in this direction, and to rebut any such inference as that a few words might be added to the clause, and the objections which the hon. member has suggested would be entirely overcome. I am quite willing that words should be added with that object in view.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies). The same idea as my hon. friend the Minister of Railways has just suggested, has struck my mind. I understand that all parties are agreed that this amendment, as a substantive provision, is a good one, but doubts are raised by my hon. friends opposite whether it would not raise a kind of legal implication that other statutes are not bound by subsequent legislation unless there is a similar clause expressly inserted. Now, that is the only dispute between the two sides of the House, and I would suggest therefore that the following words be added to the amendment of my hon. friend, which will cover that point:

> But this clause should not be construed to imply that such general subsequent legislation would not apply to the company hereby incorporated without its enactment.

That removes any possible doubt, and leaves it where the Minister of Railways says, as a formal notice to the company seeking incorporation, that it is to be bound by subsequent legislation without any fresh implied contract.

Mr. TISDALE. I think the addition, on the lines of my objection, makes it worse if possible. It makes it a class of legislation that I do not think is desirable. Surely Parliament knows its power and jurisdiction in a legislative sense. Now, the addition proposed removes the idea that there can be any concession, but it puts in still more unnecessary legislation. I know that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is an excellent lawyer who has taken a great part in discussions in this House, and I am happy to say that he and I have always agreed so far, and he has been one of the strongest advocates in this House of the idea that when a law is clear, then don't pass any more legislation about it, as otherwise you create a doubt. Now, if it is clear, and I have no hesitation in saying that it is perfectly clear, and I am sure my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will agree with me in saying so; then any amendment to any of our general Acts, such as the Railway or Companies Act, or the Companies Clauses Act, apply to all companies in existence at the time the Act was passed, as well as those that may be formed in the future. Therefore, everybody has all legal and proper notice that any legislation that is passed, any charter that is granted, is subject to the general power, is subject to these general Acts, and to the general powers of Parliament to amend them. Now,

that is my strongest objection. Any clause put in by way of notice, I don't care how you word it, implies a doubt upon that great fundamental principle, and the proper legislative principle; and it is a vicious principle, for instance, to put in too many words, to try to make a law too plain. I will give my hon. friend a very strong example that is in his own recollection, in which we had a great deal of trouble to agree upon the language, and I think that in the end his view prevailed, and I agreed with him—that was about the new ballot. The new ballot has a circle, and when we passed that Act we provided at first that unless the cross was marked in the circle and nowhere else, the ballot should be bad. We struck out the words, "and nowhere else," because it was considered that no language could make it plainer than to say that it must be in the circle. And yet to-day people are attempting to raise doubts about it. Now, there is no doubt. You talk of giving people notice by an Act that we are passing now, that hereafter we will change the Railway Act. Why should we give the notice? The legal notice is the constitutional right and the constitutional power to pass these Acts, and these Acts do control railways now, and will for all time to come. When Parliament passes these Acts they stand as part of the constitution, and corporations receiving charters under them are bound by their provisions. I quite agree with the proposition generally, but I want to see the clause if I am to be considered as agreeing to its adoption, although, of course, that is a secondary matter. I appreciate the desire manifested by the Minister of Railways to improve the general Railway Act, and I believe there are other points in which it can be improved; but I feel it to be my duty, as I have endeavoured to take my share in passing private and public legislation, to insist that no provision is made to notify those interested in legislation of this character, except the undoubted constitutional ones which exist. It would be most unfortunate if we threw any doubts on any of these railway charters, and thus affect important interests. A court seeks to give effect to every clause in an Act. The judge would say what effect can be given to this clause, if Parliament has the right to change the Railway Act and make it apply to all railway charters. The judge would say that some meaning must be given to the clause because Parliament must have had some intention in passing it. The court will determine what the language means and that becomes the law, and under our constitution that is the law and the people are bound by it and are supposed to have knowledge of it. I am protesting in a moderate sense because I am a little surprised and a little disappointed with the position taken by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Davies), not that I impute his motives, because I know he is fair-minded in legal discussion and is a lawyer of long experience. If hon. gentlemen opposite are satisfied to pass this clause, I have nothing more to say.

Mr. SPROULE. Taking up the Railway Act, it seems to be plain. I take the application of the Act, and I find the following:—

> The provisions of this Act, from Section 4 to Section 39, both inclusive, being Part One of this Act, shall apply to every railway constructed or to be constructed——

So it refers to the past as well as the future.

> —under the authority of any Act passed by the Parliament of Canada, and shall, in so far as they are applicable to the undertaking, and unless they are expressly varied or excepted therefrom by the Special Act, be incorporated with the Special Act, form part thereof, and be construed therewith as forming one Act.

The third clause says:

> The provisions of this Act, from Section 40 to Section 106, both inclusive, being Part Two of this Act, shall apply to all railway companies and railways within the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada, except Government railways.

It is, therefore, quite plain that to make it applicable to all the railways and not make it exceptional, as this clause does, there must be either a special Bill or an amendment to the Railway Act.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No one will deny the constitutional power of Parliament to pass a general law which will apply to all existing charters of these companies and modify or control the charters given them. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tisdale), who has been for a long time chairman of the Railway Committee, knows that this is a legal right of Parliament, but a question may arise as to its being a moral right, and that the companies would say: You have entered into a compact, you have given us certain terms, people have invested their money on the strength of this contract, and you cannot now take away any of our privileges or modify any privileges already given, I thought all parties were agreed that this provision should be made applicable generally, and if doubt should arise in certain cases, that doubt might be removed by declaring that the insertion of the clause must not be construed to apply to general legislation. Parliament can thus retain the constitutional right to modify existing charters, and give notice that companies shall be bound by subsequent legislation, and, at the same time, provide expressly that the insertion of the clause shall not throw any doubt on the general provisions of a charter.

Bill reported.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock) moved:

That the Bill be not now considered, but be referred back to the Committee of the Whole to consider further amendments.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

The POSTMASTER GENERAL moved:

That every member of the Parliament of Canada and of the legislature of any province or territory in Canada shall, whilst he is such member, be entitled to free transportation as a first-class passenger by all the regular passenger trains; provided, however, that the company shall not be liable for any injury to such member, or for any loss or damage to his baggage or property, when being so transported.

Mr. TISDALE. Surely my hon. friend the Postmaster General is not serious. Surely he is not supporting this amendment. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) whose motion it is is not here, but I understand the Postmaster General is moving it for him.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Oh, no; the member for Vancouver (Mr. Maxwell) moved it.

Mr. TISDALE. I do not wish to take up time in discussing this matter, but if this proposition is to be seriously considered it should be brought in by a substantive Bill. I apprehend that the amendment will be withdrawn without any discussion.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is a very important matter and it is one that ought to be dealt with on general principles and not dealt with in a Bill of this kind. I would suggest to my hon. friend (Mr. Maxwell) that he do not press the amendment now. If he desires to have the opinion of Parliament upon it, he can take occasion to bring the subject up in a general way.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

JAMES BAY RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. LOUNT moved third reading of Bill (No. 32) respecting the James Bay Railway Company.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair) moved:

That the said Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of adding the following as an additional section:—

Any Act which may hereafter be passed for the purpose of controlling railway companies incorporated by or subject to this Parliament as to the issuing of its stock or bonds, and as to its rates or tolls and the regulation thereof, and as to running powers over or other rights in connection with the railway of any company by any other company and the exercise of powers conferred upon railway companies shall apply to the company hereby incorporated from the time such Act goes into effect, but this cluase shall not be construed to imply that such general subsequent legislation would not apply to the company hereby incorporated without its enactment.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

MEDICINE HAT RAILWAY AND COAL COMPANY.

Mr. LOUNT moved third reading of Bill (No. 56) respecting the Medicine Hat Railway and Coal Company.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair), moved: That the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of adding the following as an additional section to this Bill, viz.:—

Any Act which may hereafter be passed for the purpose of controlling railway companies incorporated by or subject to this Parliament as to the issuing of its stock or bonds, and as to its rates or tolls and the regulation thereof, and as to running powers over or other rights in connection with the railway of any company by any other company and the exercise of powers conferred upon railway companies shall apply to the company hereby incorporated from the time such Act goes into effect, but this clause shall not be construed to imply that such general subsequent legislation would not apply to the company hereby incorporated without its enactment.

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

CALGARY AND EDMONTON RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. OSLER moved third reading of Bill (No. 33) respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.

Mr. OLIVER moved:

That the said Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of adding the following words:—

"Such route and plans shall provide for the tablishment of a station for the purpose of receiving and delivering freight and passengers within the present corporate limits of the town of Macleod."

Motion agreed to, and House again resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On the amendment,

Mr. TISDALE. After a long discussion in the Railway Committee, the clause as it now stands was agreed upon as a compromise, and passed the committee unanimously. It reads as follows :—

> The said company shall not proceed with the construction of the extension hereby authorized, until the route, point of junction and plans have been approved of by the Governor in Council.

The promoters of the Bill simply asked for the usual extension of a charter already in existence. The hon. gentleman who now moves this amendment wished a clause inserted providing that the railway must pass through Macleod. It was suggested as a compromise that this should be left to the Government. The reasonableness of that will, I think, be apparent to the committee, as an ample protection to the town of Macleod. The route and the plans having to be submitted to the Governor in Council, the responsibility would be upon the Government and the engineers of the Government to see that the route went in the best possible direction, and whether there were any engineering difficulties or other reasons why it should not go through the town of Macleod. This was accepted by the committee as a solution of the difficulty ; and this is possibly the first time in the history of such legislation in this House in which an addition of this sort was ever allowed in a Bill for the simple extension of a charter. It has been usual, unless some good cause can be shown why a road should not be given an extension of time, to renew its charter as a matter of course. In this case, the company has shown its good faith by constructing and operating a considerable portion of the road, and the Railway Committee considered it a great concession to the hon. gentleman to allow a condition of any sort to be imposed. The whole matter is now in the hands of the Government of which the hon. gentleman is a supporter, and surely he ought not to be more captious than my hon. friends on this side who are opposed to the general policy of the Government. The whole Railway Committee were willing that this compromise should be adopted and that the Minister of Railways and the Government should be seized with the responsibility of dealing with the question. But the hon. gentleman it seems is not satisfied with that. I fear he is somewhat difficult to satisfy at times. When the time of the Railway Committee was taken up for a whole morning with this matter and he obtained a very unusual concession, he ought to be satisfied and allow the other private legislation to be proceeded with. He is within his right if he chooses to exercise it, but he is delaying other private legislation. The Railway Committee unanimously decided on this clause, which will become law in a minute, if the hon. gentleman will allow it, and he ought not to persist in his opposition and show some confidence in the Government of the day which he is supporting.

Mr. OLIVER. I am very glad to accept the correction of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken as to my taking up the time of the Railway Committee and this House, but I will call the attention of the House to the fact that there is not a member of the Railway Committee who has taken up half the time of that committee which the hon. gentleman has. I certainly have not, although I have important interests to conserve, whereas if the hon. gentleman has any important interests to conserve, he has not told us what they are. I have been charged by certain of my constituents to see that those interests are guarded, and I propose to do so in every reasonable way. The facts of the case are these, from my side of the question. The railway company ask for a certain extension of the time in which to build their line to a certain point. I ask, on behalf of my constituents, that a certain obligation be laid upon them in return for that extension. I think that is fair and reasonable. The discussion of the Railway Committee did not turn upon the point whether the company should go into the town of Macleod or not, but upon the question as to whether or not they should be subjected to any restrictions at all, and the hon. gentleman himself stood up in the committee and declared that rather than accept any restrictions whatever, they would withdraw their Bill. That is the question that was compromised. There was no compromise on the question whether there should be a railway station established in the town of Macleod or not. There was no difference of opinion or compromise on that question. The amendment to which the hon. gentleman refers was not drawn up in the committee. It was a verbal suggestion made by the hon. leader of the Opposition, and on that suggestion, the Clerk drafted a certain clause, and I submit it is not fair for the hon. gentleman to say that the committee is bound by the form which was given to a verbal suggestion, and which, in my opinion, certainly does not represent the well-understood intent of the committee at that time. I have no quarrel with the hon. gentleman or the hon. leader of the Opposition who moved the amendment. I believe they were of opinion that the interests of the town of Macleod would be protected by that amendment, but on reading the amendment as it is, I say that certainly it does not protect the interests of Macleod. All I ask is that justice be done to that town. It may be that some hon. members do not understand the peculiar position of the town of Macleod. They are per-

haps under the impression that I am pleading the case of a lot of land speculators who have taken up a large area of public land there and hold it as a town site and wish to sell it to the railway at a high figure. Now, this town site belongs to the Government of Canada, and it is this Government which is interested in these vacant lots. All the people of the town ask is that their investments in buildings and property be protected, and surely this House will see that the interests of our country through its ownership of the town site, are protected. The objection to the clause as it stands is this, and I am not throwing any doubt on the good intentions of the Minister of Railways or the present Government when I say that this clause is not sufficient. We pass a certain clause to express a certain purpose, and if we do not say what we mean in that clause, we cannot claim that the Government has to take notice of an intent which we ourselves have not expressed. The whole argument in the committee was regarding the protection of the interests of the town of Macleod, but in this amendment the town of Macleod is not mentioned, and there is no mention of any railway station within the corporate limits of that town. Anybody knows that a railway running through a town is of no earthly benefit to it unless it has a station there.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am in order. The hour for Private Bills has expired. I draw the attention of the Chairman and of the committee to that fact. We have other business to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time for Private Bills having expired, the House will proceed with the Orders of the Day.

SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Rideau Hall, including grounds..... $18,000

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the discussion of this item for the maintenance of Rideau Hall, some wild insinuations were thrown out against the Patrons of Industry because of their silence upon the subject of increased expenditure under this item. I am glad to be able to say that there are some hon. gentlemen in this House who are endowed with the grace of prudent silence, who are not imposing expense upon the country by useless discussion. The Patrons of Industry of Ontario have been represented as going through the country using strong arguments against the expenditure in relation to the maintenance of Rideau Hall, and it is said that they made capital by these arguments, and that, in a measure, to these arguments they owe their position on the floor of this House. But I may say, personally, that is not applicable to my case. No one, especially the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), is able to say that the Patrons in Assiniboia have made use of such arguments. We are here to represent the opinions of the people, and especially to voice the public desire for economy. In view of the agricultural depression in the west it was felt that it was better to observe economy all along the line of Government expenditure than to look after party interest. The question is: Has there been a needless expenditure in connection with this item? I have looked into it somewhat and I find that the sum that is now asked to meet the case is not in excess of what has been expended upon Rideau Hall in former years. The expenditure of an extra $3,000 in this case may not be wasted. Economy does not always lie in reducing expenditure. A stitch in time, it is said, sometimes saves nine. Rideau Hall, we understand, was in such a condition that it was necessary to expend a certain amount of money to put it in proper repair. Thus, this expenditure, though it may be $3,000 in excess of what it was last year, is not necessarily a waste of money. I am free to say that when I first saw Rideau Hill I felt that its external aspect was not at all in keeping with what the residence of the Governor General of this Dominion ought to be, nor yet in keeping with the Government buildings in this city of Ottawa. I feel that if there was a need for this expenditure, and if the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) can show that this money has been legitimately expended to keep the building in repair, I, for one, am not prepared to vote against what is here asked. I would therefore ask the attention of the House to the expenditure upon this building by the late Government. I find that during the last six or seven years it has been in excess of $18,000. The figures, however, are in the possession of the hon. Minister of Public Works and he can satisfy us on this point. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin)——

Mr. DAVIN. Did I understand my hon. friend (Mr. Douglas) to say that the expenditure in the past has been in excess of $18,000?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. Further, the hon. member for West Assiniboia——

Mr. DAVIN. Will my hon. friend not give us the figures?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It has been larger for a number of years.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend must have the materials upon which that statement is founded. Will he not give us the figures ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will give the figures.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I feel that I am perfectly consistent in the vote I have given in this House in seeking to establish economy. And I would call the attention of the House to the fact that my hon. friend who makes the complaint was in a sad position no later than last night, when a reduction was proposed in the salary of one of the public officials, and he voted against that reduction. It seems to depend very much upon the direction in which the wind blows whether the hon. gentleman from West Assiniboia will vote in favour of economy or not. I do not know that any charge can be brought against me in this regard. If the Opposition can show us that there has been a waste of funds, or that we should reduce this amount by $3,000, to avoid waste, I am prepared to support the proposition. But, until then, I am disposed to support the Government in what I believe to be a necessary expenditure under the circumstances.

Mr. TAYLOR. As a supporter of the late Government I want to thank the Minister of Public Works for his statement that he had personally visited Rideau Hall and had ascertained that the expenditure could not be kept lower than the sum he was asking, $18,000, that he could not practice any further economy than the late Government had practiced. Thus we have from the hon. Minister a certificate of good conduct on the part of the late Government, and an assurance that there was no extravagance with the——

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). But you had allowed the building to run down ; it was going to pieces.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) wants to interrupt me I will thank him to rise to his feet and take off his hat. The hon. Minister of Public Works gave certain figures to the House on this subject. If I am not right in the figures I give I wish him to correct me. For the year 1891 the expenditure for the maintenance of Rideau Hall was $20,150; for 1892, it was $11,000 ; for 1893, it was $15,000 ; for 1894, it was $14,000 ; for 1895, $17,997 ; and for 1896, it was $13,861. That makes a total of $92,008 for six years, And I want to draw my Patron friends' attention to the fact that this would be an average of $15,335 per year. The Minister of Public Works made a statement about the estimate of last year being $14,000. That is their own estimate, although he will no doubt say that it was prepared by the late Government. Yet that there was an over-expenditure, and a sum was placed in the Supplementary Estimates.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I made a mistake, I will explain it.

Mr. TAYLOR. But I want to ask the Minister of Public Works by how large a sum he has exceeded the estimate of last year of $14,000, and how large a sum he will have to put in the supplementaries for the dancing hall that he had built for the Patrons and other gentlemen who go down there and drink their champagne and dance in this hall.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When I ask the House to vote the money for the repairs that I have made during the current year, then will be the time for me to give explanations.

Mr. TAYLOR. As expenditures are now being made, and as the hon. Minister knows the amount no doubt, I want him to give me the figures that the dancing hall has cost that he has erected there without first having obtained a vote from the House. Then the hon. gentleman gave the figures of expenditure on Rideau Hall for the years from 1887 to 1896. I have got the figures that he gave from 1891 to 1896. I have also in my hand a return brought down to Parliament, to an address of the House of Commons, dated the 6th of February, 1893, showing the total amount of money paid by years since confederation, on each of the building accounts. It gives a detailed statement for each year. For the year 1887 the Minister of Public Works gave $29,550. In the return brought down which I hold in my hand, additions, alterations, repairs and maintenance of Rideau Hall for the year 1887, amounted to $25,959. For 1888, the correct figures are $15,216 ; for 1889, $18,033 ; for 1890, $12,000 ; for 1891, $12,444 ; for 1892, $7,908. Now there are six years, making a yearly average of $18,213 under the Conservative Administration. Now take six years under Liberal Administration, including 1873, for they are responsible for six budget speeches, six estimates, and I give them the benefit of one year of good Conservative rule. Now taking 1873 as being under the rule of hon. gentlemen opposite, I find the expenditure on Rideau Hall was $61,123 ; for 1874, $37,914 ; for 1875, $35,018 ; for 1876, $31,376 ; for 1877, $30,265 ; for 1878, $32,469, making a total of $228,195, or an average annual expenditure of $38,032 under Liberal rule. This is for the maintenance of Rideau Hall, just like the item my hon. friend is asking a vote for now.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). You know very well that you were responsible for the estimate of 1873, and that Mr. Mackenzie's Government was not responsible.

Mr. TAYLOR. I said a few moments ago that I would give our friends opposite the benefit of one year. Now my hon. friend here is willing to support the present Government unless we can convince him that they are extravagant. Now I could prove to him, if the Minister of Public Works had answered the question I asked him, that the Government have been extravagant in fitting up a dancing hall there at an expense of $8,000 or $10,000, and now the Minister will come down to this House and ask a vote for money that is already expended, in the closing days of the session, when perhaps my Patron friends will be conveniently out of the House as they were to-day, and when the hon. member for North Wellington will be conveniently out of the House as he is to-day, when he knew this item would come up for discussion. I am glad to see the Postmaster General here, because he used to criticise these items. Personally I do not find fault with a reasonable expenditure on Rideau Hall; but when hon. gentlemen opposite were on this side they were always finding fault, and wished to have the votes cut down. I think that the average of $15,000 a year for the last six years under Conservative regime was quite sufficient, although hon. gentlemen opposite used to say it was extravagant. Now, I think these figures will prove to my hon. friend who has just spoken, that the present Government are extravagant because they are asking $18,000. My hon. friend said Rideau Hall was out of repair, and that the Minister of Public Works was asking for this money to put it in repair. Nothing of the kind. This money is not being voted for repairs that have already been made, this money is being voted for the maintenance of Rideau Hall from the 1st of July, 1898, to the 1st of July, 1899. There is not a dollar of this for the extravagant state in which Rideau Hall is fitted up in order to allow hon. gentlemen and Patrons to patronize Rideau Hall and dance there. The hon. Minister of Public Works is going to ask for that money over and above the $18,000 which he is asking for by the present vote. My hon. friend has moved to reduce the amount from $18,000 to $15,000, which was the average annual expenditure incurred by the Conservative Government, and which hon. gentlemen opposite, as will be shown by quotations from "Hansard" before the debate closes, was condemned by hon. gentlemen opposite as being extravagant. We do not want hon. gentlemen opposite to exceed the amount expended by the Conservative Government—the corrupt Government, as they were accustomed to term it—but we wish they should keep on the same track as was followed by the late Government. Hon. members on this side of the House do not wish to vote $18,000, and be called upon to pass in the Supplementary Estimates an item of $8,000 or $10,000 for a dancing hall. I shall therefore support the motion for a reduction of the amount to $15,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has given the committee some figures. I will further consider the expenditure made in the past, and will go a little further back. If hon. gentlemen will look at the expenditures they will find that in 1879 the expenditure for Rideau Hall was $61,976; in 1880, $69,932; in 1881, $24,934; in 1882, $30,679; in 1883, $66,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What year is that?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. 1882.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, yes.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A year further on, that is all.

Mr. FOSTER. A year makes a lot of difference some times.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In 1883 the expenditure was $39,402; in 1884, $40,000; 1885, $39,296; 1886, $34,230.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman continue the figures up to date?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Certainly, with the greatest pleasure. I want to show the saving made during the last few years. In 1887 the expenditure was $29,550; 1888, $23,272; 1889, $31,280; 1890, $38,780; 1891, $21,052; 1893, $15,238; 1894, $17,997; 1896, $38,061. Outside of this expenditure, the officers of my department have placed before me accounts for several thousands of dollars which have not been paid. I made a mistake when I said that a supplementary estimate for $4,000 had been voted. It was not voted. The main estimate for 1896 was for $10,000, and there was a supplementary estimate for $4,000, making a total of $14,000, but as I have said there was a large amount of unpaid accounts. The total sum of unpaid accounts for $4,477. I intend to wind up these accounts and settle them; then I hope to be able to come to the House next year and ask for a smaller vote, although I cannot pledge myself to that. I made a careful examination of the house and found it in a dilapidated condition. Then I made up my mind that it would be better to make the necessary repairs. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) strongly objects to the building which he calls a dancing hall. Those hon. members who have gone to Rideau Hall—the hon. member may not have gone there—well know that this hall has been in existence for many years. In regard to this matter I have done simply what any other Minister would have done. I repeat that I ask this vote to wind up the business, to pay old accounts, and next year I will be responsible for the expenditure.

Mr. TAYLOR. I know the Minister of Public Works does not intend to be unfair, but the statements given by him are unfair. The hon. gentleman made the statement that in 1887 the Government expended on Rideau Hall, $30,792.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I stated that the expenditure was $29,550, and I say it again.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have a return in my hand showing the expenditures from 1887 to 1892, and the statement shows as follows :—

Year ending 30th June.	Repairs and Maintenance.	Furniture.	Gardens and Grounds	Fuel and Light.	Totals.
	$	$	$	$	$
1887....	25,959	1,479	2,111	8,000	37,550
1888....	15,216	1,492	6,262	8,000	30,972
1889....	18,033	7,268	6,411	8,000	39,714
1890....	12,067	1,354	4,685	8,000	26,107
1891....	12,444	5,242	2,940	8,000	28,627
1892....	7,908	996	2,940	8,000	19,844

These figures include $8,000 a year for fuel and light, and they show an average of less than $34,000, while the hon. gentleman is asking for $18,000, $8,000 and $2,000, and these figures together with the proportion of the water rates for public buildings, will make a total of $33,000.

Mr. ROGERS. I did not intend to take any part in the discussion, for being a young man I was willing to watch and listen, but for the unfair and ungentlemanly remarks made about the Patrons.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think the hon. gentleman is in order in using the word ungentlemanly.

Mr. ROGERS. I take that word back, and I substitute unpleasant statements. I should like to know, Sir, what is your ruling as to an hon. member in this House calling a certain body of members here charlatans and humbugs. Is that a gentlemanly statement for the member to make ? I have listened attentively to those Estimates going through the House, and I have endeavoured to consider them as the best interests of my constituents demand, and in accordance with the obligations upon which I entered Parliament. I have wondered why so much time has been taken up with discussion on the different items. I was not particularly interested in the appropriations for Manitoba and the North-west this afternoon, and judging from my past experience of the delays in this House, I thought it might take an hour or two hours, or even two days, before the item we are now considering would be reached. I was called out of the Chamber, and as I was detained longer than I expected, I found this item under consideration when I returned. I found also that some hon. gentlemen had made what were, to say the least, unpleasant statements, to the effect that we were trying to shirk the vote. These nasty and ungentlemanly—well, I will say unpleasant references—were made against the Patrons ; it is pretty hard to keep within the bounds of parliamentary language under the circumstances. Now, Sir, the stand which the Patrons take in regard to the maintenance of the Governor General's house and his salary, &c., has always been reasonable, and their demands have always been moderate. We all know that the present worthy representative of our noble Queen was brought out under certain expectations, and certain promises that such and such would be done for him. We Patrons now take the stand that the Patrons did in the Ontario legislature. They wished to do away with the maintenance of the Lieutenant-Governor's residence in Toronto, but they did not propose to do it while the present occupant was in the office, nor do we wish to do so as regards our present Governor General. Neither I nor any Patron whom I have ever heard express himself, wishes to do away with the maintenance of Government House now ; but when the Governor General's time of office has expired, we decided that we should take a stand in the matter. We believed it would be a dishonourable thing not to carry out our obligations and bargain, if I may so call it, with the present Governor General. Some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House made great fun about the Patrons going down to Rideau Hall. Well, that may be looked upon in two lights. When we speak of a matter we wish to speak of it from a practical standpoint, and the Patrons want to go down there and see for themselves whereof they speak. When the Governor General kindly gave us an invitation, we wanted to show that we were not discourteous, and we wanted to show that we were gentlemen, as I hope we are. We went down to Rideau Hall, and if we refused to vote for the maintenance of it, we would be honourable enough not to go. Some hon. gentlemen opposite referred to dancing and drinking wine, and all that sort of thing ; but these gentlemen were not there to see what we were doing, or they would not have spoken in that way. I rose to refer to the unpleasant remarks that were made about the Patrons, especially by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), who recorded on "Hansard" that we were charlatans and humbugs. When that hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) goes back to his constituents he may be asked to account for these very ungentlemany expressions. The ex-Minister of Finance also referred to the Patrons in a way that I consider very slightingly, when he said that he would appeal to a much higher

grade than the Patrons; he would appeal to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). I think he might have left that slur alone, as it was very uncalled for. It is something on a par with the ex-Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Montague), who in addressing an audience of farmers told them that there was no fear of the Conservative party being beaten, because the Conservatives had the commercial and manufacturing interests at their back. That shows the opinion the late Government had about the farmers. I give a word of warning to the representatives in this House that when they speak of the agricultural classes who made Canada what she is to-day, they must do so in a respectful manner. Every word and expression which has been used against the farmers will be known to them, and the wool cannot be pulled over their eyes any longer. Hon. gentlemen opposite need not take such a fatherly care of the few Patrons who are here. The Patrons in this House are able to take care of themselves, and their constituents will take care of them when they go back. We came to this House to give whatever Government was in power a fair and reasonable chance to proceed with their policy along the lines of our platform. If the Conservatives had been in power we would have given them the same fair chance to move along the lines of our platform.

Mr. BERGERON. You are all Grits.

Mr. ROGERS. The references made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron), who has interrupted me, were not very kindly to the Patrons. There are not many of them in Quebec, but probably there will be before next Parliament, and he will have to reckon with them.

Mr. BERGERON. They have no show in Quebec.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). There are no Conservatives in Quebec now to fight and we do not need them.

Mr. ROGERS. The farmers and Patrons are anxious to keep their own buildings in a proper state of repair, and they would not thank me if I went back to my constituency after having voted against repairing our public buildings. I have faith and confidence in the Minister of Public Works, judging from his many attempts at economy, that he will be able to give a proper account of the expenditure. We will watch the proceedings closely, and we are willing to give the Government a chance. We have three years or more to consider this matter, and if the expenditure is not properly guarded we will have time to act then. We do not wish to be unreasonable, nor to ask for too much, but we wish to give this Government a chance to economize, as we would have given the Conservative Government a chance if they had been returned to power. A man who had written an editorial for one of our city papers, showed it to me in the proof, said to me that although he was not a friend of ours he spoke in favour of our platform—as I am glad to say the press did all through the country. He said to me: "Nothing but a political alligator would attempt to swallow such a monster as the Patron platform." I said to him: "My good man, did you ever hear it said in the public press or on the public platform that the Patrons demanded all they were asking for at once? It is along these lines that we are working, and we hope to attain those things in the end, but we wish to be reasonable, honourable and common-sense;" and that is the principle we are working on to-day. Now, Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to say even so much; but I could show you in a few words what would be a great stroke of economy, in my judgment. Let a resolution be passed to make every member of this House pay for his share of the "Hansard." If that were done, some hon. gentlemen would go home with a volume in their pocket; they would have to use their mileage, and have their passes pretty well mortgaged, to be able to get home again; and it would be well for this country if that were the case. For my part, I am willing to pay my little share. I would just say that I am willing to give this Government a fair chance, though I have been an old-time Conservative. These very unpleasant allusions which are continually made to the Patrons make it much harder for us to live up to our principles. Hon. gentlemen would do much better if they left us alone. It is very unpleasant for the Patrons to be referred to so sneeringly, but it puts us a little more on our mettle. I am willing not only to give an account of myself to my own constituency, but I will also go to the constituencies of some other gentlemen and make myself heard there.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the few remarks I made this afternoon have had the desired effect, and that the coon has come down.

Mr. ROGER. We will come down again, too.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman had the honour of being elected by acclamation last summer in the county of Frontenac, where the feeling of Patronism ran very high. The leader of the Patron movement in the local House also represents that riding. At that time the "Canada Farmer's Sun" made some remarks in reference to "the first blow in the campaign," and among other things it said:

> Hurrah for Frontenac! Frontenac draws first blood; Rogers succeeds Calvin; they are both good men.

Well, I think if the "Farmer's Sun" were to recapitulate the history of the hon. gen-

tleman, it would find that he drew the first of everything when he came here ; because when several leather trunks were sent here as samples at a cost of $40 each, I saw one of them in the vestibule labelled with the name of the hon. member for Frontenac.

Mr. ROGERS. Will you allow me a word ? Just take that back right off.

Mr. BENNETT. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he has not received a leather trunk ?

Mr. ROGERS. Will I get up in this House and villify myself and make a fool of myself in that way ? No, Sir.

Mr. BENNETT. Of course the hon. gentleman took the trunk. He took a trunk full of stationery, too. If anything were required to show the character of the Patrons of this country, it is the exhibition the hon. gentleman has given in this House to-night. Is there a Liberal organization in this country that would ever have chosen him as a candidate Is there a Conservative organization that would have chosen him as a candidate ?

Mr. ROGERS. Take that back. I ask your ruling, Mr. Chairman, whether the hon. gentleman is not to take that statement back. It is a false charge against me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. gentleman denies that he accepted a trunk——.

Mr. ROGERS. I took the stationery, but I took no leather trunk.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman has not denied that he accepted the trunk. Now, Mr. Chairman, in that riding——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take that back.

Mr. RICHARDSON. He said he took the stationery, but not the trunk.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, tell the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) that fools rush in where angels fear to tread.

Mr. ROGERS. I ask your ruling, Mr. Chairman. I took no leather trunk. I do not want that false statement to go in "Hansard."

Mr. BENNETT. Now, Mr. Chairman, if I can have a little protection——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. BENNETT. I am going to refer to the fact that the county of Frontenac is represented in the local legislature as well as in this House by a Patron. Let me tell the House further that in point of ability——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. McCLURE. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I ask the committee to be quiet and listen to the speeches made.

Mr. McCLURE. I understood the hon. member for Frontenac to say distinctly that he had not taken a leather trunk. If that be true, the hon. gentleman ought to withdraw the remark.

Mr. BENNETT. So far as the hon. gentleman who has just stood up is concerned, it is quite patent that his verdancy in this House has hardly worn off yet.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand that the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has made a statement concerning the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers), and that that hon. member has denied the statement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No. Yes, he has.

Mr. ROGERS. I emphatically deny it. I said so.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would ask the members of the committee to hear what the hon. member for Frontenac has to say. Does he deny the statement made by the hon. member for East Simcoe ?

Mr. ROGERS. I did. I took no leather trunk.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. member for East Simcoe will accept the statement the hon. gentleman has made.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. member for North Wellington said to-day——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. I understand that the hon. member for Frontenac has denied the statement which the hon. member for East Simcoe has made, and I expect that the hon. member will accept that denial.

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. gentleman says that he has not yet received his trunk, I withdraw the statement ; but I will anxiously scan the public accounts to see if he does get one before the end of this Parliament.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Shame.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Mr. Chairman, I do not think——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand the hon. member for Huron is rising to a point of order.

Mr. MACDONALD. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) made the charge against the hon. member for Frontenac that he received one of the leather trunks which was provided for the members of this House, and the hon. member for Frontenac denied, in toto, that he received or accepted a trunk.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, he did not.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Yes he did. The hon. member for East Simcoe is, in duty bound, as a man and a member of this House, to withdraw the accusation he has made.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not understand that the hon. member for Simcoe made any charge against the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers), but he made a certain statement which has been denied by the hon. member for Frontenac, and I expect the hon. member for Simcoe will accept that statement.

Mr. BENNETT. I accept the statement, and if all these small fire crackers over there will keep quiet, I will proceed with my remarks. I was about to say, when I was greeted with these interruptions, that the county of Frontenac is represented in the local legislature by a Patron in the person of Mr. Haycock; and I am bound to say, and I hope it will not hurt the hon. gentleman's feelings, that the difference between himself and Mr. Haycock, in point of ability, is as the difference between dollars and doughnuts.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The hon. gentleman is out of order——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I rise to a point of order. The satement of the hon. member for East Simcoe is equivalent to calling the member for Frontenac a doughnut.

Mr. WALLACE. I wish to say a word on the point of order. It must be a mighty fine constituency that sends a Haycock and a doughnut to Parliament.

Mr. BENNETT. Now, I have this to say that the hon. member for Frontenac is the personification of all the humbug that is being manifested——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must withdraw that expression.

Mr. BENNETT. I will withdraw it, and say that he is the personification of the rectitude and straightforwardness and of everything else that has been promised and not carried out in this House on behalf of the Patrons. And he is not alone. Near him sits another illustrious member of the great Patron order, of whom it was said, in the "Farmers' Sun" on December 18th, 1896:

> Brother Stubbs, the candidate in Cardwell, is a member of the Patron Order and a popular farmer, whose nomination was regarded so favourably that no Patron nomination was offered in opposition, it being deemed inadvisable.

What have these hon. gentlemen done? They went about the country last June masquerading before the electors as being more holy than either Liberals or Conservatives. Their politics did not consist in denunciation of the trade policy of the country, their politics was not taken up with any of the broad measures before the country, but they went around with a policy of the peanut kind order, denouncing the expenditure on trunks and stationery and jack-knives and other trumpery matters of that kind, and among other things they pledged themselves to the strictest economy, one of the chief items of which was the abolition of the Government House at Ottawa. Now, where do these hon. gentlemen stand to-night? Under the party lash of hon. gentlemen opposite, they have responded to the crack, and are going to vote for what? Not for the abolition of Government House at all, but for spending $18,000 on its maintenance. To-night they are voting that a large sum of money be expended on a dancing hall at Government House. Let me say this with regard to my position. I am prepared to-night to vote for a reduced figure and to denounce the expenditure at Rideau Hall as altogether too high.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is a pity you did not do it years ago.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman says it is a pity I did not do it years ago. All I have to reply is this, that while the hon. gentleman participated in the festivities at Rideau Hall he denounced them, but while I denounce them, I shall have the manliness to refrain from indulging in them. That is the difference between the hon. gentleman's attitude and mine on this question. What is the position of these gentlemen who represent the Patrons? They went before the electors pledged to retrenchment and economy on all these different lines, and to-night their vote is not their own but that of the electors who sent them here and who consented to their election on the ground that they would carry out what they pledged themselves in honourable faith to do. The hon. gentleman from Frontenac sought to give me a little advice. He told me that I had better not say anything disparaging to the Patrons. Well, I have this to say. I had last June a Patron candidate opposed to me, and had he been elected to this House, I can tell the hon. gentleman that he would have made him blush because he would have stood to his word of honour and not responded to the crack of the party whip. I have nothing to take back. I say that I respect the Liberal who comes to this House elected as a Liberal on a straight party platform; but when I see hon. gentlemen elected to this House on a picayune, peanut policy, responding to the crack of the party whip, when I see these hon. gentlemen cringing to the Ministers as they do, all I have to say is this, that I am prepared to denounce the Patron party, as exempli-

fied by their representatives in this House. I have only this to say to the hon. Minister —that if he will promise the House that he will add $100 to the expenditure and use it to get a flash-light picture made of Rideau Hall dancing room with the Patrons in full fling, I will, with the greatest pleasure, support the vote. For, Sir, I would ask no better campaign literature with which to go into the county of Frontenac and politically decapitate its present member than such a picture.

Mr. OLIVER. If I am in order I would like to say a few words on this subject, not because I am a member of the Patron order, but because having received a very large support from that order and sympathizing with their views to a great extent, I think it would not be creditable for me to sit in silence and hear such epithets hurled against them and such insinuations made against them, and, above all, the attempt that has been made to browbeat them and drive them from their right of free action in this House. These gentlemen are elected as free men, representing free constituents, and free ideas; and I think it ill becomes any representative to stand here and use the language that was used by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) who has just sat down with regard to any hon. member. We all recognize the ability of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, but I think the House will unanimously agree with me that on this occasion he has not done himself credit. I think it is not a little disgraceful that such epithets should have been——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. OLIVER. I would not wish to transgress the rules of the House. If I am out of order in using that expression I am willing to withdraw it. I wish to argue this point fairly and squarely without abuse of any kind. I think it must be patent to any member of the House, to any member of the Patron organization, to any Patron constituency throughout this country or, if you like, to any agricultural constituency of the country—for the views of the Patrons are the views of the agriculturists, and they prevail wherever there is an agricultural constituency—that the action of certain gentlemen on the opposite side to-night will not redound to their credit with the Patrons or the agriculturists of this country. If these gentlemen have used the expression "humbug" and "arrant humbug" as applied to the Patrons——

Mr. BENNETT. No, no; but to the members here.

Mr. OLIVER. I think that they may very well reply that the members of the Opposition who are taking part in this debate, under the circumstances that we see are, at the least—I hope I shall not be out of order for saying it—part of an organized hypocrisy. While these hon. gentlemen have been saying everything that could be said in abuse of the Patrons, they have been calling upon those Patrons to do what they themseves would not wish to do, to do what they have never done or never wanted to do, what they have, until this amendment, declared themselves against doing—and, as an hon. gentleman beside me remarks, what they never will do. They are entitled, however, to have it said that, hypocritical as their motions are, they have certainly never made hypocritical professions, for they have never declared that they desire these reductions in the ordinary public expenditure that the Patrons, the agriculturists and most right-thinking men in the country have called for. A large majority of the people called for them on the 23rd of June last, and the majority is still increasing. When hon. gentlemen opposite come before this House with a reasonable proposition, when they come before this House with a motion that they are prepared to back up with facts, they may reasonably expect other members of the House to vote with them. But when they come forward with a motion in which they themselves have no faith, which they themselves would not carry out if they had the power, which they do not even declare they would carry out if they had the power, I do not see how they can in reason, expect other members to support them. I do not see how they can expect members of this House to fall in with such a gilt-brick swindle as that would be.

The question before the House is the expenditure upon Rideau Hall. An hon. gentleman opposite has moved to reduce that expenditure. Those who are responsible for that motion have given no reason for it. They do not even say the vote is too large. But they say: We want to catch the Patrons. Well, I do not think that the Patrons or those who send the Patrons here are quite foolish enough as to be caught with such a saw-dust swindle as this is. I do not know how hon. gentlemen opposite will take it; but, if they are in favour of economy—although I do not know that they are—I have a suggestion for them which I think will receive the support of the Patrons and probably of everybody on this side of the House. Ever since this House met on 25th March last much time has been taken up by hon. gentlemen opposite talking about what? About saving money by reducing the expenditures of Government? Nine-tenths of the time of this House since the opening of this session has been taken up by hon. gentlemen opposite, objecting to savings that the Government has attempted to make in regard to the civil service of the country. Now, I don't ask these gentlemen to agree with these proposals of economy in the expenditures of the country. We know from their past record that

they do not agree with that idea at all, just as the country does not agree with them; but I do ask them in reason and in common sense, for their benefit as well as ours, hereafter to consider that every day they talk about nothing, is costing themselves, and us, and the country a very large amount of money, and if they will only, just like the Patrons, keep silent when they have nothing to say, they will save this country more than the total expenditure on Rideau Hall several times over.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works if I understood him aright when I understood him to say that in this vote he had included a lot of money to pay back bills.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I said that a sum of money amounting to $4,470 had to be added to the vote of $14,000 which had been asked last year. This year I am asking for $18,000 to make repairs and improvements that I thought were necessary, after having made a careful investigation of the case.

Mr. FOSTER. I must have misunderstood my hon. friend. I cannot see how he made the succeeding argument, because he turned round to his supporters and said that he was asking for this vote in order to pay back bills and the like of that, and he hoped another year that he would be able to reduce the sum. However, if my hon. friend now says that that is not so, that clears the matter up. I was going to point out to him that back bills are always the subject of a supplementary vote. Now, I want to ask him whether, in the comparison he made of the later years, he included in the expenditure of those years the $8,000 for fuel and light, because in all the figures he read of the preceding years, $8,000 for fuel and light were included in the total amounts.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Quite so.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is asking for $26,000, for $18,000 and for $8,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, my hon. friend, in clearing up these two things, did not deal quite lucidly with the House with reference to the comparative expenditures under the two Governments. The returns are easily accessible, they have been brought down and printed, and no doubt the hon. gentleman has seen them. If he will look at them he will find there are some instructive lessons, and I have no doubt we might learn from the lessons of the past, together with certain votes that are being asked for this year, a lesson for the future. The lesson to be learned from the past is this: That under Liberal Conservative rule up to 1873, certain expenses were incurred for Government House under different heads, under the heads of additions, alterations, repairs and maintenance, and the like of that; and crockery, carpets, furniture, garden, grounds, &c. This is the fact that remains, that under Liberal Conservative rule up to 1873, the expenditures were kept at a certain level; that during all that time the Liberals who were out of power were making the usual statements as to extravagance, and the usual professions as to economy. Well, they came into power in 1873, and if my hon. friend will run his eye over all those items, he will find that immediately they came into power these items began to increase, and that during no period of five years from that time to the present had the expenditures been so lavish as they were during that time. Now, if he will look again at the last five years of Liberal Conservative rule, he will find that those expenditures have been drawn down very materially. Now, the Liberals during all that time made their protestations of economy, and their protestations against extravagance, just the same as in the period before 1874. They got into power, and what becomes of the protestations? Not only on the general vote do they ask for two millions more than ourselves the first year they bring down Estimates, but when they come to the small items, and this amongst others, my hon. friend raises it to $18,000, raises it at once. The same old path is commencing to be travelled, once they get into power the expenditures begin to leap up. Now, I do not think that there is any reason why, under the large expenditure of the past year, and what has been done—and those of us who have been to Government House know that a great deal has been done—that there is any need for making this extra expenditure of $18,000. As for the Patron members who represent their constituencies in this House, they need not think that any one on this side of the House has any quarrel with them, because they are Patrons, or any quarrel with them because they are agriculturists; the quarrel is with members on the opposite side, and the Patrons are almost as guilty as any others in that although they conduct a canvass on certain professions of economy, when they came in and the party is in power, they sit behind the party that is in power and vote for the party that is in power, and the party that is in power violates every one of the canons of the creed which the Patron members have professed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. My hon. friend——

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend must allow me to make my little speech, then he may have the floor. Does not my hon. friend who rose just now know that a part of the creed of the Patron organization was economy, a lessening of expenses for civil government, a lessening of the number of

civil servants, a lessening of all expenditures of government, which they declared were too high and could be reduced; that they asked for the abolishment of the Senate, the abolishment of the expenses of Government House, a reduction all along the line—that was the 'ad captandum' argument that they addressed to the agricultural voters.

Mr. ROGERS. When?

Mr. FOSTER. Ever since my hon. friends have stood on their two legs on public platforms. Does my hon. friend repudiate the Patron principles, and deny that he was asking for economy, and pointing out the different items in which economy could be practised? Does he want me to read the Patron platform? Is he a Patron, or is he not? If he is a Patron, he subscribed to that platform; if he is not a Patron and repudiates the Patrons and their platform, let him get up and say so, and then we will know where he is. If he is a Grit, then he is at the tail of the Grit kite, but if he is a Patron, he has subscribed to the Patron's creed, and to these among other items:

Rigid economy in every department of the public service, simplification of the laws, and a general reduction in the machinery of the Government.

Are there less Ministers to-day than there were when the Patrons put that in their platform?

Mr. ROGERS. Give us time.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend did not want any time when he stood before the voters and canvassed them; he did not say. Give me time to effect economy, and when I effect economy vote for me. He said, Vote for me now, because I am in favour of economy from the soles of my feet to the crown of my head.

A tariff for revenue only, and so adjusted as to fall as far as possible upon the luxuries, and not upon the necessaries of life.

Have they given the country a tariff for revenue? When the Patrons were catching votes in the North-west, and agricultural votes in other parts of the country, did they not inveigh against high duties upon agricultural implements? Did they not inveigh against high duties on coal? Did they not inveigh against high duties on lumber? To-day don't they know that the farmers are looking to them, and looking to this Government, to implement their promises? Don't they know that there are a great many men who, like that honest farmer in the North-west, at Winnipeg I think it was, got enthusiastic before the commission and declared: "If Mr. Laurier only gives us free trade, we will put up in all our rooms, 'God bless Mr. Laurier!'" But free trade has not been given, and I am afraid these little mottoes calling down blessings on the head of my hon. friend will not be put up in the agricultural homes of this country. But there was no single discordant note in the Patrons' canvass of the voters. Will they tell me when they voted for increased economy? They resemble the hon. member for North Wellington, who says: I wish the Government would economize, and reduce this item and the other items. But he always ends up by a confession of faith: I have great confidence in the Minister of Public Works, I have great confidence in the Minister of Customs. So hon. gentlemen opposite bottle up their economical ebulitions and keep them down with the stopper, which consists in the great faith they have that in the distant future, at some time, these extravagant Ministers will be a little economical and enable them to square themselves with their constituents. Why should I read all the Patrons' platform? Everybody knows it. But we ask those gentlemen to be consistent and independent, according to their declaration. There was an appeal made by an hon. member from the far North-west to hon. members, that there should be more independence. That is what we fail to find—independence. We are waiting with great expectancy to see it develop, we are waiting for its birth; but it is almost hopeless to expect that it will ever be born, on the opposite side of the House at all events. I wish to say that throughout the period when they were in Opposition the Liberals were strong, if they were strong on any small point, on this matter of over expenditure for Rideau Hall. There were gardeners galore. There were gardeners looking after the grounds, growing roses and all sorts of plants, and vice-royalty was not there. Tens of thousands of poor voters were described as toiling under the hot sun, through rain and shine, summer and winter for the purpose of securing this vote of $18,000 or $20,000 to be spent on Government House. These statements formed the stock in trade of hon. gentlemen opposite. We have not, however, heard from the hon. member from Vancouver (Mr. Maxwell) yet. I should like to hear what he has to say in regard to economy. Is he in favour of it, or not? He and his workingmen friends shed tears over toil and taxes. They were like precious drops which fell into the common receptacle and were bottled up and helped to make the fund out of which $18,000 are expended yearly for Government House. The hon. member for Vancouver has not yet told us what he thinks about it. Will he do so? I hope he will.

Mr. MAXWELL. In response to the syren-like invitation of the ex-Finance Minister, I rise to give expression to my views with respect to this vote. I do not know that his description of my campaign speeches is exactly correct. I think I only made one speech in regard to the public expenditure of the late Conservative Government, but certainly I never adopted the tactics he

imputed to me by his closing remarks. I hope at all times, I do not care what Government is in power, to take what I consider to be a sensible view of the needs of the country and the money absolutely necessary to be expended for the well-being of the country. I will not and cannot support the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Kent, N.B. I have listened to the reasons given why I should support that amendment. So far as I could gather, the principal reason that was urged up to the last few moments was founded on the utterances of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) and the Postmaster General. I am not familiar with those utterances, because although I have tried to get the back numbers of "Hansard" I have been unable to get them as yet, and so I am not versed in the utterances of those hon. members with respect to Rideau Hall. But I may say this, that it may be true in politics as in other spheres, that those young men may have sown their wild political oats, and those utterances may be regarded as youthful indiscretions. I believe it is possible for a man to learn and to grow wiser as the days go by, and I have the same hope of the hon. member for Kent, that he will also in the sweet by and by change his opinion with respect to the amendment he has moved this evening. If the hon. member for North Wellington has made a fool of himself in the past——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. HUGHES. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. MAXWELL. Well, in order to satisfy the tender feelings of the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) I will say that if the hon. member for North Wellington has been foolish in the past, there is no reason why the hon. member for Kent, who is supposed to be wiser, shoud act the foolish part this evening; and if hon. gentlemen feel aggrieved at these utterances of the past, I think it is very unwise and very foolish of hon. gentlemen opposite to repeat them and to take a stand to-night which was formally condemned by them when taken by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. For that reason I cannot support the amendment. I do not propose to be bound by the utterances of any one. I intend to look at this question and to carefully study it irrespective of party politics. If hon. members now on this side of the House made statements against Rideau Hall, I do not intend to follow them, and if similar statements are made by hon. gentlemen opposite, I do not intend to follow them; but I oppose the motion for this reason: Rideau Hall is an institution of the country, it is one of our public institutions, and it would be a shame if the Parliament of Canada and the members of this House, on both sides of it, who I believe are loyal to the core to British institutions, did not make due provision for everything necessary for the maintenance of that house. I appeal to hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. This is the year of jubilee. What is the use of members of this honourable House, when we are so full of loyalty to Her Majesty, when we desire to give in this year an ostensible manifestation of our devotion to the Throne, when we are anxious to make it manifest to the world that Canada is the chief colony of all the colonies which claims her as sovereign, I say, what is the use of us tinkering, and harping, and carping upon a miserable vote like this. A very practical way of showing our devotion to the Throne of England is to treat the representative of our Sovereign generously. It would be a standing disgrace to us if the Governor General's house is not maintained as it ought to be maintained, and I say that this amendment is not an amendment expressive of loyalty; it is not an amendment expressive of economy; it is not an amendment that commends itself to the common-sense of the gentlemen of this House. I do not believe that half of the gentlemen on the opposite side of the House will support it, and hence I desire, when I record my vote, to be among the majority of my Conservative friends, at least on this particular occasion.

Mr. McINERNEY. I do not intend to say very much before the vote is taken on this question, but I do intend to resent the gratuitous advice that was given to me by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maxwell) who has just taken his seat. He said, that he rose to express his opinion, at the siren-like invitation of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), but, Sir, the advice which the hon. gentleman from Vancouver has seen fit, in his great wisdom, to give me, rather tastes of that advice which the serpent gave when he "sat squat in the ear of Eve." He tells me, that I will get wisdom; it was something like that, the serpent whispered. He tells me that I will get knowledge; it was something like that, the serpent whispered, and while I do not wish to compare the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maxwell) with that grovelling reptile, I at the same time am disposed to take my own opinion in this matter, and not to be guided by the advice tendered me so gratuitously by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maxwell).

Now, Sir, I did not make this motion for the purpose of catching the Patron vote. I have nothing unkind, or discourteous, or unpleasant to say to the Patron representatives in this House, or to the Patrons outside of this House. But, Sir, by their fruits we shall judge them, and by their action on this vote and votes like this, we will be able to form our opinion of the Patron representatives in the Parliament of Canada. A few moments ago the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) read the platform of the Patrons, but I have here something later, and something very much to the point. It is from the "Canadian

Farmer's Sun" of May 6th; and this I understand is the organ of the Patrons, and the advocate of the Patron movement. What do I find here? At the very end of a long article upon useless and extravagant expenditure, the editor says this:

> The Patrons and farmers in general in Ontario have demanded, and are about to obtain, a reduction of the cost of the Government House establishment at Toronto. Let them now call for a drastic reform at Rideau Hall and an equally thorough overhauling at Regina. Twenty-five thousand dollars and find himself should be enough for the Governor General. The Lieutenant-Governors would be amply repaid for all they do with $5,000 and find themselves. Whatever figures may be determined upon, the necessity for a sweeping economy is obvious; but, in the meantime, the demand of the Patrons will be, that these officials shall at least be paid nothing more than the salaries that are now placed at their disposal.

I do not pretend to say "Yea, Yea" to all this, but I may fairly ask hon. gentlemen who are supposed to represent the men who find their advocate in that paper, to tell me, what answer they can give to such an appeal as that coming from the men they are supposed to represent. Now, Sir, neither am I disposed to take the slur that was cast upon my motion by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maxwell). He said that my motion smacks of disloyalty. How does it smack of disloyalty for me to rise in this House, and say, that the vote of $18,000 in this item proposed by the Minister of Public Works, should be reduced to $15,000. Does that smack of disloyalty? If it does, what is to be said of the hon. the Postmaster General who several times proposed in this Chamber, a resolution for the curtailment of expenses at Government House, and for a reduction of the salary paid to the Governor General himself. What is to be said of many men now supporting the Government, who in season and out of season, declared against the extravagant expenditure that they said obtained at Government House. There is nothing disloyal in this motion, and I shall not have that slur cast upon me, or upon my motives in this particular. I am free to admit and bold to state, that no one will go further than I to maintain in proper dignity, and in proper comfort, and in luxury even, the representative in Canada of Her Gracious Majesty. But, Sir, I am well within the bounds of reason when I ask for the reduction I have proposed. The Minister of Public Works asked for "$18,000 for Rideau Hall, including grounds, renewals, improvements, repairs, furniture and maintenance." Now, if I am able to make out a case, and to show the representatives of the Patron movement in this House, and also other gentlemen who are disposed to look upon this matter independently; if I can show them that from 1887 to 1896 the Conservative Government spent a less sum than $18,000, and a less sum than $15,000, the amount named in my amendment, then I say that these gentlemen should vote for that amendment. And in order to show that, I have but to take the figures contained in the return which was brought down in 1893, showing the expenditure made under this item from 1887 to 1892, inclusive. It was as follows:—

Expenditure for	1887	$25,959
do	do 1888	15,216
do	do 1889	18,033
do	do 1890	12,000
do	do 1891	12,444
do	do 1892	7,908

Now, Sir, divide that total expenditure by six, the number of years I have enumerated, and you will get an average of $15,260 expended annually from 1887 to 1892, inclusive. It is not $18,000 as stated by my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) because he made the mistake of dividing the total of $91,000 by five, instead of by six, the latter figure being the number of years from 1887 to 1892, inclusive. I have shown by these figures, taken from an authentic official return, that $15,260 a year was the whole amount spent under this item, from 1887 to 1892, inclusive; and I now take the figures given by the Minister of Public Works this afternoon, to show what was spent under this item from 1892 to 1896, inclusive:

Expenditure for	1892	$11,000
do	do 1893	15,000
do	do 1894	14,000
do	do 1895	17,997
do	do 1896	13,861

The total for these five years is $71,858, or an average from 1892 to 1896 of $14,371 per year.

I have proved, Sir, from this authentic return, that from 1887 to 1892, the average annual expenditure on Rideau Hall under this item was $15,260, and I have shown by the figures given by the Minister of Public Works himself, that from 1892 to 1896, inclusive, the expenditure only averaged $14,371 a year. Am I, then, disloyal for asking anything unreasonable when I propose that $15,000 should be enough for this year under this economical Government, who have obtained power largely on the cry that they would bring about a reign of economy in the public expenditure? I claim that the motion I have made is perfectly in order, that I have a perfect right to make it, and that there is nothing disloyal about it. What have we to say of the gentlemen who, from time to time, in years gone by, made propositions in this House to reduce this very expenditure very much more than I seek to do, and who now blandly stand up and say, "Oh, this is a jubilee year, and we should make this expenditure larger." And what have we to say of gentlemen who were elected on a platform to cut off every expenditure in connection with Government House except the Governor General's sal-

ary, and to reduce that from $50,000 to $25,000, in view of the utterances of their organ which I have read to-night, calling upon them even at this hour to reduce the expenditure on Government House and bring it within reasonable limits. I appeal to the sense of fairness of the Patrons in this House. I do not ask their votes on any catch motion. It is a fair motion, which should appeal to their reason, and it represents their platform—not in its entirety, but to this extent at least. I call upon them in honesty and fair-play, representing the people they do, to put themselves on record in the direction of economy, or to stand stultified before the people of Canada as having been elected on false pretenses and as proving false to the people whom they are supposed to represent.

Mr. STENSON. I will not detain the House very long, for I think this matter has taken up sufficient time already. I think the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McInerney), instead of correcting the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), has made a mistake himself by quoting the wrong figures. The hon. member for Leeds found that the average expenditure from 1887 to 1892 was $18,000, while the hon. member for Kent finds that it is only $15,260. Now, if we just throw in one year of Conservative rule, 1873, and take the average of those seven years, we would find the average very much over $18,000. After all the discussion and all the figures that have been given, I think we may reasonably come to the conclusion that the amount now asked is not more than the amount usually asked for improvements to Rideau Hall; and I think it is a very inopportune time to ask that these improvements should be curtailed. As an hon. member has stated, it is not in this jubilee year that we should be so parsimonious as not to grant to the representative of Her Majesty Queen Victoria less than has been granted in the past to keep his residence in proper order. When I hear an hon. gentleman say that it may be well enough for those who patronize Rideau Hall to vote for this expenditure, I am a little surprised, for I do not think it is the Liberals and the Patrons alone who patronize Rideau Hall; I would be very sorry to find that it was. I would be very sorry if the great Conservative party would show so little loyalty as not to patronize Rideau Hall and the representative of Her Majesty; and I would also be very sorry to think that the great Conservative party would refuse to the occupants of Rideau Hall the sum necessary to keep it in proper repair. With regard to that dancing hall, I think the hon. Minister of Public Works has shown that it was not built for that purpose. It was only repaired, and I would not say that it was repaired for dancing. But if that hall is not in good repair, I think it is only right that it should be put in good repair. We should at least have the interior of Rideau Hall put in a proper state when the exterior looks so dilapidated. With regard to what has been said of the Patrons, I really regret to see that the great Conservative party have so lost so much of the chivalry that they claimed to have in former times, as to attack a small party in this House—a party which, although small, is a respectable party, and a party representing the great body of the bone and sinew of this country. Let these hon. gentlemen who belong to what used to be the great Conservative party attack the Liberal party. There they will find us man to man, and a little more; but let them leave the Patrons alone, and leave them to vote according to their judgment. It is not to these gentlemen that the Patrons are responsible. It is to their constituents. Let the Patrons answer to their constituents for their conduct in this House, and I trust that when they do they will not meet such a reception as the great Conservative party met with last June.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a return that has been presented to this House showing the expenditures on Rideau Hall since 1867. I will not trouble the House by reading the whole of it, but I will read from the time hon. gentlemen opposite came into power in 1879.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Begin at 1874.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to give the figures of the expenses of Rideau Hall under hon. gentlemen opposite. From 1879 they were as follows:—

1879	$61,976 32
1880	69,952 20
1881	24,924 71
1882	30,679 52
1883	39,602 01
1884	43,570 94
1885	39,296 42
1886	34,280 40
1887	37,550 71
1888	30,972 31
1889	39,714 00
1890	26,107 41
1891	28,637 24
1892	19,844 53

So that every year——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. McMULLEN. So that every year that hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, their expenditure was in excess of the amount now asked. They appear very anxious to have it reduced this year. I can tell them that we have many difficult questions to deal with, as well as the expenditure on Rideau Hall, which is a legacy they have left us. We are going to deal with them all in a prudent and economical manner, but these hon. gentlemen have left us a very sad and unfortunate record. The hon. Minister of Public Works has started in the right direction by reducing the expenses this year—although he did not con-

trol the entire expenses—to $18,000, and possibly next year it may be less. Hon. gentlemen opposite should feel ashamed of their own record. They do not look back upon it, because if they did, they would hesitate before making this attack.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend should be ashamed to read a part of the figures and not the whole. He read the figures of some of the years when the Liberal-Conservative Government was in office, and he was able sometimes to raise the figure to $39,000 and then would get it down to $31,000, and finally got it down to $19,000. But when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power let us see what they did. Their expenditure on Rideau Hall was as follows :—

1874	$56,017
1875	45,027
1876	42,031
1877	41,466
1878	44,602

Last year we spent $13,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $18,037.

Mr. FOSTER. Last year we spent, according to the Auditor General's report, $13,000 plus $8,000, the stated sum for fuel, making $21,000. The hon. member for Wellington says that the Minister of Public Works is commencing right by reducing that to $26,000. He read the figures before 1892 but he did not read those after 1892, because they would have upset my hon. friend, and in his present delicate condition, we quite understand he did not want to upset himself.

The PRIME MINISTER. We have now spent some five hours in discussing the motion of the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McInerney). I submit that if anything more is to be said on this question, it will not enlighten the House. Let me just say a word in reply to the motion of my hon. friend, and I want, in the fairest way possible, to appeal to the common sense and fairness of the House. The hon. Minister of Public Works has asked for a vote of $18,000 for the repairs to Rideau Hall, and the hon. member for Kent proposes to reduce that by $3,000, because the average expenditure during the last five years has been about $15,000. The moment he speaks of average expenditure, my hon. friend admits that in some years the expenditure was more and in others less. If he found that the average expenditure of this Government was greater than $15,000, he might have some good reason to attack us. But he has no reason to attack us for the expenditure of one year on the ground that it exceeds the average of a number of years. This year there is good reason why we should vote this amount. Every one who has been at Rideau Hall knows that the building is in a most dilapidated condition. The outside of it is in a very poor condition. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) did something. He placed curtains on the windows of the hall, and to my certain knowledge they have been there since 1879. If these curtains are replaced, there is surely no extravagance in that. Let us glance through the items and see whether the improvements are judicious or not. But surely this vote cannot be condemned on the basis of an average expenditure.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am the last man in this House who would be disposed to question the propriety of any sufficient provision being made for Rideau Hall, but I draw my hon. friend's attention to the fact that he seems to be labouring under the delusion that the vote is for this year instead of for next year, and I feel bound to enter my protest against this increased expenditure. The fact has been stated by the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) in the clearest manner that, during the regime of the Liberal party, the expenditure in connection with Government House was greatly augmented. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite have for eighteen years been attacking the Government of the day for their expenditure in connection with Rideau Hall, and I hold that it is hon. gentlemen themselves who are primarily responsible for those figures. There is no hon. gentleman in this House, who has had any experience on the Treasury-benches, who does not know that it is impossible to avoid falling necessarily into the channel which was created by our predecessors. If the expenditure was increased by our predecessors, it is almost impossible for the incumbents of the Treasury-benches to reduce that expenditure. I put it to the judgment of hon. gentlemen who have had anything to do with the administration of public affairs whether, especially with regard to such an expenditure as this, it is not of the utmost importance to prevent any unnecessary increase, not merely because of the waste involved in that unnecessary expenditure, but for the additional reason that it entails larger expenditures for the future. The Liberal party of this country are responsible for an enormous amount of public money expended in connection with Rideau Hall, because of the additions they made to this item during the time they were in office from 1873 to 1878. The public accounts demonstrate clearly that during that time the expenditures in connection with Government House were enormously swollen. I am the more surprised that the advent of this present Government should be marked by the same misfortune that happened when the Liberal party was in power before, because, when I look across at the Treasury benches, whom do I see? I see not only gentlemen who like their friends behind them, have been denouncing the expenditure in connection with Rideau Hall, but I find two gentlemen who have had experience in connection with the expendi-

ture for other representatives of Her Majesty. I find the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) the late Prime Minister of the province of New Brunswick. Should not that hon. gentleman explain to this House why he, in the discharge of his duties, as Premier of the province, cut down the expenditure upon Government House to such an extent as to provide nothing even for necessary repairs, so that the Governor of the province was absolutely driven out of the house? I see also the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton). How can he reconcile the present vote with the fact that the Government of which he was a member in the province of Manitoba cut down the established expenditure in connection with the Government House in Manitoba and threw upon the Governor large expenditures which were absolutely necessary to protect the building, to heat it, and to make it habitable, expenditures formerly borne by the Government. How can these hon. gentlemen reconcile the niggardly manner in which they acted in provincial affairs, depriving the Governors of the several provinces of the rights and privileges that had been accorded to their predecessors with their coming here and forming again a Liberal Government and marking their advent to power by a proceeding which increases this expenditure over what it was before.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend (Mr. McInerney) has shown you what the expenditure was, and has shown there is a large increase. Why should this increased expenditure be entailed upon the people of this country? Is there any necessity for it? Is there any demand for it? Why should this Government maintain an army of servants and gardeners and employees——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman had better hear me out; he had better let me finish my sentence. Why should an army of gardeners and servants be employed in connection with Rideau Hall, when we know that it is not for the benefit or interest of the Governor General and his family? This expenditure is utter waste, because the Governor General and his family spend the summer a thousand miles from Rideau Hall. The money expended is absolutely lost, so far as the Governor General is concerned. Why, Sir, the public business of this country has suffered again and again through the absence of the Governor General from the seat of Government, while this army of servants and employees are wasting the public money in keeping up an establishment and beautifying grounds that nobody visits and nobody sees. In my judgment, the House would not be justified in starting out again upon the increased expenditure which marked the regime of the Liberal party before, and which, when entered upon, can hardly be discontinued. The hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) says he has looked into this question and finds this expenditure necessary. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) lays the flattering unction to his soul that it is only necessary to give the Minister of Public Works time to investigate all the economies that can be made and all will be right. Did he hear the Minister of Public Works say that he is not in the position the hon. gentleman supposes, that he has ascertained that this expenditure is necessary, and that it is the least figure he is prepared to take to carry out this service? I do hope, as it has been shown conclusively that this is a largely increased expenditure, that the hon. Minister will withdraw this increase and will allow this vote to be reduced by $3,000, as an earnest of a determination on the part of this Government not to indulge in unnecessary increased expenditure in connection with Government House.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I always like to agree with hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) the House will observe, was good enough to say that any Government succeeding another Government were more or less compelled to tread in the footsteps of their predecessors, and that if those predecessors spent a large amount of money, it was hard for those coming in to retrench. I propose to apply that rule. The House knows that the hon. gentleman and his colleagues were in office in 1873, and he will not deny that besides that they prepared the Estimates for 1874. In 1873 the total expenses of Rideau Hall were $62,838. Consequently my hon. friend, the late lamented Alexander Mackenzie, was unable to retrench as he would liked to have done, and was obliged to spend some $56,000 in the immediately succeding year, for which the estimates were prepared by his predecessors and during a large part of which they were in office. Then he asked for $45,000, and he reduced the expenditure to $44,000 by 1878. Immediately afterwards in 1879 the expenditures rose to $61,961. My hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) beside me will no doubt explain fully the reasons why he requires $18,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have only one word to add. I am sure that my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) has no intention of deceiving the House. But, when he says that I am entering upon a regime of increased expenditure under this item, he is not quite right. Let him look at the figures for the last two years. In 1895 the amount on Rideau Hall under this item was $17,997—or within $3 of $18,-

000. In 1896 the amount actually spent was $13,861. But, as I said, there was an amount of $4,470 of unpaid accounts for the same year, which brings up the expenditure to $18,631.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What are the unpaid accounts for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is $4,470 for linen delivered in January, 1896. As I said, this is a great expenditure—$18,037. I pledge myself that next year I will go more carefully into the accounts, and if I can bring down the expenditure, I will be only too glad to do so. But I have found such a state of things in Rideau Hall that I would not feel justified in allowing them to remain as they are. The House, the stables, and everything were and are still to-day in a dilapidated condition.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. gentleman intend to bring down a supplementary Estimate for the $4,000 that he mentions ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. I cannot do otherwise.

Mr. MOORE. I do not desire to take up much time of the House on this occasion. but as the varicus heads of departments are asking for appropriations, I feel that I must express my views with regard to what I consider to be an undue expenditure in this branch of the public service. Although I would prefer that others with greater parliamentary experience should perform this important function. I have no desire to embarrass or obstruct the Government or the Ministers in making——

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. I remind the hon. gentleman that he has no right to read his speech.

Mr. MOORE. As many hon. members on both sides of the House have spoken on this question, I feel that in justice to myself, and in justice to my constiuents, I should also put my views upon record upon this important subject. It is not my intention to criticise the present Government and Ministers, or to criticise the old Government. I do not consider it to be a sufficient excuse for the Minister of Public Works to say that the old Government were equally as extravagant as some of us deem that the present Government is in connection with this matter. I believe that I have sufficient evidence to prove that the old Government was extravagant in those matters, and we are looking for better treatment at the hands of the new Ministers who have pledged themselves to economy and retrenchment in every department of the public service. I have some figures here which I will ask the hon. gentleman to allow me to present to this House, as evidence of my contention that the expenditures in the past twenty years have been greater in this department than they ought to have been, and it is not sufficient for the Minister of Public Works to prove that he is equally as economical as the late Ministers were. It is a very difficult matter to understand whether sufficient economy has been practiced in this department. I am not going to undertake to analyse the figures which have been presented by both sides of this House, in order to come to a conclusion ; but when we take into consideration and compare the expenditures which are being made in the United States and in Canada on similar departments, we can then come to some conclusion as to whether a fair degree of economy is being practised in respect to the expenditure at Rideau Hall. The population of the United States is estimated to be about 70,000,000 ; while the population of Canada is only about 5,000,000. The expenditures in the United States in 1897 are $472,293,121. The Estimates of Canada for this year are $45,000,000.

The PRIME MINISTER. I must rise to a point of order. I would be very sorry indeed not to allow my hon. friend to deliver the speech which he has evidently prepared upon the subject of the expenditure on public works ; but at this time of night when we are within a few minutes of midnight, I would suggest to my hon. friend and to the Chair that the speech which he is now delivering is not germane to the question. The speech which my hon. friend is delivering deals with the comparative expenditure upon public works generally, whereas the question before the House is the expenditure on Rideau Hall. If my hon. friend will discuss the expenditure on Rideau Hall, he will be within his rights, but if he enlarges that discussion so as to include the whole expenditure upon public works, I submit that he is out of order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I rise to the question of order. I put it to my hon. friend the leader of the House whether he can raise this question when the discussion on this item, as conducted by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, has already taken a far wider range than my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Moore) is now taking. He is presenting a perfectly legitimate argument in relation to the public expenditure of Canada, and comparing it with the expenditure in another country on a precisely similar department. No doubt it is very desirable to keep as closely as possible to the question, but, under the circumstances I do not think that my hon. friend can be shut off from making his argument.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the point of order is well taken, and the hon. gentleman should confine his remarks to the item of $18,000 under consideration.

Mr. MOORE. I was about to make a comparison between the expenditure on Rideau Hall and the expenditure on the White House at Washington, and I think that is a perfectly germane argument.

I find from the public accounts that the total expenditures on Rideau Hall, including the salary of the incumbent, are as follows:—Governor General's salary, $48,666.66; secretaries' offices, as per Estimate, $11,150; improvements, repairs, and maintenance of Rideau Hall, $18,000, according to the Estimates now asked for. Allowance for fuel and light, $8,000; removal of snow and for water, as Rideau Hall's proportion of the whole Estimate, $6,000. These expenditures show an annual charge upon the people of Canada of $91,816.16. I will now make a statement of the cost incurred for similar services at the White House at Washington. The President of the United States receives $50,000 a year. His secretary receives $3,500, an assistant $2,500, two executive clerks $2,300 each, one steward $2,000, one messenger $1,200. The total expenditure is $63,800. This is the total expenditure incurred for the President of a great nation of over 70,000,000 of people, and it is $28,000 less than is incurred for a similar purpose in Canada. While the salary of the noble lord who represents our gracious Sovereign in this country has been fixed by the Imperial Government, so that we do not desire to meddle with it, I think it is only reasonable that we should endeavour to cut down as much as possible the expenses in connection with the maintenance and repairs of Rideau Hall. I have been somewhat surprised at hon. gentlemen accusing members on this side of the House almost of disloyalty if we do not accept this item, but I consider that the noble Queen of England would consider us more loyal if we should seek to reduce this expenditure instead of taxing poor people to pay extravagant amounts for services of this kind. Holding these views, I shall vote for the amendment moved by the hon. member for Kent.

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister of Public Works stated that in addition to the expenditure of $13.000 odd, there was an amount of $4,000 required. Did I understand the Minister correctly to say that this amount of $4,000 had been paid?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The officers of the department tell me that besides the amount of $13.851, there was an amount of $4.470 of unpaid accounts. That sum we have paid out of this year's expenditure, and for which of course we shall have to bring down Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. HAGGART. Then, the hon. Minister, out of this vote, has paid $4.000 odd, and he intends to ask a Supplementary Estimate to cover it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. POPE. It is some time since I have had the pleasure of being in this House, and I anticipated that broader questions would be discussed than an item connected with the maintenance of the Governor General's house and small expenditures of that kind. In days gone by, when I had the pleasure of sitting on the other side of the House, we were quite accustomed to treats of this sort from this side of the House. I certainly never sympathized with the remarks of the Opposition of that day with respect to these small items, and I must say I have not changed my opinion, and I cannot sympathize with hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who have occupied five or six hours in discussing an item so small as this. While I do not wish for extravagant management, and while I am prepared to support the Government on all questions when I believe the true interests of Canada are involved, I believe it is in the interest of this Dominion that the residence of the Governor General should make the very best possible appearance, and I think a very poor appearance it presents. As regards this amount of $3,000 or $4,000, I think it is very poor economy, I think it is very bad policy on the part of the Conservative party, looking back on its old record, on its old reputation, and on the great events brought about through the exertions of that party, to say that we have no broader issue to discuss than an item of this kind. I sincerely regret having to criticise the course taken by hon. gentlemen with whom I have acted on many occasions, and with whom on all occasions I hope to be able to act and vote, but on this special occasion I shall have to vote against the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Kent.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). I desire to obtain some information, as I was not in the House when this discussion arose. I have every respect for Her Majesty's representative in this country. I am willing that everything that is just shall be granted to Rideau Hall; but at the same time it must be remembered that the hon. Premier stated that the building is in a dilapidated state, and the last speaker said it was in a very poor condition. It must be remembered that over $1,000,000 has been expended on this building in sums of $40,000, $50,000 or $60,000 a year. If we are going to continue to expend similar sums on that building, it would be more economical to erect a new building. The amount has been reduced during the last two or three years, and I should like to know how the increase of $4,000 for this year arises. The Minister of Public Works has stated that $4,700 was paid for linen. This sum for linen in one year will be considered by the Patrons as a large amount for one item. However, I am not going to speak of the Patrons. Their record is well known. I cannot understand how a Patron can vote against the amendment, when one of the planks of the Patron platform is reduction of expenses for Govern-

ment House. I understand the Minister proposes to bring in a Supplementary Estimate for $4,700, and this will bring the total up to $22,700 or about $8,700 more than last year; and I should like the Minister to explain how that sum of $4,000 arises. I have every respect and loyalty for Her Majesty's representative in this country, and I believe it is due to him that the people of Canada should act generously and liberally; but it is also due to the taxpayers of this country that extravagance of this kind shall be no longer continued.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). I have asked the Minister why this additional $4,000 over and above the estimate of last year is placed in the Estimates, when he has told us he is going to bring down $4,700 more in the Supplementary Estimates.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have already explained that I am asking the $18,000 for next year, and that it does not cover the amount of $4,000.

Mr. WALLACE. The explanation of the Minister of Public Works as to the expenditure of that $18,000 will not be satisfactory to this House or to the country. Nor will his explanation—or his two or three different explanations—of the other over expenditure of the $4,770 in 1895-96 be found satisfactory either. He has told us that this amount was over-paid, but I can tell him that if that sum expended in 1895-96 was taken from the appropriation that Parliament voted last year for 1896-97, then the Minister of Public Works has unlawfully and illegally diverted $4,700 for a purpose he had no right to appropriate it for. He had no right to take one dollar of that $14,100 that was voted last year for the expenditure of 1896-97, and apply it to the expenditure of 1895-96. It was an illegal act on his part. Apparently he did not know anything about it this afternoon, because in the earlier stages of the debate he told us one story, and then he said he consulted some one, and came here with an entirely different story. If that $4,700 indebtedness was incurred in 1895-96, it was the duty of the Minister, to have come to the Parliament of Canada last session, and asked for a further estimate for 1895-96, because he states that this expenditure was in that year. He tells us to-night that he is gong to ask this amount in Supplementary Estimates. He cannot ask for Supplementary Estimates for 1895-96, because the accounts of that year are completed, and I see by the Public Accounts of Canada for the fiscal year ending the 30th June, 1896, that there was expended for Rideau Hall $13,861, and for fuel and light at Rideau Hall $8,000 additional. We have the very interesting fact before the House, that for the six years from 1887 to 1892, the average expenditure for the maintenance of Rideau Hall—leaving out the $8,000 for fuel—was $15,260 per annum, and that the average expenditure for the next five years from 1892 to 1896 inclusive, was $14,370, or about $1,000 a year less for the last five years than for the preceding six years. This shows that the expenditure on Rideau Hall had been gradually decreasing under the Conservative Government, and if we compare it with the years previous to that we will find a very large decrease indeed. What are we asked to do to-night? We are asked to expend $18,000 for the coming fiscal year, and as the Minister has told us that he will ask for $4,770 additional, that will make an expenditure of $22,000 next year as compared with $14,300, the average for the last five years, or an increase of $8,000 a year. In my opinion this is a very largely increased and unwarranted expenditure of public money. I do not think there can be any justification for this increase. We have been liberal and more than liberal with the expenditures on Rideau Hall in the past. The Parliament of Canada has voted an average of $14,000 and $15,000 a year for the last eleven years, and in addition to that $8,000 for fuel and light, and a sum estimated at $6,000 for water and other supplies for the establishment. The Minister of Public Works is in the habit of telling us that our public works are going to decay, and that he is obliged to spend large amounts on locks, and canals, and wharfs and piers. His cry is, that he is going to bring everything into a fine state of repair. Well, Sir, we know that $4,000 was expended in one year for painting Rideau Hall, and surely it should not require another $4,000 for painting in the following year. We are now told that this $4,700 is for linen for the establishment. We vote £10,000 sterling per annum or $48,600 for the salary of the Governor General, and I am sure that this House votes that amount loyally and cheerfully for the salary of the Governor General who is the connecting link, as it were, between Canada and the Empire. We vote, besides, thousands of dollars for the maintenance of that establishment, and I think the Governor General should be fairly called upon to expend some of his own salary for items which the Parliament of Canada is constantly called upon to pay in addition to the salary. A statement has been read by an hon. member showing the salary of the Governor General, $48,600, the expenses of the office, $11,150, the amount asked for here, $18,000, fuel, $8,000, water and other supplies, $6,000, making the total $91,000. My opinion is that that amount is entirely too large, that the Parliament of Canada should not be asked to vote it, especially by these hon. gentlemen who have lifted up their voices long, loudly and eloquently in denunciation of these expenditures, and of even smaller expenditures in connection with Rideau Hall. We have waited this even-

ing to hear the Minister of Public Works give some details of this proposed expenditure of $18,000, and we have not yet heard him do so. We know that there is $8,000. for fuel, and about $6,000 for water and other supplies, but we want the Minister to give us in detail the items of this proposed expenditure, which we must have before we can pass this vote understandingly.

Mr. McMULLEN. If my hon. friend from West York had not the assurance of a bronze statue, he would not get up and make the statement he has just made. The history of hon. gentlemen opposite from 1880 to 1892 proves that they spent very much in excess of what the Minister of Public Works now asks for. The hon. gentleman has given figures to the House with regard to the expenses of the last five years. If he had turned up the Auditor General's Report, he would have found that the Government which he supported spent in 1892, $23,238.42, in 1893, $18,011.03, in 1894 $23,238.42, in 1895, $23,912.28, and in 1896, $25,970.70. And yet hon. gentlemen opposite have spent the whole night criticising the estimate of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works of $18,000. I am amazed at the hon. member for West York, who above all men in this House, declares himself at all times an uncompromising admirer of Her Majesty and everything that represents Her Majesty in this country, and who to-night in a small way criticises the expenditure on Rideau Hall, after having for eighteen years swallowed all the extravagance of the late Government. I hope he will try to cultivate a more patriotic spirit. He professes to belong to an association that is very patriotic, and I hope he will soon see new light on this question.

Mr. WALLACE. I want to point out the honesty of the hon. member for North Wellington. In comparing the figures of the years he read, he has added the $8,000 for fuel in each case, and has then compared the total with the present vote without fuel. I do not think there was ever a more dishonest attempt to mislead the House. For instance, he says that the expenditure for 1895 was $25,797. That is made up by $17,797 for the expenses, and $8,000 for fuel, and that of 1896, $21,681, is made up by $13,861 for expenses and the $8,000 for fuel added; and then he said, "We are only asking for $18,000," the very next item of the Minister of Public Works is $8,000 for fuel, which we will be asked to vote as soon as this item is voted. And the minister for North Wellington—not the minister, but the would-be minister, but it might perhaps better be said the wont-be-minister, for the hon. gentleman has for two months of this session tried, by subserviency to the members of the Government, and by his fulsome, sickening laudation of the Minister of Public Works to-day, to earn a portfolio which I do not believe he will ever get. Why does he give figures to this House that are misleading and untrue? Because they are untrue. When the hon. member for North Wellington gets up and attempts to impose upon this House with these crooked figures, I think this House can fairly ask for an apology from him, and a promise that he will never do the like again.

Mr. HENDERSON. When the hon. First Minister, a short time ago, asked that this debate be brought to a close, I was prepared to accede to his desire, but when the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) as well as the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) thought fit, after their leader had made that request, to rush into the debate, I think I may be pardoned if for a few moments I occupy the time of the House. I do not intend to parade a long array of figures, but am satisfied to take the Auditor General's Report for the year ending 30th June, 1896, where I find the expenditure on Government House, under the item we are now discussing, to be $13,861. That sum I may divide into three parts. First, for wages of carpenters, bricklayers and labourers, painters, firemen and clerk of works, $7,740; second, lumber, hardware and furniture, &c., $3,180; third, care of the grounds, $2,940. I desire to call attention to the fact that since we spent $7,740 last year in repairing Rideau Hall, no further repairs can be required this year. So much having been expended last year for repairs, is a strong argument that the large sum asked for to-night for the same purpose is not required. The hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) said he was not particular with regard to the amount because the estimate was not in excess of the average of previous years. I beg to draw his attention to the fact that hon. gentlemen on both sides—I make no distinction between Patrons and Liberals and Conservatives—were elected on the line of economy. Every member of this House, when he went to his constituents, claimed that if returned he would favour a line of strict economy in the management of the affairs of the country, and I believe the time has come to carry out that pledge. Last year $13,861 was found sufficient for the maintenance of Rideau Hall; and having succeeded in reducing the expenditure down to that figure, we shall make a mistake now if we attempt to raise it to what it was years ago. I care not what it was twenty years ago under the regime of Mr. Mackenzie, or in later years, I say that now, after we have succeeded by continued economy in reducing the expenditure to the figure I have mentioned, without impairing in any way the dignity of Vice-Royalty, we would make a mistake if we were to go back and add thousands of dollars to that

expenditure for the years to come. Parties have changed sides, and the old Conservative party is no longer in power. But there is a party in power that has a history, and we may judge what is in store for us by the history of that party. No matter whether in the provincial legislatures or the Dominion Parliament, their record has always been on the line of extravagant expenditure. I make that broad statement, and I do not propose to give you the figures because it is patent to every member of this House. In the province of Quebec the Mercier regime is a standing record of what I say. Take the province of Nova Scotia, which was ruled over by the hon. Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), I am sure he will not get up in his place and pretend to say that he endeavoured to practice economy. He came into office with a small debt and left office with a large debt and a heavily increased annual expenditure. The same remark applies to New Brunswick. I am sure the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) will not attempt to refute what I say. In Prince Edward Island, we have the same history, and in the good province of Ontario, to-day we have not a dollar of surplus though we used to have our millions of money in the bank. Take away the $3,000,000 borrowed for railway annuities and the $2,000,000 drawn from the Dominion on account of our trust funds, and more than the entire surplus claimed by the Ontario Government is wiped out.

Mr. CASEY. I rise to a point of order. You have ruled, Sir, that we are discussing the item of expenditure on Rideau Hall, and I must ask you to rule that the financial condition of the Hardy Government in Ontario has nothing to do with that rule.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think the hon. gentleman is quite out of order, but I would ask him to confine himself as much as possible to the subject under discussion.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have no desire to transgress the rules but am quite sure the point is pertinent. The point I wish to make is, that it is the history of the Liberal party when in power, whether in the provinces or in the Dominion, to spend money freely. That being the case, and the Liberal party now being in power here, it behooves the members of this House to be guarded as to the extent to which they will allow the Government to control the money of this country. Having succeeded in bringing the expenditure for the maintenance of Rideau Hall to the small sum of $13,861, I think we ought to endeavour to keep it there. For every member of this House, I care not whether Liberal or Conservative, was elected upon a platform of economy. Not one of us came here without having declared to the people that we would endeavour to reduce the expenditure. Now, with reference to the item of $4,000 odd around which so much confusion has been thrown, I confess that I have not fully understood the explanations made. But there is one thing that seems clear from what has been stated by the Minister of Public Works, and that is that it was paid out of money in the hands of the Government since the 30th June, 1896—that it is not part of the $18,000. I understand the hon. Minister to say that a Supplementary Estimate is to be brought down to cover this amount of $4,000. Whether it is an item that we ought to pay or not, I do not know. I think that before we vote the $4,000, we ought to know who ordered the goods. But this is not the question we need debate now, because this is not a part of the sum we are voting this money for. With regard to the loyalty cry, I think that has been sufficiently dealt with. As we are voting a sum to be expended a year hence and not in the jubilee year, I think that the argument is pretty far-fetched.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Chairman,——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) has stated that the expenses for Rideau Hall last year were $13,000 odd. Now, I have here the Auditor General's Report for 1895-96, and I will read to the hon. gentleman the figures.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I ask the committee to listen quietly to the remarks of the hon. gentleman.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman will find the figures at page 3 of the Auditor General's Report. It is shown here that the expenditure under this item was $17,997. To this must be added the $8,000 for fire and light.

And a vote being taken on the amendment (Mr. McInerney) : Yeas, 50 ; nays, 100.

Amendment negatived.

Telephone Service, Public Buildings, Ottawa $4,000

Mr. FOSTER. There is an increase of $200 here. I would like to have an explanation why the system is extended.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have been obliged to increase the number of telephones.

Mr. FOSTER. Where are the increases ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I could not give the names to-night.

Mr. FOSTER. When the hon. gentleman asks us for $200 more for telephones, he must be able to tell us where they are placed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Surely my hon. friend, as one of the leaders of the House, would not insist on my giving the names and location of the additional telephones for which $200 is asked. Still, I cannot deny his right to demand it.

Mr. FOSTER. The telephone service is one that is very easily abused.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I remember now that some of the new telephones were established after the fire in the Western Block, in order to ensure better protection against fire.

Mr. FOSTER. Where were they placed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think they were for the use of some of the night watchmen. But if my hon. friend desires that item to stand over, I will consent. But I may say that I will take it upon myself to bring down the information before my estimates are closed.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman will not get all his estimates through to-night ; he might as well let this item stand.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I can explain part of that item. There are two telephones inside the Langevin Block, one between my department and some other part of the building.

Major's Hill Park, Ottawa..... $3,500

Mr. FOSTER. How is this done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. By contract for one year at a time. Tenders are asked for.

Rents of Dominion Public Buildings..... $18,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is an increase because of the fact that the Department of the Interior transferred to us all their rentals, which we have to pay now.

Mr. FOSTER. We will find the reduction in the Interior Department ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Resolutions to be reported.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.45 a.m. (Thursday).

OTTAWA : Printed by S. E. DAWSON, Printer to the Queen's most Excellent Majesty, 1897.

INDEX.

SECOND SESSION—EIGHTH PARLIAMENT, 1897.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following :—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; *, without remark or debate; Acts., Accounts; Adjn., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment; Amts., Amendments; Amalg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; B. C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C. P. R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence; Consd., Consider; Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate; Dept., Department; Depts., Departments; Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; Hse., House; H. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; m., moved; Neg., Negatived; N.B., New Brunswick; N.W.T., North-west Territories; N.S., Nova Scotia; O.C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island; P.O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Prop., Proposed; Q., Quebec; Ques., Question; Recom., Recommit; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Reps., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Rys., Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp., Special; Stmnt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary; Wthdn., Withdrawn; Wthdrl., Withdrawal; Y. N., Yeas and Nays; Names in Italic and parentheses are those of the mover.

Bain, Mr. T. W., *North Wentworth.*

Agriculture and Colonization Com., 2nd Rep. (cold storage) conc., 1899 (i).

Order, Ques. of, Newspaper quotations (remarks) 2521 (i).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 2286 (i).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 4923 (ii).

Bazinet, Mr. C., *Joliette.*

Timothy Seed and Clover, Imposition of Duty (Ques.) 793 (i).

Beattie, Mr. T., *London.*

Post Office Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 5393 (ii).

Queen's Diamond Jubilee, Can. Militia Contingent, on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 844 (i).

Ry. Passenger Tickets (B. 121) 1°, 3234 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff :

In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 3074, 3169; (Indian corn) 4444 (ii).

Beausoleil, Mr. C., *Berthier.*

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.) 4943, 4946; (Que.) 5280 (ii).

Belcourt, Mr. N. A., *Ottawa.*

American Bank Note Co.'s (B. 68) 1°*, 1373; on M. for 3°, 3285 (ii).

Can. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 35) 1°*, 914 (i).

National Museum, Erection at Ottawa (M. for Ret.) 2426 (i).

Ottawa Gas Co.'s (B. 102) 1°*, 1983 (i).

Richelieu and Lake Memphremagog Ry. Co.'s (B. 49) 1°*, 1171 (i).

Bell, Mr. J. W., *Addington.*

Ways and Means—The Tariff :

In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 3153 (ii).

Bell, Mr. A. C., *Pictou.*

Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1887 (i).

Bounties on Iron and Steel, in Com. on Res., 5190 (ii).

Controverted Elections Act Amt. (B. 96) 1°*, 1738 (i).

Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5356 (ii).

Farm Implements, &c., Abolition of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2167 (i).

Hudson Bay Expedition, Emplymt. of Sealer *Diana* (remarks), 1825 (i).

Moore, W.B., Fuel Inspector I.C.R., Dismissal (Ques.) 2121 (i).

Queen's Diamond Jubilee, Names of Militia Officers, &c. (Ques.) 3236 (ii).

Subsidies to Rys. B. 151 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5363 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Miscellaneous (Tariff inquiry) 5209 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (dredging) 2784; (N.S.) 2729 (ii).

Railways—Capital: I.C.R., 3836; (rolling stock) 5338 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff :

In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 2930; (iron or steel, scrap) 3610; (coal, bituminous) 4197 (ii),

Bennett, Mr. W. H., *East Simcoe.*
Address, on The, 409 (i).
Alien Labour Restriction B. 5 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 636 (i).
American Bank Note Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in M. for 3°, 3289, 3461 (ii).
Anderson, Geo., Appnmt. as Agent to Japan (Ques.) 3339 (ii).
Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1854 (i).
Challenger, Dredge, Work done at Midland (Ques.) 260 (i).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4583 (ii).
Export Duty on Logs, par in Midland *Free Press* (remarks) 4105 (ii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 870 (i).
Jones, County Court Judge, Resignation and Gratuity (Ques.) 2882 (ii).
——— (M. for Cor.) 3537 (ii).
Owen Sound and Collingwood Harbour, Expenditure (Ques.) 796 (i).
Penetanguishene Customs Collector, Vacancy (Ques.) 261 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 4503 (ii).
——— Mail Contracts, in Com. of Sup., 5103 (ii).
Ry. Return Fare Tickets B. 11 (Mr. *McLennan, Glengarry*) on M. for 2°, 699 (i).
Returns (inquiry) 4122 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (Trent Valley) 4825, 5126 (ii).
Civil Government: Indian Dept., 1714. Inland Revenue, 1921. Post Office Dept., 1723 (i); (technical services) 5102 (ii).
Customs—Collection of Revenues: Customs (preventive service) 5052. Post Office (mail service) 5077 (ii).
Immigration (agents' salaries) 2812 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Investigating charges, N.W.T.) 5221 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Buildings (western deptl. block) 4893. *Income:* Buildings (N.S) 4903 (ii): (Ont.) 2579; (Rideau Hall) 2593, 2622 (i). Harbours and Rivers (Collingwood Harbour) 2758; (Ont.) 2974, 2778; (Rimouski pier) 4964 (ii).
Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1501 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 3029, 3036, 3162; Res. 17 (combine clause) 3314 (ii).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., *Beauharnois.*
Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1895 (i).
Beauharnois Canal, Collector A. D. Danis (Ques.) 925 (i).
——— Collector of Tolls, Appnmt., &c. (M. for O.C.) 1663 (i).
——— Dismissal of Lockmen (Ques.) 1743 (i).
——— Postmaster and County Election (Ques.) 268 (i).
——— Appnmt. (Ques.) 572 (i).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*
Beauharnois Canal, Dismissal of Alexis Doutre (M. for Cor., &c.) 836 (i).
Bibaud, Azarie, Emplymt. in House of Commons (Ques.) 3509 (ii).
Brodeur, S. A., Collector of Tolls, &c. (Ques.) 2419 (i).
Conservative Newspapers, Postal Delivery (Ques.) 918 (i).
Convicts Liberated, Sentences Commuted, &c. (M. for Ret.), 546 (i).
Danis, A. D., Contributions to Pension Fund (Ques.) 2421 (i).
Dismissals from Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fairlie) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2317 (i).
Excise Collections by A. D. Danis, Valleyfield (Ques.) 2422 (i)
Gill Nets and Seines, New Regulations, &c., Montreal District (remarks) 4372 (ii).
Mercier, Wilfrid, Appnmt. as Commissioner (Ques.) 917 (i).
——— Investigation at Post Office, Valleyfield (M. for Ret.*) 2448 (i).
Montreal Inland Revenue, Cost of Collection, &c. (Ques.) 3057 (ii).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 114 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 4115 (ii).
Provincial Courts Judges Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4724 (ii).
Soulanges Canal, Appnmt. of Arbitrators (Ques.) 1540 (i).
Speaker, Dep., and Elections (Personal Explanation) 2218 (i).
Subsidies to Rys. B. 151 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5506 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c.: (N.W.T. Exhibition) 4860.
Canals—Capital: Beauharnois, 5271; Trent Valley (construction) 5129. *Income:* Beauharnois (damages) 5131 (ii).
Civil Government: Indian Affairs (Sec.'s salary) 4828. Interior Dept. (salaries) 4838. Justice (salaries) 4834 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Que) 2553 (i); (preventive service) 5004, 5045, 5051 (ii). Excise (preventive service) 2500; (travelling, &c.) 2508 (i). Post Office (mail service) 5071. Railways (Baie de Chaleurs) 5135 (ii).
Government of N.W.T. (schools, subsidies, &c.) 5002 (ii).
Immigration (agents' salaries) 4036, 4053; (general expenses) 4067 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (sessional indemnity) 4846 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Port Mulgrave, &c., and Port Hood) 4999; (Quebec and Gaspé Basin) 4996 (ii).
Militia (Jubilee contingent) 4994; (Royal Military College) 4816 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Commissions of investigation) 5236; (gratuities, Interior Dept.) 5001; (repatriation of Canadians from Brazil) 4861; (Tariff inquiry) 5207 (ii).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Penitentiaries: Kingston (Commissioners' Rep.) 4740, 4792; (payments to Commissioners) 4801 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Buildings (electric lighting, Ottawa) 4899; (western deptl. block, fire) 4896 *Income:* Buildings (N.S.) 4901; (grounds, Ottawa, &c.) 4943; (Rideau Hall) 2566; (Alexandria Reformatory) 4949; (Rat Portage) 5285 (ii); (Ont.) 2568; (Que.) 2577 (i). Harbours and Rivers, (Ont. Fort Francis Locks) 4970; (Que.) 4958; (Gatineau River) 4959; (Rimouski) 4953 (ii).
Miscellaneous (clerical assistance) 4892 (ii).
Valleyfield Collector of Customs, Appnmt. (Ques.) 926 (i).
——— Mail Service, Delay in Transit (Ques.) 1743 (i).
——— Postmaster Appnmt., &c. (Ques.) 2566 (i).
——— Appnmt. of E. Dion (Ques.) 418 (i).
Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Co.'s B. 118 (Mr. *Morrison*) on Sen. Amts., 5226 (ii).

Bethune, Mr. J. L., *Victoria, N.S.*
I.C.R., Iona Station Restaurant (Ques.) 1739 (i).
Iona Wharf, Victoria Co., Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 489, 921, 1740, (i).
North Harbour, Aspey Bay, Harbour of Refuge (M. for Cor.*) 2445 (ii).
North River, St. Anns, Building of Wharf (Ques.) 1740 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 2720 (ii).

Blair, Hon. A. G. (Minister of Railways and Canals) *Sunbury and Queen's.*
Amqui Municipality, Reimbursement for Ry. Crossing (Ans.) 1541 (i).
Ault, Mr. E., Dismissal by Govt. (Ans.) 2879 (ii).
Baie des Chaleurs Ry., Govt. Control (Ans.) 261.
Beauharnois Canal, Collector A. D. Danis (Ans.) 925 (i).
——— Dismissal of Lockmen (Ans.) 1743 (i).
Brodeur, S. A., Collector of Tolls (Ans.) 2419 (i).
Business of the Hse. (remarks) 5286 (ii).
Canal Contracts, Deposits on Tenders (Ans.) 1026 (i).
C.P.R. Rates and Tolls, West of Toronto (Ans.) 4204 (ii).
——— Abrogation of Article in Contract (Ans.) 97 (i).
——— Transport of Grain from N.W.T. and Man., 1891 to 1897 (Ans.) 3509, 3670 (ii.)
Chambly Canal, Expenditure on Culvert (Ans.) 1028 (i).
——— Tenders for Stone (Ans.) 1028 (i).
Chateauguay and Northern Ry., Rivière des Prairies Bridge (Ans.) 567 (i).
Cornwall and Beauharnois Canals, Cost of Breaks in 1894-95 (Ans. 2425 (i).
——— and Soulanges Canals, Dimensions and Contractors (Ans.) 2411 (i).
——— Dismissal of Employees (Ans.) 2564 (i).

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Con.*
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. and C.P.R., Construction (Ans.) 568 (i).
——— Plans deposited by C.P.R. (Ans.) 267 (i).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. (B. 146) Com. on Res. (m.) 3870; in Com. on Res., 4512; in Com., on B., 5164, 5338, 5346 (ii).
Danis, A. D., Contributions to Pension Fund 2421 (i).
Dismissals, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4013 (ii).
Dom. Safe Deposit and Trust Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. *Gibson*) on M. for 2°, 2778.
Drummond Co. Ry. and G.T.R., in Com. of Sup., 5080 (ii).
——— *See* "I.C.R. Extension."
Export Duty on Logs, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 4708 (ii).
G. T. Ry. and Dom. Govt. and reported Grant of $300,000, on M. to adjourn Hse. (remarks) 577.
I.C.R. Extension to Montreal (remarks) 1546 (i).
——— Par. in Speech from Throne (remarks) 2657 (ii).
——— Drummond Co. Ry. and G. T. R. (Rep. presented) 4202 (ii).
——— Agreement (B. 142) Com. on Res. (M.) 4258; agreed to (Y. 91, N. 47) 4340; in Com., 4344-4394; 1°, 4477: 2° m., 4612; 3° m., 4654 (ii).
——— Bicycles as Baggage (remarks) 2743 (ii).
——— McDonald, A. R., General Inspector, Appnmt. (Ans.) 1078 (i).
——— Dismissals, McLean, James, Foreman Carpenter (Ans.) 212 (i).
——— Pierre Begin, Section man (Ans.) 1638 (i).
——— Eugène Blanchet, Section Foreman (Ans.) 1082, 1639 (i).
——— Moore, W. B., Fuel Inspector (Ans.) 1541 2121 (i).
——— Employees Dismissed at Antigonish (Ans.) 2565 (i).
——— at Rimouski (Ans.) 2566 (i).
——— Dismissals (Ret. presented), 4203 (ii).
——— St. Charles' Stationmaster (Ans.) 1540 (i).
——— Iona Station Restaurant (Ans.) 1739 (i).
——— New Time Table (remarks) 3242 (ii).
James Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. *Lount*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 2609 (i).
Lachine Canal, Michael Behan's Dismissal (Ans.) 2565 (i).
——— Dame David's Dismissal (Ans.) 3338 (ii).
——— Employees Dismissed (Ans.) 923, 2410 (i).
——— Michael Enright's Dismissal (Ans.) 2564.
Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 2164; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 2602; in Com., 2603 (i).
Medicine Hat Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 56 (Mr. *Lount*) 3° m. (Amt.) 2610 (i).
McArthur, Wm., Fenelon Falls, Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1639 (i).
N. S. Central Ry., Balance of Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 3868 (ii).

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Con.*

Otonabee, Dredge, Dismissal of Engineer (Ans.) 259.

Point Tupper (C.B.) Station Agent, Appnmt. (Ans.) 788 (i).

Pontiac County, Drowned Lands, Claims unsettled, &c. (Ans.) 3869 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 5402 (ii).

Quebec Oriental Ry. Subsidy (Ans.) 919 (i).

Ry. Act Amt. (Bicycles as Baggage) B. 16 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2°, 1797 (i).

Rys. and Canals, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 492 (i).

Restigouche and Victoria Ry. Co.'s B. 99 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) on M. for 3°, 2454 (i).

Restigouche Ry. and Bridge Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. *Domville*) on M. for 2°, 2777 (ii).

Robertson, Mr. A. B., Dismissal (Ans.) 2879 (ii).

St. Lawrence River Canals, Improvements (Ans.) 2423 (i).

St. Peter's Canal, Daniel B. Stone's Dismissal (Ans.) 2414 (i).

Soulanges Canal (Sections 4, 5, 6, 7) Tenders (Ans.) 341; Contracts (Ans.) 488 (i).

——— Appnmt. of Arbitrators (Ans.) 1540 (i).

——— Section 12, Contract (Ans.) 489 (i).

South Shore Ry. Co., Govt. Aid (Ans.) 671 (i).

Stanley Bridge and P. E. I. Ry., Pets. *re* Construction (Ans.) 2882 (ii).

Subsidies (Dom.) to Rys., &c. (remarks) 269 (i).

Subsidies to Rys. (prop. Res.) 4736, 5117; in Com., 5362; (B. 151) 1°*, 5529; in Com. on Res., 5479, 5511, 5535 (ii).

——— Strathroy and Western Counties, in Com. on Res., 5519 (ii).

——— Joliette and St. Jean de Matha, in Com. on Res. (Amt.) 5513 (ii).

——— Sunny Brae, &c., in Com. on Res., 5521 (ii).

——— G.T.R., Victoria Bridge, in Com. on Res., 5526 (ii).

——— Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa, in Com. on Res., 5512 (ii).

——— Pembroke Southern Ry., in Com. on Res., 5516 (ii).

——— Campbellton, N.B., in Com. on Res., (Amt.) 5513 (ii).

——— Ottawa and New York, in Com. on Res., 5512 (ii).

Sunny Brae (N.S.) Ry., Govt. Aid, Construction (Ans.) 1542 (i).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Capital: Beauharnois, 5270; Cornwall (enlargement) 3862, 5115; Galops, 3862; Grenville, 3876, 3922; Lachine, 3875, 4823, 4892; (enlargement) 5113; North Channel, 3862; River Reaches, 3862; St. Pierre River, 5150; Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 3874, 5118; Soulanges (construction) 3961, (contractors' claims) 5124; Trent Valley, 3863, 4825, 5127. *Income:* (Beauharnois (damages) 5131, 5275; St. Peter's (repairs) 5274. (ii).

Civil Government: Railways and Canals, 1928 (i), (contingencies) 4830 (ii).

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Collection of Revenues: Canals (Williamsburg) retiring allowance to Mr. Hickey, 5266. Railways (Baie des Chaleurs) 5133 (ii).

Miscellaneous (investigating charges, N. W. T.) 5215 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Montmagny P. O.) 5282 (ii).

Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Dartmouth branch) 5114; (extension to Montreal) 3746, 3800; (land damages) 5422; (rolling stock) 5269, 5288, 5338; 3onc., 5477. P. E. I. Ry., 3854 (ii). *Income:* I. C. R. (expenses of commissions) 5254; P. E. I. Ry. (compassionate allowance) 5276 (ii).

Trent Valley Canal, Balsam Lake Section, Dismissal of Timber Inspector (Ans.) 260 (i).

——— Rosedale Works, Dismissal of Foreman (Ans.) 259 (i).

Victoria Bridge, Montreal, O. C. *re* Govt. Aid (Ans.) 489 (i).

Welland Canal, Dismissals (Ans.) 2122 (i).

Williamsburg Canal, W. J. Casselman's Dismissal (Ans.) 2415 (i).

Winnipeg, Duluth and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 17 (Mr. *Macdonell*) on M. for 3°, 2449 (i).

Boisvert, Mr. F., *Nicolet.*

Great Eastern Ry. Co.'s (B. 92) 1°*, 1666 (i).

I.C.R. Extension to Montreal, Cor. with G.T.R., &c. (M. for copy*) 2446 (i).

Montreal Bridge Co.'s (B. 90) 1°*, 1666 (i).

Nicolet River Breakwater, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 671 (i).

South Shore Ry. Co., Govt. Aid (Ques.) 671 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L., *Halifax.*

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. 33 (Mr. *Osler*) in Com., 2342 (i).

I.C.R. Extension to Montreal (G.T.R. and Drummond Co. Ry.) B. 142 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4355 (ii).

O'Brien, Wm., Dismissal from Str. *Lansdowne* (Ques.) 4008 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 5379, 5391 (ii).

Stewart, J. S., Postmaster, Upper Musquodoboit Dismissal (Ques.) 1542 (i).

Subsidies to Rys. (Port Hawkesbury and Port Hood) in Com. on Res., 5522 (ii).

Sunny Brae Ry., Govt. Aid (Ques.) 1542 (i).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice (travelling expenses) 4842; (Supreme Court) 4986 (ii).

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 2279 (i).

Canals—Capital: Grenville (dismissals) 3957 (ii).

Collection of Revenues: Railways (Baie des Chaleurs) 5137; (I.C.R., commissions of investigation) 5261. Weights and Measures (salaries) 2534 (ii).

Immigration (agents' salaries) 2824 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (Algoma election expenses) 4988; (room accommodation) 4852 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Newfoundland) 4994 (ii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Penitentiaries (gratuities, retiring officials) 4987 (ii)
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (dredging) 2782; (Ont.) 4969; (P.E.I.) 4981 (ii).
Quarantine (salaries and contingencies) 2245 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (extension to Montreal) 3823 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 2888; (skates, &c.) 4152 (ii).

Bostock, Mr. H., *Yale and Cariboo.*
B. C. Southern Ry. Disallowance of Provincial Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 518 (i).
Columbia River Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 87) 1°*, 1539 (i).
Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 93) 1°*, 1666.
——— Return of Fees (M.) 4651 (ii).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4553 (ii).
Kaslo and Lardo-Duncan Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 73) 1°*, 1373 (i).
McNab, Fisher, Inspector, Instructions from Govt. (Ques.) 3058 (ii).
Subsidies to Rys. B. 151 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5504 (ii).
Telegraph Lines in B.C., Govt. and C.P.R. (Ques.) 2567 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (mutton, &c.) 3391 (ii).

Bourassa, Mr. J. H. N., *Labelle.*
Ottawa and Gatineau Ry. Co.'s (B. 100) 1°*, 2473.
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Little Rapids Locks) conc., 5444 (ii).

Britton, Mr. B. M, *Kingston.*
Address, on The, 469 (i).
Alien Labour Restriction B. 5 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 3552 (ii).
Business of the Hse, on M. to adjn. for Queen's Birthday, 2740 (ii).
Coasting Laws of Can. and U.S. (M. for Cor.) 3525 (ii).
Criminal Code (seduction and abduction) B. 13 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. to conc. in Amts., 3542.
Dom. Portland Cement Co.'s incorp. (B. 79) 1°*, 1538 (i).
Drainage across Ry. Lands B. 14 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2°, 1070 (i).
I.C.R. Extension to Montreal, in Com., on Res., 4386 (ii).
Interest Act Amt. B. 134 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4255 (ii).
Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s (B. 38) 1°*, 950 (i).
Methodist Trust Fire Ins. Co.'s incorp. (B. 23) 1°*, 707 (i).

Britton, Mr. B. M.—*Con.*
Subsidies to Rys. B. 151 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., on Res., 5508 (ii).
——— Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa, in Com. on Res., 5512 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (Supreme Court) 4986.
Canals—Capital: Cornwall, 5116. *Income:* Rideau (land damages, &c.) 5275 (ii).
Collection of Revenue: Canals (Williamsburg, retiring allowance to Mr. Hickey) 5277. Railways (Baie des Chaleurs) 5149 (ii).
Civil Government: Inland Revenue. 1918; Interior, 1706 (i); Justice (salaries) 4836 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (sessional clerks) 4850 (ii).
Militia (Royal Military College) 4818 (ii).
Miscellaneous (litigated matters) 3864; (St. Johns, P.Q., Postmaster's defalcations) 5214 (ii).
Penitentiaries: Kingston (Commissioners' Rep.) 4744, 4782 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 2587; (Rat Portage) 5286; Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4968; (Man.) 4971 (ii).
Supreme Court Ont. B. 131 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4213 (ii).
U.S. and Can. Mail Regulations, wthdrls. before Delivery (Ques.) 1635 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: Res. 17 (combine clause) 3255; (surgical instruments) 3478; (axes, scythes, &c.) 4178; (cotton fabrics) 4179; (cotton duck) 4186 (ii).

Broder, Mr. A., *Dundas.*
Address, on The, 393 (i).
Ault, Mr. E., Dismissal by Govt. (Ques.) 2879 (ii).
Butter Exports, Bonus, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 1802 (i).
Morrisburg Collector of Customs, Appnmt. (Ques.) 341, 489 (i).
——— David Halliday's Appnmt. (M. for Ret.*) 1775 (i).
Robertson, Mr. A. B., Dismissal by Govt. (Ques.) 2879 (ii).
Williamsburg Canal, W. J. Casselman's Dismissal (Ques.) 2415 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Ont.) 2554 (ii).

Brodeur, Mr. L. P., *Rouville.*
Hull, St. Louis Dam and Victoria Springs Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 85) 1*, 1539 (i).
Montreal and Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s (B. 101) 1°*, 1899 (i).
See SPEAKER, MR. DEPUTY.

Brown, Mr. J. P., *Chateauguay.*
Ste. Philomène Postmaster, Dismissal and Complaints against (Ques.) 3236 (ii).

Calvert, Mr. W. S., *West Middlesex.*
Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M for 2°, 885 (i).

Calvert, Mr. W. S.—*Con.*
Strathroy Customs Officer, Name, &c. (Ques.) 482 (i).
——— Inland Revenue Officer, Name, &c. (Ques.) 483 (i).
——— Post Office, Tenders and Contracts (Ques.) 797 (i).

Cameron, Mr. M. C., *West Huron.*
Cobourg Postmaster, &c., Charges against (Ques.) 1306 (i).
——— Charges against (M. for copy*) 2020 (i).
Dismissals from Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fairlie) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2201 (i).
Fisheries Protection Service, Officers on Govt. Steamers (Ques.) 3670 (ii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 756 (i).
Post Office Inspectors, creation of New Offices (M. for Cor.*) 1664 (i).
Mail Contracts cancelled since July, 1896 (M. for Ret.*) 1664 (i).
Post Office Dept., Administration. Appnmt. of Inspectors, &c. (M. for Cor., &c.) 493 (i).
Stratford Street Letter-box Service (Ques.) 2126.
SUPPLY:
Civil Government—Inland Revenue, 1916 (i).
Veterans of 1837-8, Pension Claims, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 3537 (ii).
Winnipeg Industrial School, Name of Principal, Date of Appnmt. (Ques.) 490 (i).
——— Appnmt. of Supt. (M. for Cor.*) 1664 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com. (salt, &c.) 3715 (ii).

Campbell, Mr. A., *Kent.*
Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1895 (i).
Ry. Return Fare Tickets B. 11 (Mr. *McLennan, Glengarry*) on M. for 2°, 701 (i).
Restigouche Ry. and Bridge Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. *Domville*) 2° m., 2777 (ii).

Cargill, Mr. H., *East Bruce.*
Post Office Mail Contracts, in Com. of Sup., 5105.
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Post Office (technical services) 5105 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: Res. 17 (combine clause) 3346; (files and rasps) 4141; (Indian corn) 4443, 4457 (ii).

Caron, Hon. Sir A., K.C.M.G., *Three Rivers.*
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, 2nd proposal (remarks) 782 (i).
——— Tenders (M. for copies) 2426 (i).
Bazinet, Mr., of Joliette, and Quebec Elections (Ques.) 1634 (i).
Bounties on Iron and Steel, in Com. on Res., 5199 (ii).
Caplin River Postmaster, reported Dismissal (Ques.) 1027 (i).

Caron, Hon. Sir A.—*Con.*
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5351 (ii).
Dablon Postmaster, Dismissal (Ques.) 1027 (i).
I. C. R., Dismissal of Employees at Rimouski (Ques.) 2566 (i).
Militia, Active, Non-commissioned Officers and Men (M. for Ret.*) 2445 (i).
"Our Lady of the Snows," on M. to adjourn., 1550 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. P. 129 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 4501, 4726, 5377, 5409 (ii).
——— Mail Contracts, in Com. of Sup., 5083 (ii).
Pouliot, Mr., late M.P., deceased (remarks) 5184 (ii).
Queen's Diamond Jubilee, Militia Contingent and par. in Quebec *Chronicle* (remarks) 3241 (ii).
——— Bank Holiday (remarks) 4872 (ii).
St. Valérien de Rimouski, Postmaster, Dismissal (Ques.) 2566 (i).
Smith, John L., Fishery Overseer, Dismissal (M. for Ret.*) 2446 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Justice (salaries) 4835; Post Office (statutory increases) 5078, 5267; (technical services) 5100 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (sessional indemnity, &c.) 4844 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Quebec and Gaspé Basin) 4998 (ii).
Militia (monuments, battlefields of Canada) 4861; (Military College) 4813 (ii).
Miscellaneous (St. Johns, P.Q., Postmaster's defalcations) 5214 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Dredging (St. Lawrence River Channel) 2576. *Income:* Buildings (Ont.) 2578; (Que.) 2577 (ii); (west deptl. block, fire) 4884 (ii),
Quarantine (salaries and contingencies) 2204 (i).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R., K.C.M.G. (Minister of Trade and Commerce), *South Oxford.*
Address, on the, 85, 99 (i).
Adjournment (remarks) 5540 (ii).
Anderson, Geo., Appnmt. as Agent to Japan (Ans.) 3339 (ii).
Artillery, Garrison Battery, No. 3, Disbandment (Ans.) 340 (i).
Aspdin, Thos. W., Claim for Scrip (Ans.) 1374.
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, 2nd proposal (remarks) 782 (i); Contract (remarks) 4216 (ii).
——— on M. to adjn. House (remarks) 938 (i), 2775, 3742 (ii).
——— par in Ottawa *Citizen*, 2742 (ii.)
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2758, 2775 (ii).
——— (prop. Res.) 3976; agreed to (Y. 134, N. 22) 4251 (ii).
Bounties on Iron and Steel, in Com. on Res., 5187 (ii).
Bounty to Fishermen, Increased (Ans.) 4471 (ii).
Business of the Hse., Queen's Birthday, adjnmt. (M.) 2740 (ii).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R.—*Con.*
Business of the Hse. Morning Sittings (M.) 3582.
——— on M. to adjn., 4203 (ii).
——— (remarks) 5010, 5038, 5287 (ii).
Cataract Power Co. of Hamilton, B. 124 (Mr. *MacPherson*) on prop. introd., 3579 (ii).
Coal Oil Supply, St. John Barracks, Tenders (Ans.) 1078 (i).
Cold Storage, Com. on Res. (M.) 3842 (ii).
Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s B., Return of Fees (remarks) 4652 (ii).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4539, 4601; 1°*, 4725 (ii).
Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. B. 125 (Mr. *Davies*) in Com., 4128 (ii).
Drummond Co. Ry. and G.T.R., in Com. of Sup., 5079 (ii).
——— *See* "I. C. R. Extension."
Estimates, Suppl. (remarks) 972 (i).
Export of Bacon, Hams, &c., on prop. wthdrl. of B., 4341 (ii).
Export Duty on Logs, &c., on prop. Res (Mr. *Fielding*) 4709 (ii).
Fisheries Act (saw-dust in rivers) Act Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Davies*) in Com., 3728 (ii).
Forged or Unauthorized Endorsements of Bills (B. 123) 1°*, 3580 (ii).
Ft. Anne, Annapolis Co., Caretaker (Ans.) 5010.
Fortification Walls, Quebec, Repairs (Ans.) 1302 (i).
Gananoque Drill Shed, Removal (Ans.) 1078 (i).
Gray, Lt.-Col., late Inspector of Stores, Retiring Allowance, &c. (Ans.) 2881 (ii).
Inspection (General) Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 3571 (ii).
I. C. R., Extension to Montreal (G.T.R. and Drummond Co. Ry.) B. 142 (Mr. *Blair*) on prop. Res., 4086; on M. for Com. on Res., 4259; in Com. on Res., 4387; *pro forma* stage of Rep. of Com., 4477; on M. for 2°, 4612 (ii).
Iron, Pig, Can. Manufacture and Bounty (Ans.) 97 (i).
Issac's Harbour Postmaster, Dismissal (remarks) 4107 (ii).
Kingston and London Barracks, Wood Contracts (Ans.) 2425 (i).
Loans, Govt., Temporary (Ans.) 949 (i).
Loan (Public Service) $15,000,000 (prop. Res.) 4735 (ii).
Mail Service, Ottawa and Brockville West (remarks) 4106 (ii).
Man. School Fund, Com. on Res. (M.) 3842 (ii).
Militia Camps, Eastern Townships Battalions (Ans.) 3669 (ii).
——— Corps, Morris (Man.) Organization (Ans.) 1307 (i).
Militia and Defence, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 667 (i).
Military College, Kingston (Ans.) 4108 (ii).
——— Administrative Changes (Ans.) 791 (i).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R.—*Con.*
Military College, Change in Administration (remarks) 3541 (ii).
——— Professional Staff (Ans.) 4120 (ii).
——— Sergeants, Services dispensed with (Ans.) 4122 (ii).
Military Equipments, Conditions of Test, &c. (Ans.) 5465 (ii).
Muma, Henry, Official Referee, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3719 (ii).
N. S. Southern Ry. Subsidy (Ans.) 4471 (ii).
Old Fort Erie, Change of Control (Ans.) 2415 (i).
Pacific Cable, Govtl. Action (remarks) 4109 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 120 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for Com., 5531; in Com., 5532 (ii).
Pouliot, Mr., late M. P., Deceased (remarks) 5184 (ii).
Prorogation (intimation) 5542 (ii).
Pulp Wood, Export Duty (remarks) 2021 (i).
——— on adjnmt. (remarks) 2297 (i).
Quebec and Gaspé Basin, communications between (Ans.) 790 (i).
Queen's Diamond Jubilee, Can. Militia contingent, on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 846 (i).
Queen's Birthday, Perpetual Holiday (remarks) 4499 (ii).
——— Colonial Troops (Ans.) 923 (i).
——— on M. to adjn. Hse, 948 (i).
——— Militia contingent (Ans.) 973 (i).
——— Militia Appnmts. (remarks) 1083 (i).
——— Names of Militia Officers, &c. (Ans.) 1991 (i), 3236 (ii).
——— Militia Contingent and Quebec *Chronicle* (remarks) 3240 (ii).
——— Celebration of Day (M.) 4736 (ii).
Queen's Own Rifles, Rep. of Commission (Ans.) 1739 (i).
Questions by Members not in Order (remarks) 3974 (ii).
Ry. Commission, Creation of (Ans.) 3976 (ii).
Ry. Employees, &c., Safety B. 2 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 3560 (ii).
Rys. in P.E.I., on M. for Ret., 2051 (i).
Returns, on inquiry for (remarks) 2969, 4032 (ii).
Rice Factories, &c., in Can., Number, &c. (Ans.) 258 (i).
Saturday Sittings (Ans.) 4394 (ii).
——— (M.) 4472, 5157 (ii).
Select Standing Coms., Name added (M.) 2051 (i).
Silver and Lead Smelting in B.C., Payments *re* (Ans.) 3146 (ii).
Subsidies to Rys. B. 151 (Mr. *Blair*) 3° m., 5541.
St. Johns (P.Q.) Military School, Contracts for Drugs, &c. (Ans.) 1028 (i).
——— Tenders for Coal and Wood (Ans.) 1029 (i).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice (travelling allowance to Judges in Man.) conc., 3732 (ii).
Charges of Management, 1666 (i).
Canals—Capital: Grenville (dismissals) 3867, 3957 (ii).

Cartwright. Hon. Sir R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Civil Government: Auditor Gen.'s office, 1721, (contingencies) 2070; Finance Dept., 1721; Geological Survey, 1981; Gov. Gen.'s office, 1666; High Commissioner's office, 1982; Interior, 1679, 1689; Justice, 1666, (Penitentiaries branch) 1668 (i), (salaries) 4834 (ii); Militia and Defence, 1669, 1926 (i), (salaries) 4831 (ii); Post Office, 5264 (ii); Printing and Stationery, 1669 (i); Railways and Canals (contingencies) 4830 (ii); Sec. of State, 1926, (contingencies) 2068; Trade and Commerce, 1931, (contingencies) 2087 (i).

Collection of Revenues: Customs (preventive service) 5006, 5028. Post Office (mail service) 5069 (ii).

Dominion Police, 2090 (i).

Indians: Man. and N.W.T. (Elkhorn school) 5000.

Legislation: House of Commons (Dep. Speaker's salary) 2091; Senate (salaries, &c.) 2090 (i).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (B.C. and San Francisco) 2791; Can. and Nfld.) 4994; Halifax and Nfld.) 2790; (Mar. Provs.) 2791; (Port Mulgrave, &c.) 2793; (Port Mulgrave and Port Hood) 4998 (ii).

Militia (gratuities, &c.) 4993; (Jubilee contingent) 2659, 4861, 4994; (Military College) 4478, 4802; (monuments, battlefields of Can.) 4861 (ii).

Miscellaneous (commissions of investigation) 5234: (litigated matters) 3864; (Jubilee expenses) conc., 5456 (ii).

Penitentiaries, 2794; (gratuities to retired officers) 4987 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.) 4944; (Ont.) 2585; (Rideau Hall) 2642. Harbours and Rivers (Ont., Fort Francis Locks) 4970. Miscellaneous (Monument to Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) 2789 (ii).

Quarantine (salaries and contingencies) 2242 (i).

Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (rolling stock) 5289. P.E.I. Ry., 3860 (ii).

Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1232 (i).

Trade and Commerce, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 6.

Trade with the Empire, on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 4104 (ii).

Volunteers of 1866, Recognition of Services by Govt. (Ans.) 3056.

Walsh, C. J., Claims on Leeward Islands Govt. (remarks) 3676 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff:

In Com., Res. 1 (Customs Acts Amts., definitions, &c.) 2842; (mutton, &c.) 3361, 3381; (cornmeal) 3422; (iron or steel, scrap) 3630; (Norway iron) 3718; (watch cases) 4168; (axes, scythes, &c.) 4171; (metal glove fasteners, &c.) 4466; (coal) 4469 (ii).

Casey, Mr. G. E., *West Elgin.*

Address, on The, 311 (i).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service Contract, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4240 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B 29 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 1°, 780 (i).

Drainage across Ry. Lands (B. 14) 1°, 481; 2°, m. 1064 (i).

Casey, Mr. G. E.—*Con.*

Farm Implements, &c., Abolition of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2136 (i).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 729 (i).

Business of the Hse., precedence, on M. to take Wednesdays, &c., 1900 (i).

Govt. of N.W.T., Subsidy and Power, on M. for Ret,, 1050 (i).

Hudson Bay Expedition, Emplymt. of Sealer *Diana* (remarks) 1832 (i).

Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 10 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 688.

Order (Ques. of) Chairman's Ruling, in Com. of Sup., 2547 (i).

Public Bills, &c., on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 563 (i).

——— Bills 2 and 3, rep. from Sel. Com. (M. to place on Order Paper) 3500; (remarks) 4500 (ii).

Queen's Diamond Jubilee, Can. Militia contingent, on M. Res. (remarks) 842 (i).

Ry. Employees Safety (B. 2) 1°, 87: 2° m., 608; on ref. to Com., 615; on Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) 620; Pets. *re* B. (M.) 1299: in Com., 3560 (ii).

——— adoption of Rep. and suspension of Rule (M). 4007 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. (B. 16) Bicycles as Baggage, 1°, 565; 2°, 1775 (i).

Saskatchewan Election, Member's Seat challenged, on M. to adjn. Hse. (Ques. of Order) 960, 964 (i).

Special Com., reduction of Quorum (M.) 1227 (i).

Subsidies to Rys. B. 151 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5486 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Dominion Lands—Capital (surveys, &c.) 4082 (ii).

Fisheries (payments to collectors) conc., 5427 (ii).

Immigration (Agents' salaries) 2815 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) conc., 5436 (ii).

Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1560 (i).

Casgrain, Mr. T. C., *Montmorency.*

Address, on The. 149 (i).

Blanchet, Eugène, Dismissal from I. C. R. (Ques.) 1082 (i).

——— (M. for Ret.*) 2446 (ii).

Bridge at Quebec, reported Govt. Aid (Ques.) 341 (i).

Delisle, L. T., Lighthouse-keeper, Dismissal (Ques.) 1307 (i).

Exchequer Court, Local Judge in Admiralty, Appnmt. (Ques.) 1986 (i).

Fisheries Case, Appeal from Supreme Court Judgment (Ques.) 1303 (i).

Fortification Walls, Quebec, Repairs (Ques.) 1303 (i).

Hudson Bay Expedition, Emplymt. of Sealer *Diana* (remarks) 1827 (i).

I. C. R., Eugène Blanchet, Section Foreman, Dismissal (Ques.) 1639 (i).

Casgrain, Mr. T. C.—*Con.*
I. C. R., Pierre Begin, Sectionman, Dismissal (Ques.) 1638 (i).
——— Castonguay Station-master, Dismissal (M. for Ret.*) 2446 (i).
——— St. Charles' Station-master, Dismissal (Ques.) 1540 (i).
——— Extension to Montreal, in Com. of Sup., 3765 (ii).
Interest Act Amt. B. 134 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4254 (ii).
Irvin, John, Appnmt. as Lightship-keeper (Ques.) 1633 (i).
Laverge, M. P., late Dep. Postmaster, Quebec, Dismissal (M. for Ret.*) 2446 (i).
Mercier, Jos., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1633, 1835 (i).
Personal Explanation (Mr. *Choquette*) 4205 (ii).
Quebec Bridge, Speech of Mayor of Quebec (Ques.) 1637 (i).
Quebec Land Slide, Appnmt. of Commission (Ques.) 3719 (ii).
St. Aubert and St. Pamphile Mail Service, Contract, Tenderers, &c. (Ques.) 3235 (ii).
St. Gervais and St. Charles Mail Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 3721 (ii).
Smith, F. X., Lighthouse-keeper, Gaspé, Dismissal (Ques.) 1305 (i).
——— (M. for Ret.*) 2446 (i).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (travelling expenses) 4841 (ii).
Canals—Capital: Lachine, 4893 (ii).
Civil Government: Justice (salaries) 4837 (ii); Public Works Dept., 1736 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (preventive service) 4864, 5035 (ii). Excise (preventive service) 2494 (i). Railways (Baie des Chaleurs) 5133; (I.C.R., commissions of investigation) 5262 (ii).
Fisheries (counsel fees, award of Judicial Com.) 4999 (ii).
Immigration (agents' salaries) 2808, 2819 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Que. and Gaspé Basin) 4996 (ii).
Miscellaneous (investigating charges, N. W. T.) 5220 (ii).
Penitentiaries: Kingston (Commissioners' Rep.) 4797; (payments to Commissioners) 4801 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Buildings (electric lighting, Ottawa) 4899; Harbours and Rivers (St. Lawrence ship channel) 4867. *Income:* Buildings (generally) 2592; (N.B.) 5275; (N.S.) 4902; (Que., Montmagny P.O.) 5281. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4967; (Manitoulin Island) 4964. Miscellaneous (clerical assistance) 4892 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (extension to Montreal) 3765; (rolling stock) 5314 (ii).
Supreme Court (Ont.) B. 131 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 4211; in Com., 4214 (ii).
Vezina, Geo., and Inland Rev. Dept. (Ques.) 2569.
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: Res. 17 (combine clause) 3251 (ii).
Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Co.'s B. 118 (Mr. *Morrison*) on Sen. Amts., 5232 (ii).

Charlton, Mr. J., *North Norfolk.*
Atlantic Fast SS. Service Contract, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4228 (ii).
Cheese and Creameries Registration B. 117 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 3722 (ii).
Criminal Code (1892) Seduction and Abduction (B. 13) 1°*, 339; 2° m., 1060; in Com., 2474 (i).
Export Duty on Logs, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 4707 (ii).
——— on Pulp Wood (remarks) 3874 (ii).
Fisheries Act (Saw-dust in Rivers) Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Davies*) in Com., 3725 (ii).
Forged or Unauthorized Endorsement of Bills B. 123 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 3723 (ii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 860, 881 (i).
I. C. R. Extension to Montreal (G. T. R. and Drummond Co. Ry.) B. 142 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for Com. on Res., 4314 (ii).
Lord's Day, Better Observance (B. 10) 1°*, 258; 2° m., 674; in Com., 2460 (i).
National Museum, Erection at Ottawa, on M. for Ret., 2432 (i).
Personal Explanation, Speech at Tonawanda, 914 (i).
Presbyterian Church of Can., Temporalities Fund (B. 18) 1°*, 707 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 3044; (Indian corn) 4407 (ii).

Champagne, Mr. N., *Wright.*
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Que., Gatineau River) 4960 (ii).

Chauvin, Mr. L. A., *Terrebonne.*
Address, on The, 374 (i).
Civil Servants, County of Gaspé, Commission *re* (Ques.) 1451 (i).

Choquette, Mr. P. A., *Montmagny.*
Berthier Wharf, Dues collected (Ques.) 262 (i).
Debates, Official Rep., 1st Rep. of Com., conc. (M.) 707 (i).
——— 2nd Rep. of Com. (presented) 5183 (ii).
Fire in West Deptl. Block, Documents destroyed, &c. (Ques.) 919 (i).
I. C. R. New Time Table (remarks) 3241 (ii).
Personal Explanation *re* Quebec Bridge, 4205 (ii).
Quebec Oriental Ry., Subsidy (Ques.) 918 (i).
Superior Court Judge, Rimouski District (Ques.) 4476 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Justice (salaries) 4833 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (preventive service) 5036 (ii).
Immigration (agents' salaries) 2820 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Official Reporters' accommodation) 4851 (ii).
Miscellaneous (repatriation of Canadians from Brazil) 4864 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 4917 (ii).
Railways—Capital: (I. C. R. (extension to Montreal) 3756 (ii).

Christie, Mr. T., *Argenteuil.*
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com. (Indian corn) 4423 (ii).

Clancy, Mr. J., *Bothwell.*
Address, on The, 331 (i).
Alien Labour Restriction B. 5 (Mr. *Cowan*) on ref. to Com., 660 (i).
Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1859 (i).
Bounties on Iron and Steel, in Com. on Res., 5190 (ii).
Business of the Hse., on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to take in Mondays, 2968 (ii).
Brantford Free Postal Delivery (M. for Ret.*) 3537 (ii).
Canal Contracts, Deposits on Tenders (Ques.) 1026 (i).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5347, 5355 (ii).
Export Duty on Logs, in Com. on Res., 4614 (ii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 768 (i).
Galops Canal, Cardinal Section, Tenders (M. for copy*) 3538 (ii).
——— Iroquois Section, Tenders (M. for copy*) 3538 (ii).
Grenville Canal, Enlargement, Tenders for Contract (M. for copy*) 2447 (i).
Hagarsville Indian Agent, Dismissal of Dr. Jones (M. for Ret.) 3530 (ii).
Indian Office, Brantford, Appnmt. of David Hill (M. for Cor.*) 3539 (ii).
I. C. R. Extension to Montreal, in Com. on Res., 4386 (ii).
Linley, Henry, Fishery Inspector, Cedar Springs, Dismissal (Ques.) 4206 (ii).
Lord's Day Observance B. 10 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2473 (i).
Mitchell, Dr. G., Dismissal (Ques.) 927 (i).
Petroleum Inspection Act Amt. B. 139 (Sir *Henry Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 4723 (ii).
Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Foster*) Members accused of conspiracy, 5305 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 4728, 5398, 5413 (ii).
St. Lawrence River, North Channel, Tenders M. for copy*), 3538 (ii).
Six Nations Indian Office, Dismissals (M. for Cor.*, 3538 (ii).
Soulanges Canal, Sections 4, 5, 6, 7, Tenders and Contracts (M. for copy*) 2447 (i).
——— Section 12, Tenders for Contract (M. for copies*) 2447 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying interests, butter and cheese) 2180 (i).
Canals—Capital: Grenville (dismissals) 3884 (ii).
Civil Government: Post Office (technical services) 5105.
Collection of Revenues: Customs (preventive service) 5019, 5044, 5054 (ii).

Clancy, Mr. J.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Immigration (agents' salaries) 2824 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Banff Park) 5001 (ii).
Penitentiaries: Kingston (Commissioner's Rep.) 4743 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 2738 (ii).
Quarantine (hog cholera, compensation) 2272 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (rolling stock) 5317, 5339 (ii).
Tariff, The, on prop. Res (Mr. *Fielding*) 1574 (i).
Tuscarora Indians, Dismissal of Physicians (M. for Cor.) 3529 (ii).
——— Reserve, Appnmt. of Physician (M. for Cor.*) 3538 (ii).
Walpole Island Indians, Appnmt. of Physician (Ques.) 787 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 3015, 3150, 3166, 3184, 3313; (mutton, &c.) 3395; (photographs, &c.) 3476; (shoe tacks) 3654; (barbed wire) 3660; (buckthorn, strip fencing, &c.) 3680, 4147; (rice) 4132; (Indian corn) 4432 (ii).

Clarke, Mr. E. F., *West Toronto.*
Address, on The, 377 (i).
Alien Labour Restriction B. 5 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 639 (i).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service Contract, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4235 (ii).
Dom. Exhibition, Toronto, Govt. Aid (Ques.) 1633 (i).
Gray, Lt.-Col., late Inspector of Stores, Retiring Allowance, &c. (Ques.) 2881 (ii).
Queen's Birthday Perpetual Holiday B. (remarks) 4499 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Post Office (mail service) 2790 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 2739, 2779 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (Coal, bituminous) 4194; (Indian corn) 4444, 4455 (ii).

Cochrane, Mr. E., *East Northumberland.*
Inspection (General) Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 3570 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Interior, 1681 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Algoma election expenses) 4987 (ii).
Miscellaneous (St. Johns, P.Q., Postmaster's defalcations) 5213; (Tariff inquiry) 5207 (ii).
Penitentiaries: Kingston (Commissioners' Rep.) 4743 (ii).
Public Works Capital: Buildings (west deptl. block, fire) 4895. Harbours and Rivers (St. Lawrence Ship Channel) 4868. *Income:* Buildings (N.S.) 4921; (Que.) 5231; (Rideau Hall) 4886. Harbours and Rivers (Gatineau River) 4962 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Dartmouth branch) 5115 (ii).

Corby, Mr. H., *West Hastings.*
Weller Bay as an Outport, Value of Goods, Duty collected, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 1663 (i).

Costigan, Hon. J., *Victoria, N.B.*
Address, on The, 452 (i).
Restigouche and Victoria Ry. Co.'s B. 99 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) on M. for 2°, 2347, 2451 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Inland Revenue, 1922; Marine and Fisheries, 1732 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (preventive service) conc., 5449 (ii).

Cowan, Mr. M. K., *South Essex.*
Alien Labour Prohibition (B. 5) 1°, 88; 2° m., 621, 657 (i).
Coasting Laws, Can. and U. S., on M. for Cor., 3529 (ii).
Dom. Building and Loan Association (B. 48) 1°*, 1171 (i).

Craig, Mr. T. D., *East Durham.*
Address, on The, 248 (i).
Alien Labour Prohibition B. 5 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 635 (i); in Com., 3557 (ii).
American Bank Note Co.'s Contract, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2709 (ii).
Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1760 (i).
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. 33 (Mr. *Osler*) in Com., 2341 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 29 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 2026 (i),
Criminal Code (1892) Seduction and Abduction B. 13 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 1063; in Com., 2474 (i).
Dismissals from Public Service (Rev. Mr. *Fairlie*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2311 (i).
Farm Implements, &c., Abolition of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2159 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 887 (i).
Inspection (General) Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 3572 (ii).
I. C. R. Extension to Montreal (G. T. R. and Drummond Co. Ry.) B. 142 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for Com. on Res., 4324 (ii).
Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 10 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 685; in Com., 2465 (i).
Privilege (Ques. of) Rep. of Speech in *Globe*, 3672.
Ry. Act Amt. (Bicycles as Baggage) B. 16 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2°, 1792 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c: (Experimental Farms) 2117.
Civil Government: Customs Dept. (contingencies) 2076 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Dep. Speaker's salary) 2096; (extra clerks) 2104; (Official Debates) 2105 (i).
Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1359 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 2482 (i).

Craig, Mr. T. D.—*Con.*
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 2910, 2927, 3153, 3170: Res. 17 (combine clause) 3258; (wire nails) 3647; (barbed wire) 3666; (files and rasps) 3698, 4133.
Winnipeg, Duluth and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 17 (Mr. *Macdonell*) on M. for 3°, 2449 (i).

Davies, Hon. L. H. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) *Queen's, P.E.I.*
Alaskan Boundary, Quotation from Treaty *re* Mount St. Elias (Ans.) 3505 (ii).
Alien Labour Prohibition B. 5 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 665 (i); in Com., 3547 (ii).
American Bank Note Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3°, 3281 (ii).
Appnmts. under present Govt., on M. for Ret. 1055 (i).
——— by late Govt.. and Recommendations of Treasury Board, on M. for Ret., 1656 (ii).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 944 (i).
——— Contract, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3994 (ii).
Beamsville (Ont.) Postmaster, Dismissal, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 1455 (i).
Bear River (N.S.) Obstruction to Navigation, &c. (Ans.) 486 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 4772 (ii).
Behring Sea Convention, Re-opening, London Press Cor. (remarks) 4474 (ii).
——— Seal Regulations, on Orders of the Day (remarks) 2570, (i).
Berthier (P.Q.) Wharf, Dues collected (Ans.) 262.
Bibaud, Azaire, Emplymt. in House of Commons (Ans.) 3509 (ii).
Bird Rock Island Lighthouse, Casualty, Rescue of Woman (Ans.) 3508 (ii).
B.C. Southern Ry., Disallowance of Provincial Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnis*) 544 (i).
Bunker Island, Marine Hospital, Mr. LeCaine's Dismissal (Ans.) 3505, 3866 (ii).
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. 33 (Mr. *Osler*) in Com., 2338 (i).
Cap Saumon Lighthouse, Construction, Amt. paid, &c. (Ans.) 264 (i).
——— Contract for Firewood (Ans.) 264 (i).
Cascumpec Buoy Service Contract and Tenders (Ans.) 1742 (i).
Cataract Power Co. of Hamilton B. 124 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) in Com., 5051 (ii).
Cattle Shipping Regulations (Ans.) 2217 (i).
Cedar Springs (Ont.) Fishery Inspector Linley, Dismissal (Ans.) 4206 (ii).
Civil Servants, County of Gaspé, Commission *re* (Ans.) 1451 (i).
Coal Boring in P.E.I., Vote in Estimates (Ans.) 796 (i).
Coasting Laws, Can. and U.S., on M. for Cor., 3526 (ii).

Davies, Hon. L. H.—*Con.*
Criminal Code Amt. (seduction and abduction) B. 13 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. to conc. in Amts., 3542 (ii).
Criminal Code, 1892 (B. 138) 4203 (ii).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5167 (ii).
Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. (B. 125) prop. Res., 4086; 2° m., 4110; in Com. on Res., 4122; in Com. on B., 4123 (ii).
Delisle, L. T., Light-keeper, Dismissal (Ans.) 1307 (i).
Dismissals, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4012 (ii).
——— Inverness Co., Dom. Officials, 1879 (Ans.) 4477 (ii).
——— Govt. Employees, Rep. of Commissioners (presented) 4364 (ii).
Emigration Agents in U.S. Appnmts. (Ans.) 3507.
Fiddle Reef (B.C.) Marine Lights (Ans.) 1376 (i).
Fisheries Act (saw-dust in rivers) Amt. (B. 127) 1°, 3581; in Com., 3724 (ii).
Fisheries Case, Appeal from Supreme Court Judgment (Ans.) 1303 (i).
——— Protection Service, Officers on Govt. Steamers (Ans.) 3676 (ii).
Fishery Bulletins, Distribution on Gaspé Coast, Delay (Ans.) 4008.
——— Guardians, North Victoria (Ans.) 1081, 1452; (remarks) 1308 (i).
——— Inspector McNab (B.C.) Instructions from Govt. (Ans.) 3058 (ii).
Fishing License, in Bonaventure (Ans.) 671 (i).
Fish Island (P.E.I.) Light-keeper, Dismissal (Ans.) 2424 (i).
Fish Traps used by Americans in B.C. (Ans.) 1377 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 993 (i).
——— on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 548 (i).
Gaspé Lightship-keeper (Ans.) 2126 (i).
Gill Nets and Seines, New Regulations, &c., Montreal District (remarks) 4372 (ii).
Gloucester Fishing Schooners and N. S. Fishermen (remarks) 4371 (ii).
Govt. of N.W.T., Subsidy and Powers, on M. for Ret., 1048 (i).
Hudson Bay Expedition, Charter of the *Diana* (Ans.) 1987 (i).
——— Emplymt of *Diana* (remarks) 1811, 1829 (i).
——— Milburn and Co.'s offer of Ship *Port Perie* (Ans.) 1988 (i).
——— Exploratory Expedition (Ans.) 796 (i).
——— *Diana*, Names, Residence, &c., of Crew (Ans.) 2884 (ii).
"Indian Garden" Reserve (N.S.) Sale of Hay (Ans.) 3510 (ii).
Iona Wharf, Victoria (N.S.) Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 489, 921 (i).
I. C. R. Extension to Montreal, (G. T. R. and Drummond Co. Ry.) in Com. on Res., 4384 (ii).

Davies, Hon. L. H.—*Con.*
Interest Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Quinn*) on M. for 2°, 3562; in Com., 4253 (ii).
Irvin, John, Appnmt. as Light-keeper (Ans.) 1633 (i).
Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 2606 (i).
Lavoie, Dr. Nap., Emplymt. by Govt. on Str. *La Canadienne* (Ans.) 1304, 1544 (i).
Lighthouse-keepers, Limitation of Age (Ans.) 266 (i).
Lobster Fisheries, Extension of Close Season, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4773 (ii).
——— (remarks) 5416 (ii).
——— Cape Breton (remarks) 1551, 2053 (i).
Mabou Harbour Buoy Service (Ans.) 4227 (ii).
——— Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 4206 (ii).
Mackerel Fishery in N. S., Protection of Fishermen, on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 3674 (ii).
Mercier, Jos., Ste. Famille, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1835 (i).
Murray Harbour (P.E.I.) Buoy Service, Contract (Ans.) 1029 (i).
——— Harbour-master, Appnmt. (Ans.) 2216 (i).
Mycenian Marble Co.'s Relief B. 83 (Mr. *Rosamond*) in Com., 2346 (i).
Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. (B. 105) 1°*, 2215 (i); in Com., 2742; Sen. Amts., 4109.
Newfield, Str., Appnmts. (Ans.) 2125 (i).
Oak Point (N.B.) Lighthouse-keeper, Dismissal (Ans.) 3669 (ii).
O'Brien, Wm., Dismissal from Str. *Lansdowne* (Ans.) 4008 (ii).
Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Foster*) Members accused of conspiracy, in Com. of Sup., 5303 (ii).
Paris Exhibition, 1900, Can. Representation (Ans.) 3508 (ii).
Pilots (Quebec and Montreal) incorp. B. 67 (Mr. *Guay*) in Com., 3539 (ii).
Pin-plats Barges, Registration (Ans.) 922 (i).
Plebiscite Bill, Premier's promise to introduce (Ans.) 3506 (ii).
Poaching by Americans, Deep-Sea Fisheries (Ans.) 1375 (i).
Point au Baril Lighthouse-keeper, Appnmt., &c. (Ans.) 266 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 4627, 5401 (ii).
Provincial Courts Judges Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°*, 4204; in Com., 4724 (ii).
Public Bills, &c., on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 557 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Casey*) to place on Order Paper, 3501 (ii).
Ques. by Members not in Order (remarks) 3973 (ii).
Ry. Lands and Taxation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Oliver*) 3513, 3521 (ii).
Reciprocal Tariff, on Ques. of Order, 1457 (i).
Returns, on Inquiry for, 949, 2298, 2571 (i) 2969 (ii).
River Matane Fishing Leases (Ans.) 4207 (ii).

Davies, Hon. L. H.—*Con.*

Salmon (B. C.) Sold in British Market, Quality, &c., on M. for Cor., 1995 (i).

San Pedro, Removal of Wreck (Ans.) 1376 (i).

Saskatchewan Election, Member's Seat challenged, on M. to adjn. Hse. (Ques. of Order) 959 (i).

Scrip for Half-breeds, Claims, on M. for Ret., 3530 (ii).

Senate and House of Commons Sessional Indemnity (prop. Res.) 3671; in Com., 3729; 1°* of B., 3730 (ii).

Smith, F. X., Lighthouse-keeper, Gaspe, Dismissal (Ans.) 1305 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. (B. 113) 1°, 2796: in Com., 3721 (ii).

Subsidies (Dom.) to Rys., &c. (remarks) 178 (i).
——— on inquiry for Ret., 949 (i).

Subsidies to Rys., B. 151 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5368 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice (travelling expenses) conc., 4641, 3732 (ii).

Civil Government: Indian Affairs (sec.'s. salary) 4828 (ii); Interior, 1683, 1678 (i), (salaries) 4837 (ii); Justice (salaries) 4836 (ii); Marine and Fisheries, 1730 (i), conc., 3731 (ii), (contingencies) 2087 (i), 4810 (ii); Privy Council (salaries) 4630; Sec. of State (Printing Bureau) 4831 (ii).

Collection of Revenues: Customs (P.E.I.) 2560 (i); Post Office (mail service) 5066, (outside service) conc., 5418. Public Works, conc., 5417. Railways (Baie des Chaleurs) 5146 (ii). Weights and Measures (salaries) 2536 (i).

Dominion Lands: conc., 5423 (ii).

Fisheries (counsel fees, Judicial Com.) 4999; (payments to collectors) conc., 5427 (ii); (oyster culture) 2551 (i),

Immigration (general expenses) 4070, 4992 (ii).

Indians (Elkhorn school) 5000; Man. and N.W.T. (gratuities to retired officers) 5000 (ii);

Legislation: House of Commons (Algoma election expenses) 4988, 5059 (ii). Library (salaries, &c.) 2116 (i).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction, &c.) 2994; (salaries, &c.) 2993 (i).

Marine (Govt. steamers, repairs) 2290; (investigation into wrecks) 2290; (hospitals) 2297; (obstructions in navigable rivers) 2293; (repairs to wharfs) 2295: (rewards for saving life) 2290; (tidal service) 2291; (winter mail service) 2293 (i).

Miscellaneous (Banff Park) 5000; (commissions of investigation) 5260, conc., 5429; (gratuities, Interior Dept.) 5001; (investigating charges, N.W.T.) 5218; (repatriation of Canadians from Brazil) 4861; (tariff inquiry) 5206 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) conc., 5433. Harbours and Rivers (dredging, Mar. Provs.) 4889: (Ont.) 4968; (P.E.I.) 4975 (ii).

Railways—Capital: P.E.I., 3847 (ii).

Scientific Institutions (hydrographic service) 2295; (meteorological service) 2295; (Toronto observatory) 2295 (i).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Baddeck and Grand Narrows, &c.) conc., 5419 (ii).

Davies, Hon. L. H.—*Con.*

Supreme Court, (Ont.) B. 131 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 4211 (ii).

Tignish (P.E.I.) Wharf, Dues Collected (Ans.) 3057 (ii).

Trials by Jury in certain Cases in N. W. T. (B. 137) 1°*, 4203: 2° m., 4724 (ii).

Victoria Co. (N.S.) Iona Wharf, Payment for Repairs (Ans.) 489, 921 (i).

Vote in Com. of Sup., on Chairman's Ruling (remarks) 2547 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff:

In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 2865; Res. 17 (combines clause) 3264, 3306; (mutton) 3358; (cornmeal) 3431; (books) 3473; (coal oil) 3495 (ii).

Wood Mountain Scouts, Claim for Scrip, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1054 (i).

Davin, Mr. N. F., *West Assiniboia.*

Address, on The, 111 (ii).

Alien Labour Restriction B. 5 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 643 (i).

Aspdin, Thos. W., Claim for Scrip (Ques.) 1374.

Audit Act Amt. (B. 107) 1°*, 2408 (i).

Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1889 (i).

B. C. Southern Ry., Disallowance of Provincial Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 522 (i).

Butter Exports, Bonus, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 1799 (i).

Can. Investment and Agency Co.'s B. (128) 1°*, 3842 (ii).

C. P. R. Transport of Grain from N.W.T. and Man., 1891 to 1897 (Ques.) 3509, 3669 (ii).

Cartwright, Mr. F. L., Appnmt. as Inspector Mounted Police (Ques.) 489 (i).

Clerks of Works, Govt., and Private Practice (Ques.) 1306 (i).

Coal Oil Duties, on M. for Com. of Sup. (prop. Res.) 2744 (ii).

Customs and Inland Revenue Controllers Repeal B. 125 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 3580.

Daunais, C. M., Indian Instructor, Appnmt. (Ques.) 1450 (i).

Dismissals, Man. and N.W.T., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4022 (ii).

——— Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fairlie) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2330, 2348 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 60 (Mr. *Douglas*) on M. for 2°, 2042 (i).

——— (B. 61) 1°, 1229; 2° m., 2037 (i).

——— B. 116 (Mr. *Sifton*) on M. for 3°, 4118 (ii).

Estevan Land Office, Removal to Alameda (Ques.) 1638 (i).

Farm Implements, &c., Abolition of Duty, on M. for Com. of Sup. (prop. Res.) 2054, 2131; neg. (Y. 10, N. 121) 2178 (i).

Govt. of N. W. T., Subsidy and Powers (Ms. for Ret.) 1030, 1043 (i).

Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for 2°, 1574 (i).

Davin, Mr. N. F.—*Con.*

Hartney, J. H., Dismissal as Postmaster (Ques.) 2885 (ii).

Hudson Bay Expedition (Ques.) 796 (i).

——— Emplymt. of Sealer *Diana* (remarks) 1817, 1833 (i).

——— Charter of *Diana* (Ques.) 1987 (i).

——— Milburn & Co.'s offer of Ship *Port Peric* (Ques.) 1988 (i).

——— *Diana*, Names, Residences, &c., of Crew (Ques.) 2884 (ii).

Illicit Still, Seizure from Geo. Vézina, Que. (Ques.) 1374 (i).

Indian Dept., unanswered Cor., (Ques.) 1984 (i).

Indian Disturbances in N. W. T. (remarks) 3059.

Indian Office, Regina, Removal to Winnipeg (Ques.) 1985 (i).

Indian Supplies, Man. and N. W. T., Schedule of Tenders (Ques.) 487, 1078, 1301 (i).

Libel, Law of, Amt. (B. 95) 1°*, 1738 (i).

——— Mr. McColl's Letter *re* Purchases (Ques.) 1306 (i).

Lord's Day Observance B. 10 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2469 (i).

McCallum, A., Lockmaster du Lievre Works, Dismissal, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1911 (i).

McGirr, Wm., notification of Superannuation (Ques.) 1987 (i).

Mounted Police Act (1894) Amt. (B. 62) 1°, 1231; 2° m., 2037 (i).

——— (1889) Amt. (B. 89) 1°*, 1539 (i).

——— Pension Act Amt. B., wthdn., 1226 (i).

——— Pension Act (1889) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. *Davis, Saskatchewan*) on M. for 1°, 1228 (i).

Northfield (B.C.) Postmaster, Dismissal (Ques.) 1305 (i).

——— (M. to adjn.) 1377 (i).

——— Inspector Fletcher's Rep. (M. for copy*) 2021 (i).

N. W. T. Act Amt., B. wthdn., 2878 (ii).

——— B. 114 (Mr. *Sifton*) on M. for 1°, 2797; in Com., 4111; on M. for 3°, 4116.

"Our Lady of the Snows," on M. to adjn., 1546.

Personal Explanation, par. in Man. *Free Press re* M. on Order Paper, 2886 (ii).

McManus, Mrs., Postmistress, Northfield (B.C.) (M. to adjn.,) 1377 (i).

Privilege (Ques. of) Duty on Farm Implements, on Chairman's Ruling, 2126 (i).

——— par. in *Witness re* Mr. Fairlie's Letter, 2656 (ii).

Public Bills, &c.. on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 559 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. *Casey*) to place on Order Paper, 3502 (ii).

Qu'Appelle Mail Service, Tenders and Contract (Ques.) 1079 (i).

Quarantine, Man. and N. W. T. (Ques.) 3238 (ii).

——— Regulations, U. S., Man., N. W. T. and B.C. (M. for Ret.) 797, 822 (i).

Davin, Mr. N. F.—*Con.*

Quebec Bridge Co. and Hon. Mr. Dobell (Ques.) 1989 (i), 3056 (ii).

Queen's Diamond Jubilee and N. W. Mounted Police (Ques.) 97 (i).

——— Militia contingent, on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 845 (i).

——— par. in Quebec *Chronicle* (remarks) 3239 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. (Bicycles as Baggage) B. 16 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2°, 1797 (i).

Ry. Employees, &c., Safety B. 2 (Mr. *Casey*) on ref. to Com. (Amt.) 619 (i).

Ry. Lands and Taxation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Oliver*) 3513 (ii).

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s Amt. (B. 122) 1°*, 3418; M. to place on Order Paper for 2°, 3578; in Com., 4051 (ii).

Returns (inquiry) 1900, 2571 (i), 2887, 2970, 3146 (ii).

St. Paul Industrial School, Furnishing Supplies (M. for Cor.*) 1664 (i).

Saskatchewan Election (remarks) 950 (i).

——— Member's Seat challenged (M. to adjn. Hse.) 970 (i).

Scrip for Half-breeds, on M. for Ret., 3536 (ii).

Seed Grain, Distribution in Man. and N.W.T., Amounts outstanding (Ques.) 1989, 2215 (i).

Stockholm Exhibition, Walton Jones' Appnmt. (Ques.) 1984 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (creameries in N.W.T.) 2179; (dairying interests, butter and cheese) 2585 (i).

Civil Government: Indian Dept., 1715, (law clerk) 1667; Interior, 1674; Mounted Police, 1709; Privy Council (contingencies) 2056, 2066; Railways and Canals, 1934, 1967; Trade and Commerce, 1981 (contingencies) 2088 (i).

Collection of Revenues: Post Office (mail service) 2790 (ii).

Immigration (agents' salaries) 2825, 4038 (ii).

Indians: N.W.T. and Man. (supplies) 4053 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (Dep. Speaker's salary) 2091, 2100 (i).

Miscellaneous (small-pox epidemic, Winnipeg) 4084 (ii).

Mounted Police (pay of force) 4078 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.W.T.) 2589; (Ont.) 2581; (Rideau Hall) 2598. Harbours and Rivers (dredging) 2781; (Man.) 2780 (i).

Quarantine (Cattle) 2268; (salaries and contingencies) 2245 (i).

Tariff, The, on prop. Res (Mr. *Fielding*) 1322 (i).

——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 2484 (i).

Territorial Exhibition, outstanding Debts (Ques.) 1374 (i).

Vote in Com. of Sup., on Chairman's Ruling (remarks) 2547 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff:

In Com., Res. 16 (preferential clause) 2956, 3121; Res. 17 (combine clause) 3333, 3340; (wheat flour) 3455; (coal oil) 3478, 3496; (wire nails) 3650; (strip fencing) 3691; (iron or steel nuts, &c.) 3696; (buckthorn, &c., fencing) 4150; (agricultural implements) 4156; (Indian corn) 4451 (ii).

Davin, Mr. N. F.—*Con.*
Williams, P. J., Indian Instructor, Dismissal (Ques.) 1450 (i).
Wood Mountain Scouts, Claims for Scrip (prop. Res.) 1051, 2033 (i).

Davis, Mr. T. O., *Saskatchewan.*
Bremner Furs Seizure, Compensation (M. for Ret.) 1744 (i).
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. 33 (Mr. *Osler*) in Com., 2924 (ii).
Champain, Emmanuel, Claim against Govt. through Rebellion, 1885 (Ques.) 490 (i).
Dismissals, Man. and N. W. T., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4027 (ii).
Gazette and *Star*, Free Postage from Montreal (Ques.) 3841 (ii).
Govt. Horses at Prince Albert, Payments for Care, &c. (M. for Cor.*) 3537 (ii).
Grundy, Ernest, late Postmaster at Duck Lake (Ques.) 3870 (ii).
Hudson Bay Ports, Customs Collectors (Ques.) 794, 1452 (i).
Indian Disturbances in N. W. T. (remarks) 3144.
McManus, Mrs., Postmistress at Northfield (B.C.) Dismissal, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 1385 (i).
—— —— Robert, late Postmaster at Northfield (B.C.) Character (Ques.) 2879 (ii).
Man. and North-western Ry., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4766 (ii).
Mounted Police Pension Act (1889) Amt. (B. 59) 1°, 1228; 2° m., 2036 (i).
Petroleum Inspection Act Amt. (B. 139) (Sir *Henry Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 4722 (ii).
Post Office Mail Contracts, in Com. of Sup., 5094 (ii).
Prince Albert, Appnmt. of Sheriff (Ques.) 667 (i).
Prince Albert Branch, C. P. R., par. in Prince Albert *Advocate* (remarks) 2657 (ii).
Quarantine Regulations, U. S., Man., N. W. T. and B. C., on M. for Ret., 824 (i).
Ry. Lands and Taxation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Oliver*) 3515 (ii).
Regina, Long Lake, &c., Ry. Co., Govt. Subsidy (Ques.) 1637 (i).
Saskatchewan Election, Member's Seat challenged, on M. to adjn. Hse., 963 (i).
—— Mail Service, Regularity of Delivery (Ques. 1634 (i).
Saskatoon and Battleford and Onion Lake Mail Servcie (Ques.) 1633 (i).
Scrip for Half-breeds, Claims (M. for Ret.) 3530.
Smuggling by American Whalers, Mackenzie River Basin (Ques.) 794 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying interests, butter and cheese) 2190 (ii).
Immigration (agent's salaries) 4044 (ii).
Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1511.
Trans-Can. Ry. Co., change of Title (B. 22) 1°*, 707 (i).

Davis, Mr. T. O.—*Con.*
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (shoe tacks) 3655; (tea and coffee) 3718; (wire nails) 3649 (ii).

Dobell, Hon. R. R., *West Quebec.*
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3999 (ii).
Quebec Bridge Co. and Directors (Ans.) 3056 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Indians: Man. and N.W.T. (gratuities to retired officers) 5000 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (St. Lawrence ship channel) 4870 (ii).

Domville, Mr. J., *King's, N.B.*
Farm Implements, &c., Abolition of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2135 (i).
Queen's Diamond Jubilee, Can. Militia Contingent (M. to adjn. Hse.) 638 (i).
—— Colonial Troops (Ques.) 922 (i).
Restigouche and Victoria Ry. Co.'s B. 99 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) on M. for 2°, 2348 (ii).
Restigouche Ry. and Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 104) 1°*, 2051; 2° m., 2166; on Order for 2°, 2348 (i).
Scovil, Walter B., Pet. *re* (Ques.) 2415 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture &c. (dairying interests, butter and cheese) 2197 (i).
Civil Government: Railways and Canals, 1956 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Weights and Measures (salaries, &c.) 2517 (ii).
Temiscouata Ry. Co.'s (B. 58) 1°*, 1226 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 3223 (ii).

Douglas, Mr. J. M., *East Assiniboia.*
Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 60) 1°*, 1229; 2°, m., 2041 (i).
Farm Implements, Coal Oil in Tanks Duty, (Ques.) 2216 (i).
Man. and Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 24) 1°*, 707 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Rideau Hall) 2601, 2613 (ii).
Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1463 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (mutton, &c.) 3369; (wheat flour) 3458; (coal oil) 3482; (shovels, &c) 3703; (hides and skins, &c.) 3711; (agricultural implements) 4153.

Dugas, Mr. L. E., *Montcalm.*
Beauharnois Postmaster and County Election (Ques.) 268 (i).
Illicit Stills, Seizure at Pont Rouge (Ques.) 1373.
Inland Revenue Laws, Infraction (Ques.) 1544, 1637 (i).
Lavoie, Dr. Nap., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1544 (i).
—— on Str. *La Canadienne* (Ques.) 1304 (i).

Dugas, Mr. L. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Excise (travelling, &c.) 2508 (ii).
Vezina, Geo., and Inland Revenue Laws (Ques.) 1637 (ii).

Dupont, Mr. F., *Bagot.*
Address, on The, 194 (i).
I. C. R. Extension to Montreal (G. T. R. and Drummond Co. Ry.) B. 142 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for Com. on Res., 4326 (ii).
Subsidies to Rys. B. 151 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5497 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 3079; Res. 17 (combine clause) 3319 (ii).

Dyment, Mr. A. E., *Algoma.*
Atikokan Island Range Ry. Co.'s (B. 50) 1°*, 1171 (i).
Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1871 (i).
Export Duty on Logs, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com., 4717 (ii).
St. Mary's River Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 42) 1°*, 1072 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital: Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 5120 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. B.) 4942. Harbours and Rivers (Ont., Fort Francis Locks) 4970; (Manitoulin Island) 4965 (ii).

Earle, Mr. T., *Victoria, B.C.*
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4575 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (rice) 4132 (ii).

Ellis, Mr. J. V., *St. John City, N.B.*
Adjournment for Easter (remarks) 708 (i).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Winter Terminus (Ques.) 1374 (i).
——— Contract, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4218 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3677 (ii).
St. Lawrence Channel, Deepening, &c., Amts. Paid (Ques., 3867 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Weights and Measures (salaries) 2542 (ii).
Marine (hospitals) 2296 (ii).
Miscellaneous (investigating charges, N. W. T.) 5220; (small-pox epidemic, Winnipeg) 4085 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont., Rat Portage) 5286 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (wheat and flour) 3453; (books) 3473; (coal oil) 3479; (marble, &c.) 3497; (coal, bituminous) 4201 (ii).

Erb, Mr. D. K., *South Perth.*
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com. (photographs, &c.) 3475; (books, &c.) 3706; (paintings, &c.) 3708 (ii).

Ethier, Mr. J. A. C., *Two Mountains.*
Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 18 (i).

Fielding, Hon. W. S. (Minister of Finance) *Shelburne and Queen's, N.S.*
American Bank Note Co. and Mr. Reid's relation thereto (Ans.) 2881 (i).
——— Contract, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2687 (ii).
——— Cost of Engraving, &c. (Ans.) 3056 (ii).
——— Printing Contracts (remarks) 1462 (i).
——— Plates required and Cost (Ans.) 3506 (ii).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Contract, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4232 (ii).
Auditor General's Rep. (presented) 169 (i).
Baie des Chaleurs Ry., par. in Halifax *Chronicle* (remarks) 3420 (ii).
Bounties on Iron and Steel (prop. Res.) 4653; in Com., 5186; 1°* of B., 5201; in Com., 5288.
British Goods and Custom's Tariff (remarks) 1461 (i).
Budget, The, Financial Stmt., 1083, 1120 (i).
——— (remarks) 783 (i).
——— *See* "Ways and Means."
Civil Service Superannuation (Refund) Act Amt. (B. 136) Com. on Res. (M.) 3721, 4118; 1° of B., 119 (ii).
Coal Trade of N.S., reported Newspaper utterances (Ans.) 670 (i).
Customs Act Amt. and Consolid. (B. 143) 1°*, 4698 (ii).
——— *See* "Ways and Means."
Drummond Co. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 3824; conc., 5458 (ii).
Estimates, The (remarks) 270 (i).
——— Year ending 1898 (presented) 667 (i).
——— Suppl. (presented) 3742, 4008, 4612, 5009.
Export Duty on Logs, &c. (prop. Res.) 4613, 4653; Com. on Res. (M.) 4701; in Com., 4718; (B. 145) 1°, 4719 (ii).
Export Duties on Pulp Wood (remarks) 3872 (ii).
Farm Implements, Duty, Coal Oil in Tank Vessels (Ans.) 2216 (i).
G. T. R. and Dom. Govt., reported Grant of $300,000, on M. to adjn. Hse., 587 (i).
Insurance Co.'s Abstract Statement (presented) 492 (i).
Kingston Cotton Mills and Tariff changes (remarks) 98 (i).
Loan (Public Service) $15,000,000 (B. 148) prop. Res., 4736; in Com. on Res., 5160; 1°*, 5163 (ii).
Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 667 (i), 2658, 3742, 5009 (ii).
Mining Machinery, Free Entry under Tariff, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2221 (i).
"Our Lady of the Snows," on M. to adjn., 1548.

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Personal Explanation *re* prop. Tariff Changes (remarks) 175 (i).

Petroleum Inspection Act Amt. B. 139 (Sir *Henry Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 4721 (ii).

Public Accounts, Annual Rep. (presented) 169 (i).

Quebec Harbour Commissioners, Arrears of Interest (Ans.) 4471 (ii).

Queen's Diamond Jubilee Celebration, Vote for Militia, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 2658 (ii).

Reciprocal Rights, Belgium and Germany (remarks) 1462 (i).

St. Andrew's Rapids, Improvements (Ans.) 1987.

Shannon, Jas., Postmaster, Kingston, Superannuation, &c. (Ans.) 3058 (ii).

Shareholders and Chartered Banks, List (presented) 492 (i).

Subsidies to Rys., Brookfield Station, I.C.R., in Com. on Res., 5526.

——— Central and Liverpool, in Com. on Res., 5525 (ii).

——— Port Hawkesbury and Port Hood, in Com. on Res., 5522 (ii).

——— Windsor Junction, in Com. on Res., 5520.

Superannuations, July, 1896, to April, 1897, Names, &c. (Ans.) 667 (i).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Capital: Trent Valley (construction) 5128. Lachine, conc., 5451 (ii).

Charges of Management (printing bank notes) 5201 (ii).

Civil Government: Civil Service Examiners (salaries) 4828 (ii).

Collection of Revenues: Customs (preventive service) conc., 5447 (ii).

Government of N.W.T. (schools, subsidies, &c.) 5002 (ii).

Immigration (agents' salaries) 3745 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (contingencies) 4843 (ii).

Militia (B.C. fortifications) conc., 5426; (Jubilee contingent) 2659 (ii).

Miscellaneous (arbitration, Dom. and Provs.) 4083, conc., 5424; (investigating charges, N.W.T.) 5215; (tariff inquiry) 5205 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.) 4945; (N.S.) 4909. Harbours and Rivers (P.E.I.) 4984.

Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (extension to Montreal) 3824; (rolling stock) 5316; (Drummond Co. Ry.) conc., 5458 (ii).

Supply (Res. for Com.) 481 (i).

——— (B. 111) Militia Contingent, 1°*, 2662 (ii).

——— (B. 150) 1°*, 5478; 2°* in Com. and 3°*, 5535 (ii).

Tariff Res., Date of Introduction and N.S. Elections (Ans.) 268 (i).

——— Inquiry, Translation of Evidence (Ans.) 793 (i).

——— Res., 1136 (i); Res. as adopted, 4614 (ii).

——— Res. (remarks) 2476 (i).

——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 2800 (ii).

——— (M. for Com.) 2829 (ii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Tariff and Her Maj.'s Govt. *re* Res. 16 (Ans.) 2880 (ii).

——— (M. for Com.) 2829 (ii).

Thibeault, Chas., Superannuation, Contributions and Amt. drawn from Fund (Ans.) 1306 (i).

Timothy Seed and Clover, Imposition of Duty (Ans.) 793 (i).

Trusts and Combines, Existence in Can. (Ans.) 1986.

Ways and Means (Res. for Com.) 481 (i).

——— The Budget (Financial Stmnt.) 1083 (i).

——— The Tariff:

In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 2966, 3129, 3150, 3167, 3179; Res. 17 (combine clause) 3250; (item 1) 3352; (spirituous liquors, &c.) 3352; (mutton, &c.) 3358, 3381; (eggs) 3408; (condensed milk) 3409; (fresh salmon) 3418; (cornmeal) 3423; (wheat flour) 3454; (books, &c.) 3465, 3706; (advertising matter, &c.) 3474; (photographs, &c.) 3476; (medicinal preparations) 3477; (putty) 3478; (surgical instruments) 3478; (coal oil) 3482; (china ware) 3497; (iron or steel scrap) 3606; (iron or steel ingots) 3637; (iron or steel angles) 3639; (wire nails) 3640; (shoe tacks) 3652; (screws) &c.) 3656; (buckthorn, &c., strip fencing) 3683; 4147; (wire cable) 3693; (brass wire) 3694; (skates, &c.) 3697; (rasps and files) 3701, 4133; (stereotypes, &c.) 3703; (travellers' baggage) 3706; (newspapers, &c.) 3707; (paintings, &c.) 3708; (tanning bark) 3711; (salt, &c.) 3714; (Norway iron) 3718; (rice) 4130; (peaches, &c.) 4132; (India-rubber boots, belting, &c.) 4146; (India-rubber clothing, hose, &c.) 4147; (clothes wringers) 4167; (watch cases) 4167; (axes, scythes, &c.) 4169; (cotton fabrics) 4180; (shirts and shirt waists) 4181; (cotton duck) 4186; (woollen yarns) 4190; (woollen fabrics) 4191; (coal, bituminous slack) 4192; (sugar) 4395; (sugar, confectionery, &c.) 4398; (velvets, &c.) 4465; (coal) 4466 (ii).

Fiset, Mr. J. B. R., *Rimouski.*

Amqui Municipality, Reimbursement for Ry. Crossing (Ques.) 1541 (i).

Pouliot, Mr., late M.P., deceased (remarks) 5185.

River Matane Fishing Leases (Ques.) 4207 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Capital: Grenville (dismissals 3888 (ii).

Civil Government: Post Office (increased salaries) 5112 (ii).

Miscellaneous: (commissions of investigation) 5252 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Que., Rimouski Pier) 4963 (ii).

Fisher, Hon. S. A. (Minister of Agriculture), *Brome.*

American Bank Note Contract (remarks) 1560 (i).

Butter Trade with England, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 603 (i).

Cheese and Creameries Registration (B. 117) in Com., 3722 (ii).

Civil Service Examiners' Rep. (presented) 1072.

——— List (presented) 178 (i).

Cold Storage Contract (presented) 4364 (ii).

——— Transportation (B. 141) prop. Res. and in Com., 4130; 1°* of B., 4252 (ii).

Fisher, Hon. S. A.—*Con.*
Dairy Inspector (P.E.I.) Dismissal of Thos. J. Dillon (Ans.) 2424 (i).
Dismissals from Public Service (B.C. Quarantine Station) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2405 (i).
Estimates, The, Typographical Error (explanation) 708 (i).
Geological Survey, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 5542.
Grosse Isle Wharf, Extension (Ans.) 919 (i).
Inspection (General) Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 3568 (ii).
Patent Act Amt. (B. 120) 1°, 3234; in Com., 3722 (ii).
Patents for Wire Fences, Number Granted (Ans.) 2882 (ii).
P.E.I. Mail Service (remarks) 1560 (i).
Printing and Stationery, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 5542 (ii).
Quarantine, Gov. Gen's Warrants, in Com. of Sup., 4860 (ii).
——— Regulations, Victoria, B.C. (remarks) 1556.
Sec. of State's Deptl. Rep. (presented) 178 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 2106; agricultural societies) 2109; (cold storage) 2274; (criminal statistics) 2108; (dairying interests, butter and cheese) 2180, 2119; (creameries in N.W.T.) 2179; (experimental farms, printing, &c.) 2118, 2110 (i); (N. W. T. exhibition) 4960; (Stockholm exhibition) 4859 (ii); (*Patent Record*) 2107; (*Year Book*) 2108 (i); (Wm. Stoker's salary) 4859 (ii).
Civil Government: Agriculture (contingencies) 2083, 2088 (i); (salaries) 4832; (messenger's salary) 4986 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (sessional indemnity) 4844; (patent poll-book) conc., 5427 (ii).
Miscellaneous (small-pox epidemic, Winnipeg) 4085 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (P.E.I.) 2730 (ii).
Quarantine (cattle) 2283 (i); (cattle epidemic) 4991; (Gov. Gen's Warrants) 4860 (ii); (hog cholera, slaughter, compensation) 2270; (Man. Hospital) 2263; (salaries, &c.) 2203; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 2262 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (mutton, &c.) 3387, 3405; (strip fencing) 3689; (Indian corn) 4438 (ii).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. C. (Solicitor General) *Quebec County.*
Address, on The, 167, 181 (i).
Admiralty Jurisdiction and N. S. County Court Judges (Ans.) 262 (i).
Civil Service Act, Min. of Justice's Opinion (Ans.) 2124 (i).
Companies' Act Amt. (B. 135) 1°*, 3971; in Com., 4258 (ii).
Controllers of Customs and Inland Revenue Repeal (B. 125) 1°, 3580 (ii).
County Court Judges, Commissions without Legislation (Ans.) 2125 (i).
Forged or Unauthorized Endorsements of Bills B. 123 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 3723.

Fitzpatrick, Hon. C.—*Con.*
Franchise Act Repeal (B. 7) 1°, 89; 2° m., 718 (i).
——— B. 126 (Voters' Lists) 1°*, 3724 (ii).
Gahan, Convict, Release from Kingston Penitentiary (remarks) 3340 (ii).
Goodwin *vs.* The Queen, par in Toronto *Globe* (Ans.) 3841 (ii).
Interest Act Amt. (B. 134) 1°*, 3971; in Com., 4252 (ii).
Kingston Penitentiary, Dismissal of Guards (Ans.) 3339 (ii).
Lord's Day Observance B. 10 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2473 (i).
Muma, Henry, Official Referee, Dismissal, &c (Ans.) 4735 (ii).
Penitentiaries Rep. (presented) 3679 (ii).
Provincial Courts Judges Act Amt. (B. 140) in Com., 4724 (ii).
Quebec Land Slide, Appnmt. of Commission (Ans.) 3719, 3720 (ii).
Queen's Diamond Jubilee, Bank Holiday (Ans.) 4372 (ii).
Savings Banks, Prov. of Quebec (B. 147) 1°*, 5009 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (Supreme Court) 4986; (travelling allowances to Judges in Man.) conc., 3732 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (preventive service) 5006.
Legislation: House of Commons (Returning officers, &c.) 4990 (ii).
Miscellaneous (arbitration, Dom. and Provs.) conc., 5425; (litigated matters, &c.) 3863 (ii).
Penitentiaries, 2794; (gratuities to retired officials) 4987; Kingston (Commissioners' Rep.) 4740, 4758, 4780; (payments to commissioners) 4798 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (P.E.I.) 4985 (ii).
Superior Court Judge, Rimouski District (Ans.) 4477 (ii).
Supreme Court of Ont. (B. 131) 1°*, 3719; 2° m., 4207; in Com., 4214 (ii).
Voters' List, 1897 (B. 126) 1°, 3581 (ii).
Wiggins, John, Dismissal from B. C. Penitentiary (Ans.) 2418 (i).

Flint, Mr. T. B., *Yarmouth, N.S.*
Dismissals from Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fairlie) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2314 (i).
Queen's Diamond Jubilee, Colonial Troops (Ques.) 922 (i).
Saskatchewan Election, Member's Seat challenged, on M. to adjn. Hse., 969 (i).
SUPPLY:
Legislation: House of Commons (sessional indemnity) 4858 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (coal oil) 3483 (ii).
Yukon Mining, Trading and Trans. Co.'s B. 118 (Mr. *Morrison*) on Sen. Amts., 5232 (ii).

Foster, Hon. G. E., *York, N.B.*
Address, on The, 67 (i).
Allandale Postmaster, Dismissal (Ques.) 1079 (i).
American Bank Note Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on Order for 3°, 3089; on M. for 3°, 3285 (ii).
——— Contract (remarks) 1461, 1560 (i).
——— Notice of Motion, 2572 (i).
——— Cost of Engraving, &c. (Ques.) 3056 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 2662 (ii).
——— Plates required and Cost (Ques.) 3505 (ii).
Appnmts. by late Govt., Recommendations of Treasury Board, on M. for Ret., 1653 (i).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service Contract, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4002, 4224 (ii).
Baie de Chaleurs Ry., Govt. Control (Ques.) 261.
Beauharnois Canal, Appnmt. of Collector of Tolls, &c. (remarks) 2419 (i).
Bompas, Bischoff & Co., Solicitors for the Dom., Retirement (M. for Cor.*) 546 (i).
Bounties on Iron and Steel, in Com. on Res., 5187 (ii).
British Goods and Customs Tariff (remarks) 1461.
Budget, The (reply) 1172 (i).
Business of the Hse., on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to take Monday, 2967 (ii).
——— (remarks) 5010, 5038, 5286, 5287 (ii).
Civil Servants, Commissioners to investigate Charges (M. for Ret.*) 546 (i).
Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s B., Return of Fees (remarks) 4652 (ii).
Commissioners to investigate Partisan Offences (remarks) 1462 (i).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 140 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4523, 4588; further stages suggested, 4725; in Com. on B., 5164, 5338, 5342 (ii).
Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. B. 125 (Mr. *Davies*) in Com., 4125 (ii).
Daly, Hon. T. M., Rep. on Immigration (Ques.) 922 (i).
Debates, Official Rep., 1st Rep. of Com., on conc., 707 (i).
Drummond Co. Ry. and G.T.R., in Com., of Sup., 5080; conc., 5488 (ii).
——— *See* "I. C. R."
Estimates, The, (Ques.) 270; Suppl., 554, 972 (i).
Export Duties on Pulp Wood (remarks) 3873 (ii).
Export Duty on Logs, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 4613, 4704, 4713; in Com., 4718 (ii).
Export of Bacon, Hams, &c., on prop. wthdrl. of B., 4342 (ii).
Farm Implements, &c., Abolition of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2141 (i).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 93; on M. for 2°, 719; Amt., 724; prop. wthdrl. of Amt., 784 (i).
Gaspé Lightship-keeper (Ques.) 2126 (i).
G.T.R. and Dom. Govt., Reported grant of $300,000 (M. to adjn.) 574 (i).
——— (Ques.) 342, 489 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Hudson Bay Expedition, Emplymt. of Sealer *Diana* (remarks) 1821 (i).
I.C.R. Extension to Montreal B. 142 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 4612; on M. for 3°, 4694; Amt. neg. on a div., 4697 (ii).
——— Extension to Montreal (remarks) 4203 (ii).
——— G.T.R. and Drummond Co. Ry., on M. for Com. on Res., 4259, 4287; in Com., 4342, 4374 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 3748, 4810, 5269, 5288, 5328, 5338 (ii).
Kingston Cotton Mills and Tariff Changes (remarks) 98 (i).
Loan (Public Service) $15,000,000 B. 148 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 5161; 1st of B., 5163 (ii).
Loans, Govt. Temporary (Ques.) 949 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 10 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2466 (i).
Marsh Hill (Ont.) Postmaster, Appmnt. of G. G. King (Ques.) 261, 268, 483 (i).
——— (M. for Cor.*) 1662 (i).
Maugerville, Upper, Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (M. for Cor.*) 1663 (i).
McCallum, Angus, Lock Supt. du Lievre, Dismissal (Ques.) 1835 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 1903 (i).
McKnight, W., Postmaster at King's, Man., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3740 (ii).
McManus, Mrs., Postmistress, Northfield (B.C.) Dismissal, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 1380 (i).
Members, Absence of, before Prorogation (remarks) 5159 (ii).
Mining Development and Advisory Corporation, &c., B. 82 (Mr. *Maxwell*) on M. for 2°, 1937 (i).
Mining Machinery, Free Entry under Tariff, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2222 (i).
Oak Point (N.B.) Lighthouse-keeper, G. R. Pickett's Dismissal (Ques.) 3669 (ii).
Order (Ques. of) Members accused of conspiracy, in Com. of Sup., 5302 (ii).
Petroleum Inspection Act Amt. B. 139 (Sir *Henry Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 4719 (ii).
Portage la Prairie, Govt. Building, Change of Site (Ques.) 262 (i).
Postmasters, &c., King's and York (N.B.) Dismissals (M. for Ret.*) 546 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 4505, 4725, 5372, 5399, 5531, 5537; on M. for Com., 5529 (ii).
——— Mail Contracts, in Com. of Sup., 5098 (ii).
Printing Govt. Notes, Stamps, &c., Tenders and Contracts (M. for copies*) 546 (i).
Public Bills, &c., on M. to adjn. Hse (remarks) 550 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Casey*) to place on Order Paper, 3502 (ii).
Questions by Members not in Order (remarks 3972 (ii).
Reciprocal Tariff, on Ques. of Order, 1459 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Returns (inquiries) 1990, 2298, 2572 (i), 2969, 4032, 4109, 4470 (ii).

Saskatchewan Election, Member's Seat challenged, on M. to adjn. Hse., 957 (i).

Sessional Indemnity (Sen. and House of Commons) in Com. on Res., 3729 (ii).

Subsidies to Rys. B. 151 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5478; 1** of B., 5529; in Com., 5536 (ii).

——— Brookfield Station and Eastville, in Com. on Res., 5526 (ii).

——— G. T. R., Victoria Bridge, in Com. on Res., 5526 (ii).

——— Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa, in Com. on Res., 5512 (ii).

——— Ont. and Rainy River, in Com. on Res., 5517 (ii).

——— Ottawa and New York, in Com. on Res., 5512 (ii).

——— Pembroke Southern Ry., in Com. on Res., 5516 (ii).

——— Portage du Fort, in Com. on Res., 5520.

——— Port Hawkesbury and Port Hood, in Com. on Res., 5522 (ii).

——— Richelieu Valley, in Com. on Res., 5520.

——— Schomberg and Aurora, in Com. on Res., 5513 (ii).

——— Windsor Junction, in Com. on Res., 5520.

Superannuation Act (C. S.) Abolition B. 9 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 554 (i).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice (travelling expenses) conc., 3734, 4841 (ii).

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 2275 (i); (Stockholm exhibition) 4859 (ii).

Canals—Capital: Cornwall (enlargement) 3861; Galops, 3862; Grenville (dismissals) 3892, 3947; Lachine, 4823, 5113; North Channel, 3862; River Reaches, 3862; Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 3874; St. Pierre River, 5150; Soulanges (construction) 3861. *Income:* Welland, conc., 5454.

Charges of Management (printing bank notes) 5201, conc., 5455 (ii).

Civil Government: Agriculture (contingencies) 2083, 2089 (i); (salaries) 4832 (ii); Customs, 1730, (contingencies) 2072; Indian Dept., 1709, (law clerk) 1677; Inland Revenue, 1721, 1914; Interior, 1669, 1693, (contingencies) 2069 (i), 6265, (salaries) 4838 (ii); Militia, 1927 (i), (salaries) 4831 (ii); Post Office, 1721, (contingencies) 2083 (i), (statutory increases) 5077, 5265; (technical services) 5100 (ii); Printing and Stationery, 1669; Privy Council (contingencies) 2067 (i), (salaries) 4830 (ii); Public Works, 1735; Sec. of State (contingencies) 2068 (i). (Printing Bureau) 4831: Railways and Canals (newspaper subscriptions) 4830 (ii); Trade and Commerce (contingencies) 2088 (i).

Collection of Revenues, 2506; Culling Timber, 2509 (i), (salaries) 4864 (ii). Excise (preventive service) 2502. Railways (I.C.R., expenses of commission) 5258; (Baie de Chaleurs) 5133, conc., 5452. Customs (preventive service, travelling, &c.) 2507 (i), 4864, 5014, 5027. Post Office (mail service) 5059; (outside service) 5417, conc., 5431.

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Dominion Lands—Income: conc., 5423 (ii).

Dominion Police, 2090 (i).

Geological Survey, 4072 (ii).

Immigration (agents' salaries) 2800, 3743, 4038, 4053; (general expenses) 4072 (ii).

Indians: B.C. (surveys, &c.) 4076; (inspectors) 4078 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (Dep. Speaker's salary) 2092; (extra clerks) 2103; (salaries) 2102 (i); (sessional clerks) 4849; (sessional indemnity) 4843; (patent poll-book) conc., 5427 (ii). Library (salaries, &c.) 2106. Senate (salaries, &c.) 2090 (i).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction, &c.) 2294 (i).

Militia (B.C. fortifications) conc., 5426; (Jubilee contingent) 2659; (Military College) 4802 (ii).

Miscellaneous (arbitration. Dom. and Provs.) conc., 5424; (commissions of investigation) 5235; (investigating charges, N.W.T.) 5215; (gratuities, quarantine officers) 4860: (Jubilee expenses) conc., 5456; (St. Johns, P.Q., Postmaster's defalcations) 5213; (tariff inquiry) 5205 (ii).

Penitentiaries: Kingston (Commissioner's Rep.) 4740; (payments to commissioners) 4798 (ii).

Public Works—Capital: Canals (Lachine) 4892. Buildings (electric lighting, Ottawa) conc., 4895, 5429; (west deptl. block, fire) 4880, 4894. Harbours and Rivers (St. Lawrence ship channel) 4865. *Income:* Buildings (Que., Berthierville P.O.) conc., 5456; (Man., immigrant shed) 4949, (Portage Laprairie P.O.) 4950; (N.B.) 4941, 5278; (Ont., Ottawa Grounds, &c.) 4948 (ii), (Rideau Hall) 2601, 2629, 2639 (i), 4886 (ii), (telephone service) 2653 (i). Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 4973; (Ont.) 2738, 2773; (Fort Francis Locks) 4970; Collingwood Harbour) 2771; (Que., Gatineau River) 4959; (N.B.) 2733, 4956: (N.S.) 2719; (P.E.I.) 2731; (Que.) 4958; (Little Rapids Lock) conc., 5443. *Miscellaneous* (architects' salaries, &c.) 4891: (clerical assistance) 4891 (ii).

Quarantine (salaries and contingencies) 2256 (i).

Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (extension to Montreal 3748, 3810; (rolling stock) 5269, 5288, 5328, 5338; (Drummond Co. Ry.) 5080, conc., 5488. P.E.I. Ry., 3860 (ii).

Sussex (N.B.) Govt. Buildings, Appnmt. of caretaker (Ques.) 262 (i).

Tariff Changes, on Personal Explanation (Mr. *Fielding*) 176 (i).

——— Inquiry, Confidential Evidence (remarks) 793 (i).

——— Res., on M. for Com. of Sup., 2476 (i).

——— (remarks) 717 (i).

——— (Reply to Budget Speech) 1172 (i).

Victoria Bridge, Montreal, Grant of $300,000 (Ques.) 342 (i).

——— O.C. *re* Govt. Aid (Ques.) 489 (i).

——— (M. to adjn.) 574 (i).

——— Subsidy, in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5526.

Ways and Means—The Tariff:

In Com.: (arrangement as to discussion) 2033; Res. 1 (Customs Acts, Amts., definitions, &c.) 2842; Res. 12 (packages, &c., for liquids) 2843; Res. 16 (preferential clause) 2902, 2945, 2970, 3078, 3091,

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Ways and Means—Con.
3095, 3158; Res. 17 (combine clause) 3299; (spirituous liquors, &c.) 3352; (vermouth, &c.) 3357; (mutton, &c.) 3358, 3381; (eggs) 3408; (condensed milk) 3409; (Indian corn) 3409, 4451; (salmon, fresh) 3418; (cornmeal) 3421; (scrap iron) 3635; (iron and steel ingots) 3637; (iron forgings) 3639; (wire nails) 3640, 3645; (shoe tacks) 3652; (screws) 3656; (barbed wire) 3659; (brass wire) 3694; (skates, &c.) 3696; (Britannia metal) 3703; (rice) 4131; (pears and peaches) 4133; India-rubber boots, belting, &c.) 4145; (buckthorn, &c., fencing) 3069, 4147; (agricultural implements) 4153; (clothes wringers) 4166; (watch cases) 4167; (axes, scythes, &c.) 4169; shirts and shirt waists) 4181; (coal, bituminous, slack) 4194; (sugar) 4395; (sugar candy) 4398; (coal) 4466.

Fraser, Mr. D. C., *Guysborough, N.S.*
Address, on The, 420 (i).
British Yukon Chartered Co.'s incorp. (B. 64) 1°*, 1373 (i).
Farm Implements, &c., Abolition of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2142 (i).
Halifax Loan Co.'s B., Suspension of Rule (M.) 1665 (i).
Maritime Milling Co.'s incorp. (B. 40) 1°*, 1071 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (mutton, &c.) 3371; (wheat flour) 3445 (ii).

Fraser, Mr. J., *East Lambton.*
Petroleum Inspection Act Amt. B. 139 (Sir *Henry Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 4723 (ii).
Private Bills, Ref. to Com. (M.) 1227 (i).
Subsidies to Rys. (Sunny Brae and Guysborough) in Com. on Res., 5521 (ii).
Supreme Court, (Ont.) B. 131 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4215 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (coal oil) 3486 (ii).

Frost, Mr. F. T., *Leeds and Grenville.*
American Bank Note Co.'s (B. 68) 1°*, 1373 (i).
Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1875 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 893 (i).
Subsidies to Rys. (Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa) in Com. on Res., 5512 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Post Office (mail service) 5075 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 2997; (iron or steel scrap) 3621 (ii).

Ganong, Mr. G. W., *Charlotte, N.B.*
Alien Labour Restriction B. 5 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 648 (i).
Behan, Michael, Storeman on Lachine Canal, Dismissal (Ques.) 2565 (i).
Campobello Breakwater, Repairs (Ques.) 2565 (i).

Ganong, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying interests, butter and cheese) 2193 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Weights and Measures (salaries) 2542 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 3215; (coal oil) 3495, 3496; (marble, &c.) 3498 (ii).

Gauthier, Mr. J., *L'Assomption.*
Chateauguay and Northern Ry., Rivière des Prairies Bridge (Ques.) 567 (i).

Gibson, Mr. W., *Lincoln and Niagara.*
Adjournment for Easter (remarks) 709 (i).
Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1755 (i).
C.P.R. and Hull Electric Co.'s Agreement (B. 25) 1°*, 707 (i).
Can. Power Co. of Hamilton (B. 66) 1°*, 1373 (i)
Dom. Safe Deposit, Warehousing and Loan Co. s (B. 106) 1°*, 2297 (i).
G.T.R. of Can. (B. 26) 1°*, 707 (i).
Hamilton and Niagara Falls Customs Collectors (Ques.) 1540 (i).
I.C.R. Extension to Montreal (Drummond Co. Ry. and G.T.R.) B. 142 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 3°, 4671 (ii).
Jubilee Postage Stamps (Ques.) 2654 (ii).
Order (Ques. of) 2359 (i).
Printing of Parlt., 2nd Rep. of Com., conc. (M.) 4364 (ii).
Ry. Act Amt. (B. 8) 1°, 95; 2° m., 673 (i).
Trail Creek and Columbia Ry. Co.'s (B. 31) 1°*, 838 (i).

Gillies, Mr. J. A., *Richmond, N.S.*
Admiralty Jurisdiction and N. S. County Court Judges (Ques.) 262 (i).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service Contract, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4221, 4227 (ii).
Bear Island Postmaster (Ques.) 672 (i).
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. 33 (Mr. *Osler*) on Order for Com., 2163 (i).
Chisholm, W. C., Indian Agent, Dismissal (Ques.) 1375 (i).
Coal Trade of N. S., Newspaper utterances of Finance Minister (Ques.) 669 (i).
I. C. R. Extension to Montreal, in Com. of Sup., 3831 (ii).
L'Ardoise Breakwater, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 670.
Lobster Fisheries, Close Season, Extension (remarks) 5415 (ii).
Micmac Indians, Medical Attendance, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4019 (ii).
Point Tupper Station Agent, Appnmt. (Ques.) 788 (i).
St. Peter's Canal, Daniel B. Stone's Dismissa (Ques.) 2414 (i).
Subsidies to Rys. (Port Hawkesbury and Port Hood) in Com. on Res., 5521 (ii).

Gillies, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 2288 (ii).
Canals—Capital: St. Peter's (repairs) 5274 (ii).
Civil Government: Post Office, 1727 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Baddeck, &c., Grand Narrows, &c.) conc., 5419; (Mar. Provs.) 2791 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (dredging) 2784; (N.S.) 2727 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (extension to Montreal) 3831; (land damages) conc., 5431 (ii).

Gilmour, Mr. J., *East Middlesex.*
Inspection (General) Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 3577 (ii).

Guay, Mr. P. M., *Lévis.*
Pilots (Quebec and Montreal) incorp. (B. 67) 1°*, 1373 (i).
——— Refund of Fees (M.) 4734 (ii).
Military Equipments, Conditions of Tests, &c. (Ques.) 5465 (ii).

Guite, Mr. J. F., *Bonaventure.*
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Railways (Baie de Chaleurs) 5138 (ii).

Haggart, Mr. J. G., *South Lanark.*
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 942 (i).
Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1873 (i).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4608.
Export Duty on Logs, &c., in Com. on Res., 4718 (ii).
Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 2926 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 144 (Sir *Henry Joly de Lotbiniere*) in Com., 4700 (ii).
I.C.R. Extension to Montreal, (G.T.R. and Drummond Co. Ry.) B. 142 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for Com. on Res., 4319; in Com., 4345, 4378; on M. for 3°, 4655, (ii)
Man. Schools Ques. and Remedial Order (Ques.) 792 (i).
Personal Explanation *re* Rothwell's promotion, 1902 (i).
Returns (inquiry) 4109 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (Supreme Court) 4986.
Canals—Capital: Beauharnois, 5273; Cornwall, 5115; Lachine, 4824; St. Lawrence ship channel, 4867; St. Pierre River, 5150; Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 5117; Soulanges (contractor's claims) 5125. *Income:* Rideau (land damages, &c.) 5275 (ii).
Civil Government: Interior, 1675, 1701; Justice, 1667 (i); Post Office (technical services) 5104 (ii); Public Works, 1735; Railways and Canals, 1928, 1973 (i).

Haggart, Mr. J. G.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Collection of Revenues: Customs (preventive service) 5004. Post Office (mail service) 5074. Railways (Baie de Chaleurs) 5137. (P.E.I., compassionate allowance) 5276 (ii).
Fisheries (counsel fees, Judicial Com.) 4999 (ii).
Government of N. W. T. (schools, subsidies, &c.) 5002 (ii).
Indians: N.W.T. (Elkhorn school) 5000 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Algoma election expenses) 4987 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Victoria and San Francisco) 2791 (ii).
Militia (gratuities, &c.) 4993 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Banff Park) 5001; (commissions of investigations) 5225; (gratuities, Interior Dept.) 5001; (St. Johns, P.Q., postmasters' defalcations) 5213 (ii).
Penitentiaries (gratuities to retired officers) 4987.
Public Works—Capital: Buildings (electric lighting, Ottawa) 4897. *Income:* Buildings (N.S.) 4934; (Ont., Rat Portage) 5285, (Rideau Hall) 4887; (west deptl. block, fire) 4883. Harbours and Rivers (Man.) 4971; (Ont.) 4966; (Collingwood Harbour) 2764, (Fort Francis Locks) 4970; (Que., Gatineau River) 4960; (P.E.I.) 4976. Roads and Bridges (Ottawa) 4974 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (Dartmouth branch) 5113 (ii).

Haley, Mr. A., *Hants, N.S.*
McIntyre's Lake and Sydney Mail Service, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 3741 (ii).

Henderson, Mr. D., *Halton.*
Alien Labour Prohibition B. 5 (Mr. *Taylor*) on M. for 2°, 660 (i); in Com., 3555 (ii).
C.P.R. Rates and Tolls, West of Toronto (Ques.) 1204 (ii).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4599 (ii).
Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. B. 125 (Mr. *Davies*) in Com., 4127 (ii).
Export of Bacon, Hams, &c., prop. wthdrl. of B. (remarks) 4341 (ii).
Inspection (General) Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M, for 2°, 3571 (ii).
Liverpool Post Office, par. in Montreal *Gazette*, (Personal Explanation) 5542 (ii).
Parliament Grounds, Repairing Walks (Ques.) 5037 (ii).
Post Office Mail Contracts, in Com. of Sup., 5093 (ii).
Ry. Employees Safety B. 2 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 3562 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying interests, butter and cheese) 2192 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Ont.) 2555. Weights and Measures (salaries) 2545 (i).
Indians: N.W.T. (Elkhorn school) 5000 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Algoma election expenses) 4990; (sessional indemnity) 4858 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Newfoundland) 4995; (Quebec and Gaspé Basin) 4998 (ii).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Penitentiaries: Kingston (Commissioners' Rep.) 4740 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 4928 (ii); (Rideau Hall) 2650 (i). Harbours and Rivers (Fort Francis Locks) 4971 (ii).

Quarantine (cattle, tuberculosis epidemic) 4992 (ii).

Trusts and Combines, Existence in Can. (Ques.) 1986 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff:

In Com.: Res. 14, 2844; Res. 16 (preferential clause) 3180; Res. 17 (combine clause) 3308; (item 1) 3351; (mutton, &c.) 3369, 3393; (strip fencing) 3683; (Britannia metal, &c.) 3703; (books, &c.) 3707; (newspapers, &c.) 3707; (duck belting) 3710; (hides and skins, &c.) 3711; (tanning bark) 3711; (oleo-stearine) 3712; (shirts and shirt waists) 4180; (socks, &c.) 4187; (coal, bituminous) 4201 (ii).

Heyd, Mr. C. B., *North Brant.*

Hagarsville Indian Agent, Dismissal of Dr. Jones, on M. for Ret., 3530 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff:

In Com.: (wire nails) 3650; (woollen yarns) 4187 (ii).

Hughes, Mr. S., *North Victoria.*

Address, on The, 352 (i).

Bateman, Indian Agent, Scugog Island, Dismissal (Ques.) 1081 (i).

Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1891 (i).

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. 33 (Mr. *Osler*) in Com., 2338 (i).

Fenelon Falls Customs Officer (Ques.) 258 (i).

Fishery Guardians, North Victoria (Ques.) 1081, 1308, 1451 (i).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 1019 (i).

Hudson Bay Expedition, Emplymt. of Sealer *Diana* (remarks) 1834 (i).

Hungerford, Wm., Engineer Dredge *Otonabee* Dismissal (Ques.) 259 (i).

——— (M. for Cor.*) 1774 (i).

Kelley, Miss, Windsor P. O. Employee (Ques.) 920 (i).

Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 98) 1°*, 1899 (i).

Lord's Day Observance B. 10 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2463 (i).

McArthur, Wm., Fenelon Falls, Dismissal (M. for Cor.) 1639, 1774 (i).

Military College, Kingston, Administrative Changes (Ques.) 791 (i); (remarks) 3541 (ii).

Mount Albert and Holt Mail Contract (Ques.) 795 (i).

Mounted Police Act (1894) Amt. B. 62 (Mr. *Davin*) on M. for 2°, 2041 (i).

Mycenian Marble Co.'s Relief B. 83 (Mr. *Rosamond*) in Com., 2347 (i).

O'Leary, Hugh, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1302.

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Queen's Diamond Jubilee, Can. Militia contingent, on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 841 (i).

——— (Ques.) 973, 1083 (i).

——— Militia Contingent, List of Officers (remarks) 1901 (i).

Sadowa Postmaster, Appnmt., &c. (Ques.) 2123 (i).

Scugog Island Indians, Wm. Bateman's Dismissal (M. for Ret.) 3524 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms) 2111.

Civil Government: Agriculture (contingencies) 2088; Indian Dept., 1711; Interior, 1674; Militia and Defence, 1669, 1927; Mounted Police, 1709; Post Office, 1721; Railways and Canals, 1948; Trade and Commerce, 1981 (i).

Legislation: House of Commons (extra clerks) 2104; (salaries) 2102. Senate (salaries, &c.) 2090.

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 2581 (ii).

Tariff, The, arrangement as to Discussion, 3032.

Trent Valley Canal, Balsam Lake Section, Dismissal of Timber Inspector (Ques.) 259 (i).

——— Rosedale Works, Dismissal of Foreman (Ques.) 259 (i).

Veneers, Imports by Dom. Organ Co. (Ques.) 1545 (i).

Vote in Com. of Sup., on Chairman's Ruling (remarks) 2546 (ii).

Winnipeg, Duluth and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 17 (Mr. *Macdonell*) on M. for 3°, 2449 (i).

Hurley, Mr. J. M., *East Hastings.*

Drainage across Ry. Lands B. 14 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2°, 1068 (i).

Ingram, Mr. A. B., *East Elgin.*

Alien Labour Restriction B. 5 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 652 (i).

Aylmer West, Postmaster, Appnmt. and Dismissal (Ques.) 794, 795 (i).

——— Appnmt., &c., (M. for Ret.*) 1662 (i).

East and West Elgin Mail Contracts, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 837 (i).

Fishing Licenses Granted, Lake Erie (M. for Ret.) 837 (i).

——— Payments in Advance (Ques.) 267 (i).

Hagarsville Indian Agent, Dismissal of Dr. Jones, on M. for Ret., 3530 (ii).

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal (G. T. R. and Drummond Co. Ry.) B. 142 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4347 (ii).

Port Stanley Harbour Improvements, Expenditure, &c. (M. for Stmnt.*) 837 (i).

Public Bills, on M. (Mr. *Casey*) to place on Order Paper, 3501 (ii).

Ry. Employees, &c., Safety B. 2 (Mr. *Casey*) on ref. to Com., 618 (i).

St. Thomas' Collector of Customs, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 267 (i).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
SUPPLY:
Legislation: House of Commons (sessional indemnity) 4854 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (clothes wringers) 4166; (Indian corn) 4445 (ii).

Ives, Hon. W. B., *Sherbrooke.*
British Goods and Customs Tariff (remarks) 1462.
Crepeau, J. H., Postmaster, Dismissal (M. for Cor., &c.*) 1057 (i).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4604 (ii).
Danville and St. Camille Mail Service, Tenders, &c., (M. for Ret.*) 3538 (ii).
I. C. R. Extension to Montreal (G. T. R. and Drummond Co. Ry.) B. 142 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 4612 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 4507 (ii).
Ry. Employees, &c., Safety B. 2 (Mr. *Casey*) on ref. to Com., 616 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 2965 (ii).

Jameson, Mr. R. W., *Winnipeg.*
Dismissal from Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fairlie) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2307 (i).
St. Andrew's Rapids, Improvements (Ques.) 1987.
SUPPLY:
Miscellaneous (small-pox epidemic, Winnipeg) (4083 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Man., immigrant shed) 4950 (ii).

Joly de Lotbinière, Hon. Sir H., K.C.M.G., (Controller of Inland Revenue) *Portneuf.*
Coal Oil, Imports from U.S. in Tank Cars (Ans.) 796 (i).
Excise Collections by A. D. Danis, Valleyfield (Ans.) 2422 (i).
Grain Standards, Man. and N.W.T., Changes (Ans.) 1077 (i).
Illicit Still, Seizure from Geo. Vezina (Ans.) 1374 (i).
——— Seizure at Pont Rouge (Ans.) 1373 (i).
Inland Revenue Laws, Infraction (Ans.) 1544 (i).
——— Act Amt. (B. 144) Excise Res., in Com., 4698; 1°* of B., and in Com., 4699 (ii).
——— Deptl. Reps. (presented) 86 (i).
——— Deptl. Changes (Personal Explanation) 4366 (ii).
"McCarthy Act," Claim against in Provencher (Ans.) 2422 (i).
Montreal Inland Revenue, Cost of Collection, &c. (Ans.) 3057 (ii).
Petroleum Inspection Act Amt. (B. 139) 1°*, 4204; in Com., 4719 (ii).
Queen's Birthday Perpetual Holiday (B. 84) 1°*, 1738 (i).
Returns, on inquiry for, 3243 (ii).

Joly de Lotbinière, Hon. Sir H.—*Con.*
Scovil, Walter B., Pet. *re* (Ans.) 2416 (i).
Spence, John (Inland Revenue) Superannuation (Ans.) 1079 (i).
Strathroy Inland Revenue Officer, Name, &c. (Ans.) 483 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Inland Revenue, 1912 (i); (contingencies) 4839 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Culling Timber, 2509 (i); (salaries) 4864 (ii). Excise (preventive service) 2493; (salaries) 2492; (travelling, &c.) 2507. Weights and Measures, &c. (Gas inspection) 2551; (salaries) 2511 (i). Staples (inspection) 5059; (technical translation) 5058 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (mutton, &c.) 3385; (cornmeal) 3425; (wheat flour) 3459 (ii).
Weights and Measures Inspector, Port Arthur, Appnmt. (Ans.) 793 (i).

Kaulbach, Mr. C. E., *Lunenburg, N.S.*
Bounty to Fishermen, Increased (Ques.) 4471 (ii).
Fisheries Act (Saw-dust in Rivers) Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Davies*) in Com., 3728 (ii).
Gloucester Fishing Schooners and N. S. Fishermen (remarks) 4371 (ii).
Hudson Bay Expedition, Emplymt. of Sealer *Diana* (remarks) 1827 (i).
Mackerel Fishery in N. S., Protection of Fishermen (remarks) 3673 (ii).
N. S. Southern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (Ques.) 4471 (ii).
Subsidies to Rys. (Central Ry. and Liverpool) in Com. on Res., 5525 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (payments to collectors) conc., 5428 (ii).
Militia (Military College) 4812 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 4919. Harbours and Rivers (dredging) 2783, 4890; (N.S.) 2725 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: Res. 17 (combine clause) 3328; (Indian corn) 4456 (ii).

Kendry, Mr. J., *West Peterborough.*
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital: Trent Valley (construction) 5129 (ii).
Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1515 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 3207; (files and rasps) 4145 (ii).

Kloepfer, Mr. G., *South Wellington.*
Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1442 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com. (wheat flour) 3449; (Indian corn) 4462; (metal glove fasteners, &c.) 4466 (ii).

Landerkin, Mr. G., *South Grey.*
B. C. Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 65) 1°*, 1373 (i).
Can. Fire Ins. Co.'s (B. 103) 1°*, 2051 (i).
Cataract Power Co. of Hamilton, B. 124 (Mr. *MacPherson*) on M. for 1°, 3579 (ii).

Landerkin, Mr. G.—*Con.*
Columbia and Kootenay Ry. and Nav. Co.'s (B. 32) 1°*, 838 (i).
Man. and South-eastern Ry. Co.'s (B. 19) 1°*, 707 (i).
Private Bills Petitions, Extension of Time (M.) 838 (i).
——— Suspension of Rule (M.) 1665 (i).
Restigouche and Victoria Ry. Co.'s B. 99 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) on M. for Com., 4046 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Customs (preventive service) 5005. Post Office (mail service) 5063, 5075. Weights and Measures (salaries) 2544 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (sessional indemnity) 4846 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 4935 (ii).
Quarantine: Miscellaneous (gratuities) 4860 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (Indian corn) 4452 (ii).

Langelier, Mr. F., *Centre Quebec.*
Artillery, Garrison Battery No. 3, Disbandment (Ques.) 340 (i).
I. C. R. New Time Table (remarks) 3242 (ii).
Quebec Bridge Co.'s (B. 80) 2° m., 1631 (i).
Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Ry. Co.'s (B. 69) 1°*, 1373 (i).
Subsidies to Ry. Co.'s, Disallowance of Quebec Act (Ques.) 670 (i).

LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C., *Provencher.*
Address, on The, 209 (i).
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. 33 (Mr. *Osler*) in Com., 2344 (i).
"Les Cisterciens Reformes" incorp. (B. 88) 1°*, 1539; 2° m., 1632 (i).
"McCarthy Act," Claims under in Provencher (Ques.) 2421 (i).
Man. School Ques., Papers not brought down (Ques.) 168 (i).
——— ref. in Speech from Throne (Ques.) 342 (i).
——— further Papers (M. for Ret.) 826 (i).
——— Settlement (Ques.) 918, 1451 (i).
——— proposal as to Settlement (Ques.) 1307 (i).
Militia Corps, Morris, Organization (Ques.) 1307.
Mycenian Marble Co.'s Relief B. 83 (Mr. *Rosamond*) in Com., 2346 (i).
N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 114 (Mr. *Sifton*) on M. for 1°, 2798 (ii).
Public Buildings (Man.) unsettled Claim of Prov. (M. for Ret.*) 546 (i).
Superannuation Act (C. S.) Repeal B. 9 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2° (objection) 552 (i).
Terrebonne Revising Officer, Amt. Paid (Ques.) 491 (i).

Laurier, Hon. W., (President of the Council) *East Quebec.*
Address, on The, 59 (i).
——— consdn. (M.) 6 (i).
——— Reply to, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 1900 (i).
——— (Jubilee) to Her Majesty (M.) 3243 (ii).

Laurier, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Adjournment for Easter (remarks) 708; (M.) 838.
——— Ascension Day (M.) 2878 (ii).
Alien Labour Restriction B. 5 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 658 (i).
Appnmts. by late Govt., Recommendations of Treasury Board, on M. for Ret., 1650 (i).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Tenders, on M. for copies, 2426 (i).
——— Winter Terminus (Ans.) 1374 (i).
Baie de Chaleurs Ry., Govt. Aid (Ans.) 1541 (i).
Bazinet, Mr., of Joliette, and Quebec Elections (Ans.) 1634 (i).
Belgian Consul, Montreal, and Tariff Res. (remarks) 1461 (i).
Binder Twine made at Kingston Penitentiary, cost, &c. (Ans.) 1635 (i).
Bridge at Quebec, reported Govt. Aid (Ans.) 342.
B. C. Southern Ry. Co.'s Charter, Disallowance (Ans.) 340 (i).
——— Expiration of Time for Disallowance 3235.
Business of the Hse., Notices of Motion (M.) 86 (i).
——— *See* "Govt. Business."
Cartwright, Mr. F. L., Appnmt. as Inspector N. W. Mounted Police (Ans.) 489, 490 (i).
Chisholm, W. C., Indian Agent (N.S.) Dismissal (Ans.) 1375 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 29 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 1°, 778 (i).
Coal Imports from Great Britain, Rate of Duty under new Tariff (Ans.) 1634 (i).
Cobourg (Ont.) Postmaster, Charges against (Ans.) 1306 (i).
Copyright Act (1889) Govt. Action (Ans.) 1542 (i).
Criminal Code (1892) Seduction and Abduction B. 13 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 1064; in Com., 2474 (i).
Daunais, C. M., Indian Instructor, Appnmt. (Ans.) 1450 (i).
Debates, Official Rep., Sel. Com. (M.) 480 (i).
Dom. Exhibition, Toronto, Govt. Aid (Ans.) 1633 (i).
Estevan Land Office, Removal to Alameda (Ans.) 1638 (i).
Estimates, Suppl. (Ans.) 972 (i).
Exchequer Court, Local Judge in Admiralty, Appnmt. (Ans.) 1986 (i).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 92 (i).
Govt. Business, precedence, Wednesdays and Thursdays (M.) 1899 (i).
——— Thursdays (M.) 783 (i).
——— Mondays (M.) 2967 (ii).
Govt. Commissioners and Politics (Ans.) 1544 (i).
Indian Agent Bateman, Scugog Island, Dismissal (Ans.) 1081 (i).
——— Disturbance in N. W. T. (remarks) 3059 (ii).
——— Supplies (Man.) Mr. McColl's Letter *re* Purchases (Ans.) 1306 (i).
——— Man. and N. W. T., Schedule of Tenders (Ans.) 1079, 1301 (i).

Laurier, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Inland Revenue Laws, Infraction (Ans.) 1638, 2570 (i).
I. C. R. Extension to Montreal (Ans.) 1305; (remarks) 1546 (i).
Interest Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Quinn*) on M. for 1°, 550 (i).
Jones, Judge, Resignation and Gratuity (Ans.) 2882 (ii).
Kingston Penitentiary, Commissoners' Rep. (Ans.) 1983 (i).
Library Committee, Joint (M.) 666 (i).
Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 10 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 694; in Com., 2561 (i).
McManus, Mrs., Postmistress at Northfield (B.C.) Dismissal, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 1390 (i).
Man. Schools Ques., Papers not brought down (Ans.) 168 (i).
——— ref. in Speech from Throne (Ans.) 342 (i).
——— and Remedial Order (Ans.) 792 (i).
——— further Papers, on M. for Ret., 828 (i).
——— Mr. Fitzpatrick's Letter to Hon. Ed. Blake (Ans.) 836 (i).
——— Settlement (Ans.) 918, 1451 (i).
——— proposal as to Settlement (Ans.) 1307 (i).
Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 492, 1900 (i).
Mercier, Jos., St. Famille, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1633 (i).
Mounted Police Pension Act Amt. B. 59 (Mr. *Davis*) on M. for 2, 2036 (i).
——— (1894) Amt. B. 62 (Mr. *Davin*) on M. for 2°, 2038 (i).
——— (1889) Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Davin*) on M. for 1°, 1539 (i).
——— Commissioner's Rep. (presented) 1072 (i).
——— Strength of Force (Ans.) 1990 (i).
National Museum, Erection at Ottawa, on M. for Ret., 2433 (i).
Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1°*, 4; *pro formâ* (i).
O'Leary, Hugh, Appnmt. by Govt. as Commissioner (Ans.) 1303 (i).
Order (Ques. of) 724 (i), 3031 (ii).
"Our Lady of the Snows," on M. to adjn., 1548.
Pacific-Yukon Route, Surveys (Ans.) 1375 (i).
Prince Albert, Appnmt. of Sheriff (Ans.) 667 (i).
Printing Committee, Joint (M.) 666 (i).
——— addition of Name (M.) 2476 (i).
Public Bills, &c., on M. to adjn. (remarks) 555 (i).
Quarantine Regulations, U. S., Man., N. W. T. and B.C., on M. for Ret., 826 (i).
Quebec Bridge Co.'s B. 80 (Mr. *Langelier*) on M. for 2°, 1631 (i).
——— and Hon. Mr. Dobell (Ans.) 1989 (i).
——— Speech of Mayor of Quebec (Ans.) 1637 (i).
Queen's Diamond Jubilee and N. W. Mounted Police (Ans.) 97 (i).
Ry. Return Fare Tickets B. 11 (Mr. *McLennan, Glengarry*) on M. for 2°, 702 (i).
Reciprocal Tariff, on Ques. of Order, 1458 (i).
Regina, Long Lake, &c., Ry., Govt. Subsidy (Ans.) 1637 (i).

Laurier, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Returns, on inquiries for, 2572, 2969 (ii).
St. Lawrence River (Upper) Sale of Islands (Ans.) 1026 (i).
Saskatchewan Election, Member's Seat challenged, on M. to adjn., 956, 965 (i).
——— Mail Service, Regularity of Delivery (Ans.) 1634 (i).
Saskatoon, Battleford and Onion Lake Mail Service (Ans.) 1633 (i).
Scugog Island, Indian Agent Bateman, Dismissal (Ans.) 1081 (i).
Select Standing Coms. (M.) 6 (i).
——— Com. to prepare Lists (M.) 480 (i).
——— Lists (presented) 661 (i).
——— addition of Names (M.) 2408 (i).
Smuggling into the Yukon country (Ans.) 1375.
Speaker, Dep., and Elections (remarks) 2219 (i).
Subsidies to Ry. Co.'s, Disallowance of Quebec Act (Ans.) 671 (i).
Superannuation Act (C.S.) Repeal B. 9 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 552 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Customs (contingencies) 2077; Privy Council, 1978, (contingencies) 2068 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Dep. Speaker's salary) 2098 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Rideau Hall) 2639 (ii).
Tariff, The (remarks) 718 (i).
——— arrangement as to Discussion, 3033 (ii).
Terrebonne Revising Officer, amt. Paid (Ans.) 491 (i).
Territorial Exhibition, Outstanding Debts. (Ans.) 1374 (i).
Thousand Islands, Purchase from Indian Dept. (Ans.) 1080 (i).
Treaty between Great Britain and Japan (Ans.) 1985 (i).
U.S. and Can. Mail Regulations, wthdrls. before Delivery (Ans.) 1635.
Vezina, Geo., and Inland Rev. Dept. (Ans.) 1638, 2570 (i).
Victoria Bridge, Montreal, Grant of $300,000 (Ans.) 342 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 2983, 3079, 3098 (ii).
Weights and Measures, Metrical System (Ans.) 1027 (i).
Williams, P. J., Indian Instructor, Dismissal (Ans.) 1450 (i).
Wood Mountain Scouts, Allotment of Scrip, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 2031.

Lavergne, Mr. J., *Drummond and Arthabaska.*
Export Duty on Logs, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 4716 (ii).
Great Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 81) 1°, 1538 (i).
I.C.R. Extension to Montreal B. 142 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 3°, 4665 (ii).
Quebec Bridge Co.'s (B. 80) 1°*, 1538 (i).

Lavergne, Mr. J. —*Con.*
SUPPLY:
Immigration (agents' salaries) 2612 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. B.) 5279; (Que., Montmagny P.O.) 5282 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (extension to Montreal) 3767, 3795 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (wheat flour) 3445 (ii).

Lemieux, Mr. R., *Gaspé.*
Address, on The, 282, 397 (ii).
Baie de Chaleurs Ry., Govt. Aid (Ques.) 1541 (i).
Bird Rock Island, Casualty at Lighthouse, Rescue of Woman (Ques.) 3508 (ii),
Immigration Agents in U.S., Appnmts. (Ques.) 3507 (ii).
Fishery Bulletins, Distribution on Gaspé Coast, Irregularity (Ques.) 4008 (ii).
Grand River Wharf, Construction, non-Payment of Labourers (Ques.) 790 (i).
Langevin Block, Contractor's Claims (Ques.) 791.
Magdalen Islands Savings Bank (Ques.) 789 (i).
——— Winter Mail Service (Ques.) 789, 1027 (i).
Paris Exhibition (1900) Can. Representation (Ques.) 3508 (ii).
Post Office Mail Contracts, in Com., of Sup., 5089 (ii).
Queen's Diamond Jubilee, Can. Militia Contingent, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 840 (i).
——— Monument commemorative (Ques.) 3508.
Quebec and Gaspé Basin, Communication between (Ques.) 790 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Customs (preventive service) 5004, 5057. Railways (Baie de Chaleurs) 5135 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Quebec and Gaspé Basin) 4995 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (extension to Montreal) 3769 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (woollen yarns) 4190 (ii).

Lewis, Mr. W. J., *Albert, N.B.*
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (N.B.) 4957 (ii).

Lister, Mr. J. F., *West Lambton.*
Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1763 (i).
Bremner Furs Seizure, Compensation, on M. for Ret., 1746 (i).
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. 33 (Mr. *Osler*) in Com., 2340 (i).
C. P. R. Land Grants Patented and Exempted from Taxes (Ques.) 2883 (ii).
——— Patents (Ques.) 3235 (ii).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) objection to further stages, 4725; in Com., 5342 (ii).
Drainage across Ry. Lands B. 14 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2°, 1069 (i).

Lister, Mr. J. F.—*Con.*
Farm Implements, &c., Abolition of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2143 (i).
Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 2926 (ii).
McCallum, A., Lockmaster du Lievre Works, Dismissal, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1909 (i).
Mycenian Marble Co.'s Relief B. 83 (Mr. *Rosamond*) in Com., 2345 (i).
Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Foster*) 2953 (ii).
Petroleum Inspection Act Amt. B. 139 (Sir *Henry Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 4719 (ii).
Petroleum, Refined, Reduction of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Moore*) 824 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 5391 (ii).
——— Mail Contracts, in Com. of Sup., 5088 (ii).
Public Buildings erected in Dom., &c. (M. for Ret.) 493 (i).
Quarantine Regulations, U.S., Man., N.W.T. and B.C., on M. for Ret., 802 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. (Bicycles as Baggage) B. 16 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2°, 1788 (i).
Ry. Return Fare Tickets B. 11 (Mr. *McLennan, Glengarry*) on M. for 2°, 696 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital: Soulanges (contractor's claims) 5125 (ii).
Civil Government: Inland Revenue, 1922 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (preventive service) 5052 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (sessional indemnity) 4858 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Tariff inquiry) 5207 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (electric lighting, Ottawa) 4897; (N.B.) 4943; (N.S.) 4907 (ii); (Ont.) 2582, 4948. Harbours and Rivers (Ont., Manitoulin Island) 4966 (ii).
Quarantine (salaries and contingencies) 2252 (i)
Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Co.'s B. 118 (Mr. *Morrison*) on Sen. Amts., 5229 (ii).

Logan, Mr. H. J., *Cumberland, N.S.*
Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1773, 1836 (i).
Farm Implements, &c., Abolition of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2177 (ii).

Lount, Mr. W., *Centre Toronto.*
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. 33 (Mr. *Osler*) in Com., 2341 (i).
Can. General Electric Ry. Co.'s (B. 39) 1°*, 950 (i).
I. C. R. Extension to Montreal (G. T. R. and Drummond Co. Ry.) in Com. on Res., 4349 (ii).
James' Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 52) 1°*, 1172 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 10 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2468 (i).
McManus, Mrs., Postmistress at Northfield (B.C.) on M. to adjn. (remarks) 1393 (i).
Medicine Hat Ry. and Coal Co.'s (B. 56) 1°*, 1172 (i).

Lount, Mr. W.—*Con.*
National Life Ass. Co. of Can. incorp. (B. 74) 1°*, 1373 (i).
North American Life Ass. Co.'s (B.54) 1°*, 1172 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. (Bicycles as Baggage) B. 16 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2°, 1795 (i).
Saskatchewan Ry. and Mining Co.'s (change of Title) B. 53, 1°*, 1172 (i).
Supreme Court (Ont.) B. 131 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4212 (ii).
Trade Mark and Design Act Amt. (B. 45) 1°, 1072.
Trade and Other Labels (B. 46) 1°, 1075 (i).

Macdonald, Mr. A. C., *King's, P.E.I.*
Drummond Co. Ry., on conc., 5473 (ii).
Govt. of P. E. I., Claims against Federal Govt. (M. for Cor.*) 1662 (i).
Hillsborough River Bridge, Construction (M. for Cor*) 1664 (i).
Hudson Bay Expedition, Emplymt. of Sealer *Diana* (remarks) 1820 (i).
Lobsters, Extension of Close Season, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4740; (remarks) 5416 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 5403 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying interests, butter and cheese) 2180 (i).
Collection of Revenues: P. E. I. Railways (compassionate allowance) 5277 (ii).
Militia (Jubilee contingent) 4861 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (dredging) 2782; (P. E. I.) 2732 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Drummond Co. Ry.) conc., 5473. P. E. I., 3856 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 3185; (strip fencing) 3691; (Indian corn) 4399 (ii).

Macdonald, Mr. P., *East Huron.*
Atlantic SS. Service, Contract, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4219 (ii).
Coal Oil (American) Imports (Ques.) 258 (i).
——— Imports from U. S. in Tank Cars (Ques.) 796 (i).
Farm Implements, &c., Abolition of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2145 (i).
Iron, Pig, Can. Manufacture and Bounty (Ques.) 97 (i).
Kingston Penitentiary, Commissioners' Rep. (Ques.) 1983 (i).
Order (Ques. of) 2625 (i).
Rice Factories in Can., Number, &c. (Ques.) 258.
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital: Grenville (dismissals) 3919 (ii).
Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1486 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (coal oil) 3480; (salt, &c.) 3717 (ii).

Macdonell, Mr. J. A., *Selkirk.*
Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 2925, 3002 (ii).

Macdonald, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*
Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Macdonald Election) 1615 (i).
Trade and Navigation Rets., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4017 (ii).
Winnipeg, Duluth and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 17) 1°*, 707; 3° m., 2448 (i).

MacLaren, Mr. A. F., *North Perth.*
Inspection (General) Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 3564 (ii).

Maclean, Mr. W. F., *East York.*
Address, on The, 287 (i).
Alien Labour Restriction B. 5 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 1°, 89, (i).
Belgian Consulate, Montreal, and Tariff Res. (remarks) 1460 (i).
B. C. Southern Ry. Co.'s Charter, Disallowance (Ques.) 340 (i).
Business of the Hse. (remarks) 5013 (ii).
C. P. R. and I. C. R., Abrogation of Article in Contract (Ques.) 96 (i).
Cattle Conference between Mr. Gourdeau and SS. Co.'s, Rep. (M. for copy*) 2446 (i).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Plans deposited by C.P.R. Co. (Ques.) 267 (i).
——— Construction by C. P. R. (Ques.) 568 (i).
Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. B. 125 (Mr. *Davies*) in Com., 4124 (ii).
Drummond Co. Ry., on conc., 5468 (ii).
G. T. R. Co. and Dom. Govt., reported Grant of $300,000, on M. to adjn., 597 (i).
New York *Sun's* Article on Queen Victoria (Ques.) 1990 (i).
Ry. Employees Safety B. 2 (Mr. *Casey*) on ref. to Com., 615 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. (B. 3) 1°*, 87; 2° m., 621, 1058 (i).
——— (B. 4) 1°*, 88; 2° m., 1058 (i).
Soulanges Canal, Sections 4, 5, 6, 7, Tenders (Ques.) 341; Contracts (Ques.) 488 (i).
——— Section 12, Contract (Ques.) 489 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Post Office (technical services) 5102 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (preventive service) 5051; conc., 5448. Post Office (mail service) 5073; (outside service) conc., 5419 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Dep. Speaker's salary) 2095 (i).
Miscellaneous (arbitration, Dom. and Provs.) conc., 5426 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) conc., 5436; (electric lighting, Ottawa) conc., 5431 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Drummond Co. Ry.) conc., 5468 (ii).
Tariff, The, and Her Maj.'s Govt., Res. 16 (Quee.) 2880 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (spirituous liquors, &c.) 35 7; (mutton, &c.) 3369, 3379; (rasps and files) 3702, 4144; (agricultural implements) 4166 (ii).

MacPherson, Mr. T. H., *Hamilton.*
Address, on The, 291 (i).
Cataract Power Co. of Hamilton (B. 124) 1°, 3579.

McAlister, Mr. J., *Restigouche, N.B.*
Fishery Officer, Restigouche River, Dismissal, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 1662 (i).
Fishing Licenses in Bonaventure (Ques.) 671 (i).
Oak Bay Mills P.O., closing (M. for Ret*) 1663.
Restigouche and Victoria Ry. Co.'s B. 99 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) on M. for 2°, 2348 ; 2452 (i) ; 2776 ; on M. for Com., 4046 (ii).
Restigouche Ry. and Bridge Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. *Domville*) on Order for 2°, 2348 ; on M. for 2°, 2777 (ii).
Returns (inquiry) 2571 (i).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S,) 4932. Harbours and Rivers (dredging) 2780 ; (N. B.) 4957 (ii).

McCarthy, Mr. D., *North Simcoe.*
SUPPLY :
Civil Government: Interior, 1678 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Collingwood Harbour) 2767 (ii).

McCleary, Mr. W., *Welland.*
Address, on The, 402 (i).
Beamsville Postmaster, Appnmt. and Dismissal (Ques.) 484 (i).
——— (M. to adjn.) 1453 (i).
——— Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal (M. for Cor.) 1749, 1878 (i).
Gauld, R. T. Postmaster, Bartonville, Dismissal (Ques) 1983 (i).
McManus, Mrs., Postmistress at Northfield (B.C) Dismissal, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 1392 (i).
Old Fort Erie, Change of Control (Ques,) 2415.
SUPPLY :
Canals—Capital: Grenville (dismissals) 3877 (ii).
Income: Welland (conc.) 5454 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 2587 (i).
Quarantine (cattle) 2263 ; (salaries and contingencies) 2255 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff :
In Com. : Res. 17 (combine clause) 3323 (ii).
Welland Canal, Dismissals (Ques.) 2122 (i).
White, Isaac, Postmaster at Fort Erie, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3238 (ii).

McClure, Mr. F., *Colchester.*
Dismissals from Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fairlie) on M. for Com., of Sup., 2328 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 10 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2470 (i).
Order (Ques. of) 2623 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Capital (dismissals) 3953 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff :
In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 3211 (ii).

McCormack, Mr. G., *Muskoka and Parry Sound.*
Eyng Inlet Customs Officer, Appnmt. and Dismissal (Ques.) 265 (i).
Lighthouse-keepers, Limitation of Age (Ques.) 266 (i).
Point au Baril Lighthouse-keeper, Appnmt., &c. (Ques.) 266 (i).

McDougall, Mr. H. F., *Cape Breton, N.S.*
Baie des Chaleurs Ry., par. in Halifax *Chronicle* (remarks) 3420 (ii).
Coal Imports from Great Britain, Rate of Duty under new Tariff (Ques.) 1634 (i).
Grand Narrows Preventive Officer, J. R. McNeil's Dismissal (Ques.) 3504 (ii).
G. T. R. Co. and Dom. Govt., reported Grant of $300,000, on M. to adjn., 599 (i).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 2286 (i).
Canals—Capital: Grenville (dismissals) 3895 (ii).
Quarantine (salaries and contingencies) 2242 (i).
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (extension to Montreal) 3820 (ii).
Tariff Bill, Date of Introduction and N.S. Elections (Ques.) 268 (i).

McGregor, Mr. W., *North Essex.*
Alien Labour Restriction B. 5 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 647 (i).
Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1857 (i).
Hudson Bay Expedition, Emplymt. of Sealer *Diana* (remarks) 1820 (i).
SUPPLY :
Quarantine (hog cholera, compensation) 2273 (i).
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s (B. 36) 1°*, 914 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff :
In Com. : (Indian corn) 3415, 3435, 4463 ; (wire nails) 3646 ; (barbed wire) 3665, 4150 ; (buckthorn, strip fencing, &c.) 3681 ; (salt, &c.) 3716 (ii).

McHugh, Mr. G., *South Victoria.*
Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1890 (i).
Minden and North-western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 55) 1°*, 1172 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff :
In Com. : Res. 16 (preferential clause) 3193 ; (wheat flour) 3454 (ii).

McInerney, Mr. G. V., *Kent, N.B.*
Address, on The, 250, 270 (i).
SUPPLY :
Civil Government: Post Office, 1726 ; Public Works, 1735 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Weights and Measures (salaries) 2519 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Rideau Hall) 2596, 2634 (ii).

McInnes, Mr. W. W. B., *Vancouver, B.C.*
B. C. Southern Ry., Expiration of Time for Disallowance (Ques.) 3234 (ii).
——— Disallowance of Provincial Act (prop. Res.) 493 (i).

McInnes, Mr. W. W. B.—*Con.*
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4576 (ii).
Gold Dredging, Stewart River, Yukon, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 1740 (i).
McManus, Mrs., Postmistress at Northfield, B.C., Dismissal, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 1386 (i).
Maple Bay Post Office, Claim of Wm. Beaumont (Ques.) 4364 (ii).
Nanaimo and Comox Mail Service, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 3720 (ii).
Personal Explanation *re Globe's* attack on Speech on Disallowance, 709 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Telegraph Lines (B.C.) 2788 (ii).
Quarantine (salaries and contingencies) 2230, 2237.
Treaty between Great Britain and Japan (Ques.) 1985 (i).

McIsaac, Mr. C. F., *Antigonish, N.B.*
Dismissal from Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fairlie) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2397 (i).
SUPPLY:
Legislation: House of Commons (Dep. Speaker's salary) 2094 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (iron or steel scrap) 3627 (ii).

McLennan, Mr. R. R., *Glengarry.*
Binder Twine, Cost, &c., made at Kingston Penitentiary (Ques.) 1634 (i).
Cornwall Canal, Dismissal of Employees (Ques.) 2563 (i).
Cornwall and Soulanges Canals, Dimensions and Contractors (Ques.) 2411 (i).
Ry. Return Fare Tickets (B. 11) 1°, 257; 2° m., 695 (i).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture, &c. (dairying interests, butter and cheese) 2200 (i).
Quarantine (salaries, &c.) 2202 (i).
Canals—Capital: Grenville (dismissals) 3901 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Rideau Hall) 2646 (ii).

McLennan, Mr. A., *Inverness, N.S.*
Dismissals, Inverness Co., Dom. Officials, Year 1879 (Ques.) 4477 (ii).
Inverness Election Pet. (remarks) 2299 (i).
Lobsters, Extension of Close Season, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4769 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture, &c. (dairying interests, butter and cheese) 2195 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Port Mulgrave and Margaree) 2793 (ii).
Miscellaneous (small-pox epidemic, Winnipeg) 4085 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 2720 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (extension to Montreal) 3824 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (marble, &c.) 3497; (salt, &c.) 3717 (ii).

McMillan, Mr. J., *South Huron.*
Atlantic, Fast SS. Service Contract, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4238 (ii).
Beet-Root Sugar Manufactured in Can. and Bounty Paid (Ques.) 264 (i).
Export of Bacon, Hams, &c., on prop. wthdrl. of B., 4342 (ii).
Inspection (General) Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 3577 (ii).
Quarantine Regulations, U.S., Man., N.W.T., and B.C., on M. for Ret., 808 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying interests, butter and cheese) 2198; (experimental farms) 2109 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Rideau Hall) 2601 (i).
Quarantine (cattle) 2270 (i).
Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1589 (i).
Trade and Navigation Rets., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4014 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (mutton, &c.) 3358, 3405; (cornmeal) 3421; (wire nails) 3649; (salt, &c.) 3713; (axes, scythes, &c.) 4178: (Indian corn) 4424, 4451 (ii).

McMullen, Mr. J., *North Wellington.*
Address, on The, 443 (i).
Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1844 (i).
Budget Speeches, Date of Delivery (Stmnt.) 554 (i).
Business of the Hse, on M. to adjn. for Queen's Birthday, 2741 (ii).
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. 33 (Mr. *Osler*) in Com., 2339 (i).
Central Counties Ry. Co.'s (B. 30) 1°*, 838 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 29) 1°, 774, 779; 2° m., 2022 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 847 (i).
Govt. Business, on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to take in Wednesdays, &c. (remarks) 1899 (i).
G. T, R. and Dom. Govt., reported Grant of $300,000, on M. to adjn., 598 (i).
Inspection (General) Act Amt. (B. 47) 1°, 1075 (i); 2° m., 3562 (ii).
I. C. R., Bicycles, Free Carriage (remarks) 2743.
——— Extension to Montreal, B. 142 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 3°, 4663 (ii).
Interest Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Quinn*) on M. for 1°, 550 (i).
——— B. 134 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4255 (ii).
Jury, Alf., Immigration Agent, and Toronto Street Ry. (Ques.) 2216 (i).
Kingston Postmaster, Appnmt., Superannuation, &c. (Ques.) 3738 (ii).
Lily, Tug, Payments by Govt. for Hire, &c. (Ques.) 1809 (i).
Mining Machinery, Free Entry under Tariff, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2225 (i).
Pinplats Barges, Registration (Ques.) 921 (i).
Post Office Mail Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5094 (i).

McMullen, Mr. J.—*Con.*
Public Accounts and Auditor Gen.'s Reps. (M.) 838 (i).
Public Bills, on M. (Mr. *Casey*) to place on Order Paper, 3500 (i).
Quarantine Regulations, U. S., N. W. T., Man. and B. C., on M. for Ret., 810 (i).
Queen's Birthday, on M. to adjn., 2741 (ii).
Ry. Act Amt. (Bicycles as Baggage) B. 16 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2°, 1794 (i).
Ry. Lands and Taxation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Oliver*) 3519 (ii).
Spence, John (Inland Revenue) Superannuation (Ques.) 1079 (i).
Subsidies to Rys. B. 151 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5504, 5511 (ii).
Superannuation Act (C. S.) B. 9 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 173 (i).

SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital: Grenville (dismissals) 3881; St Pierre River) 5156 (ii).
Civil Government: Auditor General (contingencies) 2071; Customs (contingencies) 2080; Indian Dept., 1711, 1720; Inland Revenue, 1920; Interior, 1700: Post Office (contingencies) 2083 (i); (technical services) 5105 (ii); Railways and Canals, 1930, 1946 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Culling Timber, 2511. Excise (preventive service) 2505. Post Office (outside service) conc., 5418; (mail service) 5070 (ii). Weights and Measures (salaries) 2529 (i).
Immigration (agents' salaries) 2821 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. B.) 4946; (N.S.) 4921, conc., 5432, 5433; (Rideau Hall) 2597, 2638, 2649 (i).
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (Dartmouth branch) 5115; (extension to Montreal) 3782 (ii).
Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1396 (i).
Volunteers of 1866, Recognition of Services, &c., by Govt. (Ques.) 3056 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.; Res. 16 (preferential clause) 3161; (spirituous liquors, &c.) 3356; (Indian corn) 3415, 3426; (wire nails) 3647; (strip fencing) 3688; (shovels) 3703 (ii).

McNeill, Mr. A., *North Bruce.*
Address, on The, 435 (i).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service Contract, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4003, 4248 (ii).
Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1840 (i).
Business of the Hse. on M. (Mr. *Laurier*) to take in Mondays, 2968 (ii).
Dismissals, Land Office, Winnipeg, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4031 (ii).
Hudson Bay Expedition, Emplymt. of Sealer *Diana* (remarks) 1829 (i).
Indian Agent Crowe (Ques.) 340, 573, 788, 847
——— McIver (Ques.) 573, 788 (i).
McCallum, A., Lock Master, du Lievre Works, Dismissal, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1911 (i).
"Our Lady of the Snows," on M. to adjn., 1548.

McNeill, Mr. A.—*Con.*
Procedure (Ques. of) Member adjourning deb. 167, 178 (i).
Queen's Diamond Jubilee adjnmt. of Hse. (M.) 946
Reciprocal Rights, Belgium and Germany (remarks) 1462 (i).
——— Tariff (remarks) 1456 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 2285 (i).
Civil Government: Customs (contingencies) 2076; Interior 1681, 1689; Railways and Canals, 1937, 1972 (ii).
Supreme Court (Ont.) B. 131 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 4209 (ii).
Tariff, The, Preferential Clause (remarks) 1308 (i).
Trade with the Empire, adjnmt. of Hse. (M.) 4101 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 2944, 3195, 3207 (ii).

Madore, Mr. J. A. C., *Hochelaga.*
Can. Securities Co. of Montreal incorp. (B. 34) 1°*, 914 (i).
SUPPLY:
Miscellaneous (commissions of investigation) 5248.

Marcotte, Mr. F. A., *Champlain.*
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 2737 (ii).

Martin, Mr. A., *East Queen's, P.E.I.*
Belle River Breakwater, Extension (Ques.) 918 (i).
——— (M. for Ret.) 2445 (i).
Belfast Postmaster, Dismissal (Ques.) 926 (i).
Cascumpec Buoy Service, Tenders and Contract (Ques.) 1742 (i).
Cheese and Butter Factories, wthdrl. of Govt. Aid (M. for Cor.*) 3538 (ii).
Coal Boring in P. E. I., Vote in Estimates (Ques.) 796 (i).
Crawford, Duncan, Postmaster, Dismissal (Ques.) 787 (i).
Dillon, Thos. J., Dairy Inspector, Dismissal (Ques.) 2424 (i).
Dismissals of Postmasters in P. E. I. (M. for Cor.) 1056 (i).
Eldon Postmaster, Dismissal (Ques.) 786 (i).
Fish Island Light-keeper, Dismissal (Ques.) 2424.
Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 1023 (i).
Lobsters, Extension of Close Season, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4774 (ii).
McDonald, Danl., sub-Collector of Customs, Charges against (Ques.) 786 (i).
McPhee, Angus, Postmaster at Hopefield, Dismissal (M. for Cor.*) 546 (i); (Ques.) 4365 (ii).
Murray Harbour Buoy Service, Contract (Ques.) 1029 (i).
——— Harbour Master, Appnmt. (Ques.) 2216 (i).
Newfoundland and Confederation (M. for Ret.) 2433 (i).

Martin, Mr. A. —*Con.*
Orwell Customs sub-collector (Ques.) 1742 (i).
——— Brush Wharf, Preventive Officer, Appnmt. (Ques.) 1301 (i).
Prince Edward, Dredge, Charges against Capt. (Ques.) 792 (i).
P. E. I. Mail Service (remarks) 1560 (i).
Postmasters' Salaries, Increase (Ques.) 787 (i).
Ry. Expenditures, Dom. (remarks) 1452 (i).
Returns (inquiries) 948 (i), 3243, 3678, 4032 (ii).
Ross, James, sub-Collector of Customs, Dismissal (Ques.) 786 (i).
——— David, Postmaster, Dismissal (M. for Cor., &c.*) 1057 (i).
Southport, Belfast, &c., prop. Ry. (M. for Cor.) 1657; (remarks) 2043 (i).
Stanley Bridge Postmaster, Dismissal (M. for Ret.*) 1663 (i).
Subsidies (Dom.) to Rys., &c. (remarks) 177, 269.
——— (inquiry for Ret.) 948 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 2287; (dairying interests, butter and cheese) 2187 (i).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (dredging) 2783; (Mar. Provs.) 4889; (P. E. I.) 2732, 4976 (ii).
Railways and Canals—Capital: P. E. I. Ry., 3843.
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: Res. 17 (combine clause) 3350; (mutton, &c.) 3407; (books) 3474; (Indian corn) 4464 (ii).
Wood Island Harbour, Dredging (Ques.) 792 (i).

Maxwell, Mr. G. R., *Burrard, B.C.*
Address, on The, 343 (i).
B. C. Southern Ry., Disallowance of Provincial Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 542 (i).
Dismissals from Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fairlie) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2360 (i).
Mining Development and Advisory Corporation of British America incorp. (B. 82) 1°*, 1538; 2° M., 1632, 1775, 1936 (i).
Salmon (B.C.) Sold in British Market, Quality, &c. (M. for Cor.) 1991 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (B.C.) 4936; (Rideau Hall) 2632 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (mutton, &c.) 3394 (ii).
Victoria, Vancouver and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. (B. 100) 1°*, 1899 (i).

Mills, Mr. J. R., *Annapolis, N.S.*
Annapolis Co. Post Offices (Ques.) 485 (i).
——— Mail Contract (Ques.) 1989 (i).
——— Mail Route, Petition respecting (Ques.) 3237 (ii).
——— Royal Postmaster, Mr. West's Appnmt., &c. (M. for Ret.) 2001 (i).
———and Liverpool, N.S., Mail Routes, Contracts (M. for Ret.*) 2446 (i).
Bear River, Obstructions to Navigation, &c., (Ques.) 486 (i).

Mills, Mr. J. R.—*Con.*
Bear River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4772 (ii).
Brown, Geo., Payment for Mail Service (Ques.) 572 (i).
Covert, D. and D. J. Riordan, Dismissal and Appmnt. (Ques.) 917 (i).
Ft. Anne, Annapolis, Caretaker (Ques.) 5009 (ii).
Mail Contracts in N. S. (Ques.) 1025 (i).
Margaretsville Pier, Tenders for Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 3868 (ii).
North Perott Postmaster, Mr. Spurr's Appnmt. (M. for Ret.) 1998 (i).
N. S. Central Ry., Balance of Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 3868 (ii).
Piers, &c., Annapolis Co., Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 486, 487 (ii).
Postmaster at Annapolis, Appnmt. and Dismissal (Ques.) 567 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 4730, 5379, 5389, 5402 (ii).
Returns (inquiry) 4651 (ii).
Riordan, D. G., Postmaster at Annapolis, Amount of Bonds (Ques.) 3235 (ii).
St. Lawrence and Adirondack Ry. Co.'s (B. 71) 1°*, 1373 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Customs (preventive service) 5022. Post Office (mail service) 5072; (outside service) conc., 5419 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 4940. Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 4956 (ii).
Thorne, James H., Complaint against (Ques.) 916.
Virginia Post Office, Mr. Bank's Appnmt. (M. for Ret.) 1999 (i).

Monk, Mr. F. D., *Jacques Cartier.*
Address, on The, 131 (i).
American Bank Note Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3°, 3284 (ii).
Belgian Consulate, Montreal, Claims of Importers (Ques.) 1542 (i).
Dame, David, Dismissal from Lachine Canal (Ques.) 3338 (ii).
Dismissals in Montreal (Lachine Canal) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2575 (i).
Govt. Commissioners and Politics (Ques.) 1543 (i).
Lachine Canal, Dismissals (Ques.) 2410 (i).
Ottawa Deptl. Building, Temporary Repairs to Roof, Tenders (Ques.) 1301 (i).
Richelieu River, Works at Belœil, Tenders (Ques.) 1302 (i).
SUPPLY:
Immigration (agents' salaries) 4036 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 2735 (ii).
Scientific Institutions (hydrographic service) 2296.
Tariff Inquiry, Translation of Evidence (Ques.) 793 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (axes, scythes, &c.) 4173; (barbed wire) 3661; (brass wire) 3694; (hats, caps, &c.) 4192; (rice) 4131; (wire nails) 3641 (ii).

Montague, Hon. W. H., *Haldimand.*
Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 721 (i).
G. T. R. and Dom. Govt., reported Grant of $300,000, on M. to adjn., 589 (i).
Kootenay Mail Service, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 5540 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 120 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 5534 (ii).
Quarantine Regulations, U.S., Man., N.W.T. and B.C., on M. for Ret., 804, 810 (i).
Subsidies to Rys. (B. C.) in Com. on Res., 5527 (ii).
——— Schomberg and Aurora, in Com. on Res., 5515 (ii).
——— Strathroy and Western Counties, in Com. on Res., 5518 (ii).
Superannuation Act (C. S.) Repeal B. 9 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 172 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Railways and Canals, 1934 (i).

Moore, Mr. A. H., *Stanstead.*
Fitch Bay Postmaster, Change, &c. (Ques.) 3868.
Petroleum, Refined, Reduction of Duty (prop. Res.) 828 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Rideau Hall) 2343 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (Indian corn) 4410 (ii).

Morin, Mr. J. B., *Dorchester.*
Cap Saumon Lighthouse, Construction, Amt. Paid, &c. (Ques.) 264 (i).
——— Contract for Firewood (Ques.) 264 (i).
Chambly Canal, Expenditure on Culvert (Ques.) 1028 (i).
——— Tenders for Stone (Ques.) 1028 (i).
Fournier, Jakes, Dismissal as Postmaster (Ques.) 921 (i).
Les Eboulements Postmaster, Dismissal (Ques.) 263 (i).
Murray Bay Wharf and P. O. Mail Contract (Ques.) 340 (i).
St. Johns Military School, Contracts for Drugs, &c. (Ques.) 1028 (i).
——— Tenders for Coal and Wood (Ques.) 1029.
Coal Oil Supply, Tenders (Ques.) 1078 (i).
St. Paul and Murray Bay Mail Contract (Ques.) 263 (i).

Morrison, Mr. A., *New Westminster.*
Alaska Boundary, Line of Demarcation (M. for Cor.*) 3538 (ii).
——— Quotation from Treaty *re* Mt. St. Elias 3505 (ii).
B. C. Southern Ry. Co., Disallowance of Provincial Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 523 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 908 (i).
Gold Discoveries, Harrison Lake Region (Ques.) 1744 (i).

Morrison, Mr. A.—*Con.*
Harrison River Rapids, Improvements (Ques.) 1744 (i).
Mining Development, &c., of British America incorp. B. 82 (Mr. *Maxwell*) on M. for 2°, 1632, 1936 (i).
——— Co.'s Pet., ref. back to Com. (M.) 2563 (i).
Pacific Postal Service, Allowances to Mail Clerks (Ques.) 2417 (i).
Restigouche and Victoria Ry. Co.'s B. 99 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) on M. for Com., 4046 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Quarantine (salaries and contingencies) 2205, 2209.
Westminster and Burrard Telephone Co. (Ques.) 2420 (i).
Wiggins, John, Dismissal from B.C. Penitentiary (Ques.) 2418 (i).
Yukon Mining Co.'s (B. 118) Sen. Amts., 5226 (ii).

Mulock, Hon. W., *North York.*
Address, on The (Personal Explanation) 367 (i).
Agriculture Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1172 (i).
Allandale (N.B.) Postmaster, Dismissal (Ans.) 1079 (i).
American Bank Note Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3°, 3004, 3462 (ii).
Annapolis Co. (N.S.) Post Offices (Ans.) 485 (i).
——— D. G. Riordan's Bonds, &c. (Ans.) 3235 (ii).
——— Mail Contract (Ans.) 1989 (i).
——— Mail Route, Petition respecting (Ans.) 3238 (ii).
——— Postmaster, Appnmt. and Dismissal (Ans.) 567 (i).
——— Royal Post Office, Mr. West's Appnmt. on M. for Ret., 2010 (i).
Ashcroft and Barkerville Mail Service (Ans.) 2417 (i).
Athabasca and Mackenzie River Mail Service (Ans.) 2421 (i).
Aylmer West Postmaster, Appnmt. and Dismissal (Ans.) 794, 795 (i).
Beamsville (Ont.) Postmaster, Appnmt. and Dismissal (Ans.) 484 (i).
——— Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1847, 1886 (i).
Bear Island (N.S.) Postmaster (Ans.) 672 (i).
Beauharnois Postmaster, Appnmt. (Ans.) 572 (i).
——— and County Election (Ans.) 268 (i).
——— Dismissal of Alexis Doutre, on M. for Cor., &c., 836 (i).
Bartonville Postmaster, Gauld, R. T., Dismissal (Ans.) 1983 (i).
Belfast (P.E.I.) Postmaster, Dismissal (Ans.) 927.
Brown, Geo., Payment for Mail Service (Ans.) 572 (i).
Caplin River Postmaster, reported Dismissal (Ans.) 1027, 1308 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 29 (Mr. *McMullen* on M. for 2°, 2030 (i).
——— (B. 130) 1°, 3677 (ii).

Mulock, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Conservative Newspapers, Delivery (Ans.) 918.
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5353 (ii).
Dablon Postmaster, Dismissal (Ans.) 1027 (i).
Drummond Co. Ry., on conc., 5473 (ii).
East Bay (C.B.) Post Office, Removal (Ans.) 4366 (ii).
Eldon (P.E.I.) Postmaster, Dismissal (Ans.) 786.
Elgin, East and West, Mail Contracts, &c., on M. for Ret., 837 (i).
Esquimalt Postmaster, Appnmt. of Telegraph Operator (Ans.) 1985 (i).
Fitch Bay Postmaster, Change, &c., (Ans.) 3868.
Fort Erie Postmaster, Dismissal of Isaac White (Ans.) 3238 (ii).
Gazette and *Star*, Free Postage from Montreal (Ans.) 3841 (ii).
Hardy, Hon. Mr., Speeches, Distribution from House of Commons (Ans.) 3741 (ii).
Hartney, (Man.) Dismissal of Postmaster (Ans.) 2885 (ii).
Jubilee Postage Stamps (Ans.) 2655 (ii).
Karsdale Postmaster, Complaint against J. H. Thorne (Ans.) 917 (i).
Kelley, Miss, Windsor P. O. Employee (Ans.) 920 (i).
Kingston Postmaster, Appnmt. of Mr. Gunn (Ans.) 3740, 3865 (ii).
——— Mr. Shannon's Dismissal (Ans.) 2653 (ii).
——— Appnmt., Superannuation, &c. (Ans.) 3739.
Kootenay Mail Service, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 5540 (ii).
Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com. (Amt.) 2609 (i).
Les Eboulements (P.Q.) Postmaster, Dismissal (Ans.) 263 (i).
McIntyre's Lake and Sydney Mail Service, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 3741 (ii).
McKnight, W., Postmaster at Ninga, Man., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3740 (ii).
McManus, Robt., late Postmaster at Northfield (B.C.) Character (Ans.) 2879 (ii).
——— Mrs., Northfield (B. C.) Dismissal, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 1379 (i).
——— Dismissal (Ans.) 1305 (i).
Magdalen Islands Savings Bank (Ans.) 789 (i).
——— Winter Mail Service (Ans.) 790, 1027 (i).
Magenta (P.Q.) Postmaster, Dismissal of Jakes Fournier (Ans.) 921 (i).
Mail Contracts in N. S. (Ans.) 1025 (i).
Maple Bay (B.C.) Post Office, Claim of Wm. Beaumont (Ans.) 4365 (ii).
Marsh Hill (Ont.) Postmaster, Appnmt. of G. G. King (Ans.) 261, 269, 484 (i).
Melocheville Postmaster, Sale of Stamps (Ans.) 2418 (i).
Mercier, Wilfrid, Appnmt. as Commissioner (Ans.) 918 (i).
Merrick, P. O. Inspector, Neglect of Duties (Ans.) 2409 (i).

Mulock, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Mount Albert and Holt Mail Contract (Ans.) 795 (i).
Murray Bay Wharf and P. O. Mail Contract (Ans.) 340 (i).
Musquodoboit Postmaster, Dismissal of J. S. Stewart (Ans.) 1542 (i).
Nanaimo and Comox Mail Service, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 3720 (ii).
Newburg and Kingston Mail Contract, on M. for Cor., 1749 (i).
New York *Sun's* Article on Queen Victoria (Ans.) 1990 (i).
Northfield (B.C.) Postmaster, Dismissal (Ans.) 1305 (i).
——— Character (Ans.) 2879 (ii).
North Perott (N.S.) Postmaster, Mr. Spurr's Appnmt., on M. for Ret., 1999 (i).
Odessa Postmaster, Name, Recommendations, &c. (Ans.) 266 (i).
Return, on inquiry for, 2571 (i).
Orangedale, Margaree, &c., Mail Contracts (Ans.) 4365 (ii).
Pacific Postal Service, Allowances to Mail Clerks (Ans.) 2417 (i).
Pirate Harbour (N.S.) Post Office, Closing (Ans.) 1028 (i).
Postmaster General's Rep., presented (Mr. *Mulock*) 2970 (ii).
Postmasters' Salaries, Increase (Ans.) 787 (i).
Postmasters in P. E. I., Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1057 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. (B. 129) 1°, 3676; (M. for Com.) 5529; in Com., 5532, 5537, 4500, 4725, 5373, 5397 (ii).
——— Mail Contracts, in Com. of Sup., 5084 (ii).
Qu'Appelle Mail Service, Tenders and Contract (Ans.) 1079 (i).
Ste. Philonène Postmaster, Dismissal and Complaints against (Ans.) 3236 (ii).
St. Andrew's (N.S.) Post Office Rep. respecting late fire (Ans.) 3235 (ii).
St. Aubert and St. Pamphile Mail Service, Contract, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 3236 (ii).
St. Charles and St. Gervais Mail Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 3721 (ii).
St. Paul and Murray Bay Mail Contract (Ans.) 263 (i).
St. Valerien de Rimouski, Postmaster, Dismissal (Ans.) 2566 (i).
Sadowa Postmaster, Appnmt., &c. (Ans.) 2123.
Salem Postmaster, Mr. Kinney's Dismissal (Ans.) 2411 (i).
Stratford Street Letter-box Service (Ans.) 2126.
Subsidies to Rys. B. 151 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5367 (ii).
——— Schomberg and Aurora, in Com. on Res., 5513 (ii).
Sunny Brae and Melrose Mail Contract (Ans.) 1028 (i).

Mulock, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Superannuation Act (C.S.) Repeal (B. 9) 1°, 169; 2°, 552 (i).
——— (prop. Res.) 551 (i).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (travelling allowances, Man.) conc., 3735 (i).
Canals—Capital: St. Pierre River, 5151. *Income:* Rideau (land damages, &c.) 5275 (ii).
Charges of Management (printing bank notes) 5202, conc., 5455 (ii).
Civil Government: Post Office, 1721, (contingencies) 2063, (statutory increases) 5078, 5111, 5265, (technical services) 5100 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Post Office (mail service) 2790, 5060; (outside service) 5417, conc., 5432 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (expenses Algoma election) 4987 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Nfld.) 4994 (ii).
Miscellaneous (commissions of investigation) 5240; (St. Johns, P.Q., postmaster's defalcations) 5213.
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Rat Portage, P.O.) 5275 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (Drummond Co. Ry.) conc., 5473 (ii).
Tatamagouche Postmaster, Wm. Dobson's Resignation (Ans.) 1541 (i).
Thornville (N.S.) Postmaster, Dismissal of D. Covert (Ans.) 917 (i).
Valleyfield Mail Service, Delay in Transit (Ans.) 1743 (i).
——— Postmaster, Appnmt. of E. Dion (Ans.) 2418 (i).
Virginia Post Office, Mr. Bank's Appnmt., on M. for Ret., 2000 (i).
Wood Island (P.E.I.) Postmaster, Crawford's Dismissal (Ans.) 787 (i).

Oliver, Mr. F., *Alberta.*
Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s (B. 21) 1°*, 707 (i).
Athabasca and Mackenzie River Mail Service (Ques.) 2421 (i).
B. C. Southern Ry. Co., Disallowance of Provincial Act., on prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 538 (i).
British Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 76) 1°*, 1538.
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. 33 (Mr. *Oliver*) on M. for 2°, 945; in Com., 2337; M. to ref. back to Com., 2610; in Com., 2612, 2920 (ii).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4556; in Com. on B., 5359 (ii).
Farm Implements, &c., Abolition of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2162 (i).
Govt. of N.W.T., Subsidy and Powers, on M. for Ret., 1041 (i).
Hudson Bay and Yukon Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. (B. 77) 1°*, 1538 (i).
Indians, Peace River and Athabasca Regions (Ques.) 1986 (i).
Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. *Richardson*) 3° m., 2602 (i).
Mounted Police, Strength of Force (Ques.) 1990.

Oliver, Mr. F.—*Con.*
Petroleum Inspection Act Amt. B. 139 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 4722 (ii).
Quarantine Regulations, U. S., Man., N. W. T. and B. C., on M. for Ret., 817 (i).
Ry. Lands and Taxation (prop. Res.) 3510, 3522.
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 122 (Mr. *Davin*) in Com., 4051 (ii).
Subsidies to Rys. B. 151 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5508 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying interests, butter and cheese) 2193 (i).
Immigration (agents' salaries) 4062 (ii).
Indians: Man. and N.W.T. (industrial schools) 4076 (ii).
Government of N. W. T. (schools) 4082 (ii).
Mounted Police (pay of force) 4079 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Rideau Hall) 2627 (i). Roads and Bridges (N.W.T.) 2787 (ii).
Quarantine (cattle) 2268 (i).
Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1356 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (mutton, &c.) 3390: (photographs, &c.) 3477; (coal oil) 3492; (wire nails) 3647; (barbed wire) 3663; (agricultural implements) 4166 (ii).
U. S. Whalers in Mackenzie River (Ques.) 4735.
Wood Mountain Scouts, Claims for Scrip, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1052 (i).

Osler, Mr. E. B., *West Toronto.*
Address, on The, 400 (i).
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s (B. 33) 1°*, 838; 2° m., 945; 3° m., 2610 (i).
McManus, Mrs., Postmistress at Northfield (B.C.) Dismissal, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 1388 (i).
Ont. Accident Ins. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 78) 1°*, 1538 (i).

Parmalee, Mr. C. H., *Shefford.*
Thibault, Chas., Superannuation, Contributions and Amts. drawn from Fund (Ques.) 1306 (i).

Paterson, Hon. W. (Controller of Customs) *North Grey.*
Beauharnois Canal, Appnmt. of Collector of Tolls, &c. (remarks) 2419 (i).
Beet-Root Sugar Manufactured in Can., and Bounty Paid (Ans.) 265 (i).
Belgian Consulate, Montreal, Claims of Importers (Ans.) 1543 (i).
British Goods and Customs Tariff (remarks) 1462.
Byng Inlet Customs Officer, Appnmt. and Dismissal (Ans.) 265 (i).
Coal Oil (American) Imports (Ans.) 258 (i).
Customs Deptl. Appnmts. (Ans.) 2422 (i).
——— Collections by A. D. Danis, Valleyfield (Ans.) 2422 (i).
——— Collectors, Hudson Bay Officials (Ans. 1452 (i).
Dismissals, Man. and N. W. T., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4029 (ii).

Paterson, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Export Duty on Logs, par. in Midland *Free Press* (remarks) 4106 (ii).
Fenelon Falls Customs Officer (Ans.) 259 (i).
Fishing Licenses, Payment in Advance (Ans.) 267 (i).
Grand Narrows (C.B.) Preventive Officer, J. R. McNeill's Dismissal (Ans.) 3504 (ii).
Gretna Sub-Collector of Customs, Dismissal of J. F. Tennant (Ans.) 3504 (ii).
Hamilton and Niagara Customs Collector (Ans.) 1540 (i).
Hudson Bay Ports, Customs Collectors (Ans.) 794.
Mining Machinery, Free Entry under Tariff, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2220 (i).
Morrisburg Customs Collector, Appnmt. (Ans.) 341, 489 (i).
Mt. Stewart (P.E.I.) sub-Collector of Customs, Dismissal (Ans.) 786 (i).
Napanee Customs Collector, Appnmt., &c. (Ans.) 482 (i).
Orwell (P.E.I.) Customs sub-Collector (Ans.) 1743 (i).
——— (Brush Wharf) Preventive Officer, Appnmt. (Ans.) 1301 (i).
Penetanguishene Customs Collector, Vacancy (Ans.) 261 (i).
Prince Edward Co., Preventive Officers (Ans.) 491 (i).
P. E. I. Customs Collector G. McDonald's Appnmt. (Ans.) 2125 (i).
Returns, on inquiry for (remarks) 4108, 4122 (ii).
St. Thomas (Ont.) Collector of Customs, Dismissal (Ans.) 267 (i).
Silver Spray and *Mary Grover*, Seizure for infraction of Revenue Laws (Ans.) 928, 1300 (i).
Smuggling by American Whalers, Mackenzie River Basin (Ans.) 794 (i), 4735 (ii).
Strathroy Customs Collector, Name, &c. (Ans.) 483 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Customs, 1730, 1980, (contingencies) 2072 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (P.E.I.) 2552; (Que.) 2553; (Ont.) 2554; (N.W.T.) 2560; (B.C.) 2561 (i); (preventive service) 5002, 5014, 5040; conc., 5448 (ii). Miscellaneous, 2562 (i)
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.) 4947. Harbours and Rivers (Collingwood Harbour) 2764 (ii).
Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1117, 1310 (i).
——— Preferential Clause (remarks) 1309 (i).
Trade and Navigation Rets. (presented) 257 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 4015 (ii).
U. S. Whalers in Mackenzie River (Ans.) 749 (i); 4735 (ii).
Valleyfield Collector of Customs, Appnmt. (Ans.) 926 (i).
Veneers, Imports by Dom. Organ Co. (Ans.) 1545 (i).

Paterson, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Vernon River Bridge (P.E.I.) sub-Collector of Customs McDonald, Charges against (Ans.) 786 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: Res. 1 (Customs Acts, Amts., definitions, &c.) 2842; (Res. 12) 2843; (Res. 14) 2844; Res. 16 (preferential clause) 2945, 2953, 3141; (vermouth, &c.) 3357; (mutton, &c.) 3367; (Indian corn) 3409, 3422; (labels) 3474; (marble, &c.) 3497; (iron or steel angles) 3638; (iron forgings) 3639; (wire nails) 3640; (shoe tacks) 3652; (screws, &c.) 3655; (barbed wire) 3659; (buckthorn, &c., fencing) 3679, 4152; (brass wire) 3694; (iron or steel nuts) 3696; (skates, &c.) 3697; (travellers' baggage) 3706; (oleo-stearine) 3712; (India-rubber boots, belting, &c.) 4146; (agricultural implements) 4157; (clothes wringers) 4166; (watch cases) 4167; (cotton fabrics) 4180; (coal) 4468 (ii).

Penny, Mr. E. G., *Montreal (St. Lawrence).*
Dismissals in Montreal (Lachine Canal) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2575 (i),
Harbours and Breakwaters, Expenditures, &c. (Ques.) 3971 (ii).
Lord's Day Observance B. 10 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2463 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners, Arrears of Interest (Ques.) 4471 (ii).
Ry. Act Amt. (Bicycles as Baggage) B. 16 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2°, 1786 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (extension to Montreal) 3781 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (wire nails) 3644 (ii).

Perry, Mr. S., *West Prince.*
Tignish Wharf, Dues Collected (Ques.) 3057 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (P.E.I.) 2739 (ii).
Railways—Capital: P.E.I. Ry., 3851 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (Indian corn) 4465 (ii).

Pettet, Mr. W. V., *Prince Edward, Ont.*
Merrick, P. O. Inspector, Neglect of Duties (Ques.) 2409 (i).
Preventive Officers, Prince Edward Co. (Ques.) 491 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Inland Revenue, 1922 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (coal oil) 3496 (ii).

Pope, Mr. R. H., *Compton.*
I. C. R. Extension to Montreal (G. T. R. and Drummond Co. Ry.) B. 142 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for Com. on Res., 4307 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Rideau Hall) 2645 (ii).

Pouliot, Mr. C. E., *Temiscouata.*
McDonald, A. R., General Inspector, I.C.R., Appnmt. (Ques.) 1078 (i).

Poupore, Mr. W. J., *Pontiac.*
Abittibi and Grand Lac Indians (Ques.) 2568 (i).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4595 (ii).
Game Laws, Quebec, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4022 (ii).
Hull Electric Co.'s (B. 20) 1°*, 707; 2° m., 784.
Pontiac County, Drowned Lands, Claims unsettled (Ques.) 3869 (ii).
Subsidies to Rys., Pembroke Southern Ry., in Com. on Res., 5516 (ii).
——— Portage du Fort Ry., in Com. on Res., 5520.
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Capital: Harbours and Rivers (St. Lawrence ship channel) 4873. *Income:* Buildings (N.S.) 4908; (Ottawa west deptl. block fire) 4884. Harbours and Rivers (Que., Gatineau River) 4960 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (rolling stock) 5312 (ii).

Powell, Mr. H. A., *Westmoreland.*
American Bank Note Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3°. 3284 (ii).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for Com. on Res., 4601 (i).
Dismissals from Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fairlie) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2380 (i).
I.C.R. Extension to Montreal (G. T. R. and Drummond Co. Ry.) B. 142 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4358; on M. for 3°, 4677 (ii).
Interest Act Amt. B. 134 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4257 (ii).
Lord's Day Observance B. 10 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2463 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. B 129 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 5385, 5405 (ii).
Restigouche and Victoria Ry. Co.'s B. 99 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) on M. for 3°, 2455 (i).
Stanley Bridge and P.E.I. Ry., Pets. *re* Construction (Ques.) 2881 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital: Grenville (dismissals) 3943 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (sessional clerks) 4848 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. S.) 4906; (Ottawa west. deptl. block, fire) 4881. Harbours and Rivers (Mar. Provs.) 2733; (P.E.I.) 2731 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (rolling stock) 5322 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: I. C. R. (expenses of commissions) 5254 (ii).
Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1603 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (books) 3472 (ii).

Prefontaine, Mr. R., *Maisonneuve.*
Address, on The, 385 (i).
La Banque du Peuple (B. 86) 1°*, 1539 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 10 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2467 (i).

Prefontaine, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Personal Explanation, par. in Montreal *Gazette, re* Preferential Clause, 2657 (ii).
Southern Counties Ry. incorp. (B. 110) 1°*, 2653 (ii.)
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital: St. Pierre River, 5151 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 2737 (ii).
Vote in Com. of Sup., on Chairman's Ruling (Amt.) 2548 (ii).

Prior, Mr. E. G., *Victoria, B.C.*
Ashcroft and Barkerville Mail Service (Ques.) 2416 (i).
Behring Sea Seal Regulations, on Orders of the Day (remarks) 2570 (i).
B. C. Southern Ry. Co., Disallowance of Provincial Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 516 (i).
Esquimalt Post Office, Appnmt. of Telegraph Operator (Ques.) 1985 (i).
Fishing by Foreigners in B. C., Illegal (M. for Ret.*) 2446 (i).
Fish Traps used by Americans in B. C. (Ques.) 1376 (i).
McManus, Mrs., Postmistress at Northfield (B.C.) Dismissal, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 1389 (i).
Marine Lights, Fiddle Reef (Ques.) 1376 (i).
Mining Machinery, Free Entry under Tariff (remarks) 2219 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 2219 (i).
Pacific-Yukon Route, Surveys (Ques.) 1375 (i).
Poaching by Americans, Deep-Sea Fisheries (Ques.) 1375 (i).
Quarantine Regulations, Victoria (remarks) 1554.
Queen's Diamond Jubilee, Can. Militia contingent, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 840 (i).
San Pedro, Removal of Wreck (Ques.) 1376 (i).
Silver and Lead Smelting in B. C., Payments *re* (Ques.) 3146 (ii).
Smuggling into the Yukon Country (Ques.) 1375.
SUPPLY:
Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction, &c.) 2294 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (B.C.) 2591 (i).
Quarantine (cattle) 2269; (salaries and contingencies) 2205, 2226 (i).
William's Head Station, Quarantine Supt., Dismissal (M. for Ret.*) 1663 (i).

Quinn, Mr. M. J. F., *Montreal (Ste. Anne's).*
Address, on The, 223; (explanation) 434 (i).
Alien Labour Restriction B. 5 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 3553 (ii).
Bounties on Iron and Steel, in Com. on Res., 5192 (ii).
Dismissals in Montreal, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2572 (i).
——— Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fairlie) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2368 (i).
Enright, Michael, Employee on Lachine Canal, Dismissal (Ques.) 2564 (i).
——— (M. for Cor.) 3537 (ii).

Quinn, Mr. M. J. F.—*Con.*
Inland Rev. Deptl. Changes, on M. to adjn., 4370 (ii).
Interest Act Amt. (B. 15) 1°, 550 (i); 2° m., 3562.
——— B. 134 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4256 (ii).
Lachine Canal Employees, Dismissals (Ques.) 922.
——— Michael Enright (Ques.) 2564 (i).
——— (M. for Cor.*) 3537 (ii).
——— Storeman Behan (M. for Cor.*) 3537 (ii).
McManus, Mrs., Postmistress at Northfield (B.C.) Dismissal, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 1385 (i).
Man. Schools Ques., Mr. Fitzpatrick's Letter to Hon. Ed. Blake (M. for copy) 836 (i).
"Our Lady of the Snows," on M. to adjn., 1549.
Personal Explanation *re* Can. Sugar Refinery (remarks) 270 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 4511, 4729 (ii).
Royal Victoria Life Ins. Co.'s incorp. (B. 27) 1°*, 707 (i).
Saskatchewan Election, Member's Seat challenged, on M. to adjn., 967 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital: Lachine, 3874; St. Pierre River, 5154. *Income:* Beauharnois (damages) 5132; Lachine, conc., 5451 (ii).
Civil Government: Inland Revenue (contingencies) 4839; Justice (salaries) 4834 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (preventive service) 5004, 5032, 5040, 5056; conc., 5450. Inspection of Staples, 5059. Railways (I. C. R., expenses of commissions) 5257; (Baie de Chaleurs) 5149 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Algoma election expenses) 4990 (ii).
Miscellaneous (commissions of investigation) 5240.
Penitentiaries: Kingston (Commissioners' Rep.) 4747, 4774; (payments to commissioners) 4802 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Buildings (electric lighting, Ottawa) 4898. Harbours and Rivers (St. Lawrence ship channel) 4874. *Income:* Buildings (Ottawa, west deptl. block fire) 4882. Harbours and Rivers (Man.) 4973; (Ont.) 4970 (ii).
Quarantine (cattle) 2267; (salaries and contingencies) 2239 (i).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (extension to Montreal) 3778, 3827 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (buckthorn, &c., fencing) 4151; (shirts and shirt waists) 4185; (woollen fabrics) 4191; (fur caps) 4192; (metal glove fasteners, &c.) 4466 (ii).

Ratz, Mr. V., *North Middlesex.*
Atlantic Fast SS. Service Contract, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4243 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (rasps and files) 4141 (ii).

Reid, Mr. J. D., *North Grenville.*
Butter Trade with England (prop. Res.) 601, 1808 (i).
Carmichael, Andrew, Postmaster, Dismissal (M. for Ret., &c.*) 1057 (i).

Reid, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*
Cornwall and Beauharnois Canals, Cost of Breaks in 1894-95 (Ques.) 2425 (i).
Freight Rates on Rys., Regulation (B. 63) 1°, 1299 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Public Works, 1737 (i).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Ont.) 2556 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Rideau Hall) 2601. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 2738 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.; (mutton, &c.) 3406 (ii).

Richardson, Mr. R. L., *Lisgar.*
Address, on The, 371 (i).
Dismissals from Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fairlie) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2308 (i).
Farm Implements, &c., Abolition of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2137 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 1017 (i).
Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 70) 1°*, 1373; 2° m., 1574 (i); in Com., 2926 (ii).
Hudson Bay Expedition, Emplymt. of Sealer *Diana* (remarks) 1810, 1824 (i).
Lake Man. Ry. and Canal Co.'s (B. 72) 1°*, 1373.
Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 51) 1°*, 1172; in Com., 2163 (i).
Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1427 (i).
Vote on Preferential Clause (remarks) 2945 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (wheat flour) 3446; (coal oil) 3478; (wire nails) 3648; (agricultural implements) 4152 (ii).

Robertson, Mr. J. Ross, *East Toronto.*
Address, on The, 320 (i).
Alien Labour Restriction B. 5 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 3550 (ii).
Copyright Act (1889) Govt. Action (Ques.) 1542.
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4543 (ii).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 906 (i).
Queen's Own Rifles, Rep. of Commission (Ques.) 1739 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. (Bicycles as Baggage) B. 16 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2°, 1787 (i).
Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1370 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 2909; (books) 3465, 3707 (ii).

Roche, Mr. W. J., *Marquette.*
Carstens, Mr., Immigration Agent, Winnipeg, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3720 (ii).
Coal, Bituminous, Steam and Slack, Imports from U.S., 1896 (M. for Ret.*) 3538 (ii).
Cottingham, W. S., Dismissal from Land Office (Ques.) 4342 (ii).
Dismissals from Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fairlie) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2384 (i).

Roche, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*
Farm Implements, &c., Abolition of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com of Sup., 2157 (i).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 1012 (i).
Gretna Customs sub-Collector, J. F. Tennant's Dismissal (Ques.) 3503 (ii).
Portage la Prairie Post Office, Change of Site (Ques.) 2883 (ii).
Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1518 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (wheat flour) 3456 (ii).

Roddick, Mr. T. G., *Montreal (St. Antoine).*
SUPPLY:
Marine and Fisheries (tidal service) 2291 (i).

Rogers, Mr. D. D., *Frontenac.*
Atlantic Fast SS. Service Contract, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4242 (ii).
Butter Exports, Bonus, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 1806 (i).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4585 (ii).
Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. B. 125 (Mr. *Davies*) in Com., 4129 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital (Trent Valley) 3863 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Rideau Hall) 2619 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Dep. Speaker's salary) 2092 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com., Res. 16 (preferential clause), 2944, 3023, 3231; (mutton, &c.) 3369; (surgical instruments) 3477; (coal oil) 3479; (china ware, &c.) 3496; (shovels) 3703; (paintings, &c.) 3709; (agricultural implements) 4155.

Rosamond, Mr. B., *North Lanark.*
Continental Heat and Light Co.'s incorp. (B. 84) 1°*, 1538; 2° m., 1632 (i).
Mycenian Marble Co. of Can. Relief (B. 83) 1°*, 1538; 2° m., 1632 (i).
Sun Life Assurance Co. of Can. (B. 91) 1°*, 1666.
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 2589 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (woollen yarns) 4187; (woollen fabrics) 4191; (coal, bituminous) 4202 (ii).

Russell, Mr. B., *Halifax.*
Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex's Speech (moved) 7 (i).
Farm Implements, Vote on Mr. Davin's Amt., (Personal Explanation) 2298 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital: Grenville (dismissals) 3960 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Post Office (mail service) 5060.
Quarantine (salaries and contingencies) 2246 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 3108; (skates, &c.) 3697; (files and rasps) 3702 (ii).

Rutherford, Mr., *Macdonald, Man.*
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4569 (ii).
Dismissals from Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fairlie) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2376 (i).
Ry. Lands and Taxation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Oliver*) 3518 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Portage Laprairie P. O.) 4953. Harbours and Rivers (Man.) 4972 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (wheat flour) 3442: (shoe tacks) 3653; (strip fencing) 3692; (hides and skins) 3712 (ii).

Scriver, Mr. J., *Huntingdon.*
Criminal Code Amt. (Seduction and Abduction) B. 13 (Mr. *Charlton*) conc. in Amts. (M.) 3542.
Pilots (Quebec and Montreal) incorp. B. 67 (Mr. *Guay*) in Com., 3539 (ii).
Subsidies to Rys. B. 15 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5494 (ii).
——— Schomberg and Aurora, in Com. on Res., 5514 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Customs (preventive service) 5046 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) conc., 5438 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (buckthorn, &c., fencing) 4152 (ii).

Seagram, Mr. J. E., *North Waterloo.*
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Customs (Ont.) 2559 (i).

Semple, Mr. A., *Centre Wellington.*
Drainage across Ry. Lands B. 14 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2°, 1070 (i).
Subsidies to Rys. B. 151 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5506 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 4933 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (strip fencing) 3692 (ii).

Sifton, Hon. C. (Minister of Interior) *Brandon.*
Abittibi and Grand Lac Indians (Ans.) 2568 (i).
Alaska Boundary, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2743 (ii).
——— Papers respecting (remarks) 2887 (ii).
——— and B.C. (remarks) 3419 (ii).
——— Memo. *re* (remarks) 4107 (ii).
C.P.R. Land Grants, Patents and Exemptions Ans.) 2883, 3235 (ii).
Cape Croker Indian Agent McIver (Ans.) 574, 788 (i).
Carstens, Mr., Immigration Agent, Winnipeg, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3720 (ii).
Champain, Emmanuel, Claim against Govt. by Rebellion, 1885 (Ans.) 490 (i).
Cottingham, W. S., Dismissal from Land Office (Ans.) 4342 (ii).

Sifton, Hon. C.—*Con.*

Daly, Hon. T. M., Rep. on Immigration (Ans.) 922 (i).

Dismissals, Land Office, Man., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4018, 4024, 4031 (ii).

——— Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fairlie) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2310 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 61 (Mr. *Davin*) on M. for 2°, 2037 (i).

——— (B. 116) 1°, 2798; 2°, 4118 (ii).

Game Laws, Quebec, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4022 (ii).

Gold Discoveries, Harrison Lake Region (Ans.) 1744 (i).

Gold Dredging, Stewart River, Yukon, Tenders, &c., 1740 (i).

Grundy, Ernest, late Postmaster at Duck Lake (Ans.) 3870 (ii).

Immigration Agent to Ireland, E. O'Kelly's Appnmt. (Ans.) 669 (i).

——— Agents, &c., Superannuation (Ans.) 573 (i).

Indian Dept., Annual Rep. (presented) 492 (i).

——— Cor. unanswered (Ans.) 1984 (i).

——— Office, Regina, Removal to Winnipeg (Ans.) 1985 (i).

Indians, Man. and N. W. T., Supplies under Treaty, Tenders (Ans.) 487 (i).

——— Peace River and Athabasca Regions (Ans.) 1986 (i).

Jury, Alf., Immigration Agent, and Toronto Street Ry. (Ans.) 2217 (i).

Land Titles Act Amt. (B. 115) 1°, 2798 (ii).

McGirr, Wm., Notification of Superannuation (Ans.) 1987 (i).

Micmac Indians, Medical Attendance, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4021 (ii).

Mitchell, Dr. Geo., Dismissal (Ans.) 927 (i).

N. W. T. Act Amt. (B. 114) 1°, 2797; in Com., 4110 (ii).

Saugeen Reserve, Indian Agent Crowe (Ans.) 340, 573, 788 (i).

Seed Grain, Amounts owing by Farmers, Man. and N.W.T. (Ans.) 1989 (i).

Stockholm Exhibition, Walton Jones's Appnmt. (Ans.) 1984 (i).

SUPPLY:

Civil Government: Indian Dept., 1709; Interior, 1669, (contingencies) 2068; Justice, 1667; Mounted Police, 1709 (i).

Dominion Lands—Capital (surveys, &c.) 4082 (ii).

Immigration (agents' salaries) 2801, 3743, 4033, 4053; (general expenses) 4066 (ii).

Indians: B. C. (surveys, &c.) 4077; Man. and N.W.T. (supplies) 4075; Oka (removal to Gibson) 4073 (ii).

Geological Survey, 4072 (ii).

Government of N. W. T. (schools) 4082 (ii).

Miscellaneous (small-pox epidemic, Winnipeg) 4083 (ii).

Mounted Police (pay of force) 4078 (ii).

Walpole Island Indians, Appnmt. of Physician (Ans.) 787 (i).

Sifton, Hon. C.—*Con.*

Ways and Means—The Tariff:

In Com.: (wheat flour) 3460 (ii).

Winnipeg Industrial School, Name of Principal, Date of Appnmt. (Ans.) 490 (i).

Snetsinger, Mr., *Cornwall and Stormont.*

Ont. Pacific Ry. Co., Change of Title (B. 28) 1°*, 707 (i).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Capital: Cornwall, 5117; Grenville (dismissals) 3908 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff:

In Com.: Res. 17 (combine clause) 3348 (ii).

Somerville, Mr. J., *North Wentworth and Brant.*

Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., conc. (M.) 1665 (i).

Muma, Henry, Official Referee, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 4735 (ii).

——— Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3719 (ii).

Mycenian Marble Co.'s Relief B. 83 (Mr. *Rosamond*) in Com., 2347 (i).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Capital: Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 5122 (ii).

Civil Government: Interior, 1678 (i).

Collection of Revenues: Customs (preventive service) 5043 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.) 4942, 5279, conc., 5437; (Kentville, &c., P.O.) 4901; (Que., Montmagny P. O.) 5283 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff:

In Com.: (files and rasps) 4130 (ii).

Speaker, Mr. (HON. JAS. D. EDGAR) *North Ontario.*

Address, Reply to, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 1900 (i).

American Bank Note Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3° (ruling) 3006 (ii).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Procedure (ruling) 3990 (ii).

Bibaud, Azaire, Emplymt. in House of Commons (Ans.) 3509 (ii).

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. 33 (Mr. *Osler*) on M. for 2°, 946 (i).

Controverted Elections, Judges' Reps. (read) 1, 420, 481, 1631 (i).

Debate, Irrelevancy of, 827, 852 (i), 3031, 5419 (ii).

Elections, Certificates received during recess (read) 3 (i).

Election Petitions, Judges' Certificates, &c. (read) 2 (i).

Franchise Act Amt. B., on M. for 2°, 724; (ruling) 730, 750 (i).

——— on M. to adjn. (remarks) 549 (i).

Govt. Business, on M. to take in Wednesdays, &c., 1900 (i).

Govt. of N.W.T., Order (Ques. of) 1044 (i).

Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 2926 (ii).

House of Commons Restaurant, Sale of Liquor (remarks) 672 (i).

Speaker, Mr.—*Con.*
Hull Electric Co.'s B. (ruling) 784 (i).
Inland Revenue Laws, Infraction, on Ques. (remarks) 1544 (i).
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 492 (i).
Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s B., on M. to pass (remarks) 2448 (i).
Library of Parlt., Joint Rep. (presented) 6 (i).
Marsh Hill (Ont.) Postmaster, Appnmt. (remarks) 268 (i).
Members Absence before Prorogation, par. in Montreal *Gazette*, 5159 (ii).
Member called to Order, 3736; (ruling) 3737 (ii).
Members, New, Certificates of Ret. (notification) 86, 950, 1664, 1983 (i).
Members' remarks checked, 163, 555, 562, 699, 711, 714, 784, 1376, 1392, 1453, 1456, 1457, 1462, 1560, 2031, 2137, 2299 (i); 3398, 4032, 4102, 4107, 4205, 4211, 4367, 5070, 5229, 5462 (ii).
Members requested to keep Order, 1381 (i).
——— to withdraw statement, 2239 (i).
Mess. from His Ex. (read) 492, 667, 1900 (i); 2659, 3742, 4008, 4013, 5009 (ii).
Ministers answering Ques. (remarks) 789 (i).
Mounted Police Pension Act Amt. B. (remarks) 1229 (i).
Order, Ques. of, Member quoting previous Debate (ruling) 827 (i).
——— Member transgressing Rules, 367 (i).
Parliament, Opening, Mess. by Black Rod, 1 (i).
Personal Explanation (Mr. *Fielding*) Member called to Order, 177 (i).
——— (Mr. *McInnes*) 711, 714 (i).
Plebiscite Bill, Premier's promise to introduce, (remarks) 3506 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 5378 (ii).
Private Bills, on ref. to Com. (remarks) 1227 (i).
Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen's Sec. (notification) 5542 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Davin*) on Chairman's Ruling, 2130 (i).
Procedure, Ques. of (Mr. *McNeil*) Member adjourning Deb. (ruling) 167, 180 (i).
Public Bills, on M. (Mr. *Casey*) to place Bills Nos. 2 and 3 on Order Paper, 3500 (ii).
Queen's Diamond Jubilee, on M. to adjn. Hse., 947 (i).
Question put by Member containing Statement of Facts (remarks) 569 (i).
Question ruled out of Order, 926 (i), 3972 (ii).
Restigouche and Victoria Ry. Co.'s B. 99 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) on M. for 2°, 2348 (i), 4046 (ii).
Routine Proceedings, Error in Printing (remarks) 1231 (i).
Saskatchewan Election, Member to conclude remarks with a Motion, 953; (ruling) 959 (i).
Saskatchewan Ry. and Mining Co.'s B., Proceedings of Hse. null and void (remarks) 5540 (ii).
Saturday Sittings (remarks) 4472 (i).

Speaker, Mr.—*Con.*
Seed Grain, Distribution in Man. and N. W. T., Amounts outstanding (Ans.) 2215 (i).
Speech from the Throne (rep.) 4 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Public Works, conc. (remarks) 5417 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (contingencies) 2103; (extra clerks) 2103 (i); (translators) 4846 (ii); (salaries) 2102 (i); (sessional indemnity) 4856 (ii).
Unparliamentary language, 235, 882, 1909, 2139.
Vacancies (notification) 3 (i).
Votes and Proceedings, Changes (remarks) 1452.
Warrants for Writs of Election, 1, 420, 481 (i).
Tariff, The, Ques. of Order (ruling) 2953 (ii).
——— Members Voting, 2945 (ii).
Winnipeg, Duluth and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 17 (Mr. *Macdonell*) on M. that B. pass (remarks) 2449 (i).

Speaker, Deputy (MR. L. P. BRODEUR) *Rouville.*
Member, New, Certificate of Return (notification) 86 (i).
Members' remarks checked, 2359 (i), 3398, 3766, 5401, 5403, 5316 (ii).
Mess. from His Ex. (read) 5009 (ii).
Order, Ques. of, Member requested to withdraw statement, 2624 (ii).
——— (ruling) 3326 (ii).
——— (Mr. *Foster*) Members accused of conspiracy (remarks) 5303; (ruling) 5305 (ii).
Restigouche Ry. and Bridge Co.'s B., on M. for 2°, 2166 (i).
Royal Assent to Bills, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 2741 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.) 4943 (ii).
Vote in Com. of Sup. (ruling) 2546 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (coal oil) 3479; (scrap iron) ruling, 3630 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S., *East Grey.*
Alien Labour Restriction B. 5 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 638 (i).
B. C. Southern Ry. Co., Disallowance of Provincial Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 533 (i).
Business of the House, on M. to adjn., 4203; (remarks) 5087 (ii).
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. 33 (Mr. *Osler*) in Com., 2338 (i).
Cataract Power Co.'s B. 124 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) in Com., 4052 (ii).
Cattle Shipping Regulations (Ques.) 2217 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 29 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 2025 (i).
——— Examinations, Appnmts. to P. O. Dept. (Ques.) 2564 (i).
Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s B., Return of Fees (remarks) 4652 (ii).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4547; in Com. on B., 5168 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Customs Deptl. Appnmts. (Ques.) 2422 (i).

Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. B. 125 (Mr. *Davies*) in Com., 4123 (ii).

Dismissal, Mr. Dobbin, Land Office, Winnipeg, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4029 (ii).

——— Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fairlie) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2316 (i).

Drummond Co. Ry., on conc., 5465 (ii).

Export Duty on Logs, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 4702 (ii).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 897 (i).

Immigration Agents, &c., Superannuation (Ques.) 572 (i).

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal (G. T. R. Co. and Drummond Co. Ry.) B. 142 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4347, 4373; on M. for 3°, 4654, 4667 (ii).

Interest Act Amt. B. 134 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4252 (ii).

Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 2605 (i).

Mycenian Marble Co.'s Relief B. 83 (Mr. *Rosamond*) in Com., 2345 (i).

Order (Ques. of) Unparliamentary Language, 2140 (i).

Patents for Wire Fences, Number Granted, &c. (Ques.) 2882 (ii).

Personal Explanation *re* Henry's and Rothwell's promotions, 1901 (i).

Petroleum Inspection Act Amt. B. 139 (Sir *Henry Joly de Lotbiniere*) in Com., 4720 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 4501, 4727, 5381, 5537 (ii).

Private Bills Pets., on M. (Mr. *Landerkin*) to suspend Rule, 1665 (i).

Quarantine Regulations, U. S., Man., N. W. T. and B. C., on M. for Ret., 813 (i).

Queen's Diamond Jubilee, Can. Militia contingent, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 844 (i).

Questions by Members not in Order (remarks) 3975.

Ry. Act Amt. (Bicycles as Baggage) B. 16 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2°, 1789 (i).

Subsidies to Rys. B. 151 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5367, 5490 (ii).

——— Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa, in Com. on Res., 5513 (ii).

——— Schomberg and Aurora, in Com. on Res., 5514 (ii).

Superannuations, July, 1896, to April, 1897, Names, &c. (Ques.) 667 (i).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice (travelling expenses. Man.) 4842 (ii).

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (agricultural societies) 2109; (cold storage) 2274; (dairy interests, butter and cheese) 2119, 2196; (experimental farms) 2115; (*Patent Record*) 2107 (i); (Stockholm Exhibition) 4859 (ii); (Year-book) 2108 (i).

Canals—Capital: Beauharnois, 5273; Grenville (dismissals) 3680, 3969; Lachine, 4824; St. Pierre River, 5154; Sault Ste. Marie, 5117 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Civil Government: Agriculture (contingencies) 2079; Customs (contingencies) 2079 (i); Indian Dept. (sec.'s salary) 4828 (ii); Interior, 1669, 1676, 1691 (i), (salaries) 4837 (ii); Justice, 1666, (i), 4834; Militia (salaries) 4831 (ii); Post Office (contingencies) 2083 (i), (statutory increases) 5079, (technical services) 5108; Railways and Canals (contingencies) 4830 (ii).

Collection of Revenues: Customs (B.C.) 2561 (i), (preventive service) 5014 (ii); (N.W.T.) 2560; (P.E.I.) 2552. Miscellaneous, 2562 (i). Public Works, conc., 5416. Railways (Baie de Chaleurs) 5148, 5453 (ii). Weights and Measures (salaries) 2548 (i).

Dominion Lands—Capital (surveys, &c.) 4082 (ii).

Geological Survey, 4072 (ii).

Immigration (agents' salaries) 4033, 4052; (general expenses) 4068, 4993 (ii).

Indians: Oka (removal to Gibson) 4073; (inspectors) 4078 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (Algoma election expenses) 4988, 5059, conc., 5451 (ii); (Dep. Speaker's salary) 2101; (official debates) 2105; (salaries) 2102 (i); (sessional clerks) 4849 (ii); (voters' lists), 2106 (i).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 2293 (i).

Militia (Military College) 4808 (ii).

Miscellaneous (arbitration, Dom. and Provs.) 4082, conc., 5423; (commissions of investigation) conc., 5429; (tariff inquiry) 5211 (ii).

Mounted Police (pay of force) 4078 (ii).

Penitentiaries (Commissioners' Rep.) 4740, 4745 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 4920, conc., 5434; (Ont.) 2586, (Ottawa, grounds, &c.) 4948; (Que.) 5281, (Montmagny P.O.) 5284; (Man., Portage Laprairie P.O.) 2589. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 2739, 4967; (Collingwood Harbour) 2766 (Fort Francis Locks) 4970. Dredging, 2780.

Quarantine (cattle) 2264; (hog cholera, slaughter) 2270; (Man. Hospitals) 2263; (salaries, &c.) 2203, 2232; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 2262 (i).

Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (rolling stock) 5291, 5296, 5309, 5339, conc., 5477; (Drummond Co. Ry.) conc., 5465 (ii).

Scientific Institutions (hydrographic service) 2295.

Supreme Court (Ont.) B. 131 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4215 (ii).

Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1409 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff:

In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 3104, 3116, 3147, 3167, 3174; Res. 17 (combine clause) 3296; (mutton, &c.) 3361; (cornmeal) 3441; (wheat flour) 3443, 3450; (strip fencing, &c.) 3683; (files and rasps) 3701, 4140; (agricultural implements) 4166; (watch cases) 4168; (sugar) 4398; (Indian corn) 4402 (ii).

Wood Mountain Scouts, Claims for Scrip, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1054 (i).

Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Co.'s B. 118 (Mr. *Morrison*) on Sen. Amts., 5228 (ii).

Stenson, Mr. M. T., *Richmond and Wolfe.*

Farm Implements, &c., Abolition of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2155 (i).

Stenson, Mr. M. T.—*Con.*
Militia Camps, Eastern Townships, Battalions (Ques.) 3668 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Immigration (agents' salaries) 4060 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Rideau Hall) 2637 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.; (Indian corn) 4417 (ii).

Stubbs, Mr. W., *Cardwell.*
Atlantic Fast SS. Service Contract, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4244 (ii).

Sutherland, Mr. J., *North Oxford.*
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. 33 (Mr. *Osler*) in Com., 2339 (i).
Dom. Safe Deposit and Trust Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. *Gibson*) 2° m., 2777 (ii).
Inspection (General) Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 3573 (ii).
Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 2165; on M. to pass B. (remarks) 2448 (i).
McManus, Mrs., Postmistress at Northfield (B.C.) on M. to adjn. (remarks) 1391 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 5412 (ii).
Private Bills, ref. to Coms. (M.) 1227 (i).
Privilege (Ques. of) Senate and I.C.R. Extension to Montreal, 5038 (ii).
Restigouche and Victoria Ry. Co.'s B. 99 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) on M. for 2°, 2776 (ii).
Saskatchewan Ry. and Mining Co.'s B., proceedings of Hse. null and void (M.) 5537, 5539.
Stationary Engineers, Examination, &c. (B. 108) 1°, 2408 (i).
Subsidies to Rys., Ont. and Rainy River, in Com. on Res., 5517 (ii).
——— Strathroy and Western Counties, in Com. on Res., 5518 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital: Grenville (dismissals) 3894; (construction) 5130 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (sessional indemnity) 4854 (i).
Militia (Jubilee contingent) 2660 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.B.) 4946; (N.S.) 4938 (ii),
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (salt, &c.) 3714 (ii).
Welland Power Supply Canal Co.'s (B. 44) 1°*, 1072 (i).

Talbot, Mr. O. E., *Bellechasse.*
Address, on The, 322 (i).
SUPPLY:
Collection of Revenues: Railways (Baie de Chaleurs) 5141 (ii).
Penitentiaries: Kingston (Commissioners' Rep.) 4795 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que., Montmagny P.O.) 5281 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (coal oil) 3480; (cornmeal) 3435; (strip fencing) 3688 (ii).

Tarte, Hon. J. I., (Minister of Public Works) *St. John and Iberville.*
Address, on The, 236 (i).
Belle River (P. E. I.) Breakwater, Extension (Ans.) 918 (i).
Campobello Breakwater (N.B.) Repairs (Ans.) 2565 (i).
Challenger, Dredge, Work done at Midland (Ans.) 260 (i).
Civil Service Examinations, Appnmts. to P.O. Dept. (Ans.) 2564 (i).
Clerks of Works, Govt., and Private Practice (Ans.) 1306 (i).
Dismissals from Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fairlie) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2324 (i).
Fire in West Deptl. Block, Documents destroyed (Ans.) 919 (i).
—— Repairs to Roof (Ans.) 1301 (i).
Grand River Wharf, Construction, non-Payment of Labourers (Ans.) 790 (i).
Harbours and Rivers, Expenditures, &c. (Ans.) 3971 (ii).
Harrison River Rapids, Improvements (Ans.) 1744 (i).
I. C. R. Extension to Montreal, in Com. of Sup., 3775, 5229; conc., 5461 (ii).
Iona (N.S.) Repairs to Wharf, &c. (Ans.) 1740 (i).
La Libre Parole, Libellous Statements against Min. of Crown (Ans.) 3972.
Langevin Block, Contractor's Claims (Ans.) 791.
L'Ardoise (N.S.) Breakwater, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 670 (i).
Laprairie P.O., Change of Site (Ans.) 2883 (ii).
Lily, Tug, Payments by Govt. for Hire (Ans.) 1810 (i).
McCallum, A., Lockmaster du Lievre Works, Dismissal, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1903 (i).
Margaretsville (N.S.) Pier, Tenders for Contract, &c. (Ans.) 3869 (ii).
Nicolet River (P.Q.) Breakwater, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 671 (i).
North River, St. Ann's (N S.) Pets. *re* Building Wharf (Ans.) 1740 (i).
Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Foster*) Members accused of Conspiracy, 5302 (ii).
Ottawa Deptl. Building, Fire, Repairs to Roof, Tenders (Ans.) 1301 (i).
Owen Sound and Collingwood Harbours, Expenditure (Ans.) 796 (i).
Parliament Grounds, Repairing Walks (Ans.) 5037 (ii).
Piers, &c., Annapolis Co. (N.S.) Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 486, 487 (i).
Pouliot, Mr., late M.P., Deceased (remarks) 5185
Prince Edward, Dredge, Charges against Capt. (Ans.) 792 (i).
McKenzie, Capt. Wm., of Dredge *Canada*, Dismissal (Ans.) 1743 (i).
Queen's Diamond Jubilee, Monument commemorative (Ans.) 3508 (ii).

Tarte, Hon. J. I.—*Con.*
Richelieu River, Works at Belœil, Tenders (Ans.) 1302 (ii).
St. Lawrence Channel, Deepening, &c., Amts. Paid (Ans.) 3867 (ii).
Strathroy Post Office, Tenders and Contract (Ans.) 797 (i).
Subsidies to Rys., Richelieu Valley, in Com. on Res., 5520 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Capital: Lachine, 4892 (ii).
Civil Government: Public Works, 1735 (i); (History of Public Works, 4893 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Buildings (electric lighting, Ottawa) 4897, conc., 5431; (west deptl. block, fire) 4893 (ii). Dredging (Kaministiquia River) 2577; (St. Lawrence River channel) 2576 (i). Harbours and Rivers (St. Lawrence ship channel) 4865 (ii). *Income:* Buildings (B.C.) 2591 (i), 4956; (N.B.) 4941, 5278; (N.S.) 4901 (ii); (Ont.) 2578 (i), 4948; (Alexandria reformatory) 4949; (Kingston drill hall) 4948; Ottawa grounds, &c.) 4948: (Smith's Falls P. O.) 4949; (Ottawa) 4948; (Rideau Hall) 2592, 2618 (i), 4886, (ii); (telephone service) 2653; (Major's Hill Park) 2654; (Rents, Dom. Buildings), 2654; (west deptl. block, fire) 4880; (Man. immigration shed) 4950 (ii); (Portage Laprairie P. O.) 2589 (i), 4951; Rat Portage P. O.) 5285 (ii); (N. W. T.) 2590 (i), 2787; (Que., Montmagny P. O.) 5263; (Montreal P. O.) 4947; (Montreal drill shed) 4947, conc. 5456 (ii). (Roads and Bridges (Ottawa) 4975 (ii). Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 4974; (dredging) 2780, 2889; (Man.) 4971; (Mar. Provs.) 2734, 4889; (N.B.) 2732, 4956, 4958; (N.S.) 2719, 2728, 4956; (Ont.) 2738, 2773, 2778; (Collingwood Harbour) 2759; (Fort Francis Locks) 4970; (Manitoulin Island) 4964; (P.E.I.) 2730, 4958; (Que.) 2735, 4958; (Gatineau River) 4959; (Rimouski Pier) 4964; (Little Rapids Lock) conc., 5445. Miscellaneous (architects, &c., salaries) 4890; (clerical assistance) 4892. Telegraph Lines (N. W. T.) 2790; (P. E. I.) 2788 (ii).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R. (extension to Montreal) 3775; (rolling stock) 5229; (Drummond Co. Ry.) conc., 5461 (ii).
Sussex (N.B.) Govt. Buildings, Appnmt. of Caretaker (Ans.) 262 (i).
Telegraph Lines in B. C., Govt. and C. P. R. (Ans.) 2567 (i).
Valleyfield Postmaster, Appnmt., &c. (Ans.) 2567 (i).
Westminster and Burrard Telephone Co. (Ans.) 2420 (i).
Wood Island (P.E.I.) Harbour, Dredging (Ques.) 792 (i).

Taylor, Mr. G., *South Leeds.*
Alien Labour Restriction B. 5 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 627 (i); in Com., 3545 (ii).
——— Prohibition (B. 6) 1°, 89; 2° m., 660 (i).
American Bank Note Co. and Mr. Reid's relation thereto (Ques.) 2881 (ii).
Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1846 (i).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*
Can. Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 43) 1°*, 1072 (i).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4592 (ii).
Dismissals from Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fairlie) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2403 (i).
Farm Implements, &c., Abolition of Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2148 (i).
Gananoque Drill Shed, Removal (Ques.) 1078 (i).
Hardy, Hon. Mr., Speeches Distributed from House of Commons (Ques.) 3741 (ii).
Immigration Agent to Ireland, E. O'Kelley's Appnmt. (Ques.) 669 (i).
Kingston Penitentiary, Dismissal of Guards (Ques.) 3338 (ii).
La Libre Parole, Libellous Statements against Min. of Crown (Ques.) 3971 (ii).
Mail Service, Ottawa and Brockville West (remarks) 4106 (ii).
Melocheville Postmaster, Stamp Sales (Ques.) 2418 (i).
Members' Absence before Prorogation, par. in Montreal *Gazette* (remarks) 5159 (ii).
Mining Machinery, Free Entry under Tariff, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2221 (i).
Niagara and Grand Island Bridge Co.'s (B. 37) 1°*, 914 (i).
Plebiscite Bill, Premier's promise to introduce (Ques.) 3506 (ii).
Public Bills, &c., on M. to adjn. Hse. (remarks) 555 (i).
River St. Claire Ry. Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s (B. 41) 1°*, 1072 (i).
Shannon, Jas., Postmaster, Kingston, Superannuation, &c. (Ques.) 3058 (ii).
Subsidies to Rys. B. 151 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5502 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairy interests, butter and cheese) 2186 (i).
Canals—Capital: Grenville (dismissals) 3905 (ii).
Collection of Revenues: Customs (preventive service) 5040 (ii).
Immigration (agents' salaries) 2820 (i).
Indians: Man. and N.W.T. (gratuities, retired officers) 5000 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Dep. Speaker's salary) 2091; (salaries) 2103 (i); (sessional indemnity, &c.) 4845, 4853 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Quebec and Gaspe Basin) 4945 (ii).
Miscellaneous (repatriation of Canadians from Brazil) 4862 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 4913 (ii); (Ont.) 2585 (i; (Rat Portage) 5286 (ii); (Rideau Hall) 2592, 2615 (i), 4885; (west deptl. block, fire) 4884; (Que., Montmagny P.O.) 5283. Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 4968 (ii).
Thousand Islands, Purchase from Indian Dept. (Ques.) 1080 (i).
Tariff, The, Members Votes, 2944 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order, 2953 (ii).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.; Res. 16 (preferential clause) 3115, 3180; Res. 17 (combine clause) 3311, 3329; (mutton, &c.) 3365; (Indian corn) 3417, 3426; (wheat flour) 3443; (coal oil) 3482; (iron forgings) 3639; (springs, axles, &c.) 3640; (wire nails) 3643; (barbed wire) 3663; (strip fencing) 3688; (iron or steel nuts) 3696; (files and rasps) 3702; (shovels) 3703; (free list, remarks) 3706; (hides and skins, &c.) 3711; (oleo-stearine, &c.) 3712; (salt, &c.) 3714; (Norway iron, &c.) 3718; (cotton fabrics) 4180; (Indian corn) 4450; (metal glove fasteners, &c.) 4466; (carriage hardware) 4470 (ii).
Weights and Measures Inspector, Port Arthur, Appnmt. (Ques.) 793 (i).

Tisdale, Hon. D., *South Norfolk.*
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. 33 (Mr. *Osler*) in Com., 2611 (i), 2920 (ii).
Dismissals, Land Office, Man., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4017 (ii).
Interest Act Amt. B. 134 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4252 (ii).
Langenburg and Southern Ry Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 2602 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 4733 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Militia (Military College) 4806, 4821 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (Indian corn) 4419 (ii).
Supreme Court (Ont.) B. 131 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 4208; in Com., 4215 (ii).
Ry. Employees, &c., Safety B. 2 (Mr. *Casey*) on ref. to Com., 614 (i).

Tupper, Hon. Sir C., Bart., *Cape Breton.*
Address, on The, 22; (remarks) 191 (i).
——— (Jubilee) to Her Majesty, 3245 (ii).
Alaska Boundary, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2742 (ii).
——— and B.C. (remarks) 3418 (ii).
——— Memo. *re* (remarks) 4107 (ii).
American Bank Note Co.'s Contract, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2703 (ii).
——— (M. for papers) 1835 (i).
Appnmts. by late Govt., Recommendations of Treasury Board (M. for Ret.) 1639 (i).
——— present Government (M. for Ret.) 1055 (i).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Colonial Sec.'s Stmnt. *re* Contract (Ques.) 783 (i).
——— on M. to adjn. (remarks) 928 (i).
——— Tenders, on M. for copies, 2426 (i).
——— par. in Ottawa *Citizen*, 2742 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2775 (ii).
——— Contract, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3987, 4231 (ii).
Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1765 (i).
Behring Sea Convention, Re-opening, London Press Cor. (remarks) 4472 (ii).
Budget, The (remarks) 783 (i).

Tupper, Hon. Sir C.—*Con.*
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. 33 (Mr. *Osler*) in Com., 2338, 2344 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 29 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 1°, 776 (i).
——— Superannuation (Refund) Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Fielding*) on prop. Res., 4119 (ii).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4529 (ii).
Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. B. 125 (Mr. *Davies*) in Com., 4126 (ii).
Dismissals from Public Service, B. C. Quarantine Station, 2406 (i).
East Bay (C.B.) Post Office, Removal (Ques.) 4366 (ii).
Export Duties on Pulp Wood (remarks), 2021 (i), 3873 (ii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 90; on M. for 2°, 973 (i).
——— on M. to adjn. (remarks) 546 (i).
G. T. R. and Dom. Govt., reported Grant of $300,000, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 578 (i).
Inland Rev., Deptl. Changes, on M. to adjn. 4367 (ii).
I. C. R. Extension to Montreal (Ques.) 1304 (i).
——— (remarks) 1545 (i), 3540 (ii).
——— par. in Speech from the Throne (remarks) 2657 (ii).
——— (G.T.R. and Drummond Co. Ry.) B. 142 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for Com. on Res., 4259; in Com., 4344–4394; on M. for 1° of B., 4478 (ii).
——— Employees Dismissed at Antigonish (Ques.) 2565 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 3745, 3785 (ii).
Lobster Fishery of Cape Breton (remarks) 2051 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 10 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2461 (i).
Military College, Kingston, Change in Administration (remarks) 3540, 4180 (ii).
——— Professional Staff (Ques.) 4120 (ii).
——— Sergeants, Services Dispensed with (Ques.) 4121 (ii).
Ministers answering Ques. (remarks) 789 (i).
N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 114 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 4110 (ii).
Pacific Cable, Govt. Action (remarks) 4109 (ii).
Personal Explanation, Duty on Coal (remarks) 673 (i).
——— (Mr. *Choquette*) 4205 (ii).
Pirate Harbour Post Office, Closing (Ques.) 1028.
Post Office Act Amt. B. 129 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 4504 (ii).
Public Bills, &c., on M. to adjn. (remarks) 556 (i).
Pulp Wood, Export Duty (remarks) 2021 (i), 3873 (ii).
Quarantine Regulations, U.S., Man., N.W.T. and B.C., on M. for Ret., 811 (i).
Queen's Birthday, Perpetual Holiday B. (remarks) 4373 (ii).
——— Diamond Jubilee, on M. to adjn., 948 (i).
Questions Ruled out of Order (remarks) 3972 (ii).

Tupper, Hon. Sir C.—*Con.*

Ry. Employees, &c., Safety B. 2 (Mr. *Casey*) on ref. to Com., 617 (i).

Ry. Lands and Taxation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Oliver*) 3517 (ii).

Restigouche and Victoria Ry. Co.'s B. 99 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) on M. for 3°, 2457 (i); on M. for 2°, 2777 (ii).

Restigouche Ry. and Bridge Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. *Domville*) on M. for 2°, 2777 (ii).

Returns (inquiry) 4108 (ii).

St. Lawrence River Canals, Improvements (Ques.) 2423 (i).

Saskatchewan Election, Member's Seat challenged, on M. to adjn., 956, 964 (i).

Saturday Sittings (Ques.) 4394 (ii).

Sunny Brae and Melrose Mail Contract (Ques.) 1027 (i).

Superannuation Act (C. S.) Repeal B. 9 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 169; on M. for 2°, 552 (i).

Public Officials, &c., under Present Administration (M. for Ret.) 2447 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 2280 (ii).
Canals—Capital: Grenville (dismissals) 3875, 3937.
Charges of Management, 1566 (i).
Civil Government: Auditor General (contingencies) 2071, 2078; (High Commissioner) 1982; Interior, 1679; Railways and Canals, 1950, 1962 (i)
Immigration (agents' salaries) 2816, 3743, 4034 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Dep. Speaker's salary) 2096; (official debates) 2105 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Halifax and Nfld.) 2790 (ii).
Marine (tidal service) 2293 (i).
Militia (Jubilee contingent) 2661; (Military College) 4480 (ii).
Penitentiaries, 2795 (ii).
Public Works: Income: Buildings (Rideau Hall) 2640. Harbours and Rivers (dredging) 2785; (N. S.) 2719; (Ont.) 2774. Miscellaneous (Monument to late Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) 2789 (ii).
Quarantine (salaries, &c.) 2231; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 2362 (i).
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (extension to Montreal) 3745, 3785 (ii).

Supreme Court (Ont.) B. 131 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 4207; in Com., 4212 (ii).

Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1258 (i).

Trade and Navigation Rets., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4016 (ii).

Trade with the Empire, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 4104 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1258 (i).

In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 2845, 2960, 3095, 3101, 3133; Res. 17 (combine clause) 3247; (spirituous liquors, &c.) 3352; (mutton, &c.) 3359, 3384; (cornmeal) 3424; (books) 3466; (medicinal preparations) 3477; (surgical instruments) 3478; (coal oil) 3480 (iron or steel scrap) 3628; (iron or steel angles) 3637; (sugar) 4395 (ii).

Tupper, Hon. Sir C. H., K.C.M.G., *Pictou.*

Alien Labour Restriction B. 5 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 3550 (ii).

American Bank Note Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3°, 3003, 3274 (ii).

Annapolis Royal Post Office, Mr. West's Appnmt., on M. for Ret., 2014 (i).

Bunker Island Marine Hospital, Mrs. Le Caine's Dismissal (Ques.) 3504, 3866. (ii).

Business of the Hse., Morning Sittings, on M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3583 (ii).

Cameron, John, Savings Bank Agent, New Glasgow, Appnmt., &c. (M. for Ret.*) 3448 (ii).

Civil Service Act, Min. of Justice's Opinion (Ques.) 2124 (i).

——— Superannuation (Refund) Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Fielding*) on prop. Res., 4119 (ii).

Customs and Inland Rev. Dept. Repeal B. 125 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 3580 (ii).

County Court Judges, Commissions without Legislation (Ques.) 2124 (i).

Criminal Code Amt. (Seduction and Abduction) B. 13 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. to conc. in Amts., 3543 (ii).

Dismissals (Hughes, Noonan and Davis) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4009 (ii).

——— Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fairlie) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2393 (i).

Dobson, Wm., Postmaster, Tatamagouche, Resignation (Ques.) 1541 (i).

Fisheries Act (Saw-dust in Rivers) Amt. B. 127 (Mr. *Davies*) in Com., 3724 (ii).

Fisheries Protection Service, Officers on Govt. Steamers (remarks) 3671 (ii).

——— Supplies and Repairs to Vessels, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 2447 (i).

Forged and Unauthorized Endorsements of Bills B. 123 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 3723.

Cahan, Convict, Release from Kingston Penitentiary (remarks) 3339 (i).

Goodwin *vs.* The Queen, par. in Toronto *Globe* (Ques.) 3840 ii).

Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for 2°, 1574 (i).

"Indian Gardens" Reserve (N.S.) Sale of Hay (Ques.) 3509 (ii).

Inspection (General) Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 3571 (ii).

I.C.R. Car Inspector at Stellarton, Dismissal (M. for Ret.*) 1663 (ii).

——— Fuel Inspector, W. B. Moore, Dismissal (Ques.) 1541 (i).

Isaac's Harbour Postmaster, Dismissal (remarks) 4106 (ii).

Kingston Postmaster, Appnmt. of Mr. Gunn (Ques.) 3740, 3865 (ii).

——— Mr. Shannon's Superannuation (Ques.) 2653 (i).

Kinney, L. W., Postmaster at Salem, Dismissal (Ques.) 2411 (i).

Lobster Fishing in Cape Breton (remarks) 1550.

Tupper, Hon. Sir C. H.—*Con.*

McDonald, G., Appnmt., sub-Collector of Customs (Ques.) 2125 (i).

McLean, James, Foreman Carpenter, I.C.R. (Ques.) 2121 (ii).

McLeod and McKay, Messrs., Bridge Tenders on I.C.R., Dismissal (M. for Rep.*) 2447 (i).

——— Ret. (inquiry) 3743 (ii).

McKenzie, Capt. Wm., Dredge *Canada*, Dismissal (Ques.) 1743 (i).

McManus, Mrs., Postmistress at Northfield (B.C.) Dismissal, on M. to adjn. (remarks) 1387.

Mabou Harbour Buoy Service, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 4206, 4226 (ii).

Mackerel Fishery in N.S., Protection to Fishermen, on M. to adjn., (remarks) 3674 (ii).

Militia Camp, Aldershot, Queen's Co., N.S., Supplies (M. for Ret.*) 2448 (i).

Newfield, Str., Appnmts. (Ques.) 2125 (i).

N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 114 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 4116 (ii).

Orangedale, Margaree, &c., Mail Contracts (Ques.) 4365 (ii).

Pilots (Quebec and Montreal) incorp. B. 67 (Mr. *Guay*) in Com., 3539 (i).

Queen's Birthday, Perpetual Holiday B. (remarks) 3583 (ii).

Ry. Employees, &c., Safety B. 2 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 3560 (ii).

Returns, (inquiries) 2054, 2298 (i), 2969, 3419. 3743 (ii).

St. Andrew's P.O. (N.S.) Rep. respecting late Fire (Ques.) 3235 (ii).

Shannon, Mr. James, Postmaster at Kingston, Superannuation (Ques.) 2653 (ii).

Shubenacadie and Dean Mail Contract (M. for Ret.*) 1663 (i).

Sullivan, Danl. Brian, Release from Prison (M. for papers*) 1663 (i); (Ques.) 3583 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice (travelling allowances, Judges of Man.) conc., 3731 (ii).

Civil Government: Inland Revenue, 1919 (i); Marine and Fisheries, conc., 3730 (ii); Railways and Canals, 1935, 1943 (i).

Collection of Revenues: Customs (Que.) 2553. Weights and Measures (salaries) 2514 (i).

Immigration (agents' salaries) 3745, 4034 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (Dep. Speaker's salary) 2094 (i).

Fisheries (oyster culture) 2552 (i).

Miscellaneous (litigated matters) 3863 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 2578 (i).

Railways—Capital: I. C. R., 3834. P. E. I. Ry., 3353 (ii).

Tariff Res., on M. for Com. of Sup., 2480 (i).

Walsh, C. J., Claim on Leeward Islands Govt. (remarks) 3676 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff:

In Com.; Res. 16 (preferential clause) 2989; (iron or steel, scrap) 3583 (ii).

Tyrwhitt, Mr. R., *South Simcoe.*

Dismissals from Public Service (Rev. Mr. Fairlie) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2389 (i).

Kingston and London Barracks, Wood Contracts (Ans.) 2425 (i).

Military College, Kingston, Reorganization (M. for Ret.*) 2447 (i).

Returns (inquiry) 2969 (ii).

Tottenham and Athlone Mail Contracts, Cancellation (M. for Cor.*) 3537 (ii).

Wallace, Hon. Mr. N. C., *West York.*

Address, on The, 300 (i).

Alien Labour Restriction B. 5 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 654 (i).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2757 (ii).

Business of the Hse. (remarks) 5011, 5039 (ii).

Crow's Nest Pass Ry. B. 146 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5176 (ii).

Dismissals from Public Service, B.C. Quarantine Station, 2105 (i).

Dom. Safe Deposit and Trust Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. *Gibson*) on M. for 2°, 2777 (ii).

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal (G. T. R. and Drummond Co. Ry.) B. 142 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for Com. on Res., 4051, 4330, 4383 (ii).

——— conc., 5459 (ii)

Morrisburg Customs Collector, Dismissal (Ques.) 489 (i).

Mycenian Marble Co.'s Relief B. 83 (Mr. *Rosamond*) in Com., 2346 (i).

Post Office Mail Contracts, in Com. of Sup., 5099 (ii).

Queen's Diamond Jubilee, Bank Holiday (Ques.) 4372 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairy interests, cheese and butter) 2202 (i); (N.W.T. Exhibition) 4859.

Canals—Capital: Grenville (dismissals) 3884; Trent Valley (construction) 5127 (ii).

Civil Government: Interior, 1702 (i); Justice (salaries) 4835; Post Office (statutory increases) 5110, (technical services) 5109 (ii).

Collection of Revenues: Customs (B.C.) 2561; (N.S.) 2552; (Ont.) 2555; (Que.) 2554 (i); (preventive service) 5002, 5020, conc., 5446. Post Office (mail service) 5067; (outside service) conc., 5418 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (Algoma election expenses) 4988; (translators) 4847; (sessional indemnity) 4852 (ii).

Immigration (agents' salaries) 3745, 4056 (ii).

Indians: Man. and N.W.T. (gratuities retired officers) 5000 (ii).

Miscellaneous (repatriation of Canadians from Brazil) 3863 (ii).

Militia (Military College) 4822 (ii).

Miscellaneous (tariff inquiry) 5212 (ii).

Penitentiaries (gratuities, retired officers) 4987. Kingston (Commissioners' Rep.) 4762, 4797 (ii).

Wallace, Hon. Mr. N. C.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Capital: Buildings (electric lighting) 4897. Harbours and Rivers (St. Lawrence ship channel) 4873. *Income:* Buildings (N.B.) 4947: (N.S.) 4910, conc., 5439; (Ottawa) 4948: (Rideau Hall) 2600, 2647, 4887; (west deptl. block, fire) 4882; (Que.) 5456. Harbours and Rivers (Ont., Collingwood Harbour) 2767; (Manitoulin Island) 4964; (Que., Gatineau River) 4960 (ii).

Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (Drummond Co. Ry.) conc., 5459 (ii).

Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1471 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff:

In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 3060; Res. 17 (combine clause) 3271, 3290, 3332; (spirituous liquors, &c.) 3353; (Indian corn) 3410, 3435; (wheat flour) 3452; (advertising matter, &c.) 3474; (wire nails) 3640; (screws, &c.) 3658; (barbed wire) 3664; (buckthorn, strip fencing, &c.) 3682; (files and rasps) 3702 (ii).

Wilson, Mr. U., *Lennox.*

Anderson, Thos. E., Appnmt. as Collector of Customs (M. for Cor., &c.) 1057 (i).

Napanee Customs Collector, Appnmt., &c. (Ques.) 482 (i).

Newburg and Kingston Mail Contract (M. for Cor.) 1748 (i).

Odessa Postmaster, Name, Recommendation, &c. (Ques.) 266 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying interests, butter and cheese) 2197 (i).

Immigration (agents' salaries) 4033 (ii).

Tariff, The, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1528 (i).

——— arrangement as to Discussion, 3031 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff:

In Com.: (Indian corn) 4446 (ii).

Wood, Hon. J. F., *Brockville.*

Alien Labour Restriction B. 5 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 641 (i).

Customs Appnmts. and Dismissals, Names, Salaries, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 1058 (i).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 856 (i).

Grain Standards, Man. and N.W.T., Changes (Ques.) 1077 (i).

Inland Revenue Dept., Dismissals and Appnmts. since July, 1896 (M. for Ret.*) 1663 (i).

Wood, Hon. J. F.—*Con.*

Returns (inquiries) 2571 (i), 3242 (ii).

St. Lawrence River (Upper) Sale of Islands (Ques.) 1026 (i).

Silver Spray and *Mary Grover*, Seizure by Inland Rev. (Ques.) 927, 1300 (i).

SUPPLY:

Civil Government: Interior, 1674; Marine and Fisheries, 1732 (i).

Collection of Revenues: Culling Timber, 2509. Excise (preventive service) 2498; (salaries) 2492; (travelling, &c.) 2507. Weights and Measures, &c. (gas inspection) 2551; (salaries) 2514 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff:

In Com.: Res. 16 (preferential clause) 3105; (cornmeal) 3427 (ii).

Weights and Measures, Metrical System (Ques.) 1027 (i).

Winnipeg, Duluth and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 17 (Mr. *Macdonell*) on M. for 3°, 2449 (i).

Wood, Mr. A. T., *Hamilton.*

Atlantic Fast SS. Service Contract, on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4004, 4216 (ii).

Beamsville Post Office, Mr. Fairbrother's Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1772 (i).

Building Societies and Loan and Savings Co.'s (B. 12) 1°*, 258; 2°*, 703 (i); Sen. Amts., 3559.

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 29 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 1°, 776 (i).

Ry. Commission, Creation of (Ques.) 3976 (ii).

Restigouche and Victoria Ry. Co.'s (B. 99) 1°*, 1899; 2° m., 2347, 2450 (i); (M. for Com.) 4046.

Restigouche Ry. and Bridge Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. *Domville*) on M. for 2°, 2777 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff:

In Com.: Res. 17 (combine clause) 3330; (wire nails) 3643; (screws, &c.) 3658; (barbed wire) 3661; (strip fencing) 3686; (wire cable) 3693; (rasps and files) 3699; (paintings, &c.) 3709; (duck belting, &c.) 3710, 4137; (axes, scythes, &c.) 4171 (ii).

Yeo, Mr. J., *East Prince, P.E.I.*

Lobsters, Extension of Close Season, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4771 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Railways—Capital: P. E. I. Ry., 3859 (ii).

INDEX—PART II

SUBJECTS

ABITTIBI AND GRAND LAC INDIANS: Ques. (Mr. *Poupore*) 2568 (i).

ALGOMA ELECTION, EXPENSES *re* COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 4987, 5059; conc., 5451 (ii).

ADDRESS, THE, IN ANS. TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH: consdn., M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6.

——— moved (Mr. *Russell*) 7; seconded (Mr. *Ethier*) 18. Deb. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 22; (Mr. *Laurier*) 59; (Mr. *Foster*) 67; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 85, 99; (Mr. *Davin*) 111; (Mr. *Monk*) 131; (Mr. *Casgrain*) 149; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 167, 181; (Mr. *Dupont*) 194; (Mr. *LaRivière*) 209; (Mr. *Quinn*) 223, 434; (Mr. *Tarte*) 236; (Mr. *Craig*) 248; (Mr. *McInerney*) 250, 270; (Mr. *Lemieux*) 282, 397; (Mr. *Maclean*) 287; (Mr. *MacPherson*) 291; (Mr. *Wallace*) 300; (Mr. *Casey*) 311; (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 320; (Mr. *Talbot*) 322; (Mr. *Clancy*) 331; (Mr. *Maxwell*) 343; (Mr. *Hughes*) 352; (Mr. *Mulock*) 367; (Mr. *Richardson*) 371; (Mr. *Chauvin*) 374; (Mr. *Clarke*) 377; (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 385; (Mr. *Broder*) 393; (Mr. *Osler*) 400; (Mr. *McCleary*) 402; (Mr. *Bennett*) 409; (Mr. *Fraser, Guysboro'*) 420; (Mr. *McNeill*) 435; (Mr. *McMullen*) 443; (Mr. *Costigan*) 452; (Mr. *Britton*) 469 (i).

——— REPLY: Presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 1900 (i).

——— (JUBILEE) TO HER MAJESTY: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3243 (ii).

ADJOURNMENTS, MS.:

EASTER (Mr. *Laurier*) 838 (i).

ASCENSION DAY (Mr. *Laurier*) 2878 (ii).

ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 928 (i).

BILLS NOT PRINTED IN FRENCH (Mr. *Laurier*) 555 (i).

INLAND REVENUE DEPTL. CHANGES (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) 4366 (ii).

MACKEREL FISHERY (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 3673 (ii).

NORTHFIELD (B.C.) POSTMASTER (Mr. *Davin*) 1377.

"OUR LADY OF THE SNOWS" (Mr. *Davin*) 1546 (i).

QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2740.

QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE (Mr. *McNeill*) 946 (i).

——— CELEBRATION OF DAY (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4736 (ii).

——— MILITIA CONTINGENT (Mr. *Domville*) 838 (i).

SASKATCHEWAN ELECTION, MEMBER'S SEAT CHALLENGED (Mr. *Davin*) 970 (i).

TRADE WITH THE EMPIRE (Mr. *McNeill*) 4101 (ii).

VICTORIA BRIDGE, G.T.R., $300,000 GRANT (Mr. *Foster*) 574 (i).

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 3731, 4141, 4841, 4986 (ii).

Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1 (Mr. *Laurier*). 1**, 4; *pro formâ*.

ADMIRALTY JURISDICTION AND N.S. COUNTY COURT JUDGES: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 262 (i).

ADVERTISING MATTER: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3474 (ii).

AGENTS (IMMIGRATION) AND EMPLOYEES IN CAN., SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 3743, 4033, 4066 (ii).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS:

AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES, AID TO: in Com. of Sup., 2100 (i).

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION COM., 2ND REP. (COLD STORAGE): conc., 1899 (i).

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT: in Com. of Sup., 2083 (i), 4832 (ii).

ARCHIVES: in Com. of Sup., 2106 (i).

ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 2106, 2179, 2226, 2274 (i), 4859, 4986 (ii).

BUTTER EXPORTS, BONUS, &C.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 601, 1799 (i).

CATTLE, CONFERENCE BETWEEN MR. GOURDEAU AND SS. CO.'S, REP.: M. for copy* (Mr. *Maclean*) 2446.

——— QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 2263 (i), 4880, 4991 (ii).

——— SHIPPING REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 2217 (i).

CHEESE AND BUTTER FACTORIES, WTHDRL. OF GOVT. AID: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Martin*) 3538 (ii).

COLD STORAGE: in Com. of Sup., 2274 (i).

——— COM. ON RES.: M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3842 (ii).

——— CONTRACT: Presented (Mr. *Fisher*) 4364 (ii).

CRIMINAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 2108 (i).

DAIRYING SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2119, 2180 (i).

DOM. EXHIBITION, TORONTO, GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1633 (i).

EXPERIMENTAL FARMS: in Com. of Sup., 2109 (i).

GAME LAWS, QUEBEC, ON M. FOR COM. OF SUP.: Remarks (Mr. *Poupore*) 4022 (ii).

GOVT. HORSES AT PRINCE ALBERT, PAYMENTS FOR CARE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Davis*) 3537 (ii).

HOGS, SLAUGHTER, SPECIAL COMPENSATION: in Com. of Sup., 2270 (i).

"PATENT RECORD": in Com. of Sup., 2107 (i).

PARIS EXHIBITION, 1900, CAN. REPRESENTATION: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 3508 (ii).

AGRICULTURE—*Con.*
PUBLIC HEALTH: in Com. of Sup., 2202, 2226 (i).
QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 2262 (i), 4860, 4991 (ii).
——— MAN. AND N. W. TERS.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3238 (ii).
——— REGULATIONS, U.S., MAN., N.W.T. AND B.C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 797, 822 (i).
——— VICTORIA, B.C.: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 1554 (i).
STATISTICAL YEAR-BOOK: in Com. of Sup., 3108 (i).
STATISTICS, GENERAL: in Com. of Sup., 2109 (i).
SEED GRAIN, AMOUNTS OWING BY FARMERS, MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1989 (i).
——— DISTRIBUTION IN MAN. AND N.W.T., AMOUNTS OUTSTANDING: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2215 (i).
STOCKHOLM EXHIBITION, WALTON JONES' APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1984 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 4859 (ii).
TERRITORIAL EXHIBITION, OUTSTANDING DEBTS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1374 (i).
TIMOTHY SEED AND CLOVER, IMPOSITION OF DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Bazinet*) 793 (i).
TUBERCULOSIS, PREVENTION OF SPREADING: in Com. of Sup., 4991 (ii).

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION, SEL. COM.: List of Members, 665 (i).
——— 2nd Rep. (Cold Storage) conc., 1899 (i).
——— DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 2083 (i), 4832 (ii).
AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS: in Com. of Ways and Means, 4152, 4155 (ii).
——— *See* "FARM IMPLEMENTS."
——— SOCIETIES, AID TO: in Com. of Sup., 2109 (i).
ALASKAN BOUNDARY: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2472 (ii).
——— PAPERS RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Sifton*) 2887 (ii).
——— AND B.C.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3418.
——— QUOTATION FROM TREATY, MT. ST. ELIAS: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 3505 (ii).
——— LINE OF DEMARCATION: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Morrison*) 3538 (ii).
——— MEMO. *re:* Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4107.
Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. No. 21 (Mr. *Oliver*). 1°*, 707; 2°*, 785 (i).
ALEXANDRIA REFORMATORY: in Com. of Sup., 4949.
Alien Labour Prohibition B. No. 6 (Mr. *Taylor*). 1°, 89; 2°, 660 (i). *See* B. 5.
Alien Labour Restriction B. No. 5 (Mr. *Cowan*). 1°, 88; 2°, 621 (i); in Com. and consolid. with B. 6, 3545; 3°*, 3559 (ii). (60-61 *Vic., c.* 11.)
Alien Act Amt. B. No. 133 (Mr. *McMullen*). 1°*, 3865 (ii).
ALLANDALE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1079 (i).
American Bank Note Co.'s B. No. 68 (Mr. *Belcourt*). 1°*, 1373; 2°*, 1573; in Com., 2449 (i); 3° m., 3003; Order for 3° read, 3089; 3° m., 3274; 3°, 3461 (ii). (60-61 *Vic., c.* 88.)
AMERICAN BANK NOTE CO. AND MR. REID'S RELATION THERETO: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2881 (ii).
——— CONTRACT: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 1462; (Mr. *Foster*) 1560 (i).
——— M. for Papers (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1835 (i).
——— Notice of Motion (Mr. *Foster*) 2572; M., 2652.
AMERICAN BANK NOTE CO.: COST OF ENGRAVING PLATES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3056 (ii).
——— PLATES REQUIRED AND COST: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3505 (ii).
AMERICAN HISTORY, BOOKS ON: in Com. of Sup., 2106 (i).
AMQUI MUNICIPALITY, REIMBURSEMENT FOR RY. CROSSING: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 1541 (i).
ANDERSON, GEO., APPNMT. AS AGENT TO JAPAN: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 3339 (ii).
ANDERSON, THOS. E., APPNMT. AS COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Wilson*) 1057 (i).
ANNAPOLIS CO. MAIL ROUTE, PET. RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 3237 (ii).
——— MAIL SERVICE, PAYMENT TO GEO. BROWN: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 572 (i).
——— CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 1989 (i).
——— POST OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 485 (i).
——— POSTMASTER, D. G. RIORDAN, AMOUNT OF BONDS: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 3235 (ii).
——— POSTMASTER, MR. WEST'S APPNMT.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mills*) 2001 (i).
——— AND LIVERPOOL (N.S.) MAIL ROUTES, CONTRACTS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mills*) 2446 (i).
APPNMTS. BY LATE GOVT., RECOMMENDATIONS OF TREASURY BOARD: M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1639 (i).
——— BY PRESENT GOVT.: M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1055 (i).
ARCHITECTS, DRAUGHTSMEN, &C., SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 4890 (ii).
ARTILLERY GARRISON BATTERY NO. 3, DISBANDMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 340 (i).
ARBITRATION, DOM. AND ONT., AND QUEBEC ACCOUNTS: in Com. of Sup., 4082; conc., 5423 (ii).
ARCHIVES: in Com. of Sup., 2106 (i).
ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 2106, 2179, 2226, 2274 (i), 4859, 4986 (ii).
ASHCROFT AND BARKERVILLE MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 2416 (i).
ASCENSION DAY, ADJNMT.: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2878.
ASPDIN, THOS. W., CLAIM FOR SCRIP: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1374 (i).
ATHABASCA AND MACKENZIE RIVER MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 2421 (i).
Atikokan Iron Range Ry. Co.'s B. No. 50 (Mr. *Dyment*). 1°*, 1171; 2°*, 1232; in Com. and 3°*, 1936 (i). (60-61 *Vic., c.* 35.)
ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE, 2ND PROPOSAL: Remarks (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 782 (ii).
——— COLONIAL SEC.'S STMNT. *re* CONTRACT: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 783 (i).
——— WINTER TERMINUS: Ques. (Mr. *Ellis*) 1374 (i).
——— TENDERS: M. for copies (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 2426.
——— Remarks (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2757 (ii).
——— Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3742 (ii).

ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE, CONTRACT: prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3976 (i).
Deb. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3987, 4231; Ruling as to Procedure (Mr. *Speaker*) 3990; (Mr. *Davies*) 3994; (Mr. *Dobell*) 3999; (Mr. *Foster*) 4002, 4244; (Mr. *McNeill*) 4003; (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) 4004, 4216; (Mr. *Ellis*) 4218; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 4219; (Mr. *Gillies*) 4221, 4227; (Mr. *Charlton*) 4228; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4216; Mr. *Fielding*) 4232; (Mr. *Clarke*) 4235; (Mr. *McMillan*) 4238; (Mr. *Casey*) 4240; (Mr. *Rogers*) 4242; (Mr. *Ratz*) 4243; (Mr. *Stubbs*) 4244; (Mr. *McNeill*) 4248; agreed to (Y. 134, N. 22) 4251 (ii).
AUDITOR GENERAL'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 2070 (i).
AULT, MR. E., DISMISSAL BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 2879 (ii).
AXES, SCYTHES, &C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 4169 (ii).
AYLMER WEST POSTMASTER, APPNMT. AND DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 794, 795 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Ingram*) 1663 (i).

BAIE DE CHALEURS RY., GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1541 (i).
——— CONTROL: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*), 261 (i).
——— OPERATING: in Com. of Sup., 5133; conc., 5452 (ii).
——— PAR. IN HALIFAX "CHRONICLE": Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) 3420 (i).
BADDECK AND IONA, GRAND NARROWS AND IRISH COVE MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 2791; conc., 5419 (ii).
BALDERSON, MR., SUPERANNUATION: in Com. of Sup., 1928 (i).
BANFF ROCKY MOUNTAIN PARK: in Com. of Sup., 5000 (ii).
BANKING AND COMMERCE, SEL. COM.: List of Members, 664 (i).
BARBED WIRE: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3659 (ii).
BATEMAN, INDIAN AGENT, SCUGOG ISLAND, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1081 (i), 3424 (ii).
BAZINET, MR., OF JOLIETTE, AND QUEBEC ELECTIONS: Ques. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 1634 (i).
BEAMSVILLE POSTMASTER, APPNMT. AND DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 484 (i).
——— DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *McCleary*) 1453 (i).
——— MR. FAIRBROTHER'S DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. *McCleary*) 1749 (i).
Deb. (Mr. *Gibson*) 1744; (Mr. *Craig*) 1760; (Mr. *Lister*) 1763; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1765; (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) 1772; (Mr. *Logan*) 1773, 1836; (Mr. *McNeill*) 1840; (Mr. *McMullen*) 1844; (Mr. *Taylor*) 1846; (Mr. *Mulock*) 1847, 1886; (Mr. *Bennett*) 1854; (Mr. *McGregor*) 1857; (Mr. *Clancy*) 1859; (Mr. *Campbell*) 1865; (Mr. *Dyment*) 1871; (Mr. *Haggart*) 1873; (Mr. *Frost*) 1875; (Mr. *McCleary*) 1878; (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 1887; (Mr. *Davin*) 1889; (Mr. *McHugh*) 1890; (Mr. *Hughes*) 1891; (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1895. (i).
BEAR RIVER (N. S.) OBSTRUCTIONS TO NAV., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 486 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Mills*) 4772 (ii).
BEAR ISLAND, POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 672 (i).
BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, COLLECTOR OF TOLLS, APPNMT.: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 2419 (i).
BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, DISMISSAL OF LOCKMEN: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1743 (i).
——— DRAINAGE CULVERTS: in Com. of Sup., 5131, 5270 (ii).
——— CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 925 (i).
——— M. for O. C.* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1663 (i).
——— POSTMASTER, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 572 (i).
——— AND COUNTY ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 268 (i).
——— DISMISSAL OF ALEXIS DOUTRE: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 836 (i).
BEET-ROOT SUGAR MANUFACTURED IN CAN., BOUNTY PAID: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 264 (i).
BEHAN, MICHAEL, STOREMAN ON LACHINE CANAL, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 2565 (i).
BEHRING SEA SEAL REGULATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 2570 (i).
——— CONVENTION, RE-OPENING, LONDON PRESS COR.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4472 (ii).
BELFAST (P.E.I.) POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 926 (i).
BELGIAN CONSULATE, MONTREAL, AND TARIFF RES.: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 1460 (i).
——— CLAIMS OF IMPORTERS: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1542 (i).
BELLE RIVER BREAKWATER (P.E.I.) EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 918 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Martin*) 2445 (i).
BENNETT, W. H., ESQ., Member for East Simcoe: introduced, 3.
BERTHIER PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 5280 (ii).
——— WHARF, DUES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 262 (i).
BIBAUD, AZARIE, EMPLYMT. IN HOUSE OF COMMONS: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3509 (ii).
BILL (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Mr. *Laurier.*)
1°*, 4; *pro formâ.*
BILL (No. 2) Further to secure the safety of Railway employees and passengers.—(Mr. *Casey.*)
1°, 87; 2° m., 608; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 614 (i); in Com., 3560 (ii).
BILL (No. 3) To promote the safety of Railway employees.—(Mr. *Maclean.*)
1°, 87; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 621 (i).
BILL (No. 4) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Maclean.*)
1°, 88; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 1058 (i).
BILL (No. 5) To restrict the importation and employment of Aliens.—(Mr. *Cowan.*)
1°, 88; 2°, 621 (i); in Com. and consolid. with B. No. 6, 3545; 3°*, 3559 (ii). (60-61 *Vic., c.* 11.)
BILL (No. 6) To prohibit the importation and immigration of Foreigners and Aliens under contract or agreement to perform labour in Canada.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°, 89; 2°, 660 (i). *See* B. No. 5.

BILL (No. 7) To consolidate and amend the law relating to the Election of Members of the House of Commons.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1°, 89; 2° m., 718; deb. adjd., 774; rsmd., 847, 973.

BILL (No. 8) In further amendment of the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Gibson.*)
1°, 95; 2°, 673 (i).

BILL (No. 9) To provide for the abolition of the Civil Service Superannuation Act and for the Retirement of members of the Civil Service.—(Mr. *Mulock.*)
1°, 169; 2° m., 552 (i).

BILL (No. 10) To secure the better observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday, as a day of rest.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)
1°*, 258; 2°, 674; in Com., 2460 (i).

BILL (No. 11) Respecting the sale of Railway Return Fare Tickets.—(Mr. *McLennan, Glengarry.*)
1°, 257; 2°, 695 (i).

BILL (No. 12) Further to amend the law respecting Building Societies and Loan and Savings Companies carrying on business in the Province of Ontario.—(Mr. *Wood, Hamilton.*)
1°*, 258; 2°, 703; in Com. and 3°*, 1775 (i); Sen. Amts., 3559 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 31.)

BILL (No. 13) To amend the Criminal Code of 1892.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)
1°*, 339; 2°, 1060; in Com., 2474 (i); M. to conc. in Amts., 3542 (ii).

BILL (No. 14) Respecting drainage on and across the lands of Railway Companies.—(Mr. *Casey.*)
1°, 481; 2°, 1064 (i).

BILL (No. 15) Further to amend the Act respecting Interest.—(Mr. *Quinn.*)
1°, 550 (i); 2° m., 3562 (ii).

BILL (No. 16) To again amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Casey.*)
1°, 565; 2° m., 1775; 2°, 1798 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3545 (ii).

BILL (No. 17) To incorporate the Winnipeg, Duluth and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Macdonell.*)
1°*, 707; 2°*, 785; in Com. and 3° m., 2448 (i); 3°*, 2775 (ii).

BILL (No. 18) To confer certain powers on the Board for the management of the Temporalities Fund of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)
1°*, 707; 2°*, 785; in Com. and 3°*, 1936 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 94.)

BILL (No. 19) Respecting the Manitoba and South-eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Landerkin.*)
1°*, 707; 2°*, 785; in Com., 2450 (i); 3°*, 2775 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 53.)

BILL (No. 20) Respecting the Hull Electric Company.—(Mr. *Poupore.*)
1°*, 707; 2°, 784 (i).

BILL (No. 21) Respecting the Alberta Railway Company.—(Mr. *Oliver.*)
1°*, 707; 2°*, 785 (i).

BILL (No. 22) Respecting the Trans-Canadian Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to the Trans-Canada Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis.*)
1°*, 707; 2°*, 785 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4050 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 65.)

BILL (No. 23) To incorporate the Methodist Trust Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Britton.*)
1°*, 707; 2°*, 785; in Com. and 3°*, 1631 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 77.)

BILL (No. 24) Respecting the Manitoba and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Douglas.*)
1°*, 707; 2°*, 785 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3465 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 52.)

BILL (No. 25) To confirm an agreement between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Hull Electric Company.—(Mr. *Gibson.*)
1°*, 707; 2°*, 785; in Com. and 3°*, 1936 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 39.)

BILL (No. 26) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Gibson.*)
1°*, 707; 2°*, 785; in Com. and 3°*, 1573 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 42.)

BILL (No. 27) To incorporate the Royal Victoria Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Quinn.*)
1°*, 707; 2°*, 785; in Com. and 3°*, 1631 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 81.)

BILL (No. 28) Respecting the Ontario Pacific Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to the Ottawa and New York Railway Company.—(Mr. *Snetsinger.*)
1°*, 707; 2°*, 945; in Com. and 3°*, 1775 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 57.)

BILL (No. 29) In further amendment of the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. *McMullen.*)
1°, 774; 2° m., 2022; wthdn., 2031 (i).

BILL (No. 30) Respecting the Central Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. *McMullen.*)
1°*, 838; 2°*, 945 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3465 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 40.)

BILL (No. 31) Respecting the Trail Creek and Columbia Railway Company.—(Mr. *Gibson.*)
1°*, 838; 2°*, 945 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3909 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 64.)

BILL (No. 32) Respecting the Columbia and Kootenay Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. *Gibson.*)
1°*, 838; 2°*, 945 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3909 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 41.)

BILL (No. 33) Respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Mr. *Osler.*)
1°*, 838; 2°, 945; Order for Com., 2163; in Com., 2337; 3° m., 2610 (i); recom. and 3°, 2920 (ii).

BILL (No. 34) To incorporate the Canadian Securities Company of Montreal.—(Mr. *Madore.*)
1°*, 914; 2°*, 1058; in Com. and 3°*, 2345 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 84.)

BILL (No. 35) Respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 914; 2°*, 1058; in Com. and 3°*, 1936 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 37.)

BILL (No. 36) Respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. *MacPherson.*)
1°*, 914; 2°*, 1058 (i); wthdn., 3144 (ii).

BILL (No. 37) Respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Ingram.*)
1°*, 914; 2°*, 1058; in Com. and 3°*, 1936 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 68.)

BILL (No. 38) Respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.—(Mr. *Britton.*)
1°*, 950; 2°*, 1058 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3540 (ii).

BILL (No. 39) Respecting the Canadian General Electric Company, Limited.—(Mr. *Lount.*)
1°*, 950; 2°*, 1058; in Com and 3°*, 1936 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 71.)

BILL (No. 40) To incorporate the Maritime Milling Company, Limited.—(Mr. *Fraser, Guysborough.*)
1°*, 1071; 2°*, 1202 (i); in Com. and 3°, 2927 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 92.)

BILL (No. 41) Respecting the River St. Clair Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. *Ingram.*)
1°*, 1072; 2°*, 1202 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1936 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 70.)

BILL (No. 42) To incorporate the St. Mary's River Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Dyment.*)
1°*, 1072; 2°*, 1202 (i).

BILL (No. 43) Respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Ingram.*)
1°*, 1072; 2°*, 1202 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2776 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 38.)

BILL (No. 44) Respecting the Welland Power and Supply Canal Company, Limited.—(Mr. *Sutherland.*)
1°*, 1072; 2°*, 1202; in Com. and 3°*, 1936 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 73.)

BILL (No. 45) In further amendment of the Trade Mark and Design Act.—(Mr. *Lount.*)
1°, 1072 (i).

BILL (No. 46) Respecting Trade and other Labels.—(Mr. *Lount.*)
1°, 1075 (i).

BILL (No. 47) In further amendment of the General Inspection Act.—(Mr. *McMullen.*)
1°, 1075 (i); 2° m., 3562 (ii).

BILL (No. 48) Respecting the Dominion Building and Loan Association.—(Mr. *Cowan.*)
1°*, 1171; 2°*, 1232; in Com. and 3°*, 1936 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 85.)

BILL (No. 49)—Respecting the Richelieu and Lake Memphremagog Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 1171; 2°*, 1232; in Com., 2450 (i); 3°*, 2775 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 61.)

BILL (No. 50)—Respecting the Atikokan Iron Range Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment.*)
1°*, 1171; 2°*, 1232; in Com. and 3°*, 1936 (i). (69-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 35.)

BILL (No. 51) Respecting the Langenburg and Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Richardson.*)
1°*, 1172; 2°*, 1232; in Com., 2163; 3° m., 2408; recom., 2602; 3°, 2609 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 50).

BILL (No. 52) Respecting the James' Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Lount.*)
1°*, 1172; 2°*, 1232; in Com., 2166; 3°, 2609 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 47.)

BILL (No. 53) To revive and further amend the Acts respecting the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company, and to change the name of the Company to the Saskatchewan Pacific Railway and Mining Company.—(Mr. *Lount.*)
1°*, 1172; 2°*, 1232 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3465; proceedings of House null and void, 5539 (ii).

BILL (No. 54) Respecting the North American Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. *Lount.*)
1°*, 1172; 2°*, 1232 (1); in Com. and 3°*, 2776 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 79.)

BILL (No. 55) To incorporate the Minden and Northwestern Railway Company.—(Mr. *McHugh.*)
1°*, 1172; 2°*, 1232; in Com., 2450 (i); 3°*, 2775 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 55.)

BILL (No. 56) Respecting the Medicine Hat Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Lount.*)
1°*, 1172; 2°*, 1232; in Com.., 2166: 3°, 2610 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 54.)

BILL (No. 57) To amend the Mounted Police Pension Act.—(Mr. *Davin.*)
1°*, 1172 (i).

BILL (No. 58) Respecting the Témiscouata Railway Company.—(Mr. *Domville.*)
1°*, 1226; 2°*, 1409; in Com., 2450 (i); 3°*, 2775 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 63.)

BILL (No. 59) To amend the Mounted Police Pension Act, 1889.—(Mr. *Davis.*)
1°, 1228; 2° m., 2036 (i).

BILL (No. 60) In further amendment of the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. *Douglas.*)
1°, 1229; 2°, 2041 (i).

BILL (No. 61) Further to amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. *Davin.*)
1°, 1229; 2°, 2037 (i).

BILL (No. 62) To amend the Mounted Police Act, 1894.—(Mr. *Davin.*)
1°, 1231; 2° m., 2037 (i).

BILL (No. 63) To regulate Freight Rates on Railways.—(Mr. *Reid.*)
1°, 1299 (i).

BILL (No. 64) To incorporate the British Yukon Chartered Company.—(Mr. *Fraser, Guysborough.*)
1°*, 1373; 2°*, 1573 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2927 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 89.)

BILL (No. 65) Respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Landerkin.*)
1°*, 1373; 2°*, 1573 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4050 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 36.)

BILL (No. 66) Relating to the Canadian Power Company.—(Mr. *Gibson.*)
1°*, 1373; 2°*, 1573 (i); wthdn., 2740 (ii).

BILL (No. 67) To incorporate the Pilots serving between Quebec and Montreal.—(Mr. *Guay.*)
1°*, 1373; 2°*, 1573 (i); in Com., 3539, 3704; 3°*, 3705 (ii).

BILL (No. 68) Respecting the American Bank Note Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 1373; 2°*, 1573; in Com., 2449 (i); 3° m., 3003; Order for 3° read, 3089; 3 m., 3274; 3°, 3461 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 88.)

BILL (No. 69) Respecting the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway Company.—(Mr. *Langelier.*)
1°*, 1373; 2°*, 1573 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3465 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 59.)

BILL (No. 70) Respecting the Great North-west Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *Richardson.*)
1°*, 1373; 2°, 1574 (i); in Com., 2925, 3002; 3°*, 3002 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 45.)

BILL (No. 71) Respecting the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bergeron.*)
1°*, 1373; 2°*, 1573; in Com., 2450 (i); 3°*, 2775 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 62.)

BILL (No. 72) Respecting the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company.—(Mr. *Richardson.*)
1°*, 1373; 2°*, 1574 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2927 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 49.)

BILL (No. 73) To incorporate the Kaslo and Lardo-Duncan Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bostock.*)
1°*, 1373; 2°*, 1574; in Com., 2450 (i); 3°*, 2775 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 48.)

BILL (No. 74) To incorporate the National Life Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Lount.*)
1°*, 1373; 2°*, 1574; in Com. and 3°*, 2345 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 78.)

BILL (No. 75) Respecting the attachment of the salaries of Dominion employees.—(Mr. *Richardson.*)
1°*, 1373 (i).

BILL (No. 76) To incorporate the British Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Oliver.*)
1°*, 1538; 2°*, 1631 (i); wthdn., 4119 (ii).

BILL (No. 77) To incorporate the Hudson's Bay and Yukon Railways and Navigation Company.—(Mr. *Oliver.*)
1°*, 1538; 2°*, 1631 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3705 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 46.)

BILL (No. 78) To amend the Act incorporating the Ontario Accident Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Osler.*)
1°*, 1538; 2°*, 1631; in Com. and 3°*, 2345 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 80.)

BILL (No. 79) To incorporate the Dominion Portland Cement Company.—(Mr. *Britton.*)
1°*, 1538; 2°*, 1631; in Com. and 3°*, 2345. (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 93.)

BILL (No. 80) Respecting the Quebec Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Langelier.*)
1°*, 1538; 2° m., 1631; 2°, 2021 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2776 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 69.)

BILL (No. 81) Respecting the Great Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Langelier.*)
1°*, 1538; 2°*, 2022 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3090 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 44.)

BILL (No. 82) To incorporate the Mining Development and Advisory Corporation of British America, Limited.—(Mr. *Maxwell.*)
1°*, 1538; 2° m., 1632, 1775; 2°, 1936 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2927 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 90.)

BILL (No. 83) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Mycenian Marble Company of Canada, Limited.—(Mr. *Rosamond.*)
1°*, 1538; 2°, 1632; in Com., 2345, 2449; 3°*, 2449 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 96.)

BILL (No. 84) To incorporate the Continental Heat and Light Company.—(Mr. *Rosamond.*)
1°*, 1538; 2°, 1632; in Com. and 3°*, 2345 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 72.)

BILL (No. 85) To incorporate the Hull, St. Louis Dam and Victoria Springs Railway Company.—(Mr. *Edwards.*)
1°*, 1539; 2°*, 1631 (i); wthdn., 3668 (ii).

BILL (No. 86) Respecting La Banque du Peuple.—(Mr. *Préfontaine.*)
1°*, 1539; 2°*, 2347 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3003 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 75.)

BILL (No. 87) To incorporate the Columbia Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Bostock.*)
1°*, 1539; 2°*, 1631 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2927 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 66.)

BILL (No. 88) To incorporate "Les Cisterciens Réformés."—(Mr. *LaRivière.*)
1°*, 1539; 2°, 1632; in Com. and 3°*, 2345 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 95.)

BILL (No. 89) Further to amend the Mounted Police Pension Act, 1889.—(Mr. *Davin.*)
1°, 1539 (i).

BILL (No. 90) Respecting the Montreal Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Préfontaine.*)
1°*, 1666; 2°*, 1937 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3465 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 67.)

BILL (No. 91) Respecting the Sun Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. *Rosamond.*)
1°*, 1666; 2°*, 1937 (1); in Com. and 3°*, 2776 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 82.)

BILL (No. 92) Respecting the Great Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Préfontaine.*)
1°*, 1666; 2°*, 1937 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3909 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 43.)

BILL (No. 93) To incorporate the Columbia and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bostock.*)
1°*, 1666; 2°*, 1937 (ii).

BILL (No. 94) To commemorate the reign of Her Majesty Queen Victoria by making her birthday a perpetual holiday—*from the Senate*—(Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière.*)
1°*, 1738 (i).

BILL (No. 95) To amend the law of Libel.—(Mr. *Davin.*)
1°*, 1738 (i).

BILL (No. 96) To amend the law respecting Controverted Elections.—(Mr. *Bell, Pictou.*)
1°, 1738 (i).

BILL (No. 97) For the relief of Adeline Myrtle Tuckett Lawry—*from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Landerkin.*)
1°, ——; 2°*, 2022; in Com. and 3° on div., 2345 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 97.)

Bill (No. 98) Respecting the Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Railway Company.—(Mr. *Hughes.*)
1°*, 1899; 2°*, 2022 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3090 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 51.)

BILL (No. 99) Respecting the Restigouche and Victoria Railway Company.—(Mr. *Wood, Hamilton.*)
1°*, 1899; 2° m., 2347, 2450 (i); 2°, 2776; M. for Com., 3909, 4046; in Com. and 3°*, 4050 (ii).

BILL (No. 100) To incorporate the Victoria, Vancouver and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. *Maxwell.*)
1°*, 1899; 2°*, 2347 (i).

BILL (No. 101) Respecting the Montreal and Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. *Prefontaine.*)
1°*, 1899; 2°*, 2022 (i).

BILL (No. 102) Respecting the Ottawa Gas Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 1983; 2°*, 2347 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2927 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 74)

BILL (No. 103) Respecting the Canadian Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Landerkin.*)
1°*, 2051; 2°*, 2347 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2776 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 76.)

BILL (No. 104) To incorporate the Restigouche Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Domville.*)
1°*, 2051; Order for 2°, 2166; M. wthdn., 2348 (i); 2°, 2777; B. wthdn., 4119 (ii).

BILL (No. 105) To amend the Act respecting the protection of navigable waters.—(Mr. *Davies.*)
1°*, 2215 (i); 2°* and in Com., 2742; 3°*, 2800; Sen. Amts., 4109 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 23.)

BILL (No. 106) Respecting the Dominion Safe Deposit, Warehousing and Loan Company (Limited), and to change the name of the Company to the Dominion Safe Deposit and Trusts Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Gibson.*)
1°*, 2297 (i); 2°, 2777; in Com. and 3°*, 3465 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 86.)

BILL (No. 107) Further to amend the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act.—(Mr. *Davin.*)
1°, 2408 (i).

BILL (No. 108) Respecting the examination of stationary engineers and the inspection of steam boilers.—(Mr. *Sutherland.*)
1°, 2408 (i).

BILL (No. 109) Respecting the Ottawa and Gatineau Railway Company.—(Mr. *Champagne.*)
1°*, 2475 (i); 2°*, 2778; in Com. and 3°*, 2927 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 58.)

BILL (No. 110) To incorporate the Southern Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. *Préfontaine.*)
1°*, 2654; 2°*, 2778; in Com. and 3°*, 4050 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 56.)

BILL (No. 111) For granting to Her Majesty the sum of $26,000 required for defraying certain expenses of the Militia Contingent to be sent to England for the Jubilee of Her Majesty in June, 1897.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1°* and 2°*, 2662; 3°*, 2742 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 1.)

BILL (No. 112) To prohibit improper speculation in the sale of butter or cheese.—(Mr. *Parmalee.*)
1°, 2795 (ii).

BILL (No. 113) Further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act.—(Mr. *Davies.*)
1°, 2796; 2° and in Com., 3721; 3°*, 3722 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 22.)

BILL (No. 114) Further to amend the Acts respecting the North-west Territories.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1°, 2797; 2° and in Com., 4110; 3°, 4118 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 28.)

BILL (No. 115) To amend the Land Titles Act, 1894.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1°, 2798; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3723 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 30.)

BILL (No. 116) Further to amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1°, 2798; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4118 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 29.)

BILL (No. 117) To provide for the Registration of Cheese Factories and Creameries, and for the Branding of Dairy Products, and to prohibit Misrepresentation as to the dates of Manufacture of such products.—(Mr. *Fisher.*)
1°*, 2878; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 3722 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 21.)

BILL (No. 118) Respecting the Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Company.—(Mr. *Maxwell.*)
1°*, 2967; 2°*, 3465; in Com. and 3°*, 4050 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 91.)

BILL (No. 119) Respecting La Mutuelle Générale Canadienne.—(Mr. *Madore.*)
1°*, 2967; 2°*, 3090; in Com. and 3°*, 3465 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 87.)

BILL (No. 120) Further to amend the Patent Act.—(Mr. *Fisher.*)
1°, 3234; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 3722 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 25.)

BILL (No. 121) To amend the Act respecting the Sale of Railway Passenger Tickets.—(Mr. *Beattie.*)
1°, 3234 (ii).

BILL (No. 122) To amend the Act relating to the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company—*from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Davin.*)
1°*, 3418; 2°*, 3705; in Com. and 3°*, 4051 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 60.)

BILL (No. 123) Respecting Forged or unauthorized Endorsements of Bills—*from the Senate.*—(Sir *Richard Cartwright.*)
1°*, 3580; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 3723 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 10.)

BILL (No. 124) Respecting the Cataract Power Company of Hamilton, Limited.—(Mr. *MacPherson.*)
1° and 2°, 3579; in Com. and 3°*, 4051 (ii).

BILL (No. 125) Respecting the Departments of Customs and Inland Revenue.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
Res. prop., 4086; 1°, 3580; 2°, 4110; in Com., 4122; 3°*, 4129 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 18.)

BILL (No. 126) Respecting the Voters' Lists.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1°, 3581; 2°* and in Com., 3724; 3°*, 3729 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 12.)

BILL (No. 127) Further to amend the Fisheries Act.—(Mr. *Davies.*)
1°, 3581; 2° and in Com., 3724; 3°*, 3728 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 24.)

BILL (No. 128) Relating to the Canada Investment and Agency Company, Limited.—*from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Davin.*)
1°*, 3842; 2°*, 3909; in Com. and 3°*, 4119 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 83.)

BILL (No. 129) Further to amend the Post Office Act.—(Mr. *Mulock.*)
1°, 3676; 2° and in Com., 4500; in Com., 4725, 5372, 5531, 5537; 3°*, 5539 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 26.)

BILL (No. 130) Further to amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. *Mulock.*)
1°, 3677; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 5539 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 14.)

BILL (No. 131) Respecting the Supreme Court of Ontario and the Judges thereof—*from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1°*, 3719; 2°, 4207; in Com., 4212; 3°*, 4719 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 34.)

BILL (No. 132) Further to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. *Davies.*)
1°, 3730; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4258 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 13.)

BILL (No. 133) To amend the law relating to Aliens.—(Mr. *McMullen.*)
1°*, 3865 (ii).

BILL (No. 134) Respecting Interest—*from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1°*, 3971; 2°* and in Com., 4252; 3°*, 4258 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 8.)

BILL (No. 135) To amend the Companies Act—*from the Senate*—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1°*, 3971; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4258 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 27.)

BILL (No. 136) To amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act, and Acts in amendment thereof.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
Res. prop. and in Com., 4118: 1°*, 4119; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 5415 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 15.)

BILL (No. 137) Respecting Trial by Jury in certain cases in the North-west Territories—*from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Davies.*)
1°*, 4203; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4724 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 32.)

BILL (No, 138) Further to amend the Criminal Code, 1892—*from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Davies.*)
1°*, 4203 (ii).

BILL (No. 139) Further to amend the Petroleum Inspection Act.—(Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière.*)
1°*, 4204; 2°* and in Com., 4719; 3°*, 4724 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 20.)

BILL (No. 140) Further to amend the Act respecting Judges of the Provincial Courts.—(Mr. *Davies.*)
1°*, 4204; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 4724 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 33.)

BILL (No. 141) Respecting Cold Storage on Steamships from Canada to the United Kingdom and in certain Cities in Canada.—(Mr. *Fisher.*)
Res. prop. and in Com., 4130; 1°*, 4252; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4724 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 7.)

BILL (No. 142) To confirm certain agreements entered into by Her Majesty with the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and the Drummond County Railway for the purpose of securing the extension of the Intercolonial Railway System to the City of Montreal.—(Mr. *Blair.*)
Res. prop., 4086; M. for Com., 4258; agreed to (Y. 91, N. 47) 4340; in Com., 4341, 4342, 4373; 1° of B., 4477; 2° and in Com., 4612; 3° m., 4654; 3°, 4697 (ii).

BILL (143) To consolidate and amend the Act respecting the Duties of Customs.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
Res. (Tariff) prop., 1136 (i); in Com., 2842, 2887, 2970, 3060, 3146, 3290, 3465, 3583, 3679, 4130, 4395, 4613; Res. as adopted, 4614; 1°* of B., 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4698 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 16.)

BILL (No. 144) Further to amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(*Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière.*)
Res. prop. and in Com., 4698; 1°* of B., 2°* and in Com., 4699; 3°*, 4701 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 19.)

BILL (No. 145) Respecting Export Duties.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
Res. prop., 4701; in Com., 4718; 1°* of B., 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4719 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 17.)

BILL (No. 146) To authorize a Subsidy for a railway through the Crow's Nest Pass.—(Mr. *Blair.*)
Res. prop., 3870; in Com., 4512; 1° of B., 4725; 2°* and in Com., 5164, 5338, 5342; 3°*, 5536 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 5.)

Bill (No. 147) To amend An Act respecting certain Savings Banks in the Province of Quebec.—*from the Senate.*—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1°*, 5009; 2°* and in Com., 5157; 3°*, 5372 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 9.)

BILL (No. 148) to authorize the raising by way of Loan, of certain sums of money for the Public Service.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
Res. prop., 4736; in Com., 5161; 1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 5163 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 3.)

BILL (No. 149) To provide for Bounties on Iron and Steel made in Canada.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
Res. prop., 4653; in Com., 5186; 1°*, 5201; 2°*, in Com. and 3°, 5288 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 6.)

BILL (No. 150) For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1897, and the 30th June, 1898, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1°*, 5478; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 5535 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 2.)

BILL (No. 151) To authorize the granting of Subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned.—(Mr. *Blair.*)
Res. prop., 4736, 5158; in Com., 5361, 5478; 1°*, 5529; 2°* and in Com., 5535; 3°, 5541 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 4.)

BILLS: Royal Assent, 2765, 5543 (ii).

BINDER TWINE MADE AT KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan, Glengarry*) 1634 (i).

BIRD ROCK ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, RESCUE OF WOMAN: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 3508 (ii).

BLANCHET, EUGÈNE, DISMISSAL FROM I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1082 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2446 (i).

BOMPAS, BISCHOFF & CO., SOLICITORS FOR THE DOM., RETIREMENT: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Foster*) 546 (i).

BOOKS, &C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3465, 3706.

BOUNDARY. *See* "ALASKAN."

BOULARDERIE WHARF, N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 2719.

BOUNTIES. *See* "IRON AND STEEL."

BOUNTY TO FISHERMEN, INCREASED: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 4471 (ii).

BRANTFORD POST OFFICE, FREE DELIVERY: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Clancy*) 3537 (ii).

BRASS WIRE: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3694 (ii).

BRAZIL, REPATRIATION OF FRENCH CANADIANS: in Com. of Sup., 4891 (ii).

BREMNER FURS SEIZURE, COMPENSATION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davis*) 1744 (i).

——— MR. DOBELL AS DIRECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3056 (ii).

BRITISH COLUMBIA:

ASHCROFT AND BARKERVILLE MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 2416 (i).

BEHRING SEA CONVENTION, LONDON PRESS COR.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4472 (ii).

——— SEAL REGULATIONS, ON ORDERS OF THE DAY: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 2570 (i).

BOUNDARY. *See* "ALASKAN."

CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 2561 (i).

CAPE BEALE AND CARMENAH TELEGRAPH LINE: in Com. of Sup., 2788 (ii).

COLUMBIA RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4973 (ii).

COLUMBIA AND WESTERN RY. CO.'S B., RETURN OF FEES: Remarks (Mr. *Bostock*) 4651 (ii).

CROW'S NEST PASS RY., PLANS DEPOSITED BY C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 267 (i).

——— CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 568 (i).

ESQUIMALT DEFENCE, &C.: conc., 5426 (ii).

——— POST OFFICE, APPNMT. OF TELEGRAPH OPERATOR: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1985 (i).

FIDDLE REEF MARINE LIGHTS: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1376 (i).

FISHING BY FOREIGNERS, ILLEGAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Prior*) 2446 (i).

BRITISH COLUMBIA—*Con.*

FISH TRAPS USED BY AMERICANS: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1376 (i).

FRASER RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4973.

GOLD DISCOVERIES, HARRISON LAKE REGION: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1744 (i).

GOLD DREDGING, STEWART RIVER, YUKON, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 1740 (i).

HARRISON RIVER RAPIDS, IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1744 (i).

KOOTENAY MAIL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 5540 (ii).

MCMANUS, ROBERT, LATE POSTMASTER AT NORTHFIELD, CHARACTER: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2879 (ii).

MCNAB, FISHERY INSPECTOR, INSTRUCTIONS FROM GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bostock*) 3056 (ii).

MAPLE BAY POST OFFICE, CLAIMS OF WM. BEAUMONT: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 4364 (ii).

NANAIMO AND COMOX MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3720 (ii).

NORTHFIELD POSTMASTER, INSPECTOR FLETCHER'S REP.: M. for copy* (Mr. *Davin*) 2021 (ii).

PACIFIC POSTAL SERVICE, ALLOWANCES TO MAIL CLERKS: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 241 (i).

PACIFIC-YUKON ROUTE, SURVEYS: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1375 (i).

POACHING BY AMERICANS, DEEP-SEA FISHERIES: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1375 (i).

QUARANTINE REGULATIONS U.S., MAN., N.W.T. AND B.C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 797, 822 (i).

——— VICTORIA: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 1554 (i).

"SAN PEDRO," REMOVAL OF WRECK: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1376 (i).

SALMON SOLD IN BRITISH MARKETS, QUALITY, &C.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Maxwell*) 1991 (i).

SILVER AND LEAD SMELTING, PAYMENTS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 3146 (ii).

SMUGGLING BY AMERICAN WHALERS, MACKENZIE RIVER BASIN: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 794 (i).

SMUGGLING INTO THE YUKON COUNTRY: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1375 (i).

TELEGRAPH LINES, GOVT. AND C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Bostock*) 2567 (i).

U. S. WHALERS IN MACKENZIE RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 4735 (ii).

VICTORIA, DRILL HALL: in Com., of Sup., 4956 (ii).

——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 2591 (i), 4956 (ii).

VICTORIA AND SAN FRANCISCO MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 2791 (ii).

WESTMINSTER AND BURRARD INLET TELEPHONE CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 2420 (i).

B.C. SOUTHERN RY. CO.'S CHARTER, DISALLOWANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 340 (i).

——— prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 493 (ii).

——— "GLOBE'S" COMMENTS ON SPEECH ON DISALLOWANCE: Personal explanation (Mr. *McInnes*) 709 (i).

——— EXPIRATION OF TIME: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3234 (ii).

B. C. Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 65 (Mr *Landerkin*). 1°*, 1373: 2°*, 1573 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4050 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 36.)

BRITISH GOODS AND CUSTOMS TARIFF: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 1461, 1462 (i).

British Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 76 (Mr. *Oliver*). 1°*, 1538: 2°*, 1631 (i); wthdn., 4119.

British Yukon Chartered Co.'s incorp. B. No. 64 (Mr. *Fraser, Guysboro'*). 1°*, 1373; 2°*, 1573 (i): in Com. and 3°*, 2927 (ii). (60-61 *Vic., c.* 89.)

BRODEUR, S. A., COLLECTOR OF TOLLS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2419 (i).

BRITANNIA METAL, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3703 (ii).

BROOKFIELD STATION (I.C.R.) AND EASTVILLE RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4738; in Com., 5526

BROWN, GEO., PAYMENT FOR MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 572 (i).

BUCKTHORN, &c., FENCING: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3679, 4147, 4161 (ii).

BUDGET SPEECHES, DATES OF DELIVERY: Stmnt. (Mr. *McMullen*) 554 (i).

BUDGET, THE: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 763 (i).

——— FINANCIAL STMNT. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1033, 1120, 1136 (i).

——— Reply (Mr. *Foster*) 1172 (i).

———. *See* "WAYS AND MEANS."

BUILDINGS, PUBLIC: in Com. of Sup., 2577 (i), 2758, 4880, 5278; conc., 5432 (ii).

Building Societies and Loan and Savings Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 12 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*). 1°*, 258; 2°, 703; in Com. and 3°*, 1775 (i); Sen. Amts., 3559 (ii). (60-61 *Vic., c.* 31.)

BULLETINS AND REPORTS, DISTRIBUTION: in Com. of Sup., 2118 (i).

BUNKER ISLAND MARINE HOSPITAL, MRS. LECAIN'S DISMISSAL: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3504, 3866 (ii).

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE, NOTICES OF MOTION: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 86 (i).

——— PRECEDENCE ON THURSDAYS: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 783 (i).

——— WEDNESDAYS AND THURSDAYS: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1899 (i).

——— MONDAYS: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2967 (ii).

——— MORNING SITTINGS: M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3582 (ii).

——— SATURDAY SITTINGS: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4394 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 5038, 5010, 5286 (ii).

Butter and Cheese (Improper Speculation in Sale) Prohibition B. No. 112 (Mr. *Parmalee*). 1°, 2795 (ii).

BUTTER TRADE WITH ENGLAND: prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 601, 1799 (i).

BYNG INLET CUSTOMS OFFICER, APPNMT. AND DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *McCormack*) 265 (i).

CACOUNA, EXTENSION OF WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4958 (ii).

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. No. 33 (Mr. *Osler*). 1°*, 838; 2°, 945; Order for Com., 2163; in Com., 2337; 3° m., 2610; (i) recom. and 3°, 2920 (ii).

CAMERON, JOHN, SAVINGS BANK AGENT, NEW GLASGOW, APPNMT., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3448 (i).

CAMPBELLTON AND GRAND FALLS (N.B.) SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737; in Com., 5513 (ii).

CAMPOBELLO BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 2565 (i).

CANALS:

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, COLLECTOR OF TOLLS, APPNMT., &c.: M. for O. C. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1663 (i).

——— COLLECTOR OF TOLLS: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 2419 (i).

CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 3861, 3919, 4823, 5115, 5270; conc., 5451.

CANAL CONTRACTS, DEPOSITS ON TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 1026 (i).

CHAMBLY CANAL, EXPENDITURE ON CULVERT: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 1028 (i).

——— TENDERS FOR STONE: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 1023.

CORNWALL AND BEAUHARNOIS CANALS, COST OF BREAKS IN 1894-95: Ques. (Mr. *Reid*) 2425 (i).

CORNWALL AND SOULANGES CANALS, DIMENSIONS AND CONTRACTORS: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan, Glengarry*) 2411 (ii).

DISMISSALS. *See* general heading.

GALOPS CANAL, IROQUOIS SECTION, TENDERS: M. for copy* (Mr. *Clancy*) 3538 (ii).

GALOPS RAPIDS, TENDERS FOR CARDINAL SECTION: M. for copy* (Mr. *Clancy*) 3538 (ii).

GRENVILLE CANAL, ENLARGEMENT, TENDERS FOR CONTRACT: M. for copy* (Mr. *Clancy*) 2447 (i).

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER, NORTH CHANNEL, TENDERS: M. for copy* (Mr. *Clancy*) 3538 (i).

SOULANGES CANAL, APPNMT. of ARBITRATORS: (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1540 (i).

——— SECTIONS 4, 5, 6, 7, CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 488 (i).

——— SECTION 12: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 489 (i).

——— TENDERS, CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 341, 488 (i).

——— SECTION 12, TENDERS, CONTRACT: M. for copies* (Mr. *Clancy*) 2447 (i).

——— SECTIONS 4, 5, 6, 7, TENDERS, &c.: M. for copy* (Mr. *Clancy*) 2447 (i).

CAN. AND NEWFOUNDLAND MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 2790, 4994 (ii).

Can. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. No. 35 (Mr. *Belcourt*). 1°*, 914; 2°*, 1058; in Com. and 3°*, 1936 (i). (60-61 *Vic., c.* 37.)

Can. Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 43 (Mr. *Ingram*). 1°*, 1072; 2°*, 1202 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2776 (11). (60-61 *Vic., c.* 38.)

Can. Fire Ins. Co.'s B. No. 103 (Mr. *Landerkin*). 1°*, 2051; 2°*, 2347 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2776 (ii). (60-61 *Vic., c.* 78.)

Can. General Electric Co.'s B. No. 39 (Mr. *Lount*). 1°*, 950; 2°*, 1058; in Com. and 3°*, 1936 (i). (60-61 *Vic., c.* 71.)

Can. Investment and Agency Co.'s B. No. 128 (Mr. *Davin*). 1°*, 3842; 2°*, 3909; in Com. and 3°*, 4119 (ii). (60-61 *Vic., c.* 83.)

——— **Power Co.'s B. No. 66** (Mr. *Gibson*). 1°*, 1373; 2°*, 1573 (i); wthdn, 2740 (ii.)

CAN. REGISTRY OF SHIPPING: in Com. of Sup., 2290.

Can. Securities Co. of Montreal incorp. B. No. 34 (Mr. *Madore*). 1°*, 914; 2°*, 1058; in Com. and 3°*, 2345 (i). (60-61, *Vic., c.* 84.)

CANNED LOBSTERS, SCIENTIFIC EXAMINATION: in Com. of Sup., 4999 (ii).

CAPE BEALE AND CARMENAH (B.C.) TELEGRAPH LINE: in Com. of Sup., 2788 (ii).
CAPE CROKER, INDIAN AGENT McIVOR: Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 573, 788 (i).
CAPE TORMENTINE (N.B.) BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4958 (ii).
CAPLIN RIVER POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 1027, 1308 (i).
CAP SAUMON LIGHTHOUSE, CONSTRUCTION: Amt. Paid: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 264 (i).
——— CONTRACT FOR FIREWOOD: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 264 (i).
CARMICHAEL, ANDREW, POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: M. for Pets., &c.* (Mr. *Reid*) 1057.
CARRIAGE HARDWARE: in Com. of Ways and Means, 4470 (ii).
CARSTENS, IMMIGRATION AGENT, WINNIPEG, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 3720.
CARTWRIGHT, MR. F. L., APPNMT. AS INSPECTOR MOUNTED POLICE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 489 (i).
CASCUMPEC BUOY SERVICE, TENDERS AND CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1742 (i).
Cataract Power Co. of Hamilton B. No. 124 (Mr. *MacPherson*). 1°* and 2°, 3579; in Com. and 3°*, 4051 (ii).
CATTLE, CONFERENCE BETWEEN MR. GOURDEAU AND SS. CO.'S REP.: M. for copy* (Mr. *Maclean*) 2446 (i).
——— QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 2263 (i), 4860, 4991 (ii).
——— SHIPPING REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 2217 (i).
CEDAR SPRINGS, FISHERY INSPECTOR HENRY LINLEY, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 4206 (ii).
Central Counties Ry. Co.'s B. No. 30 (Mr. *McMullen*). 1°*, 838; 2°*, 945 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3465 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 40.)
CENTRAL RY. CO. OF N.B. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737 (ii).
CENTRAL RY. (N.S.) AND LIVERPOOL, &C., RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4738; in Com., 5524.
"CHALLONER," DREDGE, WORK DONE AT MIDLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 260 (i).
CHAMBLY CANAL, EXPENDITURE ON CULVERT: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 1028 (i).
——— TENDERS FOR STONE: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 1028.
CHAMPAGNE, L. N., ESQ., Member for Wright: introduced, 86 (i).
CHAMPAIN, SAMUEL, CLAIM AGAINST GOVT. *re* REBELLION, 1885: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 490 (i).
CHAPLEAU'S NEW POLL-BOOK, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4843; conc., 5427 (ii).
CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 1666 (i), 5201; conc., 5455 (ii).
CHATEAUGUAY AND NORTHERN RY., RIVIÈRE DE PRAIRIES BRIDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 567 (i).
Cheese Factories and Creameries, &c., Registration B. No. 117 (Mr. *Fisher*). 1°*, 2878; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 3722 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 21.)
——— *See* "BUTTER."
CHEESE AND BUTTER FACTORIES, WTHDRL. OF GOVT. AID: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Martin*) 3538 (ii).
CHINAWARE, &C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3496.
CHISHOLM, W. C., INDIAN AGENT, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1375 (i).
CIRCUIT ALLOWANCES, TRAVELLING EXPENSES, JUDGES: in Com. of Sup., 4141 (ii).
CIVIL GOVERNMENT: in Com. of Sup., 1666, 1912, 2066 (i), 3730, 4828, 4873, 5110, 5265 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. No. 29 (Mr. *McMullen*). 1°, 774; 2° m., 2022; wthdn., 2031 (i).
——— **further Amt. B. No. 130** (Mr. *Mulock*). 1°, 3677; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 5539 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 14.)
——— *See* "SUPERANNUATION."
CIVIL SERVICE ACT, MIN. OF JUSTICE'S OPINION: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2124 (i).
——— EXAMINATIONS, APPNMTS. TO P.O. DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 2564 (i).
——— EXAMINERS: in Com. of Sup., 2066 (i), 4828 (ii).
——— SERVANTS, COMMISSIONERS TO INVESTIGATE CHARGES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Foster*) 546 (i).
——— COUNTY OF GASPÉ, COMMISSION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Chauvin*) 1451 (i).
CLERKS OF WORKS, GOVT., PRIVATE PRACTICE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1306 (i).
CLOTHES WRINGERS: in Com. of Ways and Means, 4166, 4167 (ii).
COAL, BITUMINOUS, STEAM AND SLACK, IMPORTS FROM U.S., 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Roche*) 3538 (ii).
——— in Com. of Ways and Means, 4192, 4466 (ii).
——— BORING IN P.E.I., VOTE IN ESTIMATES: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 796 (i).
——— DUTIES: Personal Explanation (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 673 (i).
——— IMPORTS FROM GREAT BRITAIN, RATE OF DUTY UNDER TARIFF: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1634 (i).
——— TRADE OF N.S., ALLEGED UTTERANCES OF FINANCE MINISTER: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 669 (i).
COAL OIL DUTIES: on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2474 (ii).
——— IMPORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 258, 796 (i).
——— in Com. of Ways and Means, 3478 (ii).
——— SUPPLY, ST. JOHNS BARRACKS, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 1078 (i).
COASTING LAWS OF CAN. AND U.S.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Britton*) 3525 (ii).
COAST LINE RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4738 (ii).
COBOURG POSTMASTER, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 1306 (i).
——— COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, CHARGES AGAINST: M. for copy* (Mr. *Cameron*) 2020 (i).
COBOURG, NORTHUMBERLAND AND PACIFIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4736 (ii).
Cold Storage on SS. from Can. to United Kingdom, &c., B. No. 141 (Mr. *Fisher*). Com. on Res. (M.) 3842; in Com., 4130; 1°* of B., 4252; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4724 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 7.)

COLD STORAGE ON SS., CONTRACT: Presented (Mr. *Fisher*) 4364 (ii).

——— in Com. of Sup., 2274 (i).

——— 2ND REP. AGRICULTURE, &c., COM.: conc., 1899 (ii).

COLLECTION OF REVENUES: in Com. of Sup., 2492 (i), 2790, 4864, 5002, 5083, 5133, 5254, 5416; conc. 5452.

COLLINGWOOD HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 2758 (ii).

Columbia and Kootenay Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. No. 32 (Mr. *Gibson*). 1°*, 838; 2°*, 945 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3909 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 41.)

Columbia River Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 87 (Mr. *Bostock*). 1°*, 1539; 2°*, 1631 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2927 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 66.)

Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 93 (Mr. *Bostock*). 1°*, 1666; 2°*, 1937 (i).

——— RETURN OF FEES: M. (Mr. *Bostock*) 4651 (ii).

COLUMBIA RIVER (B.C.) IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4973 (ii).

COMMISSIONERS TO INVESTIGATE PARTISAN OFFENCES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Foster*) 546 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 1462 (i).

COMMISSION *re* CHARGES AGAINST OFFICIALS: in Com. of Sup. 2215 (i); conc., 5429 (ii).

——— COUNTY OF GASPÉ: Ques. (Mr. *Chaurin*) 1451.

COMMITTEES:

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION COM., 2ND REP. (Cold Storage) conc., 1899 (i).

DEBATES, OFFICIAL, SEL. COM.: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 480 (i).

——— 1ST REP. OF COM.: conc. (Mr. *Choquette*) 707, 1665 (i).

——— 2ND REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr. *Choquette*) 5183 (ii).

LIBRARY COM., JOINT: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 666 (i).

PRINTING COMMITTEE, JOINT: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 666 (i).

——— ADDITION OF NAMES: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2476 (i)

——— 2ND REP. OF COM.: conc. (Mr. *Gibson*) 4364 (ii).

SELECT STANDING COMS., COM. TO PREPARE LISTS: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 480 (i).

——— Lists presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 661 (i).

——— NAMES ADDED: (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2051, 2408, 2476 (i).

SPECIAL COM., REDUCTION OF QUORUM: M. (Mr. *Casey*) 122 (i).

Companies' Act Amt. B. No. 135 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*). 1°*, 3971; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4258 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 27.)

CONNOLLY, D., POSTMASTER AT ALLANDALE, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1079 (i).

CONSERVATIVE NEWSPAPERS, DELIVERY: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 918 (i).

Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act Amt. B. No. 107 (Mr. *Davin*). 1°, 2408 (i).

Continental Heat and Light Co.'s incorp. B. No. 84 (Mr. *Rosamond*). 1°*, 1538; 2°, 1632; in Com. and 3°*, 2345 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 72.)

CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 2066, 2103, 4066, 4832 (i).

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, JUDGES' REPS.: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 1, 420, 489, 1631 (i).

Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. No. 96 (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*). 1°, 1738 (i).

CONVICTS LIBERATED, SENTENCES COMMUTED, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 546 (i).

COPYRIGHT ACT (1889) GOVT. ACTION: Ques. (Mr. *Robertson*) 1542 (i).

CORNMEAL: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3421 (i).

CORNWALL AND SOULANGES CANALS, DIMENSIONS AND CONTRACTORS: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan, Glengarry*) 2411 (i).

——— BEAUHARNOIS CANALS, COST OF BREAKS IN 1894-95: Ques. (Mr. *Reid*) 2425 (i).

——— DISMISSAL OF EMPLOYEES: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan, Glengarry*) 2563 (i).

——— ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 3861, 5115 (ii).

COTTINGHAM, W. S., DISMISSAL FROM LAND OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 4342 (ii).

COTTON DUCK: in Com. of Ways and Means, 4186 (ii).

——— FABRICS: in Com. of Ways and Means, 4179, 4180 (ii).

COUNTY COURT JUDGES, COMMISSIONS WITHOUT LEGISLATION: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2124 (i).

——— N. S., ADMIRALTY JURISDICTION: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 262 (i).

COVERT, D., AND D. J. RIORDAN, DISMISSAL AND APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 917 (i).

C.P.R., ABROGATION OF ARTICLE IN CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 96 (i).

——— LAND GRANTS, PATENTS AND EXEMPTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2883, 3235 (ii).

——— RATES AND TOLLS, WEST OF TORONTO: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 4204 (ii).

——— TRANSPORT OF GRAIN FROM N.W.T. AND MAN., 1891 to 1897: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3509, 3669.

C.P.R. and Hull Electric Co.'s Agreement B. No. 25 (Mr. *Gibson*). 1°*, 707; 2°*, 785; in Com. and 3°*, 1936 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 39.)

CRAWFORD, DUNCAN, POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 787 (i).

CREAMERIES IN N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 2179 (i).

CREPEAU, J. H., POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Ives*) 1057 (i).

Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. No. 13 (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°*, 339; 2°, 1060; in Com., 2474 (i); M. to conc. in Amts., 3542 (ii).

Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. No. 138 (Mr. *Davies*). 1°*, 4203 (ii).

CRIMINAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 2108 (i).

CROWE, JOHN, INDIAN AGENT, SAUGEEN RESERVE' DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 340, 573, 788 (i).

Crow's Nest Pass Ry. Subsidy B. No. 146 (Mr. *Blair*). Res. prop., 3870; in Com., 4512; 1° of B., 4725; 2°* and in Com., 5164, 5338, 5342; 3°*, 5536 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 5.)

Deb. in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Earle*) 4575; (Mr. *McInnes*) 4576; (Mr. *Bennett*) 4583; (Mr. *Rogers*) 4585; (Mr. *Taylor*) 4592; (Mr. *Poupore*) 4595; (Mr. *Henderson*) 4599; (Mr. *Powell*) 4601; (Mr. *Ives*) 4604; (Mr. *Blair*) 4512; (Mr. *Foster*) 4523, 4588; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4529; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4539, 4601; (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 4543; (Mr. *Sproule*) 4547; (Mr. *Bostock*) 4563; (Mr. *Oliver*) 4556; (Mr. *Rutherford*) 4569; (Mr. *Haggart*) 4606 (ii).

—— Plans Deposited by C. P. R.: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 267 (i).

—— Construction: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 568 (i).

Culling Timber: in Com. of Sup., 2509 (i), 4864, 5058 (ii).

CUSTOMS:

Anderson, Thos. E., Appnmt. as Collector of Customs: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Wilson*) 1057 (i).

Berthier Wharf, Dues Collected: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 262 (i).

British Goods and Customs Tariff: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 1461, 1462 (i).

Brodeur, S. A., Collector of Tolls, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2419 (i).

Coal, Bituminous, Steam and Slack, Imports from U. S., 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Roche*) 3538 (ii).

Coal Imports from G. B., Rate of Duty under New Tariff: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1634 (i).

Coal Oil Duties: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 2744 (i).

—— Imports: Ques. (Mr *Macdonald, Huron*) 258.

—— from U. S. in Tank Cars: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 796 (i).

Customs: in Com. of Sup., 1730, 1980, 2072, 2552 (i), 4864, 5002, 5013, 5040; conc., 5446 (ii).

—— Deptl. Appnmts.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 2422 (i).

Dismissals. *See* general heading.

Fenelon Falls Customs Officer: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 258 (i).

Hamilton and Niagara Customs Collectors: Ques. (Mr. *Gibson*) 1540 (i).

Hudson Bay Ports, Customs Collectors: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 794, 1452 (i).

Kingston Cotton Mills and Tariff Changes: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 98 (i).

McDonald, Danl., sub-Collector of Customs, Charges against: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 786 (i).

McDonald, G., Appnmt., Customs Collector, P.E.I.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2125 (i).

Mining Machinery, Free Entry under Tariff: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 2219 (i).

Morrisburg Customs Collector, Appnmt.: Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 341, 489 (i).

—— David Halliday's Appnmt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Broder*) 1775 (i).

Napanee Customs Collector, Appnmt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 482 (i).

Orwell (P.E.I.) Customs sub-Collector: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1742 (i).

—— Brush Wharf Preventive Officer, Appnmt.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1301 (i).

Penetanguishene Customs Collector, Vacancy: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 261 (i).

Preventive Service: in Com. of Sup., 2493 (i), 5002, 5013, 5040 (ii).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

Prince Edward Co., Preventive Officers: Ques. (Mr. *Pettet*) 491 (i).

Smuggling by American Whalers, Mackenzie River Basin: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 794 (i).

Smuggling into the Yukon Country: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1375 (i).

Strathroy Customs Officer, Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 483 (i).

Tariff, The. *See* "Ways and Means."

Trade and Navigation Rets.: Presented (Mr. *Paterson*) 257 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *McMillan*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4014 (ii).

Valleyfield Collector of Customs, Appnmt.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 926 (i).

Vernon River Bridge (P.E.I.) Customs Collector: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 786 (i).

Weller Bay as an Outport, Value of Goods, Duty Collected, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr *Foster*) 1663.

Customs Act Amt. and Consolidation B. No. 143 (Mr. *Fielding*). Res. (Tariff) prop., 1136 (i); in Com., 2842, 2887, 2970, 3060, 3146, 3290, 3465, 3583, 3679, 4130, 4395, 4613; Res. as adopted, 4614; 1°* of B., 2°*., in Com. and 3°*, 4698 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 16.)

Customs Appnmts. and Dismissals, Names and Salaries: M. for Pets., &c.* (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 1058 (i).

Customs and Inland Revenue Depts. B. No. 125 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*). Res. prop., 4086; 1° of B., 3580; 2°, 4110; in Com., 4122; 3°*, 4129 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 18.)

Dablon Postmaster, Dismissal: Ques. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 1027 (i).

Dairy Products. *See* "Cheese Factories," "Butter," &c.

Dairying Service: in Com. of Sup., 2119, 2180 (i).

Danis, A. D., Customs Collector, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 929 (i).

—— Contributions to Pension Fund: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2421 (i).

Daly, Hon. T. M., Rep. on Immigration: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 922 (i).

Dame, David, Dismissal from Lachine Canal: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3338 (ii).

Danville and St. Camille Mail Service, Tenders, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Ives*) 3538 (ii).

Daunais, C. M., Indian Instructor, Appnmt.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1450 (i).

Davis, T. O., Esq., Member for Saskatchewan: introduced, 3 (i).

Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., conc.: M. (Mr. *Somerville*) 707, 1665 (i).

—— 2nd Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. *Choquette*) 5183 (ii).

—— Publishing: in Com. of Sup., 2105 (i).

Delisle, L. T., Lighthouse-keeper, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1307 (i).

Dillon, Thos. J., Dairy Inspector, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2424 (i).

"Diana." *See* "Hudson Bay Expedition."

DISMISSALS:

Ault, Mr. E.: Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 2879 (i).
Beauharnois Canal, Customs Collector: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 925 (i).
——Lockmen: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1743 (i).
—— Employees: Ques. (Mr. *Maclennan, Glengarry*) 2563.
Carstens, Mr., Immigration Agent, Winnipeg: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 3720 (ii).
Cottingham, W. S., Land Office: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 4342 (ii).
Customs: Byng Inlet Customs Officer: Ques. (Mr. *McCormack*) 265 (i).
—— Covert D., and D. J. Riordan: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 917 (i).
—— Danis, A. D., Collector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 925 (i).
—— Grand Narrows (C. B.) Preventive Officer J. R. McNeill: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3504 (ii).
—— Halliday, David, Collector at Morrisburg: Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 341, 489.
—— Larouche, G.: Ques. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 1027.
—— McArthur, Wm., Fenelon Falls: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 258 (i).
—— M. for Cor. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1639, 1744 (i).
—— McNeill, J. R., Preventive Officer, Grand Narrows: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3504 (ii).
—— Morrisburg Collector: Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 489 (i).
—— Mt. Stewart (P. E. I.) Collector: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 786 (i).
—— Nunn, James Gordon, Collector, St. Thomas Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 267 (i).
—— Officials, Names and Salaries: M. for Pets. &c.* (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 1058 (i).
—— Ross, James, sub-Collector: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 786 (i).
—— St. Thomas, Collector: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 267 (i).
—— Tennant, J. F., sub-Collector at Gretna; Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 3503 (ii).
Dillon Thos. J., Dairy Inspector: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2424 (i).
Dobbin, Mr., Land Office, Winnipeg: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 4029 (ii).
Fisheries: Cedar Springs Inspector, Henry Linley: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 4206 (ii).
—— Hughes, J. W., and Messrs. Noonan and Davis: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4009 (ii).
—— Restigouche River Fishery Officer, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McAlister*) 1662 (i).
Land Office, Man.: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 4017 (ii).
Inverness Co., Dom. Officials (1879): Ques. (Mr. *McLennan*) 4477 (i).
Inland Revenue Dept., since July, 1896; M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 1663 (i).
I. C. R., Blanchet, Eugene: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1082, 1639 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2446 (i).
—— Car Inspector, Stellarton: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1663 (i).
—— Castonguay Station Master: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2446 (i).
—— Bridge Tenders: Inquiry for Ret. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3743 (ii).
—— Employees at Rimouski: Ques. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 2566 (i).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*

I. C. R., Employees at Antigonish: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2565 (i).
—— Moore, W. B., Fuel Inspector: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 2121 (ii).
—— McLeod and McKay, Messrs., Bridge Tenders: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2447.
—— Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1541 (i).
—— Pierre Begin, Sectionman: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1638 (i).
—— St. Charles Station Master: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1540 (i).
Indian Agent Wm. Bateman, Scugog Island: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1081 (i) 3524 (ii).
—— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Hughes*) 3524 (ii).
—— Chisholm, W. C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1375 (i).
—— Crowe, John, Agent, Saugeen Reserve: Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 340, 573, 788 (i).
—— Fairlie, Rev. Mr.: on M. for Com. of Sup., 2201 (i).
—— Hagarsville Agent, Dr. Jones: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Clancy*) 3539 (ii).
—— Six Nations Indian Office: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Clancy*) 3538 (ii).
—— Tuscarora Indians, Physicians: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Clancy*) 3529 (ii).
—— Walpole Island, Dr. Geo. Mitchell: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 927 (i).
Kingston Penitentiary, Guards: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3338 (ii).
Lachine Canal, Montreal: Remarks (Mr. *Quinn*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2572 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2410 (i).
—— Behan, Michael, Storeman: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 2565 (i).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Quinn*) 3537 (ii).
—— Dame, David: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3338 (ii).
—— Enright, Michael: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 2564.
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Quinn*) 3537 (ii).
—— Gahan, Mr.: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 924 (i).
—— Gallagher, John: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 923 (i).
—— Hatch, Patrick: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 923 (i).
—— Hickey, James: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 923 (i).
—— Shields, James: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 923 (i).
—— Tynan, John. Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 923 (i).
McCallum, Peter, Lock Supt., du Lievres: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1835 (i).
McKenzie, Capt. Wm., Dredge "Canada": Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1743 (i).
Man. and N.W.T.: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Davin*) 4022 (ii).
Marine, Bunker Island Marine Hospital, Mrs. Le Caine: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3504, 3866 (ii).
—— Delisle, L. T., Lighthouse-keeper: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1307 (i).
—— Fish Island (P. E. I.) Light-keeper: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2424 (i).
—— Oak Point (N. B.) Lighthouse-keeper G. R. Picketts: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3669 (ii).
—— O'Brien, Wm., Str. "Lansdowne": Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4008 (ii),
—— Smith, F. X., Lighthouse-keeper, Gaspe: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1305 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2446 (i).
Muma, Henry, Official Referee: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 4735 (ii).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*
"OTONOBEE" DREDGE, ENGINEER: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 259 (i).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Hughes*) 1774 (i).
POIRIER, T.: Ques. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 1027 (i).
POST OFFICE: ALLANDALE POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1079 (i).
—— ANNAPOLIS: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 567 (i).
—— AYLMER WEST POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 794, 795 (i).
—— BELFAST POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 926 (i).
—— BEAMSVILLE POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 484 (i).
—— M. for Cor. (Mr. *McCleary*) 1453, 1749 (i). [*See* "BEAMSVILLE."]
—— BEAUHARNOIS POSTMASTER, ALEXIS DOUTRE: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 836 (i).
—— CAPLIN RIVER POSTMASTER: Ques. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 1027, 1308 (i).
—— CARMICHAEL, ANDREW: M. for Pets., &c.* (Mr. *Reid*) 1057 (i).
—— COVERT, D., THORNVILLE (N.S.): Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 917 (i).
—— CRAWFORD, DUNCAN: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 787.
—— CREPEAU, J. H.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Ives*) 1057 (i).
—— DABLON POSTMASTER: Ques. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 1027 (i).
—— ELDON POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 786.
—— FOURNIER, JAKES: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 921 (i).
—— GAULD, R. T., BURTONVILLE: Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 1983 (i).
—— HARTNEY, J. H.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2885 (ii).
—— ISAAC'S HARBOUR POSTMASTER: Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4106 (ii).
—— KING'S AND YORK POSTMASTER: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Foster*) 546 (i).
—— KINNEY, L. W., SALEM: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2411 (i).
—— LAVERGE, M.P., LATE DEP. POSTMASTER, QUEBEC; M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2446 (i).
—— MCKNIGHT, W., NINGA, MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3740 (ii).
—— MCMANUS, MRS., POSTMISTRESS AT NORTHFIELD, B.C., DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1305.
—— MCPHEE, ANGUS, HOPEFIELD, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 4365 (ii).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Martin*) 546 (i).
—— MAGENTA, P.Q.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 921 (i).
—— MARTIN, MR., P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 926.
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Foster*) 1663 (i).
—— P.E.I. POSTMASTERS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Martin*) 1056 (i).
—— MUSQUODOBOIT, UPPER: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1542 (i).
—— ROSS, DAVID: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Martin*) 1057 (i).
—— STE. PHILOMENE POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Brown*) 3256 (i).
—— ST. VALERIEN DE RIMOUSKI: Ques. (Sir *Adolphe Caron* (2566 (i).
—— STANLEY BRIDGE, (P.E.I.): M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Martin*) 1663 (i).
—— TREMBLAY, C. E., LES EBOULEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 263 (i).
—— WEST, H. A., ANNAPOLIS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 567 (i).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*
POST OFFICE: WHITE, ISAAC, FORT ERIE: Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 3238 (ii).
—— WOOD ISLAND (P.E.I.): Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 787 (i).
POTVIN, PETER, BYNG INLET: Ques. (Mr. *McCormack*) 263 (i).
QUARANTINE SUPT., WILLIAM'S HEAD STATION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Prior*) 1663 (i).
RETURNS: Inquiry (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2054 (i), 3743 (ii).
ROBERTSON, MR. A. B.: Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 2879 (ii).
ST. PETER'S CANAL, DANIEL B. STONE: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 2414 (i).
TRENT CANAL, ROSEDALE WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 259 (i).
—— KENNEDY, MR.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 259 (i).
—— LAIDLAW, GEO., BALSAM LAKE SECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 259 (i).
WELLAND CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 2122 (i)..
WIGGINS, JOHN, B. C. PENITENTIARY: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 2418 (i).
WILLIAMSBURG CANAL, W. J. CASSELMAN: Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 2415 (i).

DISTILLERIES, EXTRA DUTY OF OFFICERS, PAY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2493 (i).

DIVISIONS:
AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS AND THE TARIFF: on M. for Com. of Supply, Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to place on Free List, neg. (Y. 10, N. 121) 2178 (i).
ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE: on M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to confirm contract with Messrs. Petersen, Tate & Co., agreed to (Y. 134, N. 22) 4250 (ii).
I. C. R. EXTENSION TO MONTREAL: on M. (Mr. *Blair*) to confirm agreement with Grand Trunk Ry. Co. and Drummond County Ry. Co., agreed to (Y. 91, N. 47) 4339 (ii).
LIVERPOOL (N.S.) PUBLIC BUILDING: on M. (Mr. *McMullen*) to strike out vote on concurrence in Rep. of Com. of Sup., neg. (Y. 20, N. 40) 5441 (ii).

Divorce (Adeline Myrtle T. Lawry) B. No. 97 (Mr. *Landerkin*). 1°, ——; 2°*, 2022; in Com. and 3° on div., 2345 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 97.)

DOBBIN, MR., DISMISSAL FROM LAND OFFICE WINNIPEG: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 4029 (i).

DOBSON, WM., POSTMASTER, TATAMAGOUCHE, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1541 (i).

Dom. Building and Loan Association B. No. 48 (Mr. *Cowan*). 1°*, 1171; 2°*, 1232; in Com. and 3°*, 1936 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 85.)

Dom. Employees Attachment of Salaries B. No. 75 (Mr. *Richardson*). 1°*, 1373 (i).

DOM. EXHIBITION, TORONTO, GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1633 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. No. 60 (Mr. *Douglas*). 1°, 1229; 2°, 2041 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. No. 61 (Mr. *Davin*). 1°, 1229; 2°, 2037 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. No. 116 (Mr. *Sifton*). 1°, 2798; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4118 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 29.)

DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 4082, 5423 (ii).

DOM. NOTES, PRINTING AND ENGRAVING: in Com. of Sup., 5201; conc., 5455 (ii).

DOM. POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 2090 (i).

Dom. Portland Cement Co.'s incorp. B., No. 79 (Mr. *Britton*). 1°*, 1538; 2°*, 1631; in Com. and 3°*, 2345 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 93.)

Dom. Safe Deposit, Warehousing and Loan Co.'s Change of Name B. No. 106 (Mr. *Gibson*). 1°*, 2297 (i); 2°, 2777; in Com. and 3°*, 3465 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 86.)

DOUTRE, ALEXIS, POSTMASTER AT BEAUHARNOIS, APPNMT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 572 (i).

——— DISMISSAL: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 836 (i).

Drainage across Railway Co.'s Lands B. No. 14 (Mr. *Casey*). 1°, 481; 2°, 1064 (i).

DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2780, 4889 (ii).

DRYDEN, SHEPPARD, APPNMT. AS CARETAKER OF GOVT. BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 261 (i).

DUCK BELTING, &C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3710 (ii).

DUNN, JOHN W., IMMIGRATION AGENT, SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 573 (i).

DRUMMOND CO. RY., RENTAL: conc., 5457 (ii).

DRUMMOND COUNTY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5158 (ii).

——— *See* "I.C.R. EXTENSION TO MONTREAL."

DYKE, JNO., IMMIGRATION AGENT, SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 572 (i).

EAST BAY (C.B.) POST OFFICE, REMOVAL: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4366 (ii).

EASTER ADJOURNMENT: Remarks (Mr. *Ellis*) 708 (i).

——— M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 838 (i).

EAST RICHELIEU VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737; in Com., 5530 (ii).

EGGS: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3408 (ii).

ELDON POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 786 (i).

ELGIN, EAST AND WEST, MAIL CONTRACTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Ingram*) 837 (i).

Election Act Amt. and Consolid. B. No. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*). 1°, 89; 2° m., 718; deb. adjd., 774; rsmd., 847, 973 (i).

Deb. on M. for 2° (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 856; (Mr. *McMullen*) 847; (Mr. *Speaker*) 852; (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 856; (Mr. *Charlton*) 860, 881; (Mr. *Bennett*) 870; (Mr. *Calvert*) 885; (Mr. *Craig*) 887; (Mr. *Frost*) 893; (Mr. *Sproule*) 897; (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 906; (Mr. *Morrison*) 908; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 973; (Mr. *Davies*) 993; (Mr. *Roche*) 1012; (Mr. *Richardson*) 1017; (Mr. *Hughes*) 1019; (Mr. *Martin*) 1023 (i).

ELECTIONS: Certificates received during Recess (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

——— *See* "CONTROVERTED."

ENRIGHT, MICHAEL, EMPLOYEE ON LACHINE CANAL, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 2564 (i).

Engineers' (Stationery) Examination and Steam Boilers Inspection B. No. 108 (Mr. *Sutherland*). 1°, 2408 (i).

ESQUIMAULT DEFENCE, &C.: conc., 5426 (ii).

——— POST OFFICE, APPNMT. OF TELEGRAPH OPERATOR: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1985 (i).

ESTEVAN LAND OFFICE, REMOVAL TO ALAMEDA: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1638 (i).

ESTIMATES, THE, 1897-98: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 667 (i).

SUPPL., 1896-97, 3742, 4008 (ii).

SUPPL., 1897-98, 4612 (ii).

FURTHER SUPPL., 1897-98, 5009.

TYPOGRAPHICAL ERROR: Explanation (Mr. *Fisher*) 708 (i).

Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 270, 972 (i).

EXCHEQUER COURT, LOCAL JUDGE IN ADMIRALTY, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1986 (i).

EXCISE DUTIES COLLECTED BY A. DANIS, VALLEYFIELD: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2422 (i).

——— OFFICERS, INSPECTORS, &C., SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 2492 (i).

EXPERIMENTAL FARMS: in Com. of Sup., 2109 (i).

EXPIRING LAWS, SEL. COM.: List of Members, 661 (i).

EXPORT DUTY ON LOGS, PAR. IN MIDLAND "FREE PRESS": Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Ways and Means, 4613 (ii).

Export Duties B. No. 145 (Mr. *Fielding*). Res. prop., 4653, 4701; in Com., 4718; 1°* of B., 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4719 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 17.)

EXPORT DUTIES ON PULP WOOD: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 3872 (ii).

EXPORT OF BACON, HAMS, &C.: prop. B., wthdrl. (Mr. *Henderson*) 4341 (ii).

FAIRBROTHER, W. D., POSTMASTER AT BEAMSVILLE, APPNMT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 484 (i).

——— *See* "BEAMSVILLE."

FAIRLIE, REV. MR., WINNIPEG INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, APPNMT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 490 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Cameron*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1664, 2201 (i).

Deb. (Mr. *Jameson*) 2307; (Mr. *Richardson*) 2308; (Mr. *Sifton*) 2310; (Mr. *Craig*) 2311; (Mr. *Flint*) 2314; (Mr. *Sproule*) 2316; (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2317; (Mr. *Tarte*) 2324; (Mr. *McClure*) 2328; (Mr. *Davin*) 2330, 2348 (i); (Mr. *Maxwell*) 2360; (Mr. *Quinn*) 2368; (Mr. *Rutherford*) 2376; (Mr. *Powell*) 2380; (Mr. *Roche*) 2384; (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) 2389; (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2393; (Mr. *McIsaac*) 2397; (Mr. *Taylor*) 2403 (i).

FARM IMPLEMENTS, DUTY ON: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. of Sup. 2054(i).

——— VOTE ON MR. DAVIN'S AMT.: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Russell*) 2298 (i).

——— DUTY, COAL OIL IN TANK VESSELS: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 2216 (i).

——— in COM. of Ways and Means, 4152, 4155 (ii).

FENELON FALLS CUSTOMS OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 258 (i).

FIDDLE REEF (B. C.) MARINE LIGHTS: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1376 (i).

FILES AND RASPS: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3698, 4133, 4137 (ii).

FINANCE:

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 169 (i).

AUDITOR GENERAL: in Com. of Sup., 2070 (i).

CAMERON, JOHN, SAVINGS BANK AGENT, NEW GLASGOW, APPNMT., &C.: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3448 (i).

FINANCE—*Con.*
CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 1666 (i), 5201; conc. 5455 (ii).
DANIS, A. D., CONTRIBUTIONS TO PENSION FUND: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2421 (i).
DOM. NOTES, PRINTING AND ENGRAVING: in Com. of Sup., 5201; conc., 5455 (ii).
FINANCE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 1721 (i).
HALIFAX LOAN CO'S. B. SUSPENSION OF RULE: M. (Mr. *Fraser, Guysboro'*) 1665 (i).
INSURANCE CO.'S ABSTRACT STATEMENT: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 492 (i).
LOANS, TEMPORARY: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 949.
LOAN (PUBLIC SERVICE) $15,000,000: Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4735 (ii).
MAGDALEN ISLANDS, SAVINGS BANK: (Mr. *Lemieux*) 789 (i).
PRINTING GOVT. NOTES, STAMPS, &C., TENDERS AND CONTRACT: M. for copies (Mr. *Foster*) 546 (i).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS, ANNUAL REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 169 (i).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS AND AUDITOR GEN.'S REPS.: M. (Mr. *McMullen*) 838 (i).
SHAREHOLDERS AND CHARTERED BANKS, LIST: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 492 (i).
SUPPLY: Res. for Com. (Mr. *Fielding*) 481 (i).
——— *See* general heading.
TREATY BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND JAPAN: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 1985 (i).
[*See* "CUSTOMS," "TRADE AND COMMERCE," &c.]
FIRE IN WEST DEPTL. BLOCK, DOCUMENTS DESTROYED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 919 (i).
FIRE PROTECTION, ELECTRIC LIGHTING, &C.: on conc., 5429 (ii).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. No. 127 (Mr. *Davies*). 1°, 3581; 2° and in Com., 3724; 3°*, 3728 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 24.)
FISHERIES:
BEHRING SEA CONVENTION, RE-OPENING, LONDON PRESS, COR.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4472.
——— SEAL REGULATIONS, ON ORDERS OF THE DAY: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 2570 (i).
BOUNTY TO FISHERMEN, INCREASE: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 4471 (ii).
DISMISSALS. *See* general heading.
FISHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 2087, 2407, 2551 (i), 4839, 4999, 5427 (ii).
FISHERY BULLETINS, DISTRIBUTION ON GASPE COAST, DELAY: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 4008 (ii).
FISHERIES CASE, APPEAL FROM SUPREME COURT JUDGMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1303 (i).
FISHERY GUARDIANS, NORTH VICTORIA: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1081, 1308, 1451 (i).
FISHERIES PROTECTION SERVICE, SUPPLIES AND REPAIRS TO VESSELS, &C.: M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2447 (i).
——— OFFICERS ON GOVT. STEAMERS; Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 3670 (ii).
FISH ISLAND LIGHT-KEEPER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2424 (i).
FISHING BY FOREIGNERS IN B. C., ILLEGAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Prior*) 2446 (i).
——— LICENSES, PAYMENT IN ADVANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 267 (i).
——— IN BONAVENTURE: Ques. (Mr. *McAlister*) 671.
——— GRANTED, LAKE ERIE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Ingram*) 837 (i).
——— TO U.S. VESSELS, ISSUING: on conc., 5427 (ii).
FISHERIES—*Con.*
FISH TRAPS USED BY AMERICANS IN B.C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1376 (i).
GILL-NETS AND SEINES, NEW REGULATIONS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 4372 (ii).
GLOUCESTER FISHING SCHOONERS AND N. S. FISHERMEN: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 4371 (ii).
LOBSTERS, CANNED, SCIENTIFIC EXAMINATION: in Com. of Sup., 4999 (ii).
——— EXTENSION OF CLOSE SEASON: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Maclennan, Inverness*) 4759 (ii).
LOBSTER FISHING IN CAPE BRETON: Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1550, 2051 (i).
MCNAB, FISHERY INSPECTOR, INSTRUCTIONS FROM GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bostock*) 3056 (ii).
MACKEREL FISHERY IN N. S., PROTECTION OF FISHERMEN: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 3673 (ii).
OYSTER CULTURE: in Com. of Sup., 2551 (i).
POACHING BY AMERICANS, DEEP-SEA FISHERIES: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1375 (i).
RIVER MATANE, FISHING LEASES: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 4207 (ii).
SALMON (B. C.) SOLD IN BRITISH MARKET, QUALITY, &C.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Maxwell*) 1991 (i).
U. S. WHALERS IN MACKENZIE RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 4735 (ii).
[*See* "MARINE."]
FITCH BAY POSTMASTER, CHANGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Moore*) 3868 (ii).
Forged or Unauthorized Endorsation of Bills B. No. 123 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*). 1°* 3580; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 3723 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 10.)
FORT ERIE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL OF ISAAC WHITE: Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 3238 (ii).
FORT FRANCIS LOCK: in Com. of Sup., 4970 (ii).
FORTIFICATION WALLS, QUEBEC, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1303 (i).
FOURNIER, JAKES, DISMISSAL AS POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 921 (i).
FRANCHISE ACT: prop. wthdrl. of Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) 784 (i).
——— on M. to adjn. Hse: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 546 (i).
——— *See* "ELECTION ACT AMT."
FRASER RIVER (B. C.) IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup. 4973 (ii).
FRECHETTE, ACHILLE, TECHNICAL TRANSLATION: in Com. of Sup. 5057 (ii).
FREE LIST: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3706 (ii).
Freight Rates. *See* "RAILWAYS."
FUR CAPS: in Com. of Ways and Means, 4192 (ii).

GAHAN, MR., LACHINE CANAL EMPLOYEE, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 924 (i).
——— CONVICT, RELEASE FROM KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3339.
GALLAGHER, JOHN, LACHINE CANAL EMPLOYEE, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 923 (i).
GALOPS CANAL, ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 3862.
——— IROQUOIS SECTION, TENDERS: M. for copy* (Mr. *Clancy*) 3538 (ii).
GALOPS RAPIDS, TENDERS FOR CARDINAL SECTION M. for copy* (Mr. *Clancy*) 3538 (ii).

GAME LAWS, QUEBEC: Remarks (Mr. *Poupore*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4022 (ii).
GANANOQUE DRILL SHED, REMOVAL: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1078 (i).
GASPE LIGHTSHIP-KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2126.
GATINEAU RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 4959.
GAULD, R. T., POSTMASTER, BURTONVILLE, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 1983 (i).
"GAZETTE" AND "STAR," MONTREAL, FREE POSTAGE: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 3841 (ii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 47 (Mr. *McMullen*). 1° 1075 (i); 2° m., 3562 (ii).
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 1981 (i), 4072.
GILL-NETS AND SEINES, NEW REGULATIONS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 4372.
GLOUCESTER FISHING SCHOONERS AND N.S. FISHERMEN: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 4371 (ii).
GODERICH HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 2740 (ii).
GOLD DISCOVERIES, HARRISON LAKE REGION: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1744 (i).
GOLD DREDGING, STEWART RIVER, YUKON, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 1740 (i).
GOODWIN *vs.* THE QUEEN, PAR. IN TORONTO "GLOBE": Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3840 (ii).
GOVERNOR GEN.'S SEC.'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 1666.
GOVT. BUSINESS. *See* "BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE."
——— COMMISSIONERS AND POLITICS: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1543 (i).
——— HORSES AT PRINCE ALBERT, PAYMENTS FOR CARE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Davis*) 3537 (ii).
——— OF NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES: in Com. of Sup., 4081, 5002 (ii).
——— SUBSIDY AND POWERS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 1030, 1043 (i).
——— OF P.E.I., CLAIMS AGAINST FEDERAL GOVT.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Macdonald*) 1662 (i).
——— STEAMERS, MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i).
GRAIN STANDARDS, MAN. AND N.W.T., CHANGES: Ques. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 1077 (i).
GRAHAME, THOS., SUPERANNUATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 573 (i).
GRAHAM, D., ESQ., Member for North Ontario: introduced, 3.
GRAND NARROWS, (C.B.) PREVENTIVE OFFICER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3504 (ii).
GRAND RIVER WHARF, CONSTRUCTION, NON-PAYMENT OF LABOURERS: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 790 (i).
GRATUITIES TO RETIRED OFFICERS: in Com. of Sup., 4987, 4993, 5001 (ii).
GRAY, LT. COL., LATE INSPECTOR OF STORES, RETIRING ALLOWANCE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2881 (ii).
Great Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 92 (Mr. *Prefontaine*). 1°*, 1666; 2°*, 1937 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3909 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 43.)
Great Northern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 81 (Mr. *Langelier*). 1°*, 1538; 2°*, 2022 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3090 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 44.)
GREAT NORTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. Mr. *Blair*) 4737 (ii).
——— ST. JEROME, &c.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5157.
GREAT NORTHERN RY. CO.'S BRIDGE AT HAWKESBURY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5158 (ii).
Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 70 (Mr. *Richardson*). 1°*, 1373; 2°, 1574 (i); in Com., 2925, 3002; 3°*, 3002 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 45.)
GRENVILLE CANAL, ENLARGEMENT, TENDERS FOR CONTRACT: M. for copy* (Mr. *Clancy*) 2447 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 3875, 3919 (ii).
GRETNA CUSTOMS SUB-COLLECTOR, J. F. TENNANT'S DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 3503 (ii).
GROSSE ISLE WHARF, EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 919 (i).
GRUNDY, ERNEST, LATE POSTMASTER AT DUCK LAKE: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 3870 (ii).
G. T. R. AND DOM. GOVT., REPORTED GRANT OF $300,000: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 574 (i).
G. T. R. Co. of Can. B. No. 26 (Mr. *Gibson*). 1°*, 707; 2°*, 785; in Com. and 3°*, 1573 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 42.)
——— SUBSIDY (VICTORIA BRIDGE): prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4738; in Com., 5536 (ii).
——— *See* "I. C. R.," &c.
GUITÉ, J. F., ESQ., Member for Bonaventure: introduced, 87 (i).
GULF SHORE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737 (ii).

HAGARSVILLE INDIAN AGENT, DISMISSAL OF DR. JONES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Clancy*) 3530 (ii).
HALIFAX LOAN CO.'S B., SUSPENSION OF RULE: M. (Mr. *Fraser, Guysboro'*) 1665 (i).
HALIFAX AND NEWFOUNDLAND MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 2790, 4994 (ii).
HALLIDAY, DAVID, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT MORRISBURG, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 341, 489 (i).
HAMILTON AND NIAGARA CUSTOMS COLLECTORS: Ques. (Mr. *Gibson*) 1540 (i).
HARBOURS AND BREAKWATERS, EXPENDITURES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Penny*) 3971 (ii).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 2577, 2719 (i), 4885, 4958 (ii).
HARDY, HON. MR., SPEECHES DISTRIBUTED FROM HOUSE OF COMMONS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3741 (ii).
HARRISON RIVER RAPIDS, IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1744 (i).
——— LAKE REGION, GOLD DISCOVERIES: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1744 (i).
HARTNEY, J. H., DISMISSAL AS POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2885 (ii).
HATCH, PATRICK, LACHINE CANAL EMPLOYEE, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 923 (i).
HATS, CAPS, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 4192.
HENRY AND ROTHWELL, MESSRS., PROMOTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1669 (i).
——— Personal Explanation (Messrs *Sproule* and *Haggart*) 1901 (i).
HEYD, C. B., ESQ., Member for South Brant: introduced, 3 (i).
HICKEY, JAMES, LACHINE CANAL EMPLOYEE, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 923 (i).

HIDES AND SKINS, &c. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3711 (ii).
HIGH COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 1982 (i).
HILLSBOROUGH (P.E.I.) RIVER BRIDGE, CONSTRUCTION : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 1664.
——— in Com. of Sup., 3843 (ii).
HILTON AND MARKDALE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4966 (ii).
HOG SLAUGHTER, SPECIAL COMPENSATION : in Com. of Sup., 2270 (i).
HOLT AND MOUNT ALBERT MAIL CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 795 (i).
HONORA WHARF, MANITOULIN ISLAND : in Com. of Sup., 4964 (ii).
HOPEFIELD POSTMASTER, ANGUS MCPHEE'S DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 4365 (ii).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Martin*) 546 (i).
HOUSE OF COMMONS :
ADDRESS TO HIS EX., CONSDN. : M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 (i).
——— REPLY, MESS. FROM HIS EX. : Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 1900 (i).
——— (JUBILEE) TO HER MAJESTY : M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3243 (ii).
ADJOURNMENT FOR EASTER : M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 838 (i).
——— ASCENSION DAY : M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2878 (ii).
BIBAUD, AZARIE, EMPLYMT. IN HOUSE OF COMMONS : Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3509 (ii).
BILLS : Royal Assent, 2765, 5543 (ii).
BUSINESS OF THE HSE., MORNING SITTINGS : M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3582 (i).
——— NOTICES OF M. : M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 86 (i).
——— PRECEDENCE ON MONDAYS : M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2867 (ii).
——— THURSDAYS : M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 783 (i).
——— WEDNESDAYS AND THURSDAYS : M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1899 (i).
——— SATURDAY SITTINGS : Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4394 (ii).
——— MS. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4472, 5157 (ii).
CHAPLEAU'S NEW POLL-BOOK, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4843 ; conc., 5427 (ii).
CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, JUDGES' REPS. : Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 1, 420, 489, 1631 (i).
EASTER ADJNMT. : Remarks (Mr. *Ellis*) 708 (i).
——— M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 838 (i).
ELECTION PETITIONS. JUDGES' CERTIFICATES, &C. : Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
——— CERTIFICATES RECEIVED DURING RECESS : Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
HARDY, HON. MR., SPEECHES DISTRIBUTIED FROM HOUSE OF COMMONS : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3741 (ii).
INVERNESS ELECTION PET. : Remarks (Mr. *McLennan*) 2299 (i).
LEGISLATION : in Com. of Sup., 2091 (i), 4843, 4987, 5059, 5427 ; conc., 5451 (ii).
LIBRARY OF PARLT., JOINT REP. : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 5 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 2106 (i).
MEMBERS' ABSENCE BEFORE PROROGATION, PAR. IN MONTREAL "GAZETTE" : Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 5159 (ii).
MEMBERS REMARKS CHECKED, 163, 555, 562, 699, 784, 1376, 1392, 1453, 1456, 1457, 1462. 1560, 2031, 2137, 2299, 2359 (i), 3398, 3766, 4032, 4102, 4107, 4205, 4211, 4367, 5229, 5316, 5401, 5403 (ii).
HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*
MEMBERS, NEW : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 86, 950, 1664, 1983 (i).
MINISTERS ANSWERING QUESTIONS : Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 789 (i).
MESS. FROM HIS EX. : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 492, 667, 789, 1900 (i), 2658, 3742, 4008, 4612, 5009 (ii).
ORDER, QUES. OF, MEMBER QUOTING PREVIOUS DEB. : Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 827 (i).
——— (Mr. *Speaker*) 177, 1381 (i).
PARLIAMENT, OPENING : Mess. by Black Rod 1 (i).
——— PROROGATION : Intimation (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 5542 (ii).
PERSONAL EXPLANATION, *re* "GLOBE'S" ATTACK ON SPEECH ON DISALLOWANCE (Mr. *McInnes*) 709 (i).
——— MEMBERS CALLED TO ORDER (Mr. *Speaker*) 177, 1381 (i).
——— SPEECH AT TONAWANDA (Mr. *Charlton*) 914 (i).
——— PREFERENTIAL CLAUSE, PAR. IN MONTREAL "GAZETTE" (Mr. *Prefontaine*) 2657 (ii).
——— PAR. IN MAN. "FREE PRESS" *re* MOTIONS ON ORDER PAPER (Mr. *Davin*) 2886 (ii).
POULIOT, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASED : Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 5184 (ii).
PRIVATE BILLS PETS. : Ms. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 838, 1665.
PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF, DUTY ON FARM IMPLEMENTS : on Mr. Chairman's Ruling (Mr. *Davin*) 2126 (i).
——— PAR. IN MONTREAL "WITNESS" *re* MR. FAIRLIE'S LETTER (Mr. *Davin*) 2656 (ii).
——— SENATE AND I.C.R. EXTENSION TO MONTREAL (Mr. *Sutherland*) 5038 (ii).
QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY, ADJNMT. : M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 4499 (ii).
——— DIAMOND JUBILEE, ADJNMT. : M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4736 (ii).
QUESTION PUT BY MEMBER CONTAINING STATEMENTS OF FACTS : Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 569 (i).
——— RULED OUT OF ORDER : (Mr. *Speaker*) 3972 (ii).
RESTAURANT, SALE OF LIQUOR ; Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 672 (i).
RETURNS, INQUIRIES FOR (Mr. *Foster*) 1999, 2298, 2572, (i), 2969, 4032, 4109 (ii).
——— (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2298 (i) 2969, 3419 4100.
——— (Mr. *Davin*) 2298, 2571 (i) 2887, 2970, 3146 (ii).
——— (Mr. *McAlister*) 2571 (i).
——— (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 2571 (i).
——— (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) 2969 (ii).
——— (Mr. *Martin*) 3243, 3678, 4032 (ii).
——— (Mr. *Haggart*) 4109 (ii).
——— (Mr. *Bennett*) 4122 (i).
——— (Mr. *Mills*) 4651 (i).
ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS, ERROR IN PRINTING : Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 1231 (i).
ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS, COM. FROM GOV. GEN.'S SEC. : Read (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 2741 (ii).
SELECT STANDING COMS. *See* "COMMITTEES."
SESSIONAL AND EXTRA CLERKS : in Com. of Sup., 2103.
——— INDEMNITY, SEN. AND HOUSE OF COMMONS : prop Res. (Mr. *Davies*) 3671 (ii).
SPEAKER, DEP., SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 2091 (i).
——— AND ELECTIONS : Personal Explanation (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2218 (i).
SPECIAL COM., REDUCTION OF QUORUM : M. (Mr. *Casey*) 1227 (i).
SPEECH FROM THE THRONE : Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE : wthdrl. requested (Mr. *Speaker*) 1909, 2137, 2139, 2140 (i).
VACANCIES : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
VOTERS' LISTS (PRINTING) ; in Com. of Sup., 2106 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*
VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS, CHANGES: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 1452 (i).
WARRANTS FOR WRITS OF ELECTION (Mr. *Speaker*) 1, 420, 481 (i).
HUDSON BAY EXPEDITION, EMPLYMT. OF SEALER "DIANA": Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) 1810, 1824. Remarks (Mr. *Davies*) 1811, 1829, 1987; (Mr. *Davin*) 1817, 1833, 1987; (Mr. *McGregor*) 1820; (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 1820; (Mr. *Foster*) 1821; (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 1825; (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 1827; (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1827; (Mr. *McNeill*) 1829; (Mr. *Casey*) 1832; (Mr. *Hughes*) 1834 (i).
——— CHARTER OF "DIANA": Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1987.
——— Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 796 (i), 2884 (ii)
——— RESIDENCE, &c., OF CREW: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2884 (ii).
——— MILBURN & CO.'S OFFER OF SHIP "PORT PERIE": Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1988 (i).
HUDSON BAY PORTS, CUSTOMS COLLECTORS: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 794 (i).
Hudson's Bay and Yukon Rys. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 77 (Mr. *Oliver*). 1°*, 1538; 2°*, 1631 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3705 (ii). (60-61 *Vic., c.* 46.)
Hull Electric Co. *See* "C.P.R."
——— **Co.'s B. No. 20** (Mr. *Poupore*). 1°*, 707; 2°, 784 (i).
Hull, St. Louis Dam and Victoria Springs Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 85 (Mr. *Edwards*). 1°*, 1539; 2°*, 1631 (i); wthdn., 3668 (ii).
HUNGERFORD, WM., ENGINEER DREDGE "OTONABEE," DISMISSAL: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Hughes*) 1774 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 259 (i).
HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 2295 (i).

IMMIGRATION:
AGENTS AND EMPLOYEES IN GREAT BRITAIN, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 4044 (ii).
——— IN CAN., SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 3743,4033; contingencies, 4066 (ii).
——— IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 4062 (ii).
——— SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 572 (i).
——— IN IRELAND, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 669.
——— IN U. S., APPNMTS.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 3507.
DALY, HON. T. M., REP. ON IMMIGRATION: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 922 (i).
DUNN, JOHN W., IMMIGRATION AGENT, SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 573 (i).
DYKE, JNO., SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 572 (i).
GRAHAME, THOS., SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 573 (i).
IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 3743, 4033, 4062, 4992.
——— BUILDING, LOUISE EMBANKMENT: in Com. of Sup., 2577 (i).
——— WINNIPEG: in Com. of Sup., 4949 (ii).
JURY, ALF., IMMIGRATION AGENT, AND TORONTO STREET RY.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2216 (i).
O'KELLEY, E., IMMIGRATION AGENT TO IRELAND, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 669 (i).
SMALL-POX AMONG IMMIGRANTS, WINNIPEG (1893): in Com. of Sup., 4083 (ii).
[*See* "AGRICULTURE, SUPPLY," &C.]
Indemnity. *See* "SENATE."

INDIANS:
ABITTIBI AND GRAND LAC INDIANS: Ques. (Mr. *Poupore*) 2568 (i).
BRANTFORD INDIAN OFFICE, APPNMT. OF DAVID HILL: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Clancy*) 3539 (ii).
CAPE CROKER, INDIAN AGENT MCIVER,: Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 573, 788 (i).
DAUNAIS, C. M., INDIAN INSTRUCTOR, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1450 (i).
DISTURBANCES IN N.W.T.: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 3059.
DISMISSALS. *See* general heading.
INDIAN DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 1709 (i), 4828 (ii).
INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 4073, 5000 (ii).
INDIAN DEPTL. COR., UNANSWERED: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1984 (i).
"INDIAN GARDENS" RESERVE (N.S.) SALE OF HAY: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3509 (ii).
INDIANS, PEACE RIVER AND ATHABASCA REGIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 1986 (i).
INDIAN SUPPLIES, MAN. AND N.W.T., SCHEDULE OF TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 130, 487, 1078, 1301.
——— MR. MCCOLL'S LETTER *re* PURCHASE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1306 (i).
MICMAC INDIANS, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *McMillan*) 4019 (ii).
REGINA, REMOVAL OF OFFICE TO WINNIPEG: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1985 (i).
ST. PAUL INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, FURNISHING SUPPLIES: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Davin*) 1664 (i).
SAUGEEN RESERVE, INDIAN AGENT CROWE: Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 573, 788, 847 (i).
SCHOOLS, CLERICAL ASSISTANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4081 (ii).
THOUSAND ISLANDS, PURCHASE FROM INDIAN DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1080 (i).
TUSCARORA INDIAN RESERVE, APPNMT. OF PHYSICIAN: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Clancy*) 3538 (ii).
WALPOLE ISLAND INDIANS, APPNMT. OF PHYSICIAN: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 787, 927 (i).
WILLIAMS, P. J., INDIAN INSTRUCTOR, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1450 (i).
WINNIPEG INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, DATE OF APPNMT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 490 (i).
——— SUPT.'S APPNMT.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Cameron*) 1664 (i).
——— *See* "FAIRLIE, Rev. Mr."
[*See* "MAN.," "N. W. T.," &c.]
INDIAN CORN: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3409, 3417, 3426, 4399 (ii).
——— "INDIAN GARDENS" RESERVE (N.S.) Sale of Hay: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3509 (ii).
INDIAN GARDEN (N.S.) &C., AND SHELBURNE RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4738 (ii).
INDIA-RUBBER BOOTS, BELTING, &C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 4145 (ii).
INLAND REVENUE:
CULLING TIMBER: in Com. of Sup., 2569 (i), 4864, 5058.
DISMISSALS. *See* general heading.
DISTILLERIES, CLERKS, EXTRA PAY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2493 (i).
EXCISE DUTIES COLLECTED BY A. DANIS, VALLEYFIELD: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2422 (i).
——— OFFICERS, INSPECTORS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2492 (i).
FRECHETTE, ACHILLE, TECHNICAL TRANSLATION: in Com. of Sup., 5057 (ii).
GAS, SALARIES OF INSPECTORS: in Com. of Sup., 2551 (i).

INLAND REVENUE—*Con.*
GRAIN STANDARDS, MAN. AND N.W.T., CHANGES: Ques. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 1077 (i).
INLAND REVENUE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 1721, 1912, (i), 4839 (ii).
—— REP.: Presented (Sir *Henri Joli de Lotbiniere*) 86 (i).
—— DEPTL. CHANGES: Personal Explanation (Sir *Henri Joli de Lotbiniere*) 4366 (ii),
—— LAWS, INFRACTION: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1544, 1637 (i).
—— COST OF COLLECTIONS, MONTREAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3057 (ii).
ILLICIT STILLS, SEIZURE FROM GEO. VEZINA: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1374 (i).
—— SEIZURE AT PONT ROUGE: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1373 (i).
PETROLEUM, REFINED, REDUCTION OF DUTY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Moore*) 828 (i).
STAPLES, INSPECTION OF: in Com. of Sup., 5058 (ii).
SPENCE, JOHN, INLAND REVENUE, SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1079 (i).
"SILVER SPRAY" AND "MARY GROVER," SEIZURE: Ques. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 927, 1300 (i).
TRAVELLING, RENT, FUEL, &C., EXCISE OFFICERS: in Com. of Sup., 2507 (i).
VEZINA, GEO., AND INLAND REV. DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2569 (i).
WEIGHTS, MEASURES, GAS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2511, 2557 (i).
WEIGHTS AND MEASURES INSPECTOR, PORT ARTHUR, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 793 (i).
—— METRICAL SYSTEM: Ques. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 1027 (i).

Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. No. 144 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*). Res. prop. and in Com., 4698; 1°* of B., 2°* and in Com., 4699; 3°*, 4701 (ii). (60-61 *Vic., c.* 19.)

INLAND REVENUE DEPT., DISMISSALS AND APPNMTS. SINCE JULY, 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 1663 (i).

Inspection Act. *See* "GENERAL."

INTERIOR:
ASPDIN, THOS. W., CLAIM FOR SCRIP: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1374 (i).
BOUNDARY. *See* "ALASKA."
BREMNER FURS SEIZURE, COMPENSATION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davis*) 1744 (i).
CARTWRIGHT, Mr. F. L., APPNMT. as INSPECTOR MOUNTED POLICE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 489 (i).
CHAMPAIN, SAMUEL, CLAIM AGAINST GOVT. BY REBELLION, 1885: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 490 (i).
COAL BORING IN P. E. I., VOTE IN ESTIMATES: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 796 (i).
DISMISSALS. *See* general heading.
DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 4083, 5223, 5423 (ii).
ESTEVAN LAND OFFICE, REMOVAL TO ALAMEDA: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1638 (i).
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fisher*) 5542 (ii).
GOLD DISCOVERIES, HARRISON LAKE REGION: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1744 (i).
GOLD DREDGING, STEWART RIVER, YUKON, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 1740 (i).
HUDSON BAY EXPEDITION. *See* "HUDSON BAY."
INDIAN AFFAIRS, DEPTL. REP.; Presented (Mr. *Sifton*) 492 (i).
INTERIOR: in Com. of Sup., 1669, 1701, 2068 (i).

INTERIOR—*Con.*
INTERIOR DEPTL. EMPLOYEES, GRATUITIES: in Com. of Sup. 5001 (ii).
MCGIRR, WM., NOTIFICATION OF SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1987 (i).
MOUNTED POLICE, STRENGTH OF FORCE: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 1990 (i).
—— COMMISSIONER'S REP.: Presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 1072 (i).
PACIFIC-YUKON ROUTE, SURVEYS: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1375 (i).
QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE AND MOUNTED POLICE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 97 (i).
SCRIP FOR HALF-BREEDS, CLAIMS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davis*) 3530 (ii).
SILVER AND LEAD SMELTING IN B. C., PAYMENTS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 3146 (ii).
WOOD MOUNTAIN SCOUTS, CLAIMS FOR SCRIP: prop. res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1051 (i).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:
ALLOWANCES TO INJURED PASSENGERS: in Com. of Sup., 5276 (ii),
BICYCLES CARRIED FREE: Remarks (Mr. *McMullen*) 2473 (ii).
COMMISSION OF INVESTIGATION, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup. 5254 (ii).
DISMISSALS. *See* general heading.
—— RET.: Presented (Mr. *Blair*) 4203 (ii).
IONA STATION RESTAURANT: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 1739 (i).
LAND DAMAGES, CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 3834; conc., 5421 (ii).
MCLEAN, JAMES, FOREMAN CARPENTER: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2121 (i).
NEW TIME TABLE: Remarks (Mr. *Choquette*) 3241 (ii).
MCDONALD, A. R., GENERAL INSPECTOR, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Pouliot*) 1078 (i).
POINT TUPPER STATION AGENT, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 788 (i).
ROLLING STOCK, &C.; in Com. of Sup., 3745, 5113, 5269, 5288, 5457; conc., 5421, 5477 (ii).
I. C. R., EXTENSION TO MONTREAL: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1304 (i).
—— COR. WITH G.T.R., &C.: M. for copy* (Mr. *Boisvert*) 2446 (i).
—— Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1545 (i), 2657, 3540.
—— DRUMMOND CO. RY. AND G.T.R.: Rep. presented (Mr. *Blair*) 4202 (ii).
—— in Com. of Sup., 5079 (ii).

I.C.R. Extension to Montreal, G.T.R. and Drummond Co. Ry. Co.'s Agreement B. No. 142 (Mr. *Blair*). Res. prop., 4086; M. for Com., 4258; agreed to (Y. 91, N. 47) 4340; in Com., 4341, 4342, 4373; 1° of B., 4477; 2° and in Com., 4612; 3° *m.**, 4654; 3°, 4697 (ii).
Deb. on M. for Com. (Mr. *Blair*) 4258, 4344-4394; (Mr. *Foster*) 4259, 4287; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4259; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4259; (Mr. *Pope*) 4307; (Mr. *Charlton*) 4314; (Mr. *Haggart*) 4319; (Mr. *Craig*) 4324; (Mr. *Dupont*) 4326; (Mr. *Wallace*) 4330 (ii).
Deb. in Com. (Mr. *Foster*) 4342, 4374; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4344-4394; (Mr. *Blair*) 4342, 4375; (Mr. *Haggart*) 4345, 4378; (Mr. *Sproule*) 4347, 4373; (Mr. *Ingram*) 4347, 4385; (Mr. *Lount*) 4349; (Mr. *Wallace*) 4351, 4383; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4355, 4386; (Mr. *Powell*) 4358; (Mr. *Davies*) 4384; (Mr. *Britton*) 4386; (Mr. *Clancy*) 4386; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4387 (ii).

I. C. R. Extension to Montreal—*Con.*
Deb. on M. for 3ª (Mr. *Blair*) 4654; (Mr. *Sproule*) 4654, 4667; (Mr. *Hoggart*) 4655; (Mr. *McMullen*) 4663; (Mr. *Lavergne*) 4665; (Mr. *Gibson*) 4671; (Mr. *Powell*) 4677; (Mr. *Foster*) 4694, 4697 (ii).

Interest Act Amt. B. No. 15 (Mr. *Quinn*). 1°, 550 (i); 2° m., 3562 (ii).

Interest B. No. 134 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*). 1°*, 3971; 2°* and in Com., 4252; 3°*, 4258 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 8.)

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION, MESS.: Presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 492 (i).

INVERNESS ELECTION PET.: Remarks (Mr. *McLennan*, *Inverness*) 2299 (i).

IONA WHARF (N.S.) REPAIRS TO WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 489, 921, 1740 (i).

——— STATION RESTAURANT: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 1739 (i).

IRONDALE, BANCROFT AND OTTAWA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5158 (ii).

IRON FORGINGS: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3639.

IRON, PIG, CAN. MANUFACTURE AND BOUNTY: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*, *Huron*) 97 (i).

IRON OR STEEL ANGLES, &C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3637 (ii).

——— NUTS, &C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3696.

Iron and Steel Bounties Provision B. No. 149 (Mr. *Fielding*). Res. prop., 4653; in Com., 5186; 1°* of B., 5201; 2°*, in Com. and 3°, 5288 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 6.)

IRON OR STEEL SCRAP: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3583 (ii).

IRVIN, JOHN, APPNMT. AS LIGHTSHIP-KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1633 (i).

ISAAC'S HARBOUR POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4106 (ii).

ISLE PERROT WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4958 (ii).

James' Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 52 (Mr. *Lount*). 1°*, 1172; 2°*, 1232; in Com., 2166; 3°, 2609 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 47.)

JAMESON, R. W., ESQ., Member for Winnipeg: introduced, 1665 (i).

JAPAN, APPNMT. OF AGENT: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 3339.

——— TREATY: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 1985 (i).

JOLIETTE AND ST. JEAN DE MATHA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737; in Com., 5513 (ii).

JONES, JUDGE, RESIGNATION AND GRATUITY: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2882 (ii).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bennett*) 3537 (ii).

ONES, DR., DISMISSAL AS INDIAN AGENT: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Clancy*) 3530 (ii).

Judges. *See* "SUPREME COURT."

JUBILEE POSTAGE STAMPS: Ques. (Mr. *Gibson*) 2654.

JUDIQUE WHARF, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 2719 (ii).

JURY, ALF., IMMIGRATION AGENT, AND TORONTO STREET RY.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2216 (i).

JUSTICE:
ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 3731, 4141, 4841, 4986 (ii).

JUSTICE—*Con.*
ADMIRALTY JURISDICTION AND N.S. COUNTY COURT JUDGES: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 262 (i).
ARBITRATION, DOM. AND ONT. AND QUEBEC ACCOUNTS: in Com. of Sup., 4082; conc., 5423 (ii).
BOMPAS, BISCHOFF & CO., SOLICITORS FOR THE DOM., RETIREMENT: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Foster*) 546 (i).
CIRCUIT ALLOWANCES, TRAVELLING EXPENSES, JUDGES: in Com. of Sup., 4141 (ii).
CIVIL SERVICE ACT, MIN. OF JUSTICE'S OPINION: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2124 (i).
CONVICTS LIBERATED, SENTENCES COMMUTED, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 546 (i).
COUNTY COURT JUDGES, COMMISSIONS WITHOUT LEGISLATION: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2124 (i).
DOM. POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 2090 (i).
EXCHEQUER COURT, LOCAL JUDGE IN ADMIRALTY, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1986 (i).
FISHERIES CASE, APPEAL FROM SUPREME COURT JUDGMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 136, 1303 (i).
GAHAN, CONVICT, RELEASE FROM KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3339.
GOVT. OF N.W.T., SUBSIDY AND POWERS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 1030, 1043 (i).
GOVT. OF P.E.I., CLAIMS AGAINST FEDERAL GOVT.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Macdonald*, *P. E. I.*,) 1662 (i).
JONES, JUDGE, RESIGNATION AND GRATUITY: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2882 (ii).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bennett*) 3537 (ii).
JUSTICE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 1666 (i), 4833 (ii).
LITIGATED MATTERS, DEPT. OF JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 3863 (ii).
MAN. SCHOOLS QUES., PAPERS NOT BROUGHT DOWN: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 168, 826 (i).
——— REF. IN SPEECH FROM THRONE: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 342 (i).
——— AND REMEDIAL ORDER: Ques. (Mr. *Haggart*) 792 (i).
——— MR FITZPATRICK'S LETTER TO HON. ED. BLAKE: M. for copy (Mr. *Quinn*) 836 (i).
——— SETTLEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 918, 1307, 1451.
MAN. SCHOOL FUND, COM. ON RES.: M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3842 (ii).
PENITENTIARIES DEPT.: in Com. of Sup. 1668, (i),
——— REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 3679 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 2794, 4740, 4798, 4774, 4987 (ii).
PRINCE ALBERT, SHERIFF, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 667.
SULLIVAN, DANL. BRIAN, RELEASE FROM IMPRISONMENT: M. for Papers* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1663 (i).
——— Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3383 (ii).
SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES, RIMOUSKI DISTRICT; Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 4476 (ii).
SUPREME COURT, R. G. DAVIS'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup, 4986 (ii).

KARSDALE POST OFFICE, COMPLAINTS AGAINST POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 916 (i).

Kaslo and Lardo-Duncan Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 73 (Mr. *Bostock*). 1°*, 1373; 2°*, 1574 (i); in Com., 2450; 3°*, 2775 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 48.)

KELLY, MISS, WINDSOR P.O. EMPLOYEE: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 920 (i).

KENNEDY, MR., DISMISSAL FROM TRENT CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 259 (i).

KENTVILLE AND LIVERPOOL P. O.: in Com. of Sup.; 4901; conc., 5432 (ii).

KING, G. G., APPNMT. AS POSTMASTER AT MARSH HILL: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 261, 268, 483 (i).

——— M. for Cor. (Mr. *Foster*) 1663 (i).

KING'S AND YORK, DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Foster*) 546 (i).

Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s B. No. 38 (Mr. *Britton*). 1°*, 950; 2°* 1058 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3540 (ii).

KINGSTON COTTON MILLS AND TARIFF CHANGES: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 98 (i).

——— DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 4948 (ii).

——— AND LONDON BARRACKS, WOOD CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) 2425 (i).

——— PENITENTIARY, COMMISSIONERS' REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1983 (i).

——— DISMISSAL OF GUARDS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3338 (ii).

——— in Com. of Sup., 2795, 4740, 4774 (ii).

——— POSTMASTER, APPNMT. AND SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3738 (ii).

——— Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3740, 3865.

KINGSTON, SMITH'S FALLS AND OTTAWA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4736; in Com., 5512 (ii).

KINNEY, L. W., POSTMASTER AT SALEM, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2411 (i).

KNIGHT'S POINT (P.E.I.) BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 2730 (ii).

KOOTENAY MAIL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) on M. to adjn., 5540 (ii).

La Banque du Peuple B. No. 86 (Mr. *Préfontaine*). 1°*, 1539; 2°*, 2347 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3003 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 75.)

LABELS: in Com. of Ways and Means, 2474.

LACHINE CANAL, DISMISSALS: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2410 (i).

——— QUES. (Mr. *Quinn*) 923 (i).

——— DAVID DAME: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3338 (ii).

——— STOREMAN BEHAN: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Quinn*) 3537 (ii).

——— MICHAEL ENRIGHT: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Quinn*) 3537 (ii).

——— ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 3874, 4823, 4892, 5113, 5150; conc., 5451 (ii).

LAFLEUR, JOHN, PAYMENT TO: in Com. of Sup., 4986.

LAIDLAW, GEO., DISMISSAL TRENT CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 259 (i).

Lake Man. Ry. and Canal Co.'s B. No. 72 (Mr. *Richardson*). 1°*, 1373; 2°*, 1574 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2927 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 49.)

"LA LIBRE PAROLE," LIBELLOUS STATEMENTS AGAINST MIN. OF CROWN: Ques (Mr. *Taylor*) 3971 (ii).

La Mutuelle Canadienne B. No. 119 (Mr. *Madore*). 1°*, 2967; 2°*, 3090; in Com. and 3°*, 3465 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 87.)

LAND DAMAGES, CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 3834; conc., 5421 (ii).

LA PRAIRIE ICE PIERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2735 (ii).

Land Titles Act (1894) Amt. B. No. 115 (Mr. *Sifton*). 1°, 2798; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3723 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 30.)

Langenburg and Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 51 (Mr. *Richardson*). 1°*, 1172; 2°*, 1232; in Com., 2163; 3° m., 2408; recom., 2602; 3°, 2609 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 50.)

LANGEVIN BLOCK, CONTRACTOR'S CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 791 (i).

L'ARDOISE, BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 670 (i).

LAROUCHE, G., DISMISSAL: Ques. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 1027 (i).

LAURIN, OCTAVE, BEAUHARNOIS POSTMASTER AND COUNTY ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 268 (i).

——— APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 572 (i).

LAVERGE, M. P., LATE DEP. POSTMASTER, QUEBEC, DISMISSAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2446 (i).

LAVOIE, DR. NAP., STR. "LA CANADIENNE": Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1304, 1544 (i).

LEGISLATION: in Com. of Sup., 2091 (i), 4843, 4987, 5059, 5427; conc., 5451 (ii).

"Les Cisterciens Réformés" incorp. B. No. 88 (Mr. *LaRivière*). 1°*, 1539; 2°, 1632; in Com. and 3°*, 2345 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 95.)

LES EBOULEMENTS POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 263 (i).

Libel Law Amt. B. No. 95 (Mr. *Davin*). 1°*, 1738 (i).

LIBRARY: in Com. of Sup., 2106 (i).

LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2293 (i).

LIGHTHOUSE KEEPERS, LIMITATION OF AGE: Ques. (Mr. *McCormack*) 266 (i).

"LILY," TUG, PAYMENTS BY GOVT. FOR HIRE: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1809 (i).

Lindsay, Haliburton and Mattawa Ry. Co.'s B. No. 98 (Mr. *Hughes*). 1°*, 1899; 2°*, 2022 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3090 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 51.)

LINLEY, HENRY, FISHERY INSPECTOR, CEDAR SPRINGS, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 4206 (ii).

LITIGATED MATTERS, DEPT. OF JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 3863 (ii).

LIVERPOOL POST OFFICE: Amt. (Mr. *McMullen*) on conc. in Vote rep. from Com. of Sup., neg. (Y. 20, N. 40) 5441 (ii).

——— PAR. MONTREAL "GAZETTE": Personal Explanation (Mr. *Henderson*) 5542 (ii).

Loan Association. *See* "DOM. BUILDING."

LOANS, GOVT., TEMPORARY: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 949.

Loan ($15,000,000) for Public Service B. No. 148 (Mr. *Fielding*). Res. prop., 4736; in Com., 5161; 1°* of B., 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 5163 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 3.)

Loan Companies. *See* "BUILDING SOCIETY."

LOBSTERS, EXTENSION OF CLOSE SEASON: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *McLennan, Inverness*) 4769 (ii).

LOBSTER FISHING IN CAPE BRETON: Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1550, 2051 (i).

Lord's Day Observance B. No. 10 (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°*, 258; 2°, 674; in Com., 2460 (i).

MACKENZIE, LATE ALEX., MONUMENT: in Com. of Sup., 2789 (ii).

MACPHERSON, DR., GRATUITY TO WIDOW: in Com. of Sup., 4860 (ii).

MCARTHUR, WM., CUSTOMS OFFICER, FENELON FALLS, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 258 (i).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Hughes*) 1639, 1774 (i).

MCCALLUM, PETER, LOCK SUPT. DU LIEVRE, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1835; on M. for Com. of Sup., 1903 (i).

MCCARTHY ACT, CLAIMS UNDER IN PROVENCHER: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2421 (i).

MCDONALD, DANL., SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 786 (i).

MCDONALD, CAPT. JOHN N., CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 791 (i).

MCDONALD, A. R., GENERAL INSPECTOR I.C.R., APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Pouliot*) 1078 (i).

MCDONALD, G., APPNMT., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, P.E.I.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2125 (i).

MCGIRR, WM., NOTIFICATION OF SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1987 (i).

——— SUPERANNUATION: in Com. of Sup., 1709 (i).

MCINTYRE'S LAKE AND SYDNEY LAKE MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Haley*) 3741 (ii).

MCIVER, JOHN, INDIAN AGENT AT CAPE CROKER: Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 573, 788 (i).

MCKENZIE, CAPT. WM., OF DREDGE "CANADA," DISMISSAL: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1743 (i).

MCKNIGHT, W., POSTMASTER AT NINGA, MAN., DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3740 (ii).

MCLEOD AND MCKAY, MESSRS., BRIDGE TENDERS ON I.C.R., DISMISSAL: M. for Reps.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2447 (i).

MCMANUS, MRS., POSTMISTRESS, NORTHFIELD (B.C.) DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1305 (i).

——— on M. to adjn. (Mr. *Davin*) 1379 (i).

Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) 1379; (Mr. *Foster*) 1380; (Mr. *Davis, Saskatchewan*) 1385; (Mr. *Quinn*) 1385; (Mr. *McInnes*) 1386; (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1387; (Mr. *Osler*) 1388; (Mr. *Prior*) 1389; (Mr. *Laurier*) 1390; (Mr. *Sutherland*) 1391; (Mr. *McCleary*) 1392; (Mr. *Lount*) 1393 (i).

——— ROBERT, LATE POSTMASTER AT NORTHFIELD, CHARACTER: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 2879 (ii).

MCNAB, FISHERY INSPECTOR, INSTRUCTIONS FROM GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bostock*) 3056 (ii).

MCNEILL, J. R., PREVENTIVE OFFICER AT GRAND NARROWS, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3504 (ii).

MCPHEE, ANGUS, POSTMASTER AT HOPEFIELD, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Martin*) 546 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 4365 (ii).

MABOU HARBOUR, BUOY SERVICE, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4206, 4226 (ii).

MACKEREL FISHERY IN N.S., PROTECTION OF FISHERMEN: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 3673, 4371 (ii).

MAGDALEN ISLANDS SAVINGS BANK: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 789 (i).

MAGDALEN ISLANDS, WINTER MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 789, 1027 (i).

MAGENTA (P.Q.) POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 921 (i).

MAIL CONTRACTS IN N. S.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 1025.

——— CANCELLED SINCE JULY, 1896: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Cameron*) 1664.

——— OTTAWA AND BROCKVILLE: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 4106 (ii).

——— in Com. of Sup., 2790, 5083 (ii).

——— SUBSIDIES AND SS. SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 2790, 4994; conc., 5419 (ii).

——— *See* "POST OFFICE."

MANITOBA:

FAIRLIE, REV. MR, PRINCIPAL WINNIPEG INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, APPNMT, &C.: Ques (Mr *Cameron*) 490 (i).

GRAIN STANDARDS, MAN. AND N.W.T., CHANGES: Ques. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 1077 (i).

HUDSON BAY EXPEDITION. *See* "HUDSON BAY."

JAMESON, R. W., ESQ., Member for Winnipeg: introduced, 1665 (i).

MCCARTHY ACT, CLAIMS UNDER IN PROVENCHER: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2421 (i).

MILITIA CORPS, MORRIS (MAN.) ORGANIZATION: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1307 (i).

PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE GOVT. BUILDINGS, CHANGE OF SITE: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 262 (i).

——— POST OFFICE, CHANGE OF SITE: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 2883 (ii).

——— in Com. of Sup., 2589 (i), 4950 (ii).

PUBLIC BUILDINGS, MAN., UNSETTLED CLAIM OF PROV.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 546 (i).

RUTHERFORD, J. G., ESQ., Member for Macdonald: introduced, 1990 (i).

ST. ANDREW'S RAPIDS IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Jameson*) 1987 (i).

SIFTON, HON. C., Member for Brandon: introduced, 3.

TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES, JUDGES, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 3731 (ii).

WINNIPEG IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4949 (ii).

WINNIPEG INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, NAME OF PRINCIPAL, &C.: Ques (Mr. *Cameron*) 490 (i).

——— APPNMT. OF SUPT.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Cameron*) 1664 (i).

WINNIPEG AND ST. BONIFACE HOSPITAL: in Com. of Sup., 2263.

[*See* "NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES."]

Man. and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 24 (Mr. *Douglas*). 1°*, 707; 2°*, 785 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3465 (ii). (60-61 *Vic., c.* 52.)

MAN. SCHOOLS QUES., PAPERS NOT BROUGHT DOWN: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 168 (i).

——— REF. IN SPEECH FROM THRONE: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 342 (i).

——— AND REMEDIAL ORDER: Ques. (Mr. *Haggart*) 792 (i).

——— MR. FITZPATRICK'S LETTER TO HON. ED. BLAKE: M. for copy (Mr. *Quinn*) 836 (i).

——— FURTHER PAPERS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 826 (i).

——— SETTLEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 918, 1307, 1451 (i).

MAN. SCHOOL FUND: M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) for Com. on Res., 3842 (ii).

Man. and South-eastern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 19 (Mr. *Landerkin*). 1°*, 707; 2°*, 785; in Com., 2450 (i); 3°*, 2775 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 53.)

MAJOR'S HILL PARK: in Com. of Sup., 2653 (i).

MARBLE, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3497 (ii).

MAPLE BAY POST OFFICE, CLAIMS OF WILLIAM BEAUMONT: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 4364 (ii).

MARCOTTE, F. A., ESQ., Member for Champlain: introduced, 950 (i).

MARGARETTSVILLE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2719 (ii).

——— TENDERS FOR CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 3868 (ii).

MARINE:

BEAR RIVER (N.S.) OBSTRUCTIONS TO NAV., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 486 (i).

——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Mills*) 4772 (ii).

BIRD ROCK ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, RESCUE OF WOMAN: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 3508 (ii).

CAN. REGISTRY OF SHIPPING: in Com. of Sup., 2290.

CASCUMPEC BUOY SERVICE, TENDERS AND CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1742 (i).

COASTING LAWS OF CANADA AND U. S.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Britton*) 3525 (ii).

CAP SAUMON LIGHTHOUSE, CONTRACT FOR FIREWOOD: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 264 (i).

——— CONSTRUCTION, AMT. PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 264 (i).

DISMISSALS. *See* general heading.

FIDDLE REEF (B.C.) MARINE LIGHTS: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1376 (i).

HUDSON BAY EXPEDITION. *See* "HUDSON BAY."

HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 3295 (ii).

GASPE LIGHTSHIP-KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2126.

GOVT. STEAMERS, MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 2260 (i).

IRVIN, JOHN, APPNMT. AS LIGHTSHIP-KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1633 (i).

"LA CANADIENNE," DR. NAP. LAVOIE: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1304, 1544 (i).

LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPERS, LIMITATION OF AGE: Ques. (Mr. *McCormack*) 266 (i).

LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2293 (i).

MARINE HOSPITALS AND SHIPWRECKED SEAMEN: in Com. of Sup., 2296 (i).

MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 1730, 2007 (i); conc., 3730, 4839 (ii).

NAVIGABLE RIVERS, OBSTRUCTIONS IN: in Com. of Sup., 2293 (i).

"NEWFIELD," STR., APPNMTS.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2125 (i).

OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2290.

PINPLATS BARGES, REGISTRATION: Ques. (Mr. *Mc Mullen*) 921 (i).

POINT AU BARIL LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER, APPNMT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McCormack*) 266 (i).

REWARDS FOR SAVING LIFE: in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i).

TIDAL SERVICE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i).

WRECKS, INVESTIGATION INTO: in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i).

[*See* "FISHERIES," &c.]

Maritime Milling Co.'s incorp. B. No. 40 (Mr. *Fraser, Guysboro'*). 1°*, 1071; 2°* 1202 (i); in Com. and 3°, 2927 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 92.)

MARSH HILL (ONT.) POSTMASTER, APPNMT. of G. G. KING: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 261, 268, 483 (i).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Foster*) 1663 (i).

MARTIN, Mr., POSTMASTER, (P. E. I.,) DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 926 (i).

MAUGERVILLE, UPPER, POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Foster*) 1663 (i).

MEDICINAL PREPARATIONS: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3477 (ii).

Medicine Hat Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. No. 56 (Mr. *Lount*). 1°*, 1172; 2°*, 1232; in Com., 2166; 3°, 2610 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 54.)

MELOCHEVILLE POSTMASTER, STAMP SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2418 (i).

MEMBERS, NEW, CERTIFICATES OF RET.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 86, 950, 1664 (i).

MEMBERS' ABSENCE BEFORE PROROGATION, PAR. IN MONTREAL "GAZETTE": Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 5159 (ii)..

——— Personal Explanation (Mr. *Henderson*) 5542.

MEMBER CALLED TO ORDER: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Speaker*) 177 (i).

MEMBERS REMARKS CHECKED: 163, 555, 562, 699, 784, 1376, 1392, 1453, 1456, 1457, 1462, 1560, 2031, 2137, 2299, 2359 (i), 3398, 3766, 4032, 4102, 4107, 4205, 4211, 4367, 5229, 5316, 5401, 5403 (ii).

MERCIER JOS., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1633, 1835 (i).

MERCIER, WILFRID, APPNMT. AS COMMISSIONER: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 917 (i).

——— INVESTIGATION AT POST OFFICE, VALLEYFIELD: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2448 (i).

MERRICK, POST OFFICE INSPECTOR, NEGLECT OF DUTIES: Ques. (Mr. *Pettet*) 2409 (i).

MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY:

ESTIMATES, THE, 1897-98: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 667 (i).

——— Suppl., 1896-97, 3742, 4008 (ii).

——— Suppl., 1897-98, 4612 (ii).

——— further Suppl., 1897-98, 5009 (ii).

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: Presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 492 (i).

QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE, MILITIA CONTINGENT: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 2658 (ii).

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE, REPLY: Presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 1900 (i).

METAL GLOVE FASTENERS, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 4466 (ii).

METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2295 (i).

Methodist Trust Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. No. 23 (Mr. *Britton*). 1°*, 707; 2°*, 785; in Com. and 3°*, 1631 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 77.)

MICMAC INDIANS, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *McMillan*) 4019 (ii).

MILITIA:

ARTILLERY GARRISON BATTERY NO. 3, DISBANDMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 340.

DISMISSALS. *See* general heading.

GANANOQUE DRILL SHED, REMOVAL: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1078 (i).

MILITIA—*Con.*

GRAY, LT. COL., LATE INSPECTOR OF STORES; Ques. (Mr *Clarke*) 2881 (ii).

KINGSTON AND LONDON BARRACKS, WOOD CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) 2425 (i).

MILITIA: in Com. of Sup., 1669, 1926 (i), 4802, 4831, 4861, 4993 (ii).

MILITIA, ACTIVE, NON-COMMISSIONED OFFICERS AND MEN: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 2445 (i).

—— ALDERSHOT CAMP (N.S.) SUPPLIES: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2448 (i).

—— CAMPS, EASTERN TOWNSHIPS BATTALIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Stenson*) 3668 (ii).

—— CORPS, MORRIS (MAN.) ORGANIZATION: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1307 (i).

MILITARY COLLEGE, KINGSTON, REORGANIZATION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) 2447 (i).

—— ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 791 (i).

—— Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3540 (ii).

—— in Com. of Sup., 4802 (ii).

—— Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4108 (ii).

—— SERGEANTS SERVICES DISPENSED WITH: Ques. 4121 (ii).

MILITIA AND DEFENCE, DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 1669, 1926 (i), 4831 (ii).

—— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 667 (i).

MONUMENTS, BATTLEFIELDS OF CAN.: in Com. of Sup., 4861 (ii),

OLD FORT ERIE, CHANGE OF CONTROL: Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 2415 (i).

QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE, MILITIA CONTINGENT: in Com. of Sup., 4861, 4994 (ii).

—— PAR. IN QUEBEC "CHRONICLE"; Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 3239 (ii).

—— NAMES OF MILITIA OFFICERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 3236 (ii).

—— CELEBRATION, VOTE FOR MILITIA: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 2558 (ii).

—— LIST OF OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1901.

—— APPNMTS.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) 973, 1083.

—— Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 973 (i).

—— COLONIAL TROOPS: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 922 (i).

—— M. to adjn. Hse. (Mr. *Domville*) 838 (i).

QUEEN'S OWN RIFLES, REP. OF COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 1739 (i).

ST. JOHNS MILITARY SCHOOL, TENDERS FOR COAL AND WOOD: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 1029 (i).

—— COAL OIL SUPPLY, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 1078 (i).

—— CONTRACT FOR DRUGS: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 1028 (i).

VETERANS OF 1837-38, PENSION CLAIMS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Cameron*) 3537 (ii).

VOLUNTEERS OF 1866, RECOGNITION OF SERVICES, &C., BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3056 (ii).

Minden and North-western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 55 (Mr. *McHugh*). 1°*, 1172; 2°*, 1232; in Com., 2450 (i); 3°*, 2775 (ii). (60-61 *Vic., c.* 55.)

Mining Development and Advisory Corporation of British America incorp. B. No. 82 (Mr. *Maxwell*). 1°*, 1538; 2° m., 1632, 1775; 2°, 1936 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2927 (ii). (60-61 *Vic., c.* 90.)

MINING DEVELOPMENT, &C., CO.'S PET., REF. BACK TO COM.: M. (Mr. *Morrison*) 2563 (i).

MINING MACHINERY, FREE ENTRY UNDER TARIFF: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 2219 (i).

MINISTERS ANSWERING QUESTIONS: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 789 (i).

MISCELLANEOUS: in Com. of Sup., 2562 (i), 3863, 4082, 5000, 5205; conc., 5456 (ii).

MITCHELL, DR. GEO., INDIAN PHYSICIAN AT WALPOLE ISLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 927 (i).

MONTFORD COLONIZATION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4738 (ii).

MONTMAGNY POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5281 (ii).

Montreal Bridge Co.'s B. No. 90 (Mr. *Préfontaine*). 1°*, 1666; 2°*, 1937 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3465 (ii). (60-61 *Vic., c.* 67.)

MONTREAL INLAND REVENUE, COST OF COLLECTIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3057 (ii).

Montreal and Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. No. 101 (Mr. *Préfontaine*). 1°*, 1899; 2°*, 2022 (i).

MONTREAL POST OFFICE, NEW SKYLIGHTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4947 (ii).

MONUMENTS, BATTLEFIELDS OF CAN.: in Com. of Sup., 4861 (ii).

MORGAN, MICHAEL, POSTMASTER AT BEAR ISLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 672 (i).

MORRISBURG CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 341, 489 (i).

—— DAVID HALLIDAY'S APPNMT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Broder*) 1775 (i).

—— DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 489 (i).

MOUNT ALBERT AND HOLT MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 795 (i).

MOUNTED POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 1709 (i), 4078 (ii).

Mounted Police Act (1894) Amt. B. No. 62 (Mr. *Davin*). 1°, 1231; 2° m., 2037 (i).

—— **Pension Act Amt. B. No. 57** (Mr. *Davin*). 1°*, 1172 (i).

—— **(1889) Amt. B. No. 59** (Mr. *Davis*). 1°, 1228; 2° m., 2036 (i).

—— **(1889) Amt. B. No. 89** (Mr. *Davin*). 1°, 1539 (i).

MOUNTED POLICE, STRENGTH OF FORCE: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 1990 (i).

MT. STEWART (P.E.I.) CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 786 (i).

MUMA, HENRY, OFFICIAL REFEREE, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 3719 (ii).

—— DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 4735 (ii).

MURRAY BAY AND ST. PAUL MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 263 (i).

—— WHARF AND MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 340 (i).

MURRAY HARBOUR (P. E. I.) HARBOUR-MASTER, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2216 (i).

—— BUOY SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1029 (i).

MUSQUODOBOIT, UPPER, DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1542 (i).

MUTTON, &C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3358 (ii).

Mycenian Marble Co. of Can. Patent Relief B. No. 83 (Mr. *Rosamond*). 1°*, 1538; 2°, 1632; in Com., 2345, 2449; 3°*, 2449 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 96.)

NAVIGABLE RIVERS, OBSTRUCTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 2293 (i).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. No. 105 (Mr. *Davies*). 1°*, 2215 (i); 2°* and in Com., 2742; 3°*, 2800; Sen. Amts., 4109 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 23.)

NANAIMO AND COMOX MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3720 (ii).

NANTEL, BRUNO, REVISING OFFICER, TERREBONNE: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 491 (i).

NAPANEE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, APPNMT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 482 (i).

National Life Assurance Co's. of Can. incorp. B. No. 74 (Mr. *Lount*). 1°*, 1373; 2°*, 1574; in Com. and 3°*, 2345 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 78.)

NATIONAL MUSEUM, ERECTION AT OTTAWA: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Belcourt*) 2426 (i).

NEW BRUNSWICK:

- BROOKFIELD STATION (I.C.R.) AND EASTVILLE RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4738; in Com., 5528 (ii).
- CAMPBELLTON AND GRAND FALLS SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737; in Com., 5513 (ii).
- CAMPOBELLO BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 2565 (i).
- CAPE TORMENTINE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4958 (ii).
- CENTRAL RY. CO. OF N. B. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737 (ii).
- DISMISSALS. *See* general heading.
- OAK BAY MILLS P. O., CLOSING: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McAlister*) 1663 (i).
- ST. JOHN HARBOUR, in Com. of Sup., 2732 (ii).
- ST. STEPHEN'S AND MILLTOWN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4738 (ii).
- SCOVIL, WALTER B., PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 2415 (i).
- SHIPPEGAN HARBOUR, in Com. of Sup., 4958 (ii).
- SUSSEX, GOVT. BUILDINGS, APPNMT. OF CARETAKER: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 261 (i).
- WELSFORD AND GAGETOWN RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4736 (ii).

[*See* "POST OFFICE," "PUBLIC WORKS," &C.]

NEPEAN POINT INTERCOLONIAL BRIDGE, OTTAWA, SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5158 (ii).

NEWBURG AND KINGSTON MAIL CONTRACTS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Wilson*) 1748 (i).

"NEWFIELD," STR., APPNMTS.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2125 (i).

NEWFOUNDLAND AND CONFEDERATION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Martin*) 2433 (i).

NEWSPAPERS, &C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3707 (ii).

NEWSPAPER CRITICISMS:

- BAIE DES CHALEURS RY., PAR. IN HALIFAX *Chronicle*: Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) 3420 (ii).
- COAL TRADE OF N. S., ALLEGED UTTERANCES, FINANCE MINISTER, Mr. (*Gillies*) 669 (i).

NEWSPAPER CRITICISMS—*Con.*

- EXPORT DUTY ON LOGS, PAR. IN MIDLAND *Free Press*: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 4105 (ii).
- GOODWIN *vs.* THE QUEEN, PAR. IN TORONTO *Globe*: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3840 (ii).
- *La Libre Parole*, LIBELLOUS STATEMENTS AGAINST MIN. OF CROWN: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3971 (ii).
- LIVERPOOL POST OFFICE, PAR. IN MONTREAL *Gazette*: Personal Explanation .Mr. *Henderson*) 5542 (ii).
- MEMBERS ABSENCE BEFORE PROROGATION, PAR IN MONTREAL *Gazette*: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 5159 (ii).
- MOTIONS ON ORDER PAPER, PAR. IN MANITOBA *Free Press*: (Mr. *Davin* 2886 (ii).
- NEW YORK *Sun's* ARTICLE ON QUEEN VICTORIA: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 1990 (i).
- PREFERENTIAL CLAUSE, PAR. IN MONTREAL *Gazette*: (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 2657 (ii).
- REP. OF SPEECH IN *Globe* (Mr. *Craig*) 3672 (ii).

Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s B. No. 37 (Mr. *Ingram*). 1°*, 914; 2°*, 1058; in Com. and 3°*, 1936 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 68.)

NICOLET RIVER BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Boisvert*) 671 (i).

North American Life Assurance Co.'s B. No. 54 (Mr. *Lount*). 1°*, 1172; 2°*, 1232 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2776 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 79.)

NORTHFIELD (B.C.) POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1305 (i).

——— INSPECTOR FLETCHER'S REP.: M. for copy* (Mr. *Davin*) 2021 (i).

NORTH HARBOUR, ASPY BAY, HARBOUR OF REFUGE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bethune*) 2445 (i).

NORTH PERROTT POST OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 485.

——— POSTMASTER, MR. SPURR'S APPNMT.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mills*) 1998 (i).

NORTH RIVER, ST. ANN'S BUILDING OF WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 1740 (i).

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES:

- ASPDIN, THOS. W., CLAIM FOR SCRIP: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1374 (i).
- ATHABASCA AND MACKENZIE RIVER MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 2421 (i).
- BANFF ROCKY MOUNTAIN PARK: in Com. of Sup. 5000.
- BREMNER FURS SEIZURE, COMPENSATION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davis*) 1744 (i).
- CARTWRIGHT, MR. F. L., APPNMT. AS INSPECTOR N. W. MOUNTED POLICE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 489 (i).
- CHAMPAIN, SAMUEL, CLAIM AGAINST GOV.'T, REBELLION, 1885; Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 490 (i).
- CREAMERIES IN N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 2179 (i).
- CUSTOMS COLLECTORS, HUDSON BAY OFFICIALS: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 794, 1452 (i).
  - ——— in Com. of Sup., 2560 (i).
- DAUNAIS, C. M., INDIAN INSTRUCTOR, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1450 (i).
- DAVIS, T. O., ESQ., Member for Saskatchewan: introduced 3 (i).
- DISMISSALS. *See* general heading.
- ESTEVAN LAND OFFICE, REMOVAL TO ALAMEDA: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1638 (i).
- GOVT. HORSES AT PRINCE ALBERT, PAYMENTS FOR CARE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Davis*) 3537 (ii).
- GOVT. OF N. W. T., SUBSIDY AND POWERS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 1030, 1043 (i).
  - ——— in Com. of Sup., 4081, 5002 (ii).

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—*Con.*

GRAIN TRANSPORT FROM N. W. T. AND MAN., 1891 TO 1897: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3509, 3669 (ii).

GRUNDY, ERNEST, LATE POSTMASTER AT DUCK LAKE: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 3870 (ii).

HUDSON BAY EXPEDITION. *See* "HUDSON BAY."

HUDSON BAY PORTS, CUSTOMS COLLECTORS: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 794, 1452 (i).

INDIAN DISTURBANCES: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 3059.

INDIAN OFFICE, REGINA, REMOVAL TO WINNIPEG: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1985 (i).

INDIANS, PEACE RIVER AND ATHABASCA REGIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 1986 (i).

INDIAN SUPPLIES, MAN. AND N. W. T., SCHEDULE OF TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 487, 1078, 1301 (i).

—— MR. MCCOLL'S LETTER *re* PURCHASE; Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1306 (i).

MOUNTED POLICE, STRENGTH OF FORCE: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 1990 (i).

PRINCE ALBERT BRANCH, C. P. R., PAR IN PRINCE ALBERT "ADVOCATE": Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) 2657.

—— SHERIFF, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 667 (i).

QU'APPELLE MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS AND CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1079 (i).

QUARANTINE, MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3238 (ii).

REGINA, LONG LAKE, &C., RY. CO., GOVT. SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1637 (i).

ST. PAUL INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, FURNISHING SUPPLIES: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Davin*) 1664 (i).

SASKATCHEWAN BRIDGE, EDMONTON: in Com. of Sup., 2787 (ii).

SASKATCHEWAN MAIL SERVICE, REGULARITY OF DELIVERY: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1634 (i).

SASKATCHEWAN RY. AND MINING CO.'S B., PROCEEDINGS NULL AND VOID: M. (Mr. *Sutherland*) 5537, 5539 (ii)

SASKATOON AND BATTLEFORD AND ONION LAKE MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1633 (i).

SCHOOLS, INDIAN, DAY, BOARDING AND INDUSTRIAL: in Com. of Sup., 4076, 5000 (ii).

SCHOOLS, UNORGANIZED TERRITORIES, SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 5002 (ii).

SCRIP FOR HALF-BREEDS' CLAIMS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davis*) 3530 (ii).

SEED GRAIN, AMOUNTS OWING BY FARMERS, MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1989, 2215 (i).

TERRITORIAL EXHIBITION, OUTSTANDING DEBTS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1374 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 4859 (ii).

WOOD MOUNTAIN SCOUTS, CLAIMS FOR SCRIP; prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1051 (i).

[*See* "POST OFFICE," "PUBLIC WORKS," &c.]

North-west Territories Act Amt. B. No. 114 (Mr. *Sifton*). 1°, 2797; 2° and in Com., 4110; 3°, 4118 (ii). (60-61 *Vic., c.* 28.)

NORWAY IRON, &C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3718 (ii).

NOVA SCOTIA:

ADMIRALTY JURISDICTION AND N.S. COUNTY COURT JUDGES: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 262 (i).

ANNAPOLIS POSTAL SERVICE. *See* "POST OFFICE."

BADDECK AND IONA, GRAND NARROWS AND IRISH COVE MAIL SUBSIDIES: in Com. of Sup., 2791; conc., 5419 (ii).

BEAR RIVER, OBSTRUCTIONS TO NAVIGATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 486 (i).

—— on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Mills*) 4772 (ii).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

BOULARDERIE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 719 (i).

CENTRAL RY. AND LIVERPOOL, &C., RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4738; in Com., 5524 (ii).

COAL TRADE OF N.S., ALLEGED UTTERANCES OF FINANCE MINISTER: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 669 (i).

COAST LINE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4738 (ii).

CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 2552 (i).

DISMISSALS. *See* general heading.

GLOUCESTER FISHING SCHOONERS AND N.S. FISHERMEN: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 3673, 4371 (ii).

HALIFAX LOAN CO.'S B., SUSPENSION OF RULE: M. (Mr. *Fraser, Guysboro'*) 1665 (i).

HALIFAX AND NEWFOUNDLAND MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 2790, 4994 (ii).

"INDIAN GARDENS" RESERVE, SALE OF HAY: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3509 (ii).

INDIAN GARDEN, &C., AND SHELBURNE RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4738 (ii).

INVERNESS ELECTION PET.: Remarks (Mr. *McLennan, Inverness*) 2299 (i).

IONA STATION RESTAURANT: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 1739 (i).

—— REPAIRS TO WHARF, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 489, 921, 1740 (i).

JUDIQUE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2719 (ii).

KENTVILLE AND LIVERPOOL P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 4901; conc., 5432 (ii).

L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 670 (i).

LOBSTER FISHING IN CAPE BRETON: Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1550, 2051 (i).

MABOU HARBOUR BUOY SERVICE, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4206, 4226 (ii).

MACKEREL FISHERY, PROTECTION OF FISHERMEN: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 3673, 4371 (ii).

MARGARETSVILLE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2719 (ii).

—— TENDERS FOR CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 3868 (ii).

MILITIA CAMP, ALDERSHOT, QUEEN'S CO., SUPPLIES; M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2448 (i).

NORTH HARBOUR ASPY BAY, HARBOUR OF REFUGE; M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bethune*) 2445 (i).

NORTH RIVER, ST. ANN'S, BUILDING OF WHARF; Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 1740 (i).

N. S. CENTRAL RY., BALANCE OF SUBSIDIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 3868 (ii).

N. S. SOUTHERN RY., SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 4471 (ii).

PIERS, &C., ANNAPOLIS CO., REPAIRS, &C.: Ques. Mr. *Mills*) 486, 487 (i).

POINT TUPPER STATION AGENT, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 788 (i).

PORT HAWKESBURY AND BROAD COVE RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4738; in Com., 5521 (ii).

PORT MULGRAVE, &C, GUYSBOROUGH, &C., MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 2793, 4998 (ii).

PUGWASH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2719 (ii).

ST. ANDREW'S P. O., REP. RESPECTING LATE FIRE: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3235 (ii).

ST. ANNE, ANNAPOLIS, CARETAKER: QUES. (Mr. *Mills*) 5009 (ii).

ST. PETER'S CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 5274 (ii).

SUNNY BRAE RY., SUBSIDY BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1542 (i).

SUNNY BRAE AND COUNTRY HARBOUR RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4738; in Com. 5521, (ii).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*
THORNE, JAMES H., COMPLAINT AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 916 (i).
TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 2262 (i).
WALLACE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2720 (ii).
WALSH, C. J., CLAIMS ON LEEWARD ISLANDS GOVT.: Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3676 (ii).
WINDSOR JUNCTION (I.C.R.) AND UPPER MUSQUODOBOIT RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4738; in Com., 5520 (ii).
[*See* "POST OFFICE," &c.]
OAK BAY MILLS POST OFFICE, CLOSING: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McAlister*) 1663 (i).
OAK POINT, (N.B.) LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER, G. R. PICKETT'S DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3669 (ii).
OATHS OF OFFICE. *See* "ADMINISTRATION."
O'BRIEN, WM., DISMISSAL FROM STR. "LANSDOWNE": Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4008 (ii).
OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i).
ODESSA POSTMASTER, NAME, RECOMMENDATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 266 (i).
OKA INDIANS, REMOVAL: in Com. of Sup., 4073 (ii).
O'KELLEY, E., IMMIGRATION AGENT TO IRELAND, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 669 (i).
OLDFIELD, SAMUEL E., LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER AT POINT AU BARIL, APPNMT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McCormack*) 266 (i).
OLD FORT ERIE, CHANGE OF CONTROL: Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 2415 (i).
O'LEARY, HUGH, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1302 (i).
OLEO-STEARINE: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3712 (ii).
ONTARIO:
ALEXANDRIA REFORMATORY: in Com. of Sup., 4949.
ALGOMA ELECTION, COMMISSION *re*: in Com. of Sup., 4987, 5059; conc., 5451 (ii).
ANDERSON, THOS. E., APPNMT. AS COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Wilson*) 1057 (i).
BENNETT, W. H., ESQ., Member for East Simcoe: introduced, 3.
BINDER TWINE MADE AT KINGSTON PENITENTIARY, COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan, Glengarry*) 1634 (i).
CAPE CROKER, INDIAN AGENT MCIVER: Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 573, 788 (i).
"CHALLONER," DREDGE, WORK DONE AT MIDLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 260 (i).
COBOURG, NORTHUMBERLAND AND PACIFIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4736 (ii).
COLLINGWOOD HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 2758 (ii).
CORNWALL, CANAL ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 3861, 5115 (ii).
—— AND SOULANGES CANALS, DIMENSIONS AND CONTRACTORS: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan, Glengarry*) 2411 (i).
—— AND BEAUHARNOIS CANALS, COST OF BREAKS IN 1894-95: Ques. (Mr. *Reid*) 2425 (i).
CROWE, INDIAN AGENT, SAUGEEN RESERVE: Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 340, 573, 788, 847 (i).
CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 2554 (i).
DISMISSALS. *See* general heading.
DOM. EXHIBITION, TORONTO, GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1633 (i).
FENELON FALLS CUSTOMS OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 258 (i).
ONTARIO—*Con.*
FISHERY GUARDIANS, NORTH VICTORIA: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1081, 1308, 1451 (i).
FISHING LICENSES GRANTED, LAKE ERIE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Ingram*) 837 (i).
FORT FRANCIS LOCK: in Com. of Sup., 4970 (ii).
GAHAN, CONVICT, RELEASE FROM KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3339 (ii).
GALOPS CANAL, IROQUOIS SECTION, TENDERS: M. for copy* (Mr. *Clancy*) 3538 (ii).
—— TENDERS FOR CARDINAL SECTION: M. for copy* (Mr. *Clancy*) 3538 (ii).
GANANOQUE DRILL SHED, REMOVAL: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 10 8 (i).
GODERICH HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 2740 (ii).
GRAHAM, D., ESQ., Member for North Ontario: introduced, 3.
HAMILTON AND NIAGARA CUSTOMS COLLECTORS: Ques. (Mr. *Gibson*) 1540 (i).
HEYD, C. B., ESQ., Member for South Brant: introduced, 3.
HILTON AND MARKDALE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4966 (ii).
HONORA WHARF, MANITOULIN ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 4964 (ii).
INDIAN OFFICE, BRANTFORD, APPNMT. OF DAVID HILL: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Clancy*) 3539 (ii).
IRONDALE, BANCROFT AND OTTAWA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5158 (ii).
KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 2577 (i).
KELLEY, MISS, WINDSOR P. O. EMPLOYEE: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 920 (i).
KINGSTON COTTON MILLS AND TARIFF CHANGES: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 98 (i).
—— DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 4948 (ii).
—— AND LONDON BARRACKS, WOOD CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) 2425 (i).
—— PENITENTIARY, COMMISSIONERS' REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1983 (i).
—— DISMISSAL OF GUARDS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3338 (ii).
—— in Com. of Sup., 4795, 4740, 4774 (ii).
KINGSTON, SMITH'S FALLS AND OTTAWA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4736; in Com., 5512 (ii).
LANGEVIN BLOCK, CONTRACTOR'S CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 791 (i).
MCIVER, JOHN, INDIAN AGENT AT CAPE CROKER: Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 573, 788 (i).
MAJOR'S HILL PARK, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 2653.
MILITARY COLLEGE. *See* "MILITIA."
MITCHELL, DR. GEO., INDIAN PHYSICIAN AT WALPOLE ISLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 927 (i).
MORRISBURG CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 341, 489 (i).
—— DAVID HALLIDAY'S APPNMT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Broder*) 1775 (i).
NAPANEE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, APPNMT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 482 (i).
NATIONAL MUSEUM, ERECTION AT OTTAWA: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Belcourt*) 2426 (i).
NEPEAN POINT, OTTAWA, INTERCOLONIAL BRIDGE: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5158 (ii).
OLD FORT ERIE, CHANGE OF CONTROL: Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 2415 (i).
O'LEARY, HUGH, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1302 (i).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

ONTARIO PACIFIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4736; in Com., 5512 (ii).

OTTAWA, ARNPRIOR AND PARRY SOUND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737 (ii).

OTTAWA AND RAINY RIVER RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737; in Com., 5517 (ii).

OWEN SOUND AND COLLINGWOOD HARBOURS, EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 796 (i).

POINT AU BARIL LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER, APPNMT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McCormack*) 266 (i).

PORT COLBORNE PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4948 (ii).

PORT STANLEY HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, EXPENDITURE, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Ingram*) 837 (i).

PORT STANLEY HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 4966 (ii).

PRINCE EDWARD CO., PREVENTIVE OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Pettet*) 491 (i).

RAINY RIVER CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 2773 (ii).

RAT PORTAGE PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 5285 (ii).

RIDEAU HALL, GROUNDS AND RENEWALS: in Com. of Sup., 2592 (i), 2613, 4885, 5132, 5274 (ii).

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER, CANALS, IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2423 (i).

—— SALE OF ISLANDS: Ques. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 1025 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1080 (i).

—— NORTH CHANNEL, TENDERS: M. for copy* (Mr. *Clancy*) 3538 (i).

SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL, CONSTRUCTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3874, 5117 (ii).

SCHOMBERG AND AURORA RY. CO 'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737; in Com., 5513 (ii).

SMITH'S FALLS PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4949 (ii).

SNETSINGER, J. D, Esq., Member for Cornwall and Stormont: introduced, 3 (i).

SOULANGES CANAL, SECTIONS 4, 5, 6, 7, TENDERS, CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 341, 488 (i).

—— SECTIONS 4, 5, 6, 7, CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 488 (i).

—— SECTION 12, CONTRACTS, &c,: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 489 (i).

—— SECTION 12, TENDERS FOR CONTRACT: M. for copies* (Mr. *Clancy*) 2447 (i).

—— SECTIONS 4, 5, 6, 7, TENDERS, &c.: M. for copy* (Mr. *Clancy*) 2447 (i).

STRATHROY CUSTOMS OFFICER, NAME, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 483 (i).

STRATHROY AND WESTERN COUNTIES RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737; in Com., 5818 (ii).

THOUSAND ISLANDS, PURCHASE FROM INDIAN DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1080 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 1025 (i).

TILSONBURG, LAKE ERIE AND PACIFIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737 (ii).

TORONTO HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 2739 (ii).

—— OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 2295 (i).

TRENT VALLEY CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 3863, 4825, 5126 (ii).

TUSCARORA INDIAN RESERVE, APPNMT. OF PHYSICIAN: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Clancy*) 3538 (ii).

WALPOLE ISLAND INDIANS, APPNMT. OF PHYSICIAN: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 787 (i).

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES INSPECTOR, PORT ARTHUR, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 793 (i).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

WELLAND CANAL, SUPERANNUATION: conc., 5454 (ii).

WELLER BAY AS AN OUTPORT, VALUE OF GOODS, DUTY COLLECTED, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Corby*) 1663 (i).

WILLIAMSBURG CANAL, RETIRING ALLOWANCE, MR. HICKEY: in Com. of Sup., 5277 (ii).

[*See* "POST OFFICE," "PUBLIC WORKS, &c."]

Ontario Accident Insurance Co.'s incorp Act Amt. B. No. 78 (Mr. *Osler*). 1°*, 1538; 2°*, 1631; in Com. and 3°*, 2345 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 80.)

Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s Change of Name B. No. 28 (Mr. *Snetsinger*). 1°*, 707; 2°*, 945; in Com. and 3°*, 1775 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 57.)

ORANGEDALE, MARGAREE, &c., MAIL CONTRACTS: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4365 (ii).

ORDER, QUES. OF, MEMBER QUOTING PREVIOUS DEBATE: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 827 (i).

—— (Mr. *Speaker*) 1381 (i).

ORWELL (BRUSH WHARF) PREVENTIVE OFFICER, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1301 (i).

—— CUSTOMS SUB-COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1742 (i).

"OTONABEE," DREDGE, DISMISSAL, ENGINEER: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 259 (i).

—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Hughes*) 1774 (i).

OTTAWA, ARNPRIOR AND PARRY SOUND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737 (ii).

Ottawa Gas Co.'s B. No. 102 (Mr. *Belcourt*). 1°*, 1983; 2°*, 2347 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2927 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 74.)

OTTAWA PUBLIC BUILDINGS, SIDEWALKS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4948 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 5037 (ii).

Ottawa and Gatineau Ry. Co.'s B. No. 109 (Mr. *Champagne*). 1°*, 2475 (i); 2°*, 2778; in Com. and 3°*, 2927 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 58.)

OTTAWA AND GATINEAU RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4736, 4738 (ii).

OTTAWA AND RAINY RIVER RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737; in Com., 5517 (ii).

Ottawa and New York Ry. Co. *See* "ONTARIO PACIFIC."

"OUR LADY OF THE SNOWS": M. to adjn. Hse. (Mr. *Davin*) 1546 (i).

—— RUDYARD KIPLING'S POEM: Quotation (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com. of Ways and Means, 1428 (i).

OWEN SOUND AND COLLINGWOOD HARBOURS, EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 796 (i).

OYSTER CULTURE: in Com. of Sup., 2551 (i).

PACIFIC CABLE, GOVT. ACTION: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4109 (ii).

—— POSTAL SERVICE, ALLOWANCES TO MAIL CLERKS: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 2417 (i).

PACIFIC-YUKON ROUTE, SURVEYS: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1375 (i).

PAINTINGS, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3708.

PARIS EXHIBITION, 1900, CAN. REPRESENTATION: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 3508 (i).

PARLIAMENT GROUNDS, REPAIRING WALKS: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 5037 (ii).
PARLIAMENT, OPENING: Mess. by Black Rod, 1.
——— PROROGATION: Intimation (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 5542 (ii).
Patents. *See* "MYCENIAN MARBLE CO."
Patent Act Amt. B. No. 120 (Mr. *Fisher*). 1°, 3234; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 3722 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 25.)
'PATENT RECORD": in Com. of Sup., 2107 (i).
PATENTS FOR WIRE FENCES, NUMBER GRANTED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 2882 (ii).
PEARS AND PEACHES: in Com. of Ways and Means, 4132, 4133 (ii).
PEMBROKE SOUTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737 (ii).
PENETANGUISHENE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, VACANCY: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 261 (i).
PENITENTIARIES: in Com. of Sup., 1668 (i), 2794, 4740, 4774, 4798, 4987 (ii).
PENSION ACT. *See* "MOUNTED POLICE."
PERSONAL EXPLANATION *re* PROP. TARIFF CHANGES: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 175 (i).
——— *re* CAN. SUGAR REFINERY: Remarks (Mr. *Quinn*) 270 (i).
——— "GLOBE'S" ATTACK ON SPEECH ON DISALLOWANCE (Mr. *McInnes*) 709 (i).
——— SPEECH AT TONAWANDA (Mr. *Charlton*) 914 (i).
——— HENRY'S AND ROTHWELL'S PROMOTIONS (Mr. *Sproule*) 1901 (i).
——— PAR. IN MONTREAL "GAZETTE," PREFERENTIAL CLAUSE (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 2657 (ii).
——— PAR. IN MAN. "FREE PRESS" *re* MOTIONS ON ORDER PAPER (Mr. *Davin*) 2886 (ii).
——— QUEBEC BRIDGE (Mr. *Choquette*) 4205 (ii).
——— *See* "PRIVILEGE," &C.
Petroleum Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 139 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbiniere*). 1°*, 4204; 2°* and in Com., 4719; 3°*, 4724 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 20.)
PETROLEUM, REFINED, REDUCTION OF DUTY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Moore*) 828 (i).
PHILLIPSBURG RY. AND QUARRY CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737 (ii).
PHOTOGRAPHS &C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3475.
PICKETT, G. R., OAK POINT LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3669 (ii).
PIERS, &C., ANNAPOLIS CO., REPAIRS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 486, 487 (i).
Pilots (Quebec and Montreal) incorp. B. No. 67 (Mr. *Guay*). 1°*, 1373; 2°*, 1573 (i); in Com., 3539, 3704; 3°*, 3705 (ii).
——— REFUND OF FEES: M. (Mr. *Guay*) 4734 (ii).
PINPLATS BARGES, REGISTRATION: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 921 (i).
PIRATE HARBOUR POST OFFICE, CLOSING: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1028 (i).
PLEBISCITE BILL, PREMIER'S PROMISE TO INTRODUCE: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3505 (ii).
POACHING BY AMERICANS, DEEP SEA FISHERIES: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1375 (i).
POINT AU BARIL LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER, APPNMT: Ques. (Mr. *McCormack*) 266 (i).
POINT TUPPER STATION AGENT, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 788 (i).
POIRIER, T., DISMISSAL: Ques. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 1027 (i).
PONTIAC COUNTY, DROWNED LANDS, CLAIMS UNSETTLED: Ques. (Mr. *Poupore*) 3869 (ii).
PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737, 4738 (ii).
PORTAGE DU FORT AND BRISTOL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737; in Com., 5520 (ii).
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE POST OFFICE, CHANGE OF SITE: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 2883 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 2589 (i), 4950 (ii).
——— GOVT. BUILDINGS, CHANGE OF SITE: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 262 (i).
PORT COLBORNE PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4948 (ii).
PORT HAWKESBURY TO BROAD COVE RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4738; in Com., 5521 (ii).
PORT MULGRAVE AND CANSO, GUYSBORO', PORT HOOD MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 2793, 4998 (ii).
PORT STANLEY HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, EXPENDITURE, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Ingram*) 837 (i).
——— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 4966 (ii).
POST OFFICE:
ANNAPOLIS CO. MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 1989 (i).
——— MAIL ROUTE, PETITION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 3237 (ii).
——— MAIL SERVICE, PAYMENT TO GEO. BROWN: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 572 (i).
——— POSTMASTER, APPNMT. AND DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 567 (i).
——— D. G. RIORDAN, AMOUNT OF BONDS: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 3235 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 485 (i).
ANNAPOLIS ROYAL AND LIVERPOOL MAIL ROUTES, CONTRACTS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mills*) 2446 (i).
——— POSTMASTER, MR. WEST'S APPNMT.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mills*) 2001 (i).
ASHCROFT AND BARKERVILLE MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 2416 (i).
ATHABASCA AND MACKENZIE RIVER MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 2421 (i).
AYLMER WEST, POSTMASTER PRICE, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 794, 795 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Ingram*) 1663 (i).
BEAR ISLAND POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 672.
——— MORGAN, MICHAEL: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 672 (i).
BEAUHARNOIS POSTMASTER, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 572 (i).
——— AND COUNTY ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 268 (i).
BRANTFORD FREE POSTAL DELIVERY: M. for Ret* (Mr. *Clancy*) 3537 (ii).
CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATIONS, APPNMTS. TO P.O. DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Spoule*) 2564 (i).
COBOURG POSTMASTER, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 1306 (i).
——— AND COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, CHARGES AGAINST: M. for copy* (Mr. *Cameron*) 2020 (i).
CONSERVATIVE NEWSPAPERS, DELIVERY: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 918 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

CONTRACTS CANCELLED SINCE JULY, 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Cameron*) 1664 (i).

DANVILLE AND ST. CAMILLE MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Ives*) 3538 (ii).

DISMISSALS. *See* general heading.

DOBSON, WM., TATAMAGOUCHE POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1541 (i).

EAST BAY (C.B.) POST OFFICE, REMOVAL: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4366 (ii).

ELGIN, EAST AND WEST, MAIL CONTRACTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Ingram*) 837 (i).

ESQUIMALT POST OFFICE, APPNMT. OF TELEGRAPH OPERATOR: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1985 (i).

FITCH BAY POSTMASTER, CHANGE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Moore*) 3868 (ii).

FLETCHER, INSPECTOR, REP.: M for copy* (Mr. *Davin*) 2021 (i).

"GAZETTE" AND "STAR," FREE POSTAGE FROM MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 3841 (ii).

GRUNDY, ERNEST, LATE POSTMASTER AT DUCK LAKE: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 3870 (ii).

HOLT AND MOUNT ALBERT MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 795 (i).

INSPECTORS, CREATION OF NEW OFFICERS: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Cameron*) 1664 (i)

JUBILEE POSTAGE STAMPS: Ques. (Mr. *Gibson*) 2654.

KARSDALE POST OFFICE, COMPLAINTS AGAINST POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 916 (i).

KELLEY, MISS, WINDSOR P.O. EMPLOYEE: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 920 (i).

KINGSTON POSTMASTER, APPNMT. AND SUPERANNUATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3738 (ii).

——— Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3740, 3865 (ii).

——— MR. SHANNON'S, SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2653 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3058 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3738 (ii).

KOOTENAY MAIL SERVICE, ON M. TO ADJN.: Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 5540 (ii).

LIVERPOOL POST OFFICE, PAR. MONTREAL "GAZETTE": Personal Explanation (Mr. *Henderson*) 5542 (ii).

MCINTYRE'S LAKE AND SYDNEY LAKE MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Haley*) 3741 (ii).

MCMANUS, ROBERT, LATE POSTMASTER AT NORTHFIELD, B.C., CHARACTER: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 2879.

MAGDALEN ISLANDS WINTER MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 789 (i).

MAIL CONTRACTS IN N.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 1025 (i).

MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2790, 5083 (ii).

——— CONTRACTS: in Com. of Sup., 5083 (ii).

MAIL SUBSIDIES AND SS. SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 2790, 4994; conc., 5419 (ii).

MAPLE BAY POST OFFICE, CLAIMS OF WM. BEAUMONT: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 4364 (ii).

MELOCHEVILLE POSTMASTER, STAMP SALE: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2418 (i).

MERCIER, WILFRID, INVESTIGATION AT POST OFFICE, VALLEYFIELD: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2448.

MAGDALEN ISLANDS WINTER MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1027 (i).

MARSH HILL (ONT.) POSTMASTER, APPNMT. OF G. G. KING: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 261, 268, 483 (i).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Foster*) 1663 (i).

MERRICK, P.O. INSPECTOR, NEGLECT OF DUTIES: Ques. (Mr. *Pettet*) 2409 (i).

MOUNT ALBERT AND HOLT MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 795 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

MURRAY BAY AND ST. PAUL MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 263 (i).

MURRAY BAY WHARF AND MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 340 (i.)

NANAIMO AND COMOX MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3720 (ii).

NEWBURG AND KINGSTON MAIL CONTRACTS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Wilson*) 1748 (i).

NORTH PERROTT POST OFFICE, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 485 (i).

——— POSTMASTER, MR. SPURR'S APPNMT.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mills*) 1998 (i).

OAK BAY MILLS, P.O., CLOSING: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McAlister*) 1663 (i).

ODESSA POSTMASTER, NAME, RECOMMENDATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 266 (i).

ORANGEDALE, MARGAREE, &c., MAIL CONTRACTS: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4365 (ii).

OTTAWA AND BROCKVILLE MAIL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 4106 (ii).

PACIFIC POSTAL SERVICE, ALLOWANCES TO MAIL CLERKS: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 2417 (i).

P.E.I. MAIL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Martin*) 1560 (i).

PIRATE HARBOUR POST OFFICE, CLOSING: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1028 (i).

POSTMASTER GENERAL'S REP.: Presented (Mr. *Mulock*) 2970 (ii).

POSTMASTERS' SALARIES, INCREASE: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 787 (i).

POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 1721, 2066 (i), 2790, 4417, 5059, 5083, 5110, 5264; conc., 5431 (ii).

——— ADMINISTRATION, APPNMT. OF INSPECTORS, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Cameron*) 492 (i).

QU'APPELLE MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS AND CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1079 (i).

RIORDAN, D. G., POSTMASTER AT ANNAPOLIS, AMOUNT OF BONDS: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 3235 (ii).

ST. ANDREW'S P. O. (N.S.) REP. RESPECTING LATE FIRE: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3235 (ii).

ST. AUBERT AND ST. PAMPHILE MAIL CONTRACT, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3235 (ii).

ST. CHARLES AND ST. GERVAIS MAIL CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3721 (ii).

ST. PAUL AND MURRAY BAY MAIL CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 263 (i).

SADOWA POSTMASTER, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2123 (i).

SASKATOON AND BATTLEFORD AND ONION LAKE MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1633 (i).

SASKATCHEWAN MAIL SERVICE, REGULARITY OF DELIVERY: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1634 (i).

SHUBENACADIE AND DEAN MAIL CONTRACT: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1663 (i).

STRATFORD STREET LETTER-BOX SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 2126 (i).

STRATHROY POST OFFICE, TENDERS AND CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 797 (i).

SUNNY BRAE AND MELROSE MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1027 (i).

TOTTENHAM AND ATHLONE MAIL CONTRACTS, CANCELLATION: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) 3537 (ii).

U. S. AND CAN. MAIL REGULATIONS, WTHDRWLS. BEFORE DELIVERY; Ques. (Mr. *Britton*) 1635 (i).

VALLEYFIELD MAIL SERVICE, DELAY IN TRANSIT: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1743 (i).

——— POSTMASTER, APPNMT. OF E. DION: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2418 (i).

——— APPNMT., &c.: (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2568 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
VIRGINIA POST OFFICE (N.S.): Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 485 (i).
—— Mr. BANK'S APPNMT.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mills*) 1999 (i).
WINTER MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2293 (i).
YOUNG'S COVE POST OFFICE (N.S.): Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 485 (i).
[*See* "PUBLIC WORKS," &c.]

Post Office Act further Amt. B. No. 29 (Mr. *Mulock*). 1°, 3676; 2° and in Com., 4500; in Com., 4725, 5372, 5531, 5537; 3°*, 5539 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 26.)

POST OFFICE DEPT., ADMINISTRATION, APPNMT. OF INSPECTORS, &C.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Cameron*) 492.
—— INSPECTORS, CREATION OF NEW OFFICERS: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Cameron*) 1664 (i).
—— MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTS: in Com. of Sup., 5083 (ii).
POTVIN, PETER, APPNMT. AND DISMISSAL AT BYNG INLET: Ques. (Mr. *McCormack*) 263 (i).
POULIOT, MR., LATE M. P., DECEASED: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 5184 (ii).

Presbyterian Church of Can. Temporalities Fund B. No. 18 (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°*, 707; 2°*, 785; in Com. and 3°*, 1936 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 94.)

PREVENTIVE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2493 (i), 5002, 5013, 5040 (ii).
PRICE, DAVID N., APPNMT. AS POSTMASTER AT AYLMER WEST: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 794, 795 (i).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND:
BELLE RIVER BREAKWATER, EXTENSION; Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 918 (i).
—— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Martin*) 2445 (i).
CASCUMPEC BUOY SERVICE, TENDERS AND CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1742 (i).
COAL BORING IN P.E.I., VOTE IN ESTIMATES: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 796 (i).
CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 2731 (ii).
DISMISSALS. *See* general heading.
GOVT. OF P.E.I., CLAIMS AGAINST FEDERAL GOVT.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Macdonald*) 1662 (i).
HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE, CONSTRUCTION: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Macdonald*) 1664 (i).
—— SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 3843 (ii).
KNIGHT'S POINT BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 2730.
LOBSTERS, EXTENSION OF CLOSE SEASON: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *McLennan, Inverness*) 4769.
MCDONALD, DANL., SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 786 (i).
MCDONALD, CAPT. JOHN N., CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 791 (i).
MCDONALD, G. APPNMT., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, P.E.I.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2125 (i).
MURRAY HARBOUR BUOY SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1029 (i).
—— HARBOUR-MASTER, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2216 (i).
ORWELL (BRUSH WHARF) PREVENTIVE OFFICER, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*, 1301 (i).
—— CUSTOMS SUB-COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1742 (i).
"PRINCE EDWARD," DREDGE, CHARGES AGAINST CAPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 792 (i).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—*Con.*
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RY.; in Com. of Sup., 3843, 3854 (ii).
—— MAIL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Martin*) 1560.
RYS. IN P.E.I.: M. for Ret., (Mr. *Martin*) 2051 (i).
SOUTHPORT, BELFAST, &C., PROP. RY.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Martin*) 1657, 2043 (i).
STANLEY BRIDGE AND P.E.I. RY., PETS. *re* CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 2881 (ii).
SUMMERSIDE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 2731 (ii).
TIGNISH WHARF, DUES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3057 (ii).
VERNON RIVER BRIDGE, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR: Ques. Mr. *Martin*) 786 (i).
WEST POINT WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2730 (ii).
WOOD ISLAND HARBOUR, DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 792 (i).
[*See* "POST OFFICE," "PUBLIC WORKS," &c.]
PRINCE ALBERT BRANCH C.P.R., PAR. IN PRINCE ALBERT "ADVOCATE": Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) 2657 (ii).
—— SHERIFF, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 667 (i).
PRINCE EDWARD CO., PREVENTIVE OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Pettet*) 491 (i).
PRINTING DAY BOOKS, PORTS OF ENTRY: in Com. of Sup., 2562 (i).
PRINTING GOVT. NOTES, STAMPS, &C., TENDERS AND CONTRACTS: M. for copies* (Mr. *Foster*) 546 (i).
—— *See* "AMERICAN BANK NOTE."
PRINTING, SEL. COM.: List of Members, 664 (i).
—— ADDITION OF NAMES: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2476 (i).
—— 2ND REP. OF COM., CONC.: M. (Mr. *Gibson*) 4364 (ii).
PRINTING AND STATIONERY DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 1669 (i), 4830 (ii).
PRIVATE BILLS PETS., EXTENSION OF TIME: M. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 838, 1665 (i.)
—— MISCELLANEOUS, SEL. COM: List of Members, 663 (i).
—— REF. TO COM.: M. (Mr. *Fraser, Guysboro'*) 1227.
PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS, SEL. COM.: List of Members, 661 (i).
PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF, DUTY ON FARM IMPLEMENTS: on Mr. Chairman's Ruling (Mr. *Davin*) 2126 (i).
—— PAR. IN "WITNESS" *re* MR. FAIRLIE'S LETTER (Mr. *Davin*) 2656 (ii).
—— REP. OF SPEECH IN "GLOBE" (Mr. *Craig*) 3672.
—— SENATE AND I.C.R. EXTENSION TO MONTREAL (Mr. *Sutherland*) 5038 (ii).
—— *See* "NEWSPAPER CRITICISMS," &C.
PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 1978, 2066 (i), 4830 (ii).
PROCEDURE, QUES. OF, MEMBERS ADJOURNING DEB.: Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 167, 178 (i).
PROROGATION: Intimation (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 5542 (ii).
Provincial Courts Judges Act Amt. B. No. 40 (Mr. *Davies*). 1°*, 4204; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 4724 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 33.)
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS, SEL. COM.: List of Members, 664.
—— AND AUDITOR GEN.'S REPS.: M. (Mr. *McMullen*) 838 (i).

PUBLIC BILLS, &c., ON M. TO ADJN. HSE. : Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 555 (ii).
——— NOS. 2 AND 3, REP. FROM SELECT COM. : M. (Mr. *Casey*) to place on Order Paper, 3500 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Casey*) 4500 (ii).
PUBLIC BUILDINGS ERECTED IN DOM., &c. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Lister*) 492 (i).
——— MAN., UNSETTLED CLAIM OF PROV. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRiviere*) 546 (i).
PUBLIC HEALTH : in Com. of Sup., 2202, 2226 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS :
ARCHITECTS, DRAUGHTSMEN, &c., SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 4660 (ii).
BELLE RIVER BREAKWATER (P. E. I.) EXTENSION : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 918 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Martin*) 2445 (i).
BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 2577, 2758, 4880, 5278 (i); conc., 5456 (ii).
CAMPOBELLO BREAKWATER, REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 2565 (i).
"CHALLONER," DREDGE, WORK DONE AT MIDLAND : Ques. (Mr *Bennett*) 2601 (i).
CLERKS OF WORKS, GOVT., PRIVATE PRACTICE : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1306 (i).
DISMISSALS. *See* general heading.
DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 2780, 4889 (ii).
DRYDEN, SHEPPARD, APPNMT. AS CARETAKER GOVT. BUILDINGS : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 261 (i).
FIRE IN WEST DEPTL. BLOCK, DOCUMENTS DESTROYED, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 919 (i).
——— TEMPORARY REPAIRS TO ROOF, TENDERS : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1301 (i).
FORTIFICATION WALLS. QUEBEC, REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1303 (i).
GRAND RIVER WHARF, CONSTRUCTION, NON-PAYMENT OF LABOURERS : Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 790 (i).
GROSSE ISLE WHARF EXTENSION : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 919 (i).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS : in Com. of Sup., 2577 (i), 2719, 4885, 4958 (ii).
HARBOURS AND BREAKWATERS, EXPENDITURES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Penny*) 3971 (ii).
HARRISON RIVER RAPIDS, IMPROVEMENTS : Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 1744 (i).
IONA WHARF (N.S.) PAYMENT FOR REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 489, 921, 1740 (i).
LANGEVIN BLOCK, CONTRACTOR'S CLAIMS : Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 791 (i).
L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 670 (i).
"LILY," TUG, PAYMENTS BY GOVT. FOR HIRE : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1809 (i).
MACKENZIE, LATE ALEX., MONUMENT : in Com. of Sup., 2789 (ii).
MABOU HARBOUR BUOY SERVICE, TENDERS, &c. : Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4206, 4226 (ii).
MARGARETSVILLE PIER, TENDERS FOR CONTRACT, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 3868 (ii).
MURRAY HARBOUR BUOY SERVICE, CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1029 (i).
——— HARBOUR-MASTER, APPNMT. : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2216 (i).
NATIONAL MUSEUM, ERECTION AT OTTAWA : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Belcourt*) 2426 (i).
NICOLET RIVER BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Boisvert*) 671 (i).
NORTH RIVER, ST. ANN'S, BUILDING OF WHARF : Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 1740 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
NORTH HARBOUR, ASPY BAY, HARBOUR OF REFUGE : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bethune*) 2445 (i).
OWEN SOUND AND COLLINGWOOD HARBOURS, EXPENDITURES : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 793 (i).
PARLIAMENT GROUNDS, REPAIRING WALKS : Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 5037 (ii).
PIERS, &c., ANNAPOLIS CO., REPAIRS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 486, 487 (i).
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE GOVT. BUILDINGS, CHANGE OF SITE : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 262 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 2883 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 2589 (i), 4950 (ii).
PORT STANLEY HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, EXPENDITURE, &c. : M. for Stmt * (Mr. *Ingram*) 837 (i).
"PRINCE EDWARD," DREDGE, CHARGES AGAINST CAPT. : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 792 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT : in Com of Sup., 1735 (i), 4893 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 2577 (i), 2719, 2758, 4865, 5280, 5416; conc., 5456 (ii).
QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, ARREARS OF INTEREST : Ques. (Mr. *Penny*) 4471 (ii).
RENTS, REPAIRS, FURNITURE, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2551, 2592, 2652 (i), 4885 (ii).
RICHELIEU RIVER, WORKS AT BELOEIL, TENDERS : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1302 (i).
ROADS AND BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 2787, 4974 (ii).
ST. ANDREW'S RAPIDS IMPROVEMENTS : Ques. (Mr. *Jameson*) 1987 (i).
ST. ANNE, ANNAPOLIS, CARETAKER : Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 5009 (ii).
SUSSEX (N.B.) GOVT. BUILDINGS, APPNMT. OF CARETAKER : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 261 (i).
TELEGRAPH LINES IN B.C., GOVT. AND C.P.R. : Ques. (Mr. *Bostock*) 2576 (i).
TEMPORARY CLERKS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4891 (ii).
TIGNISH WHARF, DUES COLLECTED : Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3957 (ii).
WESTMINSTER AND BURRARD INLET TELEPHONE CO. : Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 2420 (ii).
WHARFS, REPAIRS TO : in Com of Sup., 2295 (i).
WOOD ISLAND HARBOUR, DREDGING : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 792 (i).
PUGWASH WHARF (N.S.) : in Com. of Sup., 2719 (ii).
PULP WOOD, EXPORT DUTY : Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2021, 2297 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 3872 (ii).
PUTTY : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3478 (ii).
QU'APPELLE MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS AND CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1079 (i).
QUARANTINE : in Com. of Sup., 2262 (i), 4860, 4991 (ii).
——— MAN. AND N.W.T. : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3238 (ii).
——— REGULATIONS, U. S., MAN., N. W. T. AND B. C. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 797, 822 (i).
——— IN VICTORIA : Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 1554 (i).
——— STATION, B. C. : Remarks (Mr. *Fisher*) 2405 (i).
QUEBEC :
ABITTIBI AND GRAND LAC INDIANS : Ques. (Mr. *Poupore*) 2568 (i).
AMQUI MUNICIPALITY, REIMBURSEMENT FOR RY. CROSSING : Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 1541 (i).
ARTILLERY GARRISON BATTERY NO 3, DISBANDMENT : Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 340 (i).
BAIE DE CHALEURS RY., GOVT. CONTROL : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 261 (i).
——— GOVT. AID : Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1541 (i).
——— OPERATING : in Com. of Sup., 5133; conc., 5452.

QUEBEC—*Con.*

BAZINET, MR., OF JOLIETTE, AND QUEBEC ELECTIONS; Ques. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 1634 (i).

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, COLLECTOR OF TOLLS, APPNMT. &c.: M. for O. C.* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1663 (i).

—— APPNMT. OF COLLECTOR OF TOLLS: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 2419 (i).

—— DRAINAGE CULVERTS: in Com. of Sup., 5131, 5270.

BELGIAN CONSULATE, MONTREAL, CLAIMS OF IMPORTERS: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1542 (i).

BERTHIER PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 5280.

—— WHARF, DUES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 262 (i).

BIBAUD, AZARIE, EMPLYMT. IN HOUSE OF COMMONS: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3509 (ii).

BIRD ROCK ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, RESCUE OF WOMAN: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 3508 (ii).

BRODEUR, S. A., COLLECTOR OF TOLLS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2419 (i).

CACOUNA, EXTENSION OF WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4958 (ii).

CAP SAUMON LIGHTHOUSE, CONSTRUCTION, AMT. PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 264 (i).

—— CONTRACT FOR FIREWOOD: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 264 (i).

CHAMBLY CANAL, TENDERS FOR STONE: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 1028 (i).

—— EXPENDITURE ON CULVERT: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 1028 (i).

CHAMPAGNE, L N., ESQ., Member for Wright: introduced, 86 (i).

CHATEAUGUAY AND NORTHERN RY., RIVIERE DE PRAIRIES BRIDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 567 (i).

CIVIL SERVANTS, COUNTY OF GASPÉ, COMMISSION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Chauvin*) 1451 (i).

CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 2553 (i).

DANIS, A. D., CONTRIBUTIONS TO PENSION FUND: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2421 (i).

—— EXCISE COLLECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2422 (i).

DISMISSALS. *See* general heading.

EAST RICHELIEU VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737; in Com., 5520 (ii).

FISHERY BULLETINS, DISTRIBUTION ON GASPÉ COAST, DELAY: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 4008 (ii).

FORTIFICATION WALLS, QUEBEC, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1303 (i).

GAME LAWS, QUEBEC: Remarks (Mr. *Poupore*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4022 (i).

GASPÉ LIGHTSHIP-KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2126 (i).

GRAND TRUNK RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY (VICTORIA BRIDGE): prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4738; in Com., 5536 (ii).

GRENVILLE CANAL, ENLARGEMENT, TENDERS FOR CONTRACT: M. for copy* (Mr. *Clancy*) 2447 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 3875, 3919 (ii).

GILL-NETS AND SEINES, NEW REGULATIONS, &c. (MONTREAL DISTRICT): Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 4372 (ii).

GROSSE ISLE WHARF, EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 919 (i).

GUITE, J. F., ESQ., Member for Bonaventure: introduced, 87 (i).

GULF SHORE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737 (ii).

ILLICIT STILLS, SEIZURE AT PONT ROUGE: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1373 (ii).

QUEBEC—*Con.*

ILLICIT SEIZURE FROM GEO. VÉZINA: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1374 (i).

INLAND REVENUE LAWS, INFRACTION: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1544, 1637 (i).

IRVIN, JOHN, APPNMT. AS LIGHTSHIP-KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1633 (i).

ISLE PERROT WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4958 (ii).

JOLIETTE AND ST. JEAN DE MATHA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737; in Com., 5513 (ii).

LACHINE CANAL, ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 3874, 4823, 4892, 5113, 5150; conc., 5451 (ii).

LAPRAIRIE, ICE PIERS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2735 (ii).

LAVOIE, DR. NAP., STR. "LA CANADIENNE": Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1304 (i).

—— EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1544 (i).

NANTEL, BRUNO, REVISING OFFICER, TERREBONNE: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 491 (i).

MAGDALEN ISLANDS SAVINGS BANK: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 789 (i).

—— WINTER MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1027 (i).

MARCOTTE, F. A., ESQ., Member for Champlain: introduced, 950 (i).

MERCIER, JOS., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1633, 1835 (i).

MILITIA CAMPS, EASTERN TOWNSHIPS BATTALIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Stenson*) 3668 (ii).

MONTFORD COLONIZATION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4738 (ii).

MONTMAGNY POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5281 (ii).

MONTREAL INLAND REVENUE, COST OF COLLECTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3057 (ii).

—— POST OFFICE, NEW SKYLIGHTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4947 (ii).

OKA INDIANS, REMOVAL: in Com. of Sup., 4073 (ii).

OTTAWA AND GATINEAU RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4736, 4738 (ii).

PEMBROKE SOUTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737 (ii).

PENETANGUISHENE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, VACANCY: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 261 (i).

PHILLIPSBURG RY. AND QUARRY CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737 (ii).

PONTIAC COUNTY, DROWNED LANDS, CLAIMS UNSETTLED: Ques. (Mr. *Poupore*) 3869 (ii).

PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737, 4738 (ii).

PORTAGE DU FORT AND BRISTOL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737; in Com., 5520 (ii).

POULIOT, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASED: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 5184 (ii).

RIMOUSKI PIER: in Com. of Sup., 4963 (ii).

RIVER MATANE FISHING LEASES: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 4207 (ii).

RIVIÈRE DES PRAIRIES BRIDGE, CHATEAUGUAY AND NORTHERN RY.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 567 (i).

RIVIÈRE DU LIEVRE WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 4958.

RIVIÈRE STE. ANNE DE LA PÉRADE: in Com. of Sup., 2736 (ii).

STE. ANNE DE SOREL, ICE PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 4963 (ii).

ST. JOHNS MILITARY SCHOOL, CONTRACTS FOR DRUGS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 1028 (i).

—— TENDERS FOR COAL AND WOOD: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 1029 (i).

—— COAL OIL SUPPLY: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 1028 (i).

—— POSTMASTER'S DEFALCATION: in Com. of Sup., 5213 (ii).

QUEBEC—*Con.*

ST. LAWRENCE AND ADIRONDACK RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737 (ii).

ST. LAWRENCE CHANNEL, DEEPENING, &c., AMTS. PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Ellis*) 3867 (ii).

—— NORTH CHANNEL, STRAIGHTENING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3862 (ii).

—— RIVER REACHES: in Com. of Sup., 3862 (ii).

—— REMOVAL OF ROCKS: in Com. of Sup., 2736 (ii).

—— SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 2576 (i), 4865.

ST. MARTIN'S POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 4941, 5273.

ST. NICHOLAS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4959 (ii).

ST. PIERRE RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 5150 (ii).

SOULANGES CANAL, APPNMT. OF ARBITRATORS; Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1540 (i).

—— CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 3861, 5123 (ii).

SOUTH SHORE RY. CO., GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. *Boisvert*) 671 (i).

SUBSIDIES TO RY. CO.'S, DISALLOWANCE OF QUEBEC ACT: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 670 (i).

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES, RIMOUSKI DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 4476 (i).

TERREBONNE REVISING OFFICER, AMT. PAID: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 491 (i).

UNITED COUNTIES RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737 (ii).

VALLEYFIELD COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 926 (i).

VEZINA, GEO., AND INLAND REVENUE LAWS: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1637, 2569 (i).

VICTORIA BRIDGE, MONTREAL, GRANT OF $300,000: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 342, 489 (i).

[*See* "POST OFFICE," "PUBLIC WORKS," &c.]

Quebec Bridge Co.'s B. 80 (Mr. *Langelier*). 1°*, 1538; 2° m., 1631; 2°, 2021 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2776 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 69.)

QUEBEC BRIDGE, SPEECH OF MAYOR OF QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1637 (i).

—— AND HON. MR. DOBELL: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1989 (i), 3056 (ii).

—— Personal Explanation (Mr. *Choquette*) 4205 (ii).

QUEBEC AND GASPÉ BASIN, COMMUNICATION BETWEEN: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 790 (i).

—— MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 4995 (ii).

QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, ARREARS OF INTEREST: Ques. (Mr. *Penny*) 4471 (ii).

QUEBEC LAND SLIDE, APPNMT. OF COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3719 (ii).

Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Ry. Co.'s B. No. 69 (Mr. *Langelier*). 1°*, 1373; 2°*, 1573 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3465 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 59.)

QUEBEC ORIENTAL RY. SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 918 (i).

Queen's Birthday (Perpetual Holiday) Commemoration B. No. 94 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*). 1°*, 1738 (i).

—— Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3583; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4373; (Mr. *Clarke*) 4499 (ii).

QUEEN'S OWN RIFLES, REP. OF COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 1739 (i).

QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE AND N. W. MOUNTED POLICE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 97 (i).

—— MILITIA CONTINGENT: M. (Mr. *Domville*) to adjn. Hse., 838.

QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILLEE, MILITIA CONTINGENT: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 973, 1083 (i).

—— LIST OF OFFICERS: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) 1901 (i).

—— PAR. IN QUEBEC "CHRONICLE": Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 3239 (ii).

—— in Com. of Sup., 4861, 4994 (ii).

—— COLONIAL TROOPS: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 922 (i).

—— M. to adjn. Hse. (Mr. *McNeill*) 946 (i).

—— MILITIA APPNMTS.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) 1083 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 3236 (ii).

—— CELEBRATION, VOTE FOR MILITIA: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 2658 (ii).

—— MONUMENT, COMMEMORATIVE: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 3508 (ii).

—— BANK HOLIDAY: Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 4372 (ii).

—— CELEBRATION OF DAY: M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4736 (ii).

—— MR. LAURIER'S EXPENSES: conc., 5456 (ii).

QUESTIONS RULED OUT OF ORDER (Mr. *Speaker*) 569 (i), 3972 (ii).

RAILWAYS:

AMQUI MUNICIPALITY, REIMBURSEMENT FOR RY. CROSSING: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 1541 (i).

BAIE DE CHALEURS RY., GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1541 (i).

—— GOVT. CONTROL: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 261 (i).

—— PAR IN HALIFAX "CHRONICLE": Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) 3420 (ii).

B. C. SOUTHERN RY. CO.'S CHARTER, DISALLOWANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 340 (i).

—— DISALLOWANCE OF PROVINCIAL ACT; prop. Res. (Mr. *McInnes*) 493 (i).

—— EXPIRATION OF TIME FOR DISALLOWANCE: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3234 (ii).

—— PERSONAL EXPLANATION (Mr. *McInnes*) 709 (ii).

CHATEAUGUAY AND NORTHERN RY., RIVIERE DES PRAIRIES BRIDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 567 (i).

COLUMBIA AND WESTERN RY. CO.'S B., RETURN OF FEES: Remarks (Mr. *Bostock*) 4651 (ii).

CROW'S NEST PASS RY. AND C. P. R., CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 568 (i).

—— PLANS DEPOSITED BY C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 267 (i).

DISMISSALS. *See* general heading.

HILLSBOROUGH RIVER BRIDGE, CONSTRUCTION: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 1664 (i).

—— SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 3848 (ii).

N. S. CENTRAL RY., BALANCE OF SUBSIDIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 3868 (ii).

N. S. SOUTHERN RY., SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 4471 (ii).

PRINCE ALBERT BRANCH, C. P. R., PAR. IN PRINCE ALBERT "ADVOCATE": Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) 2657 (ii).

RAILWAYS AND CANALS, DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Blair*) 492 (i).

RYS. IN P. E. I.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Martin*) 2051 (ii).

REGINA, LONG LAKE, &c., RY. CO., GOVT. SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1637 (i).

RIVIERE DES PRAIRIES BRIDGE, CHATEAUGUAY AND NORTHERN RY.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 567 (i).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

SOUTH SHORE RY. CO., GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. *Boisvert*) 671 (i).

SOUTHPORT, BELFAST, &c., PROP. RY.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Martin*) 1657, 2043 (i).

STANLEY BRIDGE AND P.E.I. RY., PETS. *re* CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 2881 (ii).

SUBSIDIES TO RY. CO.'S, DISALLOWANCE OF QUEBEC ACT: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 670 (i).

SUBSIDIES (DOM.) TO RYS., &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Martin*) 177, 269, 948 (i).

SUNNY BRAE RY., SUBSIDY BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1542 (i).

VICTORIA BRIDGE, MONTREAL, GRANT OF $300,000: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 342, 574 (i).

—— O. C. *re* GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 489 (i).

—— SUBSIDY; prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4738; in Com., 5536 (ii).

[*See* "I. C. R.," "SUBSIDIES," &c.]

Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 4 (Mr. *Maclean*). 1°, 88; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 1058 (i).

Ry. Act further Amt. B. No. 8 (Mr. *Gibson*). 1°, 95; 2°, 673 (i).

Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 16 (Mr. *Casey*). 1°, 565; 2° m., 1775; 2°, 1798 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3545 (ii).

Ry. Employees, &c., Safety B. No. 2 (Mr. *Casey*). 1°, 87; 2° m., 608; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 614, 1299 (i); in Com., 3560 (ii).

—— **B. No. 3** (Mr. *Maclean*). 1°, 87; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 621 (i).

RY. COMMISSION, CREATION OF: Ques. (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) 3976 (ii).

Ry. Freight Rates Regulation B. No. 63 (Mr. *Reid*). 1°, 1299 (i).

RY. LANDS AND TAXATION: prop. Res. (Mr. *Oliver*) 3513 (ii).

Ry. Passenger Tickets (Sale) Act Amt. B. No. 121 (Mr. *Beattie*). 1°, 3234 (ii).

Ry. Return Fare Tickets (Sale) B. No. 11 (Mr. *McLennan, Glengarry*). 1°, 257; 2°, 695 (i).

RYS., CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES, SEL. COM.: List of Members, 661 (i).

RYS. AND CANALS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 1928, 1937, (i), 4830 (ii).

—— in Com. of Sup., 3745, 3843, 4823, 4892, 5113, 5150, 5269, 5288; conc., 5451 (ii).

RAINY RIVER CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 2773 (ii).

RAT PORTAGE PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 5285 (ii).

RECIPROCAL RIGHTS, BELGIUM AND GERMANY: Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 1462 (i).

—— TARIFF: Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 1456 (i).

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s Acts Amt. B. No. 122 (Mr. *Davin*). 1°*, 3418; 2°*, 3705; in Com. and 3°*, 4051 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 60.)

REGINA, LONG LAKE, &c., RY. CO., GOVT. SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1637 (i).

RENTS, REPAIRS, FURNITURE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2592, 2652 (i), 4885 (ii).

REPORTS PRESENTED:

AUDITOR GENERAL (Mr. *Fielding*) 169 (i).

CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINERS (Mr. *Fisher*) 1072 (i).

—— LIST (Mr. *Fisher*) 178 (i).

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY (Mr. *Fisher*) 5542 (ii).

INDIAN AFFAIRS (Mr. *Sifton*) 492 (i).

INLAND REVENUE (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbiniere*) 86.

INSURANCE CO.'S ABSTRACT STATEMENT, 492 (i).

LIBRARY OF PARLT., JOINT REP. (Mr. *Speaker*) 6 (i).

MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 667 (i).

MOUNTED POLICE, COMMISSIONER'S REP. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1072 (i).

PENITENTIARIES (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 3679 (ii).

POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. *Mulock*) 2970 (ii).

PRINTING AND STATIONERY (Mr. *Fisher*) 5542 (ii).

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS (Mr. *Fielding*) 169 (i).

RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. *Blair*) 492 (i).

SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. *Fisher*) 178 (i).

SHAREHOLDERS AND CHARTERED BANKS (Mr. *Fielding*) 492 (i).

TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 6 (i).

TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETS. (Mr. *Paterson*) 257 (i).

Restigouche Ry. and Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 104 (Mr. *Domville*). 1°*, 2051; Order for 2°, 2166; M. wthdn., 2348 (i); 2°, 2777; wthdn., 4119 (ii).

Restigouche and Victoria Ry. Co.'s B. No. 99 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*). 1°*, 1899; 2° m., 2347, 2450 (i); 2°, 2776; M. for Com., 3909, 4046; in Com. and 3°*, 4050 (ii).

REWARDS FOR SAVING LIFE: in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i).

RICE: in Com. of Ways and Means, 4130 (ii).

RICE FACTORIES IN CAN., NUMBERS, &c.: (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 258 (i).

Richelieu and Lake Memphremagog Ry. Co.'s B. No. 49 (Mr. *Belcourt*). 1°*, 1171; 2°*, 1232; in Com., 2450 (i); 3°*, 2775 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 61.)

RICHELIEU RIVER, WORKS AT BELŒIL, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1302 (i).

—— GUIDE PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 2735 (ii).

RIDEAU HALL GROUNDS AND RENEWALS: in Com. of Sup., 2592, 2613 (i), 4885, 5132, 5274 (ii).

RIVER KAMINISTIQUIA: in Com. of Sup., 2577 (i).

RIVER MATANE FISHING LEASES: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 4207 (ii).

River St. Clair Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s B. No. 41 (Mr. *Ingram*). 1°*, 1072; 2°*, 1202; in Com. and 3°*, 1936 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 70.)

RIMOUSKI PIER: in Com. of Sup., 4963 (ii).

RIORDAN, D. G., POSTMASTER AT ANNAPOLIS, AMOUNT OF BONDS: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 3235 (ii).

RIVIÈRE DU LIEVRE WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 4958.

RIVIÈRE DES PRAIRIES BRIDGE, CHATEAUGUAY AND NORTHERN RY.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 567 (i).

RIVIÈRE STE. ANNE DE LA PERADE: in Com. of Sup., 2736 (ii).

ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 2787, 4974.

ROBERTSON, MR., A. B., DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 2879 (ii).

ROSS, JAMES, SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 786 (i).

ROSS, DAVID, POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Martin*) 1057 (i).

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS, ERROR IN PRINTING: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 1231 (i).

ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS, COM. FROM GOV. GEN.'S SEC.: Read (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 2471 (ii).

Royal Victoria Life Insurance Co.'s B. No. 27 (Mr. *Quinn*). 1°*, 707; 2°*, 785; in Com. and 3°*, 1631 (i). (60-61 *Vic., c.* 81.)

RUTHERFORD, J. G., ESQ., Member for Macdonald: introduced, 1990 (i).

STE. PHILOMÈNE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL AND COMPLAINTS AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Brown*) 3256 (ii).

STE. ANNE DE SOREL, ICE PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 4963 (ii).

ST. ANDREW'S POST OFFICE (N.S.), REP. RESPECTING LATE FIRE: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3235.

ST. ANDREW'S RAPIDS IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Jameson*) 1987 (i).

ST. ANNE, ANNAPOLIS, CARETAKER: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 5009 (ii).

ST. AUBERT AND ST. PAMPHILE MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT, TENDERERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3235 (ii).

ST. CHARLES AND ST. GERVAIS MAIL CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3721 (ii).

ST. JOHN HARBOUR (N.B.): in Com. of Sup., 2732 (ii).

ST. JOHNS MILITARY SCHOOL, CONTRACTS FOR DRUGS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 1028 (i).

——— TENDERS FOR COAL AND WOOD: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 1029 (i).

——— COAL OIL SUPPLY: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 1028 (i).

——— POSTMASTER'S DEFALCATION: in Com. of Sup., 5213 (ii).

St. Lawrence and Adirondack Ry. Co.'s B. No. 71 (Mr. *Bergeron*). 1°*, 1373; 2°*, 1573; in Com., 2450 (i); 3°*, 2775 (ii). (60-61 *Vic., c.* 62.)

ST. LAWRENCE AND ADIRONDACK RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737 (ii).

ST. LAWRENCE, NORTH CHANNEL, STRAIGHTENING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3862 (ii).

——— CHANNEL, DEEPENING, &C., AMTS. PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Ellis*) 3867 (ii).

——— CANALS, IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2423 (i).

——— NORTH CHANNEL, TENDERS: M. for copy* (Mr. *Clancy*) 3538 (ii).

——— REMOVAL OF ROCKS: in Com. of Sup., 2736 (ii).

——— RIVER REACHES: in Com. of Sup., 3862 (ii).

——— (UPPER) SALE OF ISLANDS: Ques. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 1026 (i).

——— PURCHASE: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1080 (i).

——— SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 2576 (i), 4865 (ii).

ST. MARTIN'S Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 4941, 5278 (ii).

St Mary's River Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 42 (Mr. *Dyment*). 1°*, 1072; 2°*, 1202 (i).

ST. NICHOLAS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4959 (ii).

ST. PAUL INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, FURNISHING SUPPLIES: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Davin*) 1664 (i).

ST. PAUL AND MURRAY BAY MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 263 (i).

ST. PETER'S CANAL, DANIEL B. STONE'S DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 2414 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 5274 (ii).

ST. PIERRE RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 5150 (ii).

ST. STEPHEN'S AND MILLTOWN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4738 (ii).

ST. THOMAS COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 267 (i).

ST. VALERIEN DE RIMOUSKI POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 2566 (i).

SADOWA POSTMASTER, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 2123 (i).

SALMON (B. C.) SOLD IN BRITISH MARKET, QUALITY, &C.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Maxwell*) 1991 (i).

——— FRESH: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3418 (ii).

SALT, &C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3713 (ii).

"SAN PEDRO," REMOVAL OF WRECK: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1376 (i).

SASKATCHEWAN BRIDGE, EDMONTON: in Com. of Sup., 2787 (ii).

——— ELECTION, MEMBER'S SEAT CHALLENGED: M. (Mr. *Davin*) to adjn., 950, 970 (i).

Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 953. (Ruling) 959; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 956, 964; (Mr. *Laurier*) 956, 965; (Mr. *Foster*) 957; (Mr. *Davies*) 959; (Mr. *Casey*) 960, 964; (Mr. *Davis*) 963; (Mr. *Quinn*) 967; (Mr. *Flint*) 969, 970 (i).

Saskatchewan Ry. and Mining Co.'s Revival, &c., Change of Name B. No. 53 (Mr. *Lount*). 1°*, 1172; 2°*, 1232 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3465; Proceedings null and void: M. (Mr. *Sutherland*) 5537, 5539 (ii).

——— MAIL SERVICE, REGULARITY OF DELIVERY: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1634 (i).

SASKATOON AND BATTLEFORD AND ONION LAKE MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1633 (i).

SATURDAY SITTINGS: M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4472, 5157 (ii).

SAUGEEN RESERVE, INDIAN AGENT CROWE: Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 340, 573, 788 (i).

SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3874, 5117 (ii).

Savings Banks in Prov. of Quebec Act Amt. B. No. 147 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*). 1°*, 5009; 2°* and in Com., 5157; 3°*, 5372 (ii). (60-61 *Vic., c.* 9.)

SCHOOLS (INDIAN) DAY, BOARDING AND INDUSTRIAL: in Com. of Sup., 4076, 5000 (ii).

——— N. W. T., CLERICAL ASSISTANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4061 (ii).

——— UNORGANIZED TERRITORIES, SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 5002 (ii).

——— *See* "MANITOBA SCHOOL QUES."

SCHOMBERG AND AURORA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737; in Com., 5513 (ii).

SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 2295 (i).

SCOVIL, WALTER B., PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 2415 (i).

SCRAP IRON: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3583, 3630.
SCREWS, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3655 (ii).
SCRIP FOR HALF-BREEDS, CLAIMS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davis*) 3530 (ii).
SCUGOG ISLAND INDIAN AGENT, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1081 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Hughes*) 3524 (ii).
SECRETARY OF STATE:
APPOINTMENTS BY PRESENT GOVT.: M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1055 (i).
——— BY LATE GOVT.. RECOMMENDATION OF TREASURY BOARD: M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1639 (i).
BAZINET, MR., AND QUEBEC ELECTIONS: Ques. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 1634 (i).
CIVIL SERVANTS, COMMISSIONERS TO INVESTIGATE CHARGES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Foster*) 546 (i).
——— COUNTY OF GASPE, COMMISSION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Chauvin*) 1451 (i).
CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINERS: in Com. of Sup., 2066 (i), 4828 (ii).
——— EXAMINERS REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fisher*) 1072 (i).
——— LIST: Presented (Mr. *Fisher*) 178 (i).
COMMISSIONERS TO INVESTIGATE PARTISAN OFFENCES: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 1462 (i).
COMMISSION *re* CHARGES AGAINST OFFICIALS: in Com. of Sup., 2215 (i); conc., 5429 (ii).
COPYRIGHT ACT (1889) GOVT. ACTION: Ques. (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 1542 (i).
GOVT. COMMISSIONERS AND POLITICS: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1543 (i).
MCCARTHY ACT, CLAIMS UNDER IN PROVENCHER: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2421 (i).
NANTEL, BRUNO, REVISING OFFICER, TERREBONNE; Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 491 (i).
NEWFOUNDLAND AND CONFEDERATION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Martin*) 2433 (i).
PRINTING AND STATIONERY DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 1669 (i), 4830 (ii).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fisher*) 5542 (ii).
QUEBEC LAND SLIDE, APPNMT. OF COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3719 (ii).
SECRETARY OF STATE'S DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 1926, 2068 (i).
——— REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fisher*) 178 (i).
SUPERANNUATION, UNDER PRESENT ADMINISTRATION: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2447 (i).
——— JULY 1896, TO APRIL, 1897, NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 667 (i).
TERREBONNE REVISING OFFICER, AMT. PAID: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 491 (i).
WALSH, C. J., CLAIMS ON LEEWARD ISLANDS GOVT.: Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3676 (ii).
SEED GRAIN, AMOUNTS OWING BY FARMERS, MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1989 (i).
——— DISTRIBUTION IN MAN. AND N.W.T., AMOUNTS OUTSTANDING: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2215 (i).
SELECT STANDING COMS.: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 6 (i).
——— COM. TO PREPARE LISTS: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) 480 (i).
——— Lists Presented (Mr. *Laurier*) 661 (i).
——— NAMES ADDED: M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2051, 2408 (i).
SENATE: in Com. of Sup., 2090 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Act further Amt. B. No. 132 (Mr. *Davies*). Res. prop. 3671; 1° of B. 3730; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4258 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 13.)
SESSIONAL AND EXTRA CLERKS: in Com. of Sup., 2103 (i).
SHANNON, MR. JAMES, POSTMASTER AT KINGSTON, SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2653, 3740, 3865 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3058 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3738 (ii).
SHIELDS, JAMES, LACHINE CANAL EMPLOYEE, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 923 (i).
SHIPPEGAN HARBOUR (N.B.): in Com. of Sup., 4958.
SHIRTS AND SHIRT WAISTS: in Com. of Ways and Means, 4180 (ii).
SHOE TACKS: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3652 (ii).
SHOVELS, &C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3703 (ii).
SHUBENACADIE AND DEAN MAIL CONTRACT: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1663 (i).
SIFTON, HON. C., Member for Brandon: introduced, 3 (i).
SILVER AND LEAD SMELTING IN B.C., PAYMENTS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 3146 (ii).
"SILVER SPRAY" AND "MARY GROVER," " SEIZURE: Ques. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 927, 1300 (i).
SIX NATIONS INDIAN OFFICE, DISMISSALS: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Clancy*) 3538 (ii).
SKATES, &C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3696, 4152 (ii).
SMALL-POX AMONG IMMIGRANTS, WINNIPEG (1893): in Com. of Sup., 4083 (ii).
SMITH'S FALLS PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4949 (ii).
SMITH, F. X., LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER AT GASPÉ, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1305 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2446 (i).
SMITH, JOHN L., FISHERY OVERSEER, DISMISSAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2446 (i).
SMUGGLING BY AMERICAN WHALERS, MACKENZIE RIVER BASIN: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 794 (i).
——— INTO YUKON COUNTRY: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1375 (i).
SNETSINGER, J. D., ESQ., Member for Cornwall and Stormont: introduced, 3 (i).
SOCKS, &C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 4187 (ii).
SOULANGES CANAL, APPNMT. OF ARBITRATORS: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1540 (i).
——— CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 3861, 5123.
——— SECTIONS 4, 5, 6, 7, TENDERS, CONTRACTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 311, 488 (i).
——— SECTION 12: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 489 (i).
——— SECTION 12, TENDERS FOR CONTRACT: M. for copies* (Mr. *Clancy*) 2447 (i).
——— SECTIONS 4, 5, 6, 7, TENDERS, &C.: M. for copy* (Mr. *Clancy*) 2447 (i).
Southern Counties Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 110 (Mr. *Préfontaine*). 1°*, 2654; 2°*, 2778; in Com. and 3°*, 4050 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 56.)

SOUTHPORT, BELFAST, &c., PROP. RY.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Martin*) 1657, 2043 (i).
SOUTH SHORE RY. CO., GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. *Boisvert*) 671 (i).
SPEAKER, DEP., SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 2091 (i).
——— AND ELECTIONS: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2218 (i).
SPECIAL COMMITTEE, REDUCTION OF QUORUM; M. (Mr. *Casey*) 1227 (i).
SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 4 (i).
SPENCE, JOHN, INLAND REVENUE, SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1079 (i).
SPIRITUOUS LIQUORS, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3352 (ii).
SPRINGS, AXLES, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3640 (ii).
STANDING ORDERS, SEL. COM.: List of Members, 663 (i).
STANLEY BRIDGE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Martin*) 1663 (i).
——— AND P. E. I. RY., PETS. *re* CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 2881 (ii).
STAPLES, INSPECTION OF: in Com. of Sup., 5058 (ii).
STATISTICAL YEAR-BOOK: in Com. of Sup., 2108 (i).
STATISTICS, GENERAL: in Com. of Sup., 2109 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 113 (Mr. *Davies*). 1°, 2796; 2° and in Com., 3721; 3°*, 3722 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 22.)
Steam Boilers. *See* "ENGINEERS."
STEREOTYPES, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3703.
STEWART, J., POSTMASTER, UPPER MUSQUODOBOIT, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 1542 (i).
STOCKHOLM EXHIBITION, WALTON JONES' APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1984 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 4859 (ii).
STOKER, WILLIAM, STATISTICAL SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 4859 (ii).
STRATFORD STREET LETTER-BOX SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 2126 (i).
STRATHROY CUSTOMS OFFICER, NAME, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 483 (i).
——— POST OFFICE, TENDERS AND CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 797 (i).
——— AND WESTERN COUNTIES RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737; in Com., 5818 (ii).
STRIP FENCING, &c.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3633 (ii).
Subsidies to Rys. Authorization B. No. 151 (Mr. *Blair*). Res. prop., 4736, 5158; in Com., 5361, 5478; 1°*, of B., 5529; 2°* and in Com., 5535; 3°, 5541 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 4.)
Deb. in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 5362, 5479; (Mr. *Bell*, *Pictou*) 5363; (Mr. *Sproule*) 5367, 5490; (Mr. *Mulock*) 5367; (Mr. *Davies*) 5368; (Mr. *Foster*) 5478; (Mr. *Casey*) 5486; (Mr. *Scriver*) 5495; (Mr. *Dupont*) 5497; (Mr. *Taylor*) 5502; (Mr. *Bostock*) 5504; (Mr. *McMullen*) 5504; (Mr. *Semple*) 5506; (Mr. *Bergeron*) 5506; (Mr. *Britton*) 5508; (Mr. *Oliver*) 5508 (ii).
SUBSIDIES. *See*
BROOKFIELD STATION (I.C.R.) AND EASTVILLE RY.
CAMPBELLTON AND GRAND FALLS, N.B.
CENTRAL RAILWAY CO. OF N.B.
CENTRAL RAILWAY (N.S.) AND LIVERPOOL, &c., RY.
COAST LINE RY.
COBOURG, NORTHUMBERLAND AND PACIFIC RY. CO.
DRUMMOND COUNTY RY. CO.
EAST RICHELIEU VALLEY RY. CO.
GRAND TRUNK RY. CO
GREAT NORTHERN RY. CO. (ST. JEROME, &c.)
——— RY. CO. (BRIDGE OVER OTTAWA RIVER).
GULF SHORE RY. CO.
INDIAN GARDEN (N.S.) &c., AND SHELBURNE RY.
IRONDALE, BANCROFT AND OTTAWA RY. CO.
JOLIETTE AND ST. JEAN DE MATHA RY.
KINGSTON, SMITH'S FALLS AND OTTAWA RY. CO.
MONTFORT COLONIZATION RY. CO.
NEPEAN POINT (OTTAWA) INTERCOLONIAL BRIDGE.
ONT. PACIFIC RY. CO.
OTTAWA, ARNPRIOR AND PARRY SOUND RY. CO.
——— AND GATINEAU RY. CO.
——— AND RAINY RIVER RY. CO.
PEMBROKE SOUTHERN RY. CO.
PHILLIPSBURG RY. AND QUARRY CO.
PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO.
PORTAGE DU FORT AND BRISTOL RY. CO.
PORT HAWKESBURY AND BROAD COVE RY.
ST. LAWRENCE AND ADIRONDACK RY. CO.
ST. STEPHEN'S AND MILLTOWN RY. CO.,
SCHOMBERG AND AURORA RY. CO.
STRATHROY AND WESTERN COUNTIES RY. CO.
SUNNY BRAE AND COUNTRY HARBOUR RY.
TILSONBURG, LAKE ERIE AND PACIFIC RY. CO.
UNITED COUNTIES RY. CO.
VICTORIA BRIDGE, MONTREAL.
WELSFORD AND GAGETOWN (N.B.) RY.
WINDSOR JUNCTION (I.C.R.) AND UPPER MUSQUODOBOIT RY.
SUBSIDIES (DOM.) TO RYS., &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Martin*) 177, 269, 948 (i).
——— DISALLOWANCE OF QUEBEC ACT: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 670 (i).
SUGAR: in Com. of Ways and Means, 4395 (ii).
——— CANDY: in Com. of Ways and Means, 4398 (ii).
——— CONFECTIONERY: in Com. of Ways and Means, 4398 (ii).
SULLIVAN, D. B., RELEASE FROM PRISON: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3583 (ii).
——— M. for Papers* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1663 (i).
SUMMERSIDE (P.E.I.) HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 2731 (ii).
Sunday Observance. *See* "LORD'S DAY."
Sun Life Assurance Co.'s B. No. 91 (Mr. *Rosamond*). 1°*, 1666; 2°*, 1937 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2776 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 82.)
SUNNY BRAE AND COUNTRY HARBOUR RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4738; in Com., 5521 (ii).
——— AND MELROSE MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1027 (i).
——— SUBSIDY BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 1542 (i).
SUPERANNUATIONS, CIVIL SERVICE: prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 551 (i).
——— JULY, 1896, TO APRIL, 1897, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 667 (i).
——— UNDER PRESENT ADMINISTRATION: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2447 (i).

Superannuation (C. S.) Act Abolition B. No. 9 (Mr. *Mulock*). Res., prop., 551 ; 1° of B., 169 ; 2° m., 552 (i).

—— **Act, &c., Amt. B. No. 136** (Mr. *Fielding*). M. for Comon Res., 3721 ; in Com., 4118 ; 1°* of B., 4119 ; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 5415 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 15.)

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES, RIMOUSKI DISTRICT : Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 4476 (ii).

Supreme Court (Ont.) Judges' B. No. 131 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*). 1°*, 3719 ; 2°, 4207 ; in Com., 4212 ; 3°*, 4719 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 34.)

SUPREME COURT, R. G. DAVIS'S SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 4986 (ii).

SURGICAL INSTRUMENTS : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3477 (ii).

SUSSEX (N.B.) GOVT. BUILDINGS, APPNMT. OF CARETAKER : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 261 (i).

SUPPLY :

[Only subjects which caused remark or discussion noted under this head.]

AMTS. AND REMARKS TO MS. FOR COM. : Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) Dismissal of A. McCallum, 1903 ; Duty on Farm Implements, 2054, 2131. Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) 2134 ; neg. (Y. 10, N. 121) 2178. Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) Mining Machinery and the Tariff, 2219 ; (Mr. *Cameron*) Winnipeg Industrial School, Rev. Fairlie's Dismissal, &c., 3301 ; (Mr. *Foster*) The Tariff Resolutions, 2407 ; (Mr. *Quinn*) Dismissals in Montreal, &c., 2572 (i) ; (Mr. *Foster*) Bank Note Contract, 2662 ; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2742 ; (Mr. *McMullen*) Bicycles as Baggage, 2743 ; (Mr. *Davin*) Duty on Coal Oil, 2744 ; (Mr. *Wallace*) Fast Atlantic SS. Service, 2767 ; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) Dismissals, 4009 ; (Mr. *Tisdale*) Dismissals, Land Office, Man., 4017 ; (Mr. *Gillies*) Micmac Indians, Medical Attendance, 4019 ; (Mr. *Poupore*) Game Laws, Quebec, 4022 ; (Mr. *Davin*) Dismissals, 4022 ; (Mr. *Sproule*) Mr. Dobbin's Dismissal, 4029 ; (Mr. *Davis*) Man. and North Western Ry. Co., 4766 ; (Mr. *McLennan, Inverness*) Close Season for Lobsters, 4769 ; (Mr. *Mills*) Bear River Obstructions, 4772 (ii).

MESS. FROM HIS EX. : Transmitting Estimates for 1897-98, 667 (i) ; Suppl., 4612 ; further Suppl., 5009 ; Suppl., 1896-97, 3742, 4008 (ii).

RES. (Mr. *Fielding*) FOR COM., 481 ; MS., 1903, 2054, 2131, 2219, 2301, 2476, 2572 (i) ; 2662, 2742, 4009, 4766 (ii).

IN COM. : 1666, 1912, 2066, 2179, 2226, 2407, 2492, 2576 (i) ; 2719, 2758, 2778, 3743, 3843, 3874, 3919, 4033, 4052, 4740, 4774, 4865, 5013, 5083, 5201, 5234, 5288, 5338 (ii).

COMMITTEE :

Administration of Justice. See "Justice."

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics :

Agricultural Societies, Aid to, 2109 (i).

Archives, 2106 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics—Con.

Bulletins and Reports, Distribution, 2118 (i).

Cold Storage, 2274 (i).

Creameries in N.W.T., 2179 (i).

Criminal Statistics, 2108 (i).

Dairying Service, 2119, 2180 (i).

Experimental Farms, 2109 (i).

General Statistics, 2109 (i).

Lafleur, John, Payment to, 4986 (ii).

North-west Exhibition (1894), Outstanding Accounts, 4859 (ii).

Patent Record, 2107 (i).

Public Health, 2202, 2226 (i).

Statistical Year-Book, 2108 (i).

Stockholm Exhibition, 4859 (ii).

Stoker, Wm., Statistical Services, 4859 (ii).

Charges of Management, 1666 (i).

Dominion Notes, Printing and Engraving, 5201 ; conc., 5455 (ii).

Civil Government :

Agriculture, 2088 (i).

Contingencies :

Agriculture, 2083 (i), 4832 (ii)

Auditor General, 2070 (i).

Customs, 2072 (i).

Inland Revenue, 4839 (ii).

Interior, 2068 (i).

Marine and Fisheries, 2087 (i), 4839 (ii).

Militia and Defence, 4831 (ii).

Post Office Dept., 2083 (i).

Privy Council Office, 2066 (i).

Secretary of State, 2063 (i).

Railways and Canals, 4830 (ii).

Trade and Commerce, 2087 (i).

Civil Service Examiners, 2066 (i), 4828 (ii).

Customs, 1730, 1989 (i).

Finance, 1721 (i).

Geological Survey, 1981 (i).

Governor General's Secretary's Office, 1666 (i).

High Commissioner's Office, 1982 (i).

Indian Dept., 1709 (i), 4828 (ii).

Inland Revenue, 1721, 1902 (i), 4839 (ii).

Interior, 1669, 1701 (i), 4837 (ii).

Justice, 1666 (i), 4833 (ii).

Penitentiaries Branch, 1668 (i).

Marine and Fisheries, 1730 (i), 4839 ; conc., 3730 (ii).

Militia and Defence, 1669, 1926 (i), 4831.

Mounted Police, 1709 (i).

Postmaster General's, 1721, 2066 (i), 5059, 5077, 5110, 5265 (ii).

Privy Council Office, 1978 (i), 4830 (ii).

Public Printing and Stationery, 1669 (i) 4830, (ii).

Public Works, 1735 (i), 4893 (ii).

Railways and Canals, 1928, 1937 (i).

Secretary of State, 1926 (i).

Trade and Commerce, 1981 (i).

Collection of Revenues :

Dominion Lands, 4082 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Collection of Revenues—Con.
Canals:
Williamsburg, retiring allowance, Mr. Hickey, 5277 (ii).
Culling Timber, 2509 (i), 4864, 5058 (ii).
Customs:
British Columbia, 2561 (i).
North-west Territories, 2560 (i).
Nova Scotia, 2552 (i).
Ontario, 2554 (i).
Prince Edward Island, 2552 (i).
Preventive Service, 5002, 5013, 5040 (ii).
Quebec, 2553 (i).
Excise:
Extra Duty Pay, large distilleries, &c., 2493.
Frechette, Achille, technical translation, 5057.
Preventive Service, 2493 (i).
Salaries, Officers, Inspectors, &c., 2492 (i).
Travelling, rent, fuel, &c., 2507 (i).
Post Office (Outside Service):
General Vote, 5264; conc., 5431 (ii).
Mail Service, 2790, 5083 (ii).
Public Works, 5416 (ii).
Railways:
Baie des Chaleurs, operating, 5133; conc., 5452 (ii).
I. C. R., Commission of Investigation, salaries, 5254 (ii).
——— Injured Passengers, 5276 (ii).
Staples, Inspection of, 5058 (ii).
Weights, Measures, Gas, &c.:
Rent, Fuel, &c., 2551 (i).
Salaries of Officers, Inspectors, &c., 2511 (i).
——— Inspectors of Gas, 2551 (i).
Culling Timber. See "Collection of Revenues."
Dominion Lands, 4080, 5423 (ii).
Dominion Police, 2090 (i).
Customs. See "Collection of Revenues."
Excise. See "Collection of Revenues."
Fisheries:
Canned Lobsters, Scientific Examination, 4999 (ii).
Fisheries Reference to Privy Council, 4999 (ii).
Fishing Licenses to U.S. Vessels, Issuing, conc., 5427 (ii).
Oyster Culture, 2551 (i).
Salaries, Inspectors, &c., 2407.
Geological Survey, 4072 (ii).
Govt. of North-west Territories:
Schools, Clerical Assistance, &c., 4081 (ii).
——— Unorganized Territories, 5002 (ii).
Immigration:
Agents and Employees in Can., salaries, 3743, 4033 (ii).
——— Great Britain, salaries, 4044 (ii).
——— Foreign Countries, salaries, 4062 (ii).
Contingencies, 4066 (ii).
General Expenses, further Amount, 4992 (ii).
SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Indians:
General:
Inspectors, salaries, &c., 4078 (ii).
Manitoba and N.W.T.:
Schools, Day, Boarding and Industrial, 4076, 5000 (ii).
Supplies, 4073 (ii).
Retiring Officers, Gratuities, 5006 (ii).
Sundries:
Oka Indians, removal, 4073 (ii)
Survey and Reserve Commission, 4076 (ii).
Justice, Administration of:
Circuit Allowances, Travelling Expenses, Judges, 4141 (ii).
Supreme Court, R. G. Davis's Salary, 4986 (ii).
Travelling Allowances, Judges, Man., 3731 (ii).
Legislation:
House of Commons:
Chapleau's New Poll-book, &c., 4843; conc., 5427 (ii).
Commission *re* Algoma Election, 4987, 5059; conc., 5451 (ii).
Contingencies, 2103 (i).
Deputy Speaker's Salary, 2091 (i).
Publishing Debates, 2105 (i).
Returning Officers, &c., Payments, 4990 (ii).
Salaries, 2102 (i).
Sessional and Extra Clerks, 2103 (i).
Voters' Lists, Printing, 2106 (i).
Library:
American History, Books on, 2106 (i).
Salaries, 2106 (i).
Senate:
Salaries and Contingencies, 2090 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service:
Agencies, Rents and Contingencies, 2294 (i).
Construction, &c., of Lights, 2294 (i).
Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 2293 (i).
Repairs to Wharfs, 2295 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions:
Baddeck and Iona, Grand Narrows and Irish Cove, 2791; conc., 5419 (ii).
Canada and Newfoundland, 4994 (ii).
Halifax and Newfoundland, 2790 (ii).
Quebec and Gaspé, 4995 (ii).
Port Mulgrave and Canso, Guysborough, Port Hood, 2793, 4998 (ii).
Victoria and San Francisco, 2791 (ii).
Marine Hospitals:
Marine Hospitals and Shipwrecked Seamen, 2296.
Militia:
Defence of Esquimalt, &c., conc., 5426 (ii).
Gratuities to Officers retired, 4993 (ii).
Military College, Kingston, 4802 (ii).
Monuments, Battlefields of Can., 4861 (ii.)
Queen's Diamond Jubilee, Militia Contingent, 4861, 4994 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Miscellaneous :
Arbitration, Dom., and Ont. and Quebec Accounts, 4082 ; conc., 5423 (ii).
Banff, Rocky Mountain Park, 5000 (ii).
Commission *re* Charges against Officials, 2215 (i) ; conc., 5429 (ii).
Litigated Matters, Dept. of Justice, 3863 (ii).
Interior, Deptl. Employees, Gratuities, 5001 (ii).
Macpherson, Dr., Gratuity to Widow, 4860 (ii).
Printing Day Books, Ports of Entry, 2562 (i).
Queen's Diamond Jubilee, Mr. Laurier's Expenses, conc., 5456 (ii).
Repatriation of French Canadians from Brazil, 4861 (ii).
Small-pox among Immigrants, Winnipeg (1893) 4083 (ii).
St. Johns, Que., Postmaster's Defalcation, 5213 (ii).
Tariff Inquiry, additional Vote, 5205 (ii).
Mounted Police, 4078 (ii).
Ocean and River Service :
Can. Registry of Shipping, 2290 (i).
Govt. Steamers, Maintenance and Repairs, 2290 (i).
Obstructions in Navigable Rivers, 2293 (i).
Rewards for Saving Life, 2290 (i).
Tidal Service, &c., 2291 (i).
Winter Mail Service, 2293 (i).
Wrecks, Investigation into, 2290 (i).
Penitentiaries, 2794 (ii).
Commission of Investigation, Expenses, 4798.
Gratuities to Retiring Officers, 4987 (ii).
Kingston, 2795, 4740, 4774 (ii).
Post Office. See "Collection of Revenues."
Public Works—Capital :
Buildings :
Fire Protection, Electric Lighting, &c., conc., 5429 (ii).
Ottawa, Western Deptl. Block, 4893 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers :
River Kaministiquia, 2577 (i).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 2576 (i), 4865 (ii).
Public Works—Income :
Buildings :
British Columbia :
Victoria P.O., 2591 (i), 4956 (ii).
——— Drill Hall, 4956 (ii).
Manitoba :
Portage la Prairie P.O., 2589 (i), 4950 (ii).
Winnipeg Immigration Building, 4949 (ii).
Maritime Provinces generally, 2592 (i).
New Brunswick :
St. Martin's P.O., 4941, 5278 (i).
North-west Territories, 2589 (i).
Nova Scotia :
Kentville and Liverpool P.O., 4901 ; conc., 5432 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—
Buildings—*Con.*
Ontario, 2578 (i).
Alexandria Reformatory, 4949 (ii).
Kingston Drill Hall, 4948 (ii).
Ottawa Public Buildings, Sidewalks, &c., 4948 (ii).
——— Western Deptl. Block, 4880 (ii).
Port Colborne Public Building, 4948 (ii).
Rat Portage Public Building, 5285 (ii).
Smith's Falls Public Building, 4949 (ii).
Quebec :
Beauharnois Post Office, 5281 (ii).
Berthier Public Building, 5280 (ii).
Immigration Building, Louise Embankment, &c., 2577 (i).
Montreal P.O., New Skylights, &c., 4947 (ii).
Rents, Repairs, Furniture, &c.
Ottawa, Removal of Depts., &c., 4885 (ii).
Major's Hill Park, Ottawa, 2653 (ii).
Rents, Dom. Public Buildings, 2653 (i).
Rideau Hall Grounds and Renewals, 2592, 2613 (i), 4885 (ii).
Telephone Service, Ottawa, 2652 (i).
Dredging : 2780, 4889 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers :
British Columbia :
Columbia River Improvements, 4973 (ii).
Fraser River Improvements, 4973 (ii).
Manitoba, 2780, 4971 (ii).
Maritime Provinces generally, 2733 (ii).
New Brunswick, 4956 (ii).
Cape Tormentine Breakwater, 4958 (ii).
River St. John and Tributaries, 2733 (ii).
Shippegan Harbour, 4958 (ii).
St. John Harbour, 2732 (ii).
Nova Scotia, 4956 (ii).
Boularderie Wharf, 2719 (ii).
Judique Wharf, 2719 (ii).
Margaretsville Pier, 2719 (ii).
Pugwash Wharf, 2719 (ii).
Wallace Wharf, 2720 (ii).
Ontario, 2738 (ii).
Collingwood Harbour, 2758 (ii).
Fort Francis Lock, 4970 (ii).
Goderich Harbour, 2740 (ii).
Hilton and Markdale Wharf, 4966 (ii).
Honora Wharf, Manitoulin Island, 4964 (ii).
Port Stanley Harbour, 4966 (ii).
Rainy River Channel, 2773 (ii).
Toronto Harbour, 2739 (ii).
Prince Edward Island :
Knight's Point Breakwater, 2730 (ii).
Purchase of Wharfs, 4975 (ii).
Summerside Harbour, 2731 (ii).
West Point Wharf, 2730 (ii).
Quebec :
Cacouna, Extension of Wharf, 4958 (ii).
Gatineau River, East Bank, 4959 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—Con.
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Isle Perrot Wharf, 4958 (ii).
Laprairie, Ice Piers, &c., 2735 (ii).
Rimouski Pier, 4963 (ii).
River Richelieu, Guide Piers, 2735 (ii)
Rivière du Lièvre Works, 4958 (ii).
Riviere Ste Anne de la Parade, 2736 (ii).
Ste Anne de Sorel Ice Piers, 4963 (ii).
St. Lawrence River, Removal of Rocks, 2736 (ii).
St. Nicholas Wharf, 4959 (ii).
Roads and Bridges:
Bridge across Saskatchewan, Edmonton, 2787 (ii).
Maria St. Bridge, Ottawa, 4974 (ii).
Telegraph Lines:
Cape Beale and Carmenah (B.C.) alternative Lines, 2788 (ii).
Miscellaneous:
Architects, Draughtsmen, &c., salaries, 4890.
Monument, Late Alex. Mackenzie, 2789 (ii).
Temporary Clerks, &c., 4891 (ii).
Quarantine:
Cattle Quarantine, 2263 (i), 4860 (ii).
Tracadie Lazaretto, 2262 (i).
Tuberculosis, prevention of spreading, 4991 (ii).
Slaughter of Hogs, compensation, 2270.
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Hospital, 2263 (ii).
Railways and Canals:
Canals:
Beauharnois, 5131 (ii).
——— Drainage Culvert, 5270 (ii).
Cornwall, Enlargement, 3861, 5115 (ii).
Galops, Enlargement, 3862 (ii).
Grenville, Enlargement, 3875, 3919 (ii).
Lachine, Enlargement, 3874, 4823, 4892, 5113, 5150 (ii).
——— Jacques Cartier Basin, &c., conc., 5451 (ii).
North Channel, Straightening, &c., 3862 (ii).
Rideau, 5132, 5274 (ii).
St. Peter's, 5274 (ii).
St. Pierre River, 5150 (ii).
Sault Ste Marie, Construction, &c., 3874, 5117 (ii).
Soulanges Canal, Construction, 3861, 5123 (ii).
Trent Valley, Construction, 3863, 4825, 5126.
Welland, Superannuations, conc., 5454.
Railways:
Prince Edward Island Ry.:
Hillsborough Bridge, Survey, 3843 (ii).
Intercolonial Ry., 3745 (ii).
Dartmouth Branch, 5113 (ii).
Rolling Stock, 5269, 5288, 5338; conc., 5477 (ii).
Drummond Co. Ry., Rental for 9 months, 5457 (ii).
Land Damages, Claims, 3834; conc., 4421.

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Scientific Institutions:
Hydrographic Surveys, 2295 (i).
Meteorological Service, 2295 (i).
Toronto Observatory, 2295 (i).
CONCURRENCE:
Arbitration, Dom. and Ont. and Que. Accounts, 5423 (ii).
Baddeck and Iona, Grand Narrows and Irish Cove Mail Subsidy, 5419 (ii).
Bay des Chaleurs Ry., 5452 (ii).
Chapleau's Patent Poll-book, 5427 (ii).
Commission *re* Algoma Election, 5451 (ii).
——— Charges against Public Officials, 4429 (ii).
Customs, Outside Service, 5446 (ii).
Defence of Esquimalt, &c., 5426 (ii).
Dom. Notes, Printing, &c., 5455 (ii).
Fire Protection, Electric Lighting, &c., 5429 (ii).
Fishing Licenses to U.S. Vessels, 5427.
I.C.R., Drummond Co. Ry., Rental, 5457 (ii).
——— Land Damages, 5421 (ii).
——— Rolling Stock, additional, 5477 (ii).
Kentville and Liverpool P.O., 5432 (ii).
Lachine Canal, Jacques Cartier Basin, &c., 5451.
Marine and Fisheries Dept., 3730 (ii).
Post Office, Outside Service, 5431 (ii).
Public Works, 5416, 5456 (ii).
Quebec Public Buildings, 5456 (ii).
Queen's Diamond Jubilee, Hon. Mr. Laurier's Expenses, 5456 (ii).
Travelling Expenses, County Judges, Man., 3731.
Welland Canal, Superannuations, 5454 (ii).

Supply B. (Grant for Jubilee Militia Contingent) No. 111 (Mr. *Fielding*). 1°* and 2°*, 2662; 3°*, 2742 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 1.)

Supply B. (Public Service) No. 150 (Mr. *Fielding*). 1°*, 5478; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 5535 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 2.)

TANNING BARK: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3711.
TARIFF, THE: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 717 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 2476 (i), 2800 (ii).
——— AND HER MAJESTY'S GOVT. *re* PREFERENTIAL CLAUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 2880 (ii).
——— DATE OF INTRODUCTION AND N.S. ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 268 (i).
——— INQUIRY, ADDITIONAL VOTE: in Com. of Sup., 5205 (ii).
——— CONFIDENTIAL EVIDENCE: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 793 (i).
——— TRANSLATION OF EVIDENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 793 (i).
——— *See* "WAYS AND MEANS."
TEA AND COFFEE: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3718.
TELEGRAPH LINES IN B.C., GOVT. AND C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Bostock*) 2567 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 2788 (ii).
TELEPHONE SERVICE, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 2652.

Temiscouata Ry. Co.'s B. No. 58 (Mr. *Domville*). 1°*, 1126; 2°*, 1409; in Com., 2450 (i); 3°*, 2775 (ii). (60-61 *Vic., c.* 63.)

TEMPORARY CLERKS, &C., PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 4891 (ii).

TENNANT, J. F., SUB-COLLECTOR AT GRETNA, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 3503 (i).

TERREBONNE REVISING OFFICE, AMT. PAID: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 491 (i).

TERRITORIAL EXHIBITION, OUTSTANDING DEBTS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1374 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 4859 (ii).

THIBAULT, CHAS., SUPERANNUATION, CONTRIBUTIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Parmalee*) 1306 (i).

THORNE, JAMES H., COMPLAINT AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 916 (i).

THORNVILLE (N.S.) POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL OF D. COVERT: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 917 (i).

THOUSAND ISLANDS, PURCHASE FROM INDIAN DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1080 (i).

TIDAL SERVICE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i).

TIGNISH WHARF, DUES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 3057 (ii).

TILSONBURG, LAKE ERIE AND PACIFIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737 (ii).

TIMOTHY SEED AND CLOVER, IMPOSITION OF DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Bazinet*) 793 (i).

Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. No. 36 (Mr. *MacPherson*). 1°*, 914; 2°*, 1058 (i); wthdn., 3144 (ii).

TORONTO HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 2739 (ii).

——— OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 2295 (i).

TOTTENHAM AND ATHLONE MAIL CONTRACTS, CANCELLATION: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) 3537 (ii).

TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 2262 (i).

TRADE AND COMMERCE:

ANDERSON, GEO., APPNMT. AS AGENT TO JAPAN: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 3339 (ii).

ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE. *See* "ATLANTIC."

BEET-ROOT SUGAR, BOUNTY PAID: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 264 (i).

BELGIAN CONSULATE, MONTREAL, AND TARIFF RES.: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 1460 (i).

——— CLAIMS OF IMPORTERS: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1542.

BOUNTIES ON IRON. *See* "IRON AND STEEL."

CHEESE AND BUTTER FACTORIES, WTHDRL. OF GOVT. AID: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Martin*) 3538 (ii).

EXPORT DUTY ON PULP WOOD: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 3872 (ii).

——— Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2021, 2297 (i).

EXPORT DUTY ON LOGS, PAR. IN MIDLAND "FREE PRESS": Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 4105 (ii).

EXPORT OF BACON, HAMS, &C., PROP. B.: wthdrl. (Mr. *Henderson*) 4341 (ii).

IRON, PIG, CAN. MANUFACTURE AND BOUNTY: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 97 (i).

PACIFIC CABLE, GOVT. ACTION: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4109 (ii).

RECIPROCAL RIGHTS, BELGIAN AND GERMANY: Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 1462 (i).

——— TARIFF: Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 1456.

TRADE AND COMMERCE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 1881, 2067 (i).

TRADE AND COMMERCE—*Con.*

TRADE AND COMMERCE DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 6 (i).

TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETS.: Remarks (Mr. *McMillan*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4014 (ii).

TRADE WITH THE EMPIRE, ADJNMT. OF HSE: M. (Mr. *McNeill*) 4101 (ii).

TREATY WITH JAPAN: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 1985 (i).

TRUSTS AND COMBINES, EXISTENCE IN CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 1986 (i).

VENEERS, IMPORTS BY DOM. ORGAN CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1545 (i).

[*See* "CUSTOMS," "WAYS AND MEANS," &C.)

Trade Mark and Design Act Amt. B. No. 45 (Mr. *Lount*). 1°, 1072 (i).

Trade and other Labels B. No. 46 (Mr. *Lount*). 1°, 1075 (i).

Trail Creek and Columbia Ry. Co.'s B. No. 31 (Mr. *Gibson*). 1°*, 838; 2°*, 945 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3909 (ii). (60-61 *Vic., c.* 65.)

Trans-Canadian Ry. Co.'s Change of Name B. No. 22 (Mr. *Davis*). 1°*, 707; 2°*, 785 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4050 (ii). (60-61 *Vic., c.* 65.)

TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES, JUDGES, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 3731 (ii).

TRAVELLERS' BAGGAGE: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3706 (ii).

TRAVELLING, RENT, FUEL, &C., EXCISE OFFICERS: in Com. of Sup., 2507 (i).

TREATY BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND JAPAN: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 1985 (i).

TREMBLAY, C. E., POSTMASTER AT LES EBOULEMENTS, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 263 (i).

TRENT VALLEY CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of of Sup., 3863, 4825, 5126 (ii).

——— BALSAM LAKE SECTION, DISMISSAL OF TIMBER INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 259 (i).

——— ROSEDALE WORKS, DISMISSAL OF FOREMAN: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 259 (i).

Trial by Jury in N.W.T. B. No. 137 (Mr. *Davies*). 1°*, 4203; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 4724 (ii). (60-61 *Vic., c.* 32.)

TRUSTS AND COMBINES, EXISTENCE IN CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 1986 (i).

TUBERCULOSIS, PREVENTION OF SPREADING: in Com. of Sup., 4991 (ii).

TUSCARORA INDIANS, DISMISSAL OF PHYSICIAN: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Clancy*) 3529 (ii).

——— APPNMT.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Clancy*) 3538 (ii).

TYNAN, JOHN, LACHINE CANAL EMPLOYEE, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 923 (i).

UNITED COUNTIES RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4737 (ii).

UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE: 1909, 2137, 2139, 2140 (i).

UNITED STATES AND CAN. MAIL REGULATIONS, WTHDRLS. BEFORE DELIVERY: Ques. (Mr. *Britton*) 1635 (ii).

——— COAL, BITUMINOUS, IMPORTS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Roche*) 3538 (ii).

UNITED STATES, COAL OIL, IMPORTS IN TANK CARS: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 796 (i).
——— COASTING LAWS, CAN. AND U. S.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Britton*) 3525 (ii).
——— DEEP-SEA FISHERIES, POACHING BY AMERICANS: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1375 (i).
——— FISHING LICENSES TO U. S. VESSELS: on conc., 5427 (ii).
——— FISH TRAPS USED BY AMERICANS IN B. C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1376 (i).
——— ILLEGAL FISHING IN B. C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Prior*) 2446 (i).
——— QUARANTINE REGULATIONS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 792, 822 (i).
——— SMUGGLING BY WHALERS, MACKENZIE BASIN: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 794 (i).
——— SMUGGLING INTO YUKON COUNTRY: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1375 (i).
——— WHALERS IN MACKENZIE RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 4735 (ii).

VACANCIES: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
VALLEYFIELD COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 926 (i).
——— MAIL SERVICE, DELAY IN TRANSIT: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1743 (i).
——— POSTMASTER, APPNMT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2417, 2566 (i).
VELVETS, &C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 4465 (ii).
VENEERS, IMPORTS BY DOM. ORGAN CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 1545 (i).
VERMOUTH, &C.: in Com. of Ways and Means, 3357.
VERNON RIVER BRIDGE (P.E.I.) CUSTOMS COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 786 (i).
VETERANS OF 1837-38, PENSION CLAIMS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Cameron*) 3537 (ii).
VÉZINA, GEO., AND INLAND REVENUE: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1637 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2569 (i).
VICTORIA (B.C.) DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 4956.
——— in Com. of Sup., 2591 (i), 4956 (ii).
VICTORIA BRIDGE, MONTREAL, GRANT OF $300,000: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 342, 574 (i).
——— O. C. *re* GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 489 (i).
VICTORIA CO. (N.S.) IONA WHARF, PAYMENT FOR REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 489 (i).
VICTORIA AND SAN FRANCISCO MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 2791 (ii).
Victoria, Vancouver and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 100 (Mr. *Maxwell*). 1°*, 1899; 2°*, 2347 (i).
VIRGINIA POST OFFICE (N.S.): Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 485.
——— MR. BANK'S APPNMT.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mills*) 1999 (i).
VOLUNTEERS OF 1866, RECOGNITION OF SERVICES, &C., BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3056 (ii).
VOTERS' LISTS (PRINTING): in Com. of Sup., 2106 (i).
Voters' Lists B. No. 126 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*). 1°, 3581; 2°* and in Com., 3724; 3°*, 3729 (ii). (60-61 *Vic., c.* 12.)

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS, CHANGES: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 1452 (i).
——— ERROR IN PRINTING: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 1231 (i).

WALLACE WHARF (N.S.): in Com. of Sup., 2720 (ii).
WALPOLE ISLAND INDIANS, APPNMT. OF PHYSICIAN: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 787 (i).
——— DR. GEO. MITCHELL, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 927 (i).
WALSH, C. J., CLAIMS ON LEEWARD ISLANDS GOVT.: Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3676 (ii).
WARRANTS FOR WRITS OF ELECTION: Issued (Mr. *Speaker*) 1,420, 481 (i).
WATCH CASES: in Com. of Ways and Means, 4168 (ii).
WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF:
Res. for Com. (Mr. *Fielding*) 481 (i).
BUDGET, THE, Financial Stmnt. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1083, 1120 (i).
Deb. (Mr. *Foster*) 1172; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1232; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1258; (Mr. *McNeill*) 1308; (Mr. *Davin*) 1322; (Mr. *Oliver*) 1356; (Mr. *Craig*) 1359; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1409; (Mr. *Richardson*) 1427; (Mr. *Kloepfer*) 1442; (Mr. *Douglas*) 1463; (Mr. *Wallace*) 1471; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1486; (Mr. *Bennett*) 1501; (Mr. *Davis*) 1511; (Mr. *Kendry*) 1515; (Mr. *Roche*) 1518; (Mr. *Wilson*) 1528; (Mr. *Casey*) 1560; (Mr. *Clancy*) 1574; (Mr. *McMillan*) 1589; (Mr. *Powell*) 1603; (Mr. *Macdonnell, Selkirk*) 1615 (i).
PREFERENTIAL CLAUSE: In Com. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2845, 2960, 3095, 3101, 3133, 3249; (Mr. *Davies*) 2865; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2888; (Mr. *Foster*) 2902, 2945, 2970, 3078, 3091, 3095, 3099, 3127, 3158; (Mr *Ross Robertson*) 2909; (Mr. *Craig*) 2910, 3153, 3170; (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 2920; (Mr. *Rogers*) 2944, 3023, 3231; (Mr. *McNeill*) 2944, 3195, 3207; (Mr. *Paterson*) 2945, 2953, 3141; (Mr. *Davin*) 2956; (Mr. *Ives*) 2965; (Mr. *Fielding*) 2966, 3129, 3150, 3167, 3179; (Mr. *Laurier*) 2983, 3079, 3098; (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2989; (Mr. *Frost*) 2997; (Mr. *Clancy*) 3015, 3150, 3166, 3184; (Mr. *Bennett*) 3029, 3036, 3162; (Mr. *Charlton*) 3044; (Mr. *Wallace*) 3060; (Mr. *Beattie*) 3074, 3169; (Mr. *Dupont*) 3079; (Mr. *Sproule*) 3104, 3147, 3167, 3174; (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 3105; (Mr. *Russell*) 3108; (Mr. *Taylor*) 3115; (Mr. *Davin*) 3121; (Mr. *Bell, Addington*) 3153; (Mr. *McMullen*) 3161; (Mr. *Taylor*) 3180; (Mr. *Henderson*) 3189; (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 3185; (Mr. *McHugh*) 3193; (Mr. *Kendry*) 3207; (Mr. *McClure*) 3211; (Mr. *Ganong*) 3215; (Mr. *Domville*) 3223 (ii).
COMBINE CLAUSE: In Com. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3247; (Mr. *Fielding*) 3250; (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3251; (Mr. *Britton*) 3255; (Mr. *Craig*) 3258; (Mr *Davies*) 3264, 3306; (Mr. *Wallace*) 3271, 3290, 3332; (Mr. *Sproule*) 3296; (Mr. *Foster*) 3299; (Mr. *Henderson*) 3308; (Mr. *Taylor*) 3311, 3329; (Mr. *Clancy*) 3313; (Mr. *Bennett*) 3314; (Mr. *Dupont*) 3319; (Mr. *McCleary*) 3323; (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 3328; (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) 3330 (i).
TARIFF CHANGES: In Com. (advertising matter, &c.) 3474; (agricultural implements) 4152, 4155; (axes, scythes, &c.) 4169; (barbed wire) 3659; (books, &c.) 3465, 3706; (brass wire) 3694; (Britannia metal) 3703; (buckthorn, &c., fencing) 3679, 4147, 4161; (carriage hardware) 4470; (chinaware, &c.) 3496; (clothes wringers) 4166, 4167; (coal) 4466; (coal, bituminous) 4194; (coal, bituminous slack) 4192; (coal oil) 3478; (condensed milk) 3409; (corn meal) 3421; (cotton

WAYS AND MEANS—*Con.*

duck) 4186; (cotton fabrics) 4179, 4180; duck belting, &c.) 3710; (eggs) 3408; (files and rasps) 3698, 4133, 4137; (fur caps) 4192; (hats, caps, &c.) 4192; (hides and skins, &c.) 3711; (Indian corn) 3409, 3417, 3426, 4399; (India rubber boots, belting, &c.) 4145; (iron forgings) 3639; (iron or steel angles) 3637; (iron or steel ingots) 3637; (iron or steel nuts, &c.) 3696; (iron or steel, scrap) 3583, 3630; (labels) 3474; (marble, &c.) 3497; (medicinal preparations) 3477; (metal glove fasteners, &c.) 4466; (mutton, &c.) 3358; (newspapers, &c.) 3707; (Norway iron, &c.) 3718; (oleo-stearine) 3712; (paintings, &c.) 3708; (pears and peaches) 4132, 4133; (photographs, &c.) 3475; (putty) 3478; (rice) 4150; (salmon, fresh) 3418; (salt, &c.) 3713; (screws, &c. 3655; (shirts and shirt waists) 4189; (shoe tacks) 3652; (shovels, &c.) 3703; (skates, &c) 3696, 4152; (socks, &c.) 4187; (spirituous liquors, &c.) 3352; (springs, axles, &c.) 3640; (stereotypes, &c.) 3703; (strip fencing, &c.) 3633; (sugar) 4395; (sugar candy) 4398; (sugar confectionery) 4398; (surgical instruments) 3477; (tanning bark) 3711; (tea and coffee) 3718; (travellers' baggage) 3706; (velvets, &c.) 4465; (vermouth, &c.) 3357; (watch cases) 4168; (wheat flour) 3442; (wire cable) 3693; (wire nails) 3640, 3645; (woollen fabrics) 4191; (woollen yarns) 4187. (ii).

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES, GAS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2511, 2551 (i).

——— INSPECTOR, PORT ARTHUR, APPNMT. : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 793 (i).

——— METRICAL SYSTEM : Ques. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 1027 (i).

WELLAND CANAL, DISMISSALS : Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 2122 (i).

Welland Power and Supply Canal Co.'s B. No. 44 (Mr. *Sutherland*). 1°*, 1072; 2°*, 1202; in Com. and 3°*, 1936 (i). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 73.)

WELLAND CANAL, SUPERANNUATIONS : conc., 5454 (ii).

WELLER'S BAY AS AN OUTPORT, VALUE OF GOODS, &C. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Corby*) 1663 (i).

WELSFORD AND GAGETOWN (N.B.) RY. SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4736 (ii).

WEST, H. A., POSTMASTER AT ANNAPOLIS, DISMISSAL, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 567 (i).

WESTMINSTER AND BURRARD INLET TELEPHONE CO. : Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 2420 (i).

WEST POINT WHARF, P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 2730.

WHARFS, REPAIRS TO : in Com. of Sup., 2295 (i).

WHEAT FLOUR : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3442.

WHITE, ISAAC, POSTMASTER AT FORT ERIE, DISMISSAL, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 3238 (ii).

WIGGINS, JOHN, DISMISSAL FROM B.C. PENITENTIARY : Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 2418 (i).

WILLIAMSBURG CANAL, RETIRING ALLOWANCE, MR. HICKEY : in Com. of Sup., 5277 (ii).

——— W. J. CASSELMAN'S DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 2415 (i).

WILLIAMS HEAD STATION, QUARANTINE SUPT., DISMISSAL : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Prior*) 1663 (i).

WILLIAMS, P. J., INDIAN INSTRUCTOR, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1450 (i).

WINDSOR JUNCTION, I.C.R., AND UPPER MUSQUODOBOIT RY. SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 4738; in Com., 5520 (ii).

Winnipeg, Duluth and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 17 (Mr. *Macdonell*). 1°*, 707; 2°*, 785; in Com. and 3° m., 2448 (i); 3°*, 2775 (ii).

WINNIPEG IMMIGRATION BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 4949 (ii).

——— INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, NAME OF PRINCIPAL, DATE OF APPNMT., &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 490.

——— *See* "FAIRLIE, REV. MR."

——— AND ST. BONIFACE HOSPITAL : in Com. of Sup., 2263 (i).

WINTER MAIL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 2293 (i).

WIRE CABLE : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3693 (ii).

WIRE NAILS : in Com. of Ways and Means, 3640, 3645 (ii).

WOOD ISLAND (P.E.I.) DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER : (Mr. *Martin*) 787 (i).

——— HARBOUR, DREDGING : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 792.

WOOD MOUNTAIN SCOUTS, CLAIMS FOR SCRIP : prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1051, 2031, 2033 (i).

WOOLLEN FABRICS : in Com. of Ways and Means, 4191 (ii).

——— YARNS : in Com. of Ways and Means, 4187.

WRECKS, INVESTIGATION INTO : in Com. of Sup., 2290.

YOUNG'S COVE, POST OFFICE (N.S.) : Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 485 (i).

Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Co.'s B. No. 118 (Mr. *Maxwell*). 1°*, 2967; 2°*, 3465; in Com. and 3°*, 4050 (ii). (60-61 *Vic.*, c. 91.)